United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 2022 No. 107

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CORREA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 23, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable J. LUIS CORREA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASSAGE OF TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today is the 50th anniversary of the passage of Title IX, legislation that revolutionized women's sports and women's access to education.

Since the Education Amendments of 1972 passed, women's participation in sports has skyrocketed. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, only 1 out of every 27 women participated in college-level sports. Today, that number is one in five.

Title IX granted women equal access to educational opportunities, including college admissions and teaching positions at postsecondary institutions. Because of this, more women are going to college today than ever before.

While this monumental legislation has strengthened our country and our workforce beyond belief, it is under threat today. Expanding this legislation to include other designations like sexual orientation and gender identity goes beyond the intent of Congress.

It also dilutes protections for women, and in some cases, threatens their safety.

We already knew Democrats were willing to weaponize Title IX when they used it to deny due process to students accused of sexual assault on college campuses.

The rights of due process should not end simply because someone is a student, but, thankfully, the Trump administration set things right on this front.

Now, new threats are emerging. While the advancements made under Title IX have been numerous, the Biden administration is attempting to use this legislation to further a progressive social agenda.

For example, the Biden administration is threatening to hold school lunches hostage if K–12 schools do not agree to a slew of controversial gender-neutral policies.

One of these policies will likely be forcing schools to allow biological males to compete in girls' sports, something already happening at many schools across the country.

The results are in: It erases women. Let me say that again: It erases women.

Ignoring the biological differences between the male and female body is a catastrophe for women, especially in sports. It destroys a level playing field and makes women second-class citizens in their own sports.

Even the international stage has begun to take notice as the International Swimming Federation voted to restrict many transgender women from competing in international swimming competitions. We have already seen women's records in swimming and track obliterated by biological males.

Athletes give their all to be the best they can be. It is cruel to take the chance of success away from women, especially when it could mean losing out on a college scholarship or other important opportunities.

Perhaps even more concerning is the threat these policies pose to women's safety. It is completely irresponsible to take away a woman's right to privacy and security by mandating gender-neutral spaces.

Allowing biological males, even if they identify as a woman, into women's locker rooms, bathrooms, jails, and domestic violence shelters poses a threat to the safety of women.

I shouldn't have to spell this out for you. It is common sense. Today should be a day of celebration, one where we marvel at the gains women have made in sports and in education, but the Biden administration's actions have certainly put a damper on this momentous anniversary.

It is time for Democrats to regain their senses, and, once again, commit to protecting—protecting—the integrity of women's sports and the safety of women. This political agenda is destructive and unbecoming of a country dedicated to equal opportunity for all.

SLASHING THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate President

Printed on recycled paper.

Biden's massive accomplishment of slashing the Federal deficit by more than any other President in the first 16 months.

Mr. Speaker, this is huge. But even better news: Biden is on track to double down on building a better America for generations to come.

This year's deficit is on track to fall by $1.7 trillion which is the single largest 1-year reduction in American history. I repeat: This is the single largest reduction in American history.

In contrast, the Trump administration increased the Federal budget deficit. Every single year in office, it went up.

I can't say I am surprised, however. This accomplishment of the President is not coincidence. It is the result of a well-designed and well-managed recovery plan from the pandemic.

It is a result of President Biden and Congress passing key legislation like the historical American Rescue Plan which got people back to work, kids back in school, and families healthy again.

It is the result of a President who puts people first—not politics, people.

But on another note, it is no secret that the recent price hikes that have been caused by the war criminal Putin are burdening hardworking families. In fact, Putin's price hike has increased gas prices by $2 a gallon in many places since Russian troops began to threaten Ukraine, and families are seeing higher prices in the grocery aisles, too.

Sadly, Putin is increasing inflation, not only here in America, but also throughout the globe. House Democrats and President Biden won't stand for this. My colleagues and I are working side by side with the President to lower costs for working people at the gas pump, at the grocery store, and across the shelves.

That is why House Democrats passed critical bills like the Lowering Food and Fuel Costs Act, Ocean Shipping Reform Act, and the Consumer Fuel Price Gouging Prevention Act.

These key bills will strengthen our supply chains, create more maritime jobs in communities like my home district, and lower both gas and goods prices.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the President announced that he is in favor of taking a pause of 3 months on the Federal gas tax. He has challenged Congress to pass that, to put a pause on the Federal gasoline tax for 3 months.

Now, our tax is 18 cents. That would be 18 cents per gallon every time someone fills up. He challenged all of the Governors to do the same.

Some Governors, like the Governors of Florida and Georgia and others, have already done this. In my State of Texas, that means an additional savings of 20 cents. Added together, that would be 38 cents a gallon.

That is huge. That is a huge savings in cutting prices down. For an average tank of 15 gallons, that would be a savings of $5.70 every time they fill up.

So I hope that our Governor does like Florida and Georgia and rises to the challenge that the President has made yesterday and puts a pause on Texas' gasoline tax.

House Democrats are taking strong steps. We are joining hands with the President to make sure that we lower rising prices caused by Putin's cruel war in Ukraine. I call on all my Republican colleagues across the aisle to join us.

Most Republicans voted against all those bills that I just mentioned. It is time to act. Enough is enough. I urge them to fight with us for hardworking American families. Together, we can build a better America for today and for generations to come.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF COTTON ROSSER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep, deep regret and sadness over the loss of a local legend, Cotton Rosser, who was 93 years old.

Known as a top rodeo man all over the north State and even all over the country, he is known for winning so many awards and accolades in his job as a rodeo man.

He used to open for the National Finals Rodeo in Las Vegas at least 10 years in a row. He had the Flying U Company, a rodeo company that traveled all over the Western States, bringing his show.

He was always, always improving the show, making it into something spectacular. He would bring ideas from ice skating and others to make the show even more spectacular. He was innovative in that.

He was recognized in 2019 as a Legend of ProRodeo, 1995 ProRodeo Hall of Fame inductee, 1985 PRCA Stock Contractor of the Year, over 60 years doing shows, and over 70 years in rodeo.

He was truly a good man, a nice man, and his family is his legacy, the good people they are, that he leaves behind.

The legacy with the Red Bluff Round-Up and taking stock up there and Colusa Western Days, I have participated in all these things as an observer, the Marysville Stampede. It has just been such a rich part of northern California and the West and, indeed, the whole country.

I will leave you with a quote from him. You know, he was 93, so in recent years, having had to retire somewhat, he said, ''I am just the PR man now. I never imagined my rodeo career would be like this. I am the richest guy in the world with memories and friends. I loved every minute of the rodeo business, and I would do it all over again.'' Such a great memory, indeed.

A good friend of mine; hard to deal with. We are very proud of Cotton Rosser in northern California.

SECURITY FOR OUR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. Speaker, any day now, the Supreme Court is expected to make an official announcement on their decision in the Dobbs v. Jackson case.

Ever since the draft opinion was leaked, radical leftists have tried to intimidate, threaten, and harass the conservative Justices on the Court.

There have been multiple attacks against pro-life and pregnancy centers across the whole country. A deranged individual was caught plotting to assassinate Justice Brett Kavanaugh and his family at their home.

He was caught carrying a handgun, two clips of ammunition, a tactical knife, pepper spray, a crowbar, a nail punch, duct tape, a hammer, and a screwdriver outside their home.

The White House refused to condemn this heinous crime. The pro-abortion group, Ruth Sent Us, publicly threatened Justice Amy Coney Barrett's children, as well. They tweeted the exact location of the children's school and church, along with the schedules of when they would be there. These radicals are jeopardizing the lives of our Justices' families.

It took a month for congressional Democrats and Senate Leader SCHUMER to bring the Supreme Court Police Parity Act to the floor for a vote. This bill offers security to family members of the Supreme Court Justices, which is more critical than ever.

While unnecessarily delaying the bill, Speaker PELOSI even had the audacity to claim, ''Nobody is in danger over the weekend because of our not having a bill.'' There was an assassination plot. Of course, people were, in fact, in danger.

Despite the slew of threats, I pray that the Court does the right thing for our Nation's unborn and upholds our Constitution.

Overturning Roe does not ban abortion but rightly returns the abortion debate back to Congress and to the State legislatures. In our Republic, those elected by the people should be the ones to create laws and balance tradeoffs, not judges.

In the nearly 50 years since Roe became the law of the land, over 63 million unborn children have been killed due to judicial activism.

Life begins at the moment of conception, and an overwhelming number of Americans believe in protecting babies still in the womb. In order to preserve our judicial system, we cannot allow these intimidation tactics to win the day. The Court must be allowed to do its job unfettered while not actively legislating from the bench.

□ 1015

CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF PELL GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of the Pell Grant Program.

In 1972, Congress amended the Higher Education Act by creating the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant to provide direct financial aid to low-income students so they could have the same access to higher education and opportunity for success as their higher income peers.

The program was later named the Pell grant for its original sponsor, Senator Pell, Democrat from Rhode Island. The original bill was signed into law by Republican President Richard Nixon, and the program has maintained this original bipartisan support over the last 50 years.

To date, more than 80 million students have received a Pell grant to go to college since the program was created. Currently, nearly 7 million students are going to college with a Pell grant, or about 40 percent of undergraduate students. In my district in the great city of Philadelphia, nearly 22,000 students receive $90.5 million to pursue their higher education goals.

The Federal investment in Pell grants is targeted to students with demonstrated financial need, students whose families have incomes of $40,000 or less. The investment pays off by increasing college completion and economic mobility.

On the 50-year anniversary of the Pell Grant Program, I encourage the United States to celebrate national Pell grant day by recognizing the current students and successful graduates who have benefited from the program by telling their student success stories and encouraging the same access for future students, demonstrating the importance of what the Pell grant has meant.

The Pell grant is significant to the future of this country, and it is important that we all stand up for this program that has been valuable to our young people for the future, no matter what side of the aisle we are on.

THE PERILS OF EXPERTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, we all know the tale of ''The Emperor's New Clothes.'' Grifters convince an emperor that they are expert tailors who weave a cloth so fine that only the virtuous can see it. The emperor wraps himself in nothing and parades the streets as all the townspeople compete to signal their own virtue by proclaiming how beautiful the material is, even though their own common sense tells them otherwise. This scheme is successful until a little boy who knows better states the obvious.

For 2 years now, we were told by the experts that they could stop COVID–19 if everyone did exactly as they commanded. I am science, as one put it. They quashed debate within the medical community and ridiculed, censored, and fired any dissenters.

Looking back, we can clearly see what a self-destructive folly they produced. Study after study now confirms the obvious, that the mask mandate, school closures, home detention orders, and business closures had virtually no impact on the virus. But they did appalling damage to the economy, seriously harmed children in ways we are still cataloging, and cost untold lives due to suicides, drug and alcohol overdoses, delayed health screenings and treatments, and poverty-related deaths.

This recent, tragic experience should warn us all to be much more skeptical of surrendering common sense to so-called experts and of suppressing free debate over what science actually is telling us, which brings us to the Democrats' ongoing and escalating war on fossil fuels.

The road they have placed us on leads to a bleak future of unaffordable energy, rolling blackouts, empty shelves, and increasingly brutal rationing of every watt of electricity and drop of gasoline that we once took for granted.

Gasoline prices are already the highest ever seen in this country as we have discouraged production. Electricity prices are skyrocketing, pushed by the crushing cost of renewables. Utilities across the county are now warning of summer blackouts because renewable mandates have destabilized the electricity grid.

Joe Biden and the Democrats promised to wage war on fossil fuels, and they have succeeded. On his first day in office, he canceled the Keystone pipeline, which today should have been completed and delivering 830,000 barrels of crude oil every day into American markets. He canceled oil and gas exploration on Federal lands. Just last month, he withdrew 1 million acres of land from exploration and production in oil-rich Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico.

And he blames Vladimir Putin? Under the progrowth policies of the Trump administration, America didn't need Putin's oil. We were energy independent for the first time in our lifetimes. We were producing more oil than Russia and even Saudi Arabia. The day the Democrats took office, gasoline was averaging $2.39 a gallon.

Today's sky-high fuel prices are aggravating supply chain breakdowns and adding to consumer prices. Acreage once devoted to growing corn for food is now used to produce ethanol, which requires trading an entire acre of corn to produce just 550 gallons of ethanol.

The irony is, at a time when these Green New Deal policies can't guarantee enough electricity to keep the lights on this summer at any price, these Democrat elitists are telling families to buy electric cars. Where do they think the electricity for their electric cars comes from? Eighty percent comes from fossil fuels that they are ruthlessly shutting down.

The excuse for all of this, of course, is to stop global warming, but they cannot account for why it is that there have been periods throughout paleo history when temperatures have been much higher and also much lower than they are today. Nor do they account for the infinitely more powerful natural forces that shape our constantly changing climate.

The blind reliance on handpicked experts and the suppression of dissent in our approach to COVID cost lives and destroyed the most prosperous economic expansion in our lifetimes. But its excesses pale in comparison to what the green left is now doing to our society. The pain and damage we are feeling today is just the first bitter taste of what is to come if they prevail.

Of one thing we can be certain: Whether or not we destroy our Nation's prosperity by continuing the Democrats' war on fossil fuels, the Earth will continue to warm and cool, as it has for billions of years. The only question we can answer is whether ours will be a future of abundance or scarcity, prosperity or poverty, comfort or misery.

FAREWELL TO JULIE NICKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge my chief of staff, Julie Little Nickson, who, after 22 years of service in the House and 20 years in my office, will soon be departing the Hill.

Let me take a moment to acknowledge Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, who Julie worked for prior to coming to my office and for her gracious help with Julie's transition to my office.

Julie joined my staff in 2002 and quickly distinguished herself as a skilled manager and leader of Team Lee. She undoubtedly got to know many district constituents and hit the ground running.

Her keen understanding of the intersection of policy, politics, and procedure has helped drive so many accomplishments through the decades. She has also ensured that my constituents understand the relationship between our work in Washington, D.C., and their daily lives.

From her work advancing my efforts as coauthor of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, PEPFAR, back in 2003 to the development and enactment of the historic American Women Quarters act in 2020, Julie has been the strategic guiding force propelling my agenda. She makes sure that the inclusion of staff is prominent in everything I do and that staff is recognized and is central to her work.

She has been the key and steady leader of my work to prevent the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Of course, that work grew and expanded to include numerous efforts to end our forever wars and rein in unchecked executive war powers, including my work to repeal the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs.

As my chief of staff during my time as both the chair of the CPC and later when I chaired the Congressional Black Caucus in 2009 and 2010, Julie helped build coalitions and advanced our policy and communications agenda forward. This was really not an easy task, but as always, she rose to the occasion.

Her two decades of appropriations experience has helped me deliver significant resources to my congressional district over the years, including from major infrastructure and transit projects, critical research and healthcare funding, and so many projects that have helped improve the lives of my constituents.

Her knowledge of both domestic and international Federal spending programs and policies has helped me champion and support the growth of vital human needs programs along with domestic and international health and development.

As a manager, Julie has always led by example with her deep commitment and mission-driven approach to the work. She has helped and led, shaped, and developed numerous staff, interns, and many fellows over the years, and they have soared in their professions and what they do after they leave my office.

In a very determined yet congenial way, she has made sure my district staff and D.C. staff work together as one seamless staff, reflecting the values and commitment to public service and constituent casework as Team Lee.

I have had the privilege to know Julie through many phases of her life. When she came to my office, she was single with no children. She got married to a wonderful man, Mike Nickson. Later, when she became pregnant, we were really all happy for her and Mike but wondered when she would stop working. She worked until the last minute, and we all were delighted that she had a beautiful daughter, Cate, who will turn 16 next month.

Cate has become a progressive, free-spirited young lady. Of course, Cate spent many years in my office through the years and developed a keen sense of social justice through watching and listening to her mother as she executed our agenda for the people.

As the daughter of Sandra and Harell Little, who instilled such a strong commitment to public service, Julie has been a caring and loving daughter and has always demonstrated an amazing work-life balance. I thank her parents for raising such a brilliant and passionate daughter.

As Julie enters her next phase of life, she will now work directly to save lives as a representative of the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network. She has always been about life-affirming efforts, and no doubt she will continue with her life's mission as she has answered God's call for this next chapter of her life.

We wish her good luck. We wish her God's blessings.

And just a reminder, Julie, that once a member of Team Lee, always a member of Team Lee.

CORRECTING AN EGREGIOUS MISTAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, almost 50 years ago, the Supreme Court incorrectly decided that the right to end an unborn child's life existed in the U.S. Constitution. On that day, the United States became one of only six countries that allow abortion on demand throughout the entirety of pregnancy, putting us in the same category as Communist China and North Korea.

Now, almost 50 years later, we might be on the precipice of the Court correcting their egregious mistake. Unfortunately, due to the actions of a rogue actor with no regard for the laws or institutions of our country, Justices must withstand attempts to dissuade them from changing that ruling. Inexcusably, those attempts to intimidate the High Court's opinion have even turned violent.

In fact, since that rogue actor, who I believe broke the law and should be held accountable to the full extent of the law, leaked Justice Alito's draft opinion on Dobbs v. Jackson, a fence had to be constructed outside the Court to prevent attempts from left-wing agitators to ''burn it down.''

There was also a reported attempt to assassinate Justice Kavanaugh, which was thankfully foiled by our brave law enforcement officers.

As we are all surely aware, anti-life demonstrators have held protests for weeks outside the homes of Justice Clarence Thomas, Amy Coney Barrett, and Brett Kavanaugh, which is a direct violation of 18 U.S.C. 1507.

Instead of breaking up these illegal demonstrations and putting an end to the intimidation and mob rule so prevalent on the left these days, President Biden's Justice Department has allowed them to proceed unabated.

This, in my mind, sounds like an endorsement of lawlessness or at least a two-tiered justice system. This administration doesn't seem interested in enforcing laws that aren't politically expedient, whether it is at the southern border or elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that I am 100 percent pro-life. I signed an amicus brief in support of overturning Roe v. Wade, and I remain hopeful that the Supreme Court will, indeed, finally overturn it. The number of lives lost since Roe v. Wade was wrongly decided is truly unfathomable. Countless lives have been lost that will never be granted the privilege to walk on God's Earth with those listening to this speech today.

For years, we have prayed. Finally, those prayers may potentially be answered.

□ 1030

If so, that does not mean our work is done. While the power to legislate with regard to abortion policy will be returned to the legislative bodies where our Founders intended such power to reside, much work remains at every level of government—State, local, and Federal—to ensure Progressives don't pass legislation that provides for taxpayer-funded abortions, something that polls show 58 percent of Americans do not support.

I promise to work day in and day out to ensure that every child is guaranteed the same right to life we all enjoy today. I will be a voice for the voiceless throughout the remaining time I have in Congress and even well after, much like my time before I arrived here in Washington. Because after all, if there is no life, there is no liberty or pursuit of happiness.

WE MUST REPEAL THE WEP AND GPO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of older Americans in my district to call for the repeal of the windfall elimination provision and the government pension offset.

For far too long, the WEP and GPO provisions have wrongfully penalized our Nation's public servants who have paid into Social Security by working second or even third jobs. That means that public servants in my district, like Fran, a retired schoolteacher from San Jacinto, are seeing their Social Security cut because of bureaucratic red tape. She wrote to me and told me that her Social Security benefits have been reduced by $500 per month. Fran deserves better.

Our Nation's retired teachers, police officers, and firefighters deserve better, too. After a lifetime of hard work and paying into Social Security, there is no justification for them to miss out on their earned income in their golden years. We have an obligation, a responsibility, to take care of them and ensure they receive the benefits that they have earned through years of hard work.

We must pass the Social Security 2100 Act to finally eliminate the WEP and GPO provisions, strengthen Social Security, and give our Nation's seniors a much-needed increase in benefits. This repeal is long overdue. Our seniors cannot afford to wait any longer for the fairness, relief, and peace of mind that they deserve.

IN SUPPORT OF THE FARM WORKFORCE MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to call on the Senate to stand with our Nation's farmworkers and pass H.R. 1603, the Farm Workforce Modernization Act, immediately.

Yesterday, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus brought together over 20

key national and regional organizations that advocate for farmworkers who, despite carrying the burden of injuries and illnesses during the pandemic, kept our country fed.

We discussed injustices that our campesinos face when it comes to healthcare, education, housing, workers' rights, and immigration. Together, we are working together to craft meaningful solutions to these challenges that will help our Nation's farmworker communities thrive.

An immediate solution is for the Senate to pass the bipartisan Farm Workforce Modernization Act that the House has passed. We need 10 Republican Senators to agree and pass the Farm Workforce Modernization Act out of the Senate to make this much-needed legislation into law.

Right now, from vineyards in California to fields in the Midwest and ranches in the South, growers are concerned about an unstable workforce and a labor shortage. Many farmworkers toil in the fields with uncertainty and fear of being deported and separated from their families. The COVID–19 pandemic has only heightened these concerns.

Unfortunately, this uncertainty and these labor disruptions are contributing to the destabilization of our farms and to higher food prices across America.

We need the Farm Workforce Modernization Act to bring certainty and solutions for growers, farmworkers, and their families.

Now, more than ever, we must stabilize and modernize our farm workforce, keep families together, and secure a pathway to citizenship for our essential and vital farmworkers.

This Congress, the CHC recognized these urgent needs and led the charge to get this bipartisan bill passed out of the House.

Now, I repeat, we just need 10 Republican Senators to get on board so that we can pass this out of the Senate and make it law.

To them I say, Let's get it done.

To our Nation's farmworkers, I say, We stand with you. We fight for you. The CHC is doubling down. We will never stop fighting for our farmworker communities. We will fight ''with strength,'' ''con puno y fuerza,'' to ensure that their labor rights, immigration status, and access to education, healthcare and housing are secure.

Together, we stand firm in our resolve and strong in our fight to protect farmworkers, our vital workforce, and their access to healthcare, education, housing rights, and citizenship.

As the proud son of farmworkers, I stand before this body today to let our farmworkers know, ''Together, we can. Yes, we can.'' ''Juntos podemos. Si se puede.''

REMEMBERING PAUL LOVEZZOLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the wonderful life of Mr. Paul Lovezzola of Bloomingdale, Georgia, who passed away on Friday, June 3. He was 79 years old.

He was the owner and operator of the beloved Lovezzola's Pizza Family Restaurant since 1978, which has proudly fed of city of Pooler for almost 45 years.

Above all, Paul was a devout family man who worked hard to support his family and spoil his grandchildren.

Paul was orphaned at the age of 12. From that young age, he looked up to our military servicemembers, which led him to serve in the U.S. Air Force.

He was communicant of Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Church, where he is remembered as a people person, a hard worker, and for always having a story to tell.

Paul served the people of Pooler for many years. In fact, he loved the city so much that he faced his restaurant toward Pooler instead of I–95.

My prayers are with his wife of 57 years, Juanita Lovezzola, and his three children, Steven, Sherri, and Tim, along with their nine grandchildren whom he dearly loved.

RECOGNIZING SOUTHERN SOUL BARBEQUE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Southern Soul Barbeque for winning the Brunswick-Golden Isles Small Business of the Year for their superior barbecue and service to their community.

The Small Business of the Year award is awarded to a business that demonstrates excellent knowledge and integrity while providing a valuable service to the community.

Southern Soul Barbeque has continuously delivered their mission of support for the citizens and the local business community while exhibiting initiative, creativity, and a can-do attitude.

Businesses like this are what binds our precious communities together and keeps our economies moving in the right direction. Plus, it is always great to enjoy some exceptional southern-style barbecue.

I look forward to being in St. Simons for many reasons, but the pulled pork from Southern Soul Barbeque is certainly toward the top of the list. It is a must every time for me.

It is my honor to recognize a commendable business such as Southern Soul Barbeque, and I wish them great success in the future as they continue to set an example for other small businesses in the community.

IN MEMORY OF KIRK WARNER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of the legendary and beloved Kirk Warner, a teacher, a coach, a mentor, a father figure, and a friend to so many in his community, who peacefully passed away last June 16.

Kirk was a football fanatic with an apparent gift for the game from a young age, which ultimately led him to play tight end for the University of Georgia and then go on and spend 21 seasons as the head coach of the Liberty County High School football team.

From his first day at the school, he made Liberty County his home and was known for being a humble man with a true passion for inspiring the next generations through his coaching.

He was known for putting highly competitive teams on the field and took pride in his players being the best they could be, inspiring some to make it to the NFL.

The fact that his players respect him as much as they do, truly speaks to his character as a coach and as a man.

His legacy has been left for the rest of us to learn from and live by, to help guide the future generations of young student leaders and athletes through faith, love, and respect for others.

STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH THE LGBTQI+ COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with transgender and nonbinary young people and condemn the relentless discriminatory, anti-LGBTQ+ bills and hateful rhetoric we are witnessing across the Nation.

In recent months, Republican State legislatures and elected officials have targeted the LGBTQ+ community for cheap political gain and referred falsely to anyone who opposes attempts to infringe on the rights of others as ''groomers''.

There are at least 206 active bills across State legislatures this year alone that target the LGBTQ+ community.

Here are some samples of this hateful legislation:

Excluding trans youth from participating in school sports.

Restricting trans youth from accessing the bathroom.

Banning curriculum to deny the existence of LGBTQ+ people in the classroom.

Criminalizing medical providers who provide gender-affirming healthcare.

Targeting parents of LGBTQ+ children who simply want to support their kids as best they can.

That is right: LGBTQ+ rights are being attacked from all angles.

In Texas, providing gender-affirming healthcare is now considered ''child abuse,'' and parents of transgender youth face a real risk of being separated from their children.

This month, in Idaho, a group of extremists were arrested after plotting to riot and cause violence during a Pride event. In recent days, as people around the United States have sought out the joyous parades and events that come with Pride Month, including in my own district, GOP politicians and preachers have put out calls for killing LGBTQ+ people.

There is no doubt: Bigotry toward the LGBTQ+ community has grave and potentially life-threatening consequences. According to the Trevor Project, in the past year, 45 percent of LGBTQ+ young people seriously considered attempting suicide, including more than half of transgender and nonbinary youth. Similarly, 93 percent of transgender and nonbinary youth reported worrying about being denied access to medical care due to State and local laws.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as the dad of a gay son and a longtime ally of the LGBTQ+ community to say that these radical policies have no place in America and that this Congress must take concrete action.

In February of this year, I was proud to vote to pass the Equality Act, which protects LGBTQ+ people from discrimination in jobs, housing, and public accommodations. While it would not undo every single one of these horrible State policies I have mentioned, it would go a long way to enhance the civil rights of the LGBTQ+ community and send the message that we stand against bigotry and hate.

Unfortunately, the filibuster is holding this bill up in the Senate. One thing is for certain: The filibuster must be abolished to create any viable pathway to send the Equality Act to President Biden's desk. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to hear the cries of the LGBTQ+ community members, and particularly trans and nonbinary young people, who need these protections desperately and are counting on your support.

Here in the House, our work is far from done. I am glad we are considering the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act, which improves data collection on sexual orientation and gender identity to provide better resources for the LGBTQ+ community so that we have the data we need to make good law. We must also pass legislation to provide mental health care for LGBTQ+ people, offer hate crimes protections, and uplift and support the dignity of all LGBTQ+ individuals across this Nation.

All of us, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, must stand collectively against this hate and foster inclusion for all. Let's get to work.

FARM BILL IMPACT SERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to deliver the twelfth installment of my Farm Bill Impact Series: The Second State of Agriculture.

We are at the end of the second quarter, and one of the biggest issues facing agriculture across the board is the cost of things. Farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers are laboring under the skyrocketing input costs while they work hard to keep our country fed, fueled, and clothed. They deserve workable solutions to this inflation crisis before the situation gets any worse.

The U.S. farm economy crashed in the early to mid-1980s due in part to surging inflation. From 2000 to 2020, the average annual rate of inflation was 2.1 percent, which economists consider a normal rate of inflation that helps drive overall economic growth. Last year, prices increased 7 percent overall throughout 2021, which was the largest December-to-December percentage change since 1981.

□ 1045

Inflation is a matter of life and death for the American farm. We saw it in the early 1980s, and now we are seeing it again. Farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers are feeling the effects of inflation more acutely than almost anyone else in America.

In agriculture, commodity prices generally rise during periods of inflation, but input costs rise as well. Data collected by USDA shows that over the past three decades, on average, the input costs for U.S. farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers tend to increase more than the rate of inflation and more than the prices that they receive for their products. To make matters worse, USDA estimates that input costs will continue to rise at least 5 to 6 percent throughout 2022.

In the last 12 months, feed, supplies, and repairs are all up 13 percent while ag chemicals, building materials, and machinery are all up 21 percent.

Most shockingly, just during the last 12 months, fuel is up 115 percent, natural gas is up 202 percent, and fertilizer is up 220 percent.

Think about that. This year it is costing farmers more than double what it cost last year to farm their land.

The farm bill contains relief safety net programs like crop insurance and livestock indemnity, but these programs don't account for the rising costs of fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed. Agriculture is a business, and business owners can't afford to lose money year after year, which is happening now thanks to skyrocketing inflation. We need to get this situation under control.

A Kansas wheat grower recently said to me:

''Fertilizer is one of the largest expenses on any commercial farming operation. My farm has already used more than 450 tons of fertilizer for this cropping season, which includes nearly 350,000 pounds of UAN, specifically. Even though we cut back on how much we use because of the increased price, it will still cost our farm almost $70,000 more than last year. Looking forward, we will undoubtedly have to cut back on fertilizer again until prices begin to come down.''

Fertilizer cost is a major problem, but the rising cost of everything else is only compounding the issue further. For instance, if you are a Kansas rancher looking to replace all the fence on your farm with 4-barb, Red Brand wire, last year you would have been quoted $10,000 per mile. This year, quotes are coming in at around $20,000 a mile, so it has doubled. Think about that.

From fertilizer to fuel to equipment to fencing, inflation is crushing producers across this country. How can small business owners keep up with this? How can we expect the people who bear the responsibility of feeding, fueling, and clothing the world to shoulder that burden while going broke from doing so?

The people who make sacrifices so that we can eat can't afford to buy gas to drive their kids to school right now. They can't afford to pay their mortgages. American farmers are perfectly capable of producing plentiful, healthy affordable food, but no matter how much they grow and sell, inflation is killing their margins and they are going out of business.

How does the Biden administration respond to this crisis? Well, the President's budget proposal dismantles the stepped-up basis and imposes new capital gains taxes like the farm killer tax on small businesses held in families for 90 years or more. These proposals would destroy thousands of American family farms overnight. House Democrats, for their part, would like to distract the Federal Reserve with social policy while inflation is at a 40-year high.

These ideas are a slap in the face to every American farmer, rancher, and agricultural producer. While this administration burns through money like there is no tomorrow, American producers are working tirelessly to keep America secure despite the effects of inflation on their businesses. We owe them not only a debt of gratitude, but also real solutions to the inflation crisis before it is too late.

SOCIAL SECURITY—A SACRED TRUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, this global pandemic has impacted every nation in the world. But here in America, as we have seen, with just over a million people who have passed, 750,000 of them are over the age of 65.

Those seniors are also the people hurt hardest by inflation, as are all the individuals who are on a fixed income. Democrats have a plan. We have a plan to address all of Americans' rising expenses that they are experiencing. We have a plan to address them today, tomorrow, and into the future. It is called Social Security.

Social Security is the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty

program for children. And yet, Congress has not taken any action to expand benefits in more than 50 years. Democrats have a plan to expand benefits today, tomorrow, and forever.

The Republicans have a plan also. Their plan is to end Social Security in 5 years. It is time for us to have this debate in front of the American public, not behind closed doors and let people know where their Member stands.

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to this poster behind me. This poster demonstrates that Democrats have a plan to increase Social Security benefits. Republicans have a plan to cut benefits 20 percent across the aboard.

Democrats have a plan that will ensure that Americans are able to keep pace with inflation and rising costs. The last time Congress did anything with Social Security, a gallon of milk was 71 cents. We all know what the cost of living is today, but inaction is inexcusable.

The Republicans call for 20 separate benefit cuts to Social Security, and most importantly, say we are going to get there by raising the age. For every year you raise the age, that is a 7 percent cut in people's benefits. The idea that people would say, Well, people are living longer so we have to raise their age—imagine that. So you are living longer; the Republicans want you to live on less or work until you die.

The time of reckoning is upon us. President Biden has called Social Security a sacred trust. As you heard Mr. RUIZ say before, the concept of making sure that WEP and GPO is repealed so that teachers and firefighters and policemen can get the benefits they deserve, and also to make sure that nobody who works all their life and pays into a system. These are not entitlements, as they say in their book and in their Republican study plan. These are the benefits that people have paid for out of their pockets; working people, of all races, colors, and creed in this Nation who deserve that sacred trust, that promise that the American people know is theirs in the sacred trust that Social Security represents.

The Republicans have a plan to end Social Security in 5 years. How about you join us and expand Social Security benefits for people who need them in the midst of this pandemic, in the face of what is happening to our seniors.

The time to act is now. We don't need a double-secret probation study like they are advocating in the Senate. We need to do this out in public, with the people, demonstrating what we stand for.

Democrats stand for enhancing benefits and improving the quality of life of our seniors. You stand for cutting their benefits and ending Social Security in 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, we will have a Special Order on this topic later today.

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

KEEP KIDS FED ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, summer is the hungriest time of year for over 11 million children currently facing food insecurity. That is 11 million children who rely on school meals as their only meal of the day.

The Federal waivers that provide free or reduced-price meals—especially during the prolonged school closures—are set to expire at the end of the month, leaving far too many students without a reliable food source.

Local schools are facing an uphill battle: Four-decade high inflation, skyrocketing costs of food, and supply chain disruptions have made for unique challenges in my district and across the country.

The Keep Kids Fed Act will transition schools—and the families served—back to paid school meal programs without increasing costs to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor to the Keep Kids Fed Act, and I urge Congress to do its part and pass this important legislation.

MY BODY, MY DATA ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, right now, as we meet in this Chamber, the Supreme Court is releasing a new slate of opinions. And like millions of people across the country, I have been waiting with dread for what is coming. As we wait, we are texting, messaging our friends and loved ones, providing support, looking for more information, and it is all taking place on our devices. That is how we live in 2022.

I am determined to make sure that as we continue to fight for our rights, we do so with policies that reflect today's world. That is why I am proud to have introduced the My Body, My Data Act, new legislation to protect our personal reproductive health data. I am proud that Senator HIRONO and Senator WYDEN have introduced a companion bill in the Senate and that we have 43 cosponsors from across the ideological spectrum here in the House.

When the Supreme Court's draft decision on Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization leaked, the decision that would undo decades of precedent and overturn the landmark opinion of Roe v. Wade, I immediately started hearing from friends and constituents, panicked that their reproductive health data could fall into the wrong hands, panicked that the personal information on their phones, on their computers could be used against them in a post-Roe world where abortion is criminalized and where laws, like the Texas bounty hunter law, give extremists a financial incentive to target vulnerable people.

Shortly after, experts started sounding the alarm that our personal reproductive health data—from search engines to menstruation and pregnancy-tracking apps—would be used to target people if abortion is criminalized. Right now, there are no protections from that happening.

Mr. Speaker, as a young woman, reproductive healthcare is my healthcare. And like tens of millions of Americans, I have used apps to track my period. When the draft decision leaked, I knew we couldn't wait for the final opinion. We couldn't just wait for Roe to be overturned so I got to work, because it is unconscionable that our personal reproductive information could be sold to the highest bidder and weaponized against us—and especially against low-income people and people of color, who would be the most impacted if Roe is overturned.

To protect access, Congress must codify the right to an abortion, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Women's Health Protection Act. Alongside strong protections for abortion access, we need strong privacy protections. That is why I introduced the My Body, My Data Act. Our personal reproductive and sexual health information is our most sensitive and personal data, and it deserves the highest level of privacy protection that the government can provide.

I am proud to say that is what the My Body, My Data Act accomplishes. It is endorsed by Planned Parenthood, NARAL, the Electronic Frontier Foundation, and many others. This bill restricts businesses and nongovernmental organizations from collecting, using, retaining, or disclosing reproductive health information beyond what is strictly necessary to provide a product or service.

The bill provides everyday people with the right to access or delete their personal reproductive health information, if they choose to, and it requires organizations to publish their privacy policies.

Importantly, the My Body, My Data Act includes strong enforcement mechanisms, including a private right of action that allows individuals to bring a lawsuit if their privacy is violated.

With 26 States likely or certain to ban abortion if Roe is overturned, this legislation is more urgent than ever. I am proud to lead this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1100

RED FLAG LAWS RIPE FOR ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, our Founders were clear. The Second Amendment was designed as the backbone upon which individual rights and liberties could be secured.

Efforts by the ruling class in our government are aimed at crippling this Nation and corroding our Republic.

It is true: Red flag laws sound benign on paper. Flagging dangerous individuals and keeping them from weaponry seems like a cut-and-dried issue, but a simple cursory glance at the actions of our overreaching Federal Government clearly shows that these laws are ripe for Federal abuse. They will abuse your rights and mine.

Make no mistake, red flag laws will be used to flag those who vote for freedom, strip them of their right to self-defense, and empower faceless bureaucrats to dole out or not to dole out the right of self-defense to a downtrodden and oppressed class of citizens.

They will be weaponized to demonize and destroy political dissidents in this country. If you raise your children to adhere to Proverbs instead of POTUS, you may be stripped of your gun rights. If you vote against the regime, you may be stripped of your gun rights. If you refuse the medical decisions pushed by the regime, you may be stripped of your gun rights.

To the American people, I say this: It is not a right if you have to ask permission to exercise it. We are very near to this government becoming the exact reason our Founders penned the Second Amendment, not to hunt deer but to defend against tyranny or invasion.

Red flag laws sound harmless on paper. We all want to keep firearms out of the hands of dangerous people, but remember who the government says that you are. The CDC has labeled you a national security problem for protecting your health. The FBI, last September, called your mothers and wives domestic terrorists for protecting your children. A House committee labeled half the country as coup-sympathetic just a few weeks ago.

The same faceless fact checkers who censor your speech will seize your sovereignty and come to your front door, and they won't be coming with a clipboard and a smile.

These liberal lackeys will show up before dawn, invade your home, seize your property, and smash any concept of individual liberty you may possess. Remember the actions the ruling elite took against those at Waco and Ruby Ridge.

We must wake up. We cannot trust this government, and we must not give them more legal avenues to persecute Americans that they took an oath to defend.

INVESTIGATE FIRES AT FOOD PROCESSING FACILITIES

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, what is next? You want our guns. You took our gas. Now, it seems that even the simple act of providing food is too difficult for this administration to accomplish.

Last week, according to The Washington Times, a fire ravaged a Festive Foods plant near Waupaca, Wisconsin. Earlier this month, at a JBS meatpacking plant near Green Bay, a fire caused nearly $30,000 in damage. In April, fires destroyed the headquarters of Azure Standard, a distributor of organic food in Oregon; the Taylor Farms processing facility in Salinas, California; and an East Conway Beef & Pork butcher shop and slaughterhouse in Conway, New Hampshire.

At least 12 U.S. food processing facilities have burned down in the last 6 months. Does no one else believe that this is worth an investigation?

This comes as 37 million chickens have been killed on U.S. poultry farms this year due to the avian flu, the worst outbreak in recorded U.S. history, and the deaths of at least 2,000 cattle in Kansas during a heat wave this month.

These accidents are coming at a time of shortages across our Nation. Essentials such as fuel, semiconductors, and even baby formula have ceased being commodities and have become as rare as coherent speech from the White House.

The American people have every right to be skeptical and to demand answers about the incidents shutting down food facilities.

It begs the question: What exactly are they doing in the White House about this? Why has a seemingly unexplainable series of food industry accidents gone unreported by the media?

Mr. Speaker, does no one care that children are starving while you and your colleagues feast at Le Diplomate?

We survived the Great Depression because our supply chains were local and a large share of American households grew much of their own food. I hope we are all practicing hunting and gardening because I am afraid that we may need it soon.

CELEBRATING LIBERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I love this Nation, and I stand on the premise of the Declaration of Independence. Even though my ancestors did not benefit at the origins of this Nation, I am a patriot.

I remind my fellow colleagues of the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men and women are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our Founding Fathers understood that this Nation would grow and would breathe life into these words and breathe life into democracy. The Constitution began with:

> We the people of United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty.

This is a living document that ensures that we safeguard America and, particularly, that we safeguard its citizens and our children.

This Pride Month, I wish all of those who are in our wonderful community of LGBTQ a wonderful existence and recognition of their individual liberty. I am so grateful that this Nation allows everyone to have a seat at the table.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their vigorous celebration of Juneteenth, which is legislation that I introduced and fought for, for over a decade. I am so amazed at the celebrations from east to west and north to south, understanding the ancestors of African descendants didn't get free in Texas until June 1865.

All of us, no matter our backgrounds, were having celebrations. Members, Republicans and Democrats, were joining in on the liberty of Juneteenth. That gives me hope as we move to discuss the response to H.R. 40, the Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans Act, and find ways for repair and restoration. It gives me hope.

As I mentioned, this Pride Month is about liberty and empowerment for all people. I stand here on the floor of the House with such excitement and exhilaration that I have standing on the foundation of this very book that covers the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. That is why it is so important to fight for democracy and to recognize the sovereignty of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in fighting for the release of Brittney Griner, Paul Whelan, and many others who are held as hostages, and those who went to volunteer to fight for democracy in Ukraine who are now held.

I raise my voice for Brittney Griner today, a young woman born and raised in Houston, Texas, a graduate of Nimitz High School whose family in Houston is in desperate need for us to pay attention to the very vile way that she now is being held as a hostage in Russia.

I ask the Russian people and Mr. Putin to release these people, release them from this inappropriate detention, incarceration, and holding. Release them now.

Let us pray with the family. Release them now. Release Brittney Griner. Free Brittney Griner, a renowned WNBA player and Olympian, but just a plain human being, an American who has shown herself to love this country and to be such a wonderful, generous person who gives to others, as many have said.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague Congressman STANTON of Arizona, my colleague Congressman ALLRED, and I will be presenting a resolution that says: Free Brittney Griner now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about how we honor our dear friend, who passed away in 2020, John Lewis.

I am reminded of his nonviolent tendencies, and he taught us well. In teaching us, we were here on the floor of the House to demand gun safety legislation some years ago. At one point, we just couldn't manage it and take it anymore. We sat on the House floor. I

have pictures that I will cherish because it was nonviolent resistance.

Now, we have an opportunity to stand in the gap for the families in Uvalde, families in Buffalo and Tulsa, and pass real gun safety legislation. Join us and be what America is all about, taking care, creating a more perfect Union, Mr. Speaker, and passing gun safety legislation that I and the Judiciary Committee, Chairman NADLER, and other Members have really stood up for.

RECOGNIZING MATTHEW E. McLOGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize west Michigan's own Grand Valley State University Vice President Matthew E. McLogan, who for nearly 35 years has delivered unparalleled leadership and expertise to our region's academic communities.

Originally hired in 1987—I won't mention that that is the year before I was born—he is the longest serving executive officer in university history.

Prior to his time at GVSU, Matt was a fixture in broadcast news and served honorably as Michigan's former public service commissioner with a booming baritone voice that many of us recognize.

He took the exceptional skill set that he had built in these professions and brought it to Grand Valley State University. When Matt joined GVSU and became a Laker, the school's lone campus was home to just 8,000 students. As of 2022, the Laker community has grown threefold, boasting over 23,000 students across five locations. Their technological centers, libraries, and resources are the envy of competing universities at home in west Michigan and across the Nation.

Having served through the previous four of five university presidents, Matt facilitated and witnessed firsthand Grand Valley State University's historic expansion. For years, he has been essential to the success of Grand Valley's executive leadership, playing a crucial role in government and alumni relations and the school's marketing programs and as secretary to the board of trustees.

Matt maintains responsibility for some of the institution's memorable accomplishments: the university's presence on our famous Medical Mile in Grand Rapids, the school's unprecedented expansion, and game-changing additions requiring public support.

Matt is known widely throughout the community as one of west Michigan's best boosters and academic professionals.

It is largely thanks to the leadership and expertise of Vice President McLogan that GVSU is poised to continue unprecedented growth for years to come. Matt has brought great fortune to the Lakers, and there is no doubt that the successes of his leadership have made a lasting impact on our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to take this time to recognize his accomplishments. I applaud Matt for his decades of selfless leadership and service to the Grand Valley State University community. I can say with great certainty that his accomplishments will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), my colleague and friend from the Second District.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding. As we come to the floor to honor Matt, I know that Matt and his colleagues are watching right now.

My colleague was able to run through the litany of his career, but I will note that, in 1987, I was just graduating from high school when Matt was hired. He has had an incredible tenure.

I can tell you that throughout his career, Matt has put the staff and Grand Valley community at the center of it all, but most importantly, it was about the students for him. It was always about the students.

Whether it was him looking out for who would be the next leader for the student council and the student body president or who would be a great intern in an office like mine or many others, whether it be in Lansing or in Washington, D.C., Matt was always there for the students.

As was said, when he joined the university, it was a smaller college of 8,000 students literally in the middle of a cornfield, and it now is this juggernaut, powerhouse of a university in Michigan with five locations and 23,000 students. That is, in part, due to Matt's efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of knowing Matt personally for well over 25 years, and I, too, grew up listening to Matt on local television at first. I can tell you that his wisdom, his counsel, and his encouragement that he has to offer to friends, family, and colleagues is something that he is known for. I have never met anyone quite so positive as Matt when it comes to life.

In addition to his time at Grand Valley and his time on television, he served the State in lots of various ways, on committees and commissions.

□ 1115

One very notable one was the Public Service Commission as he was there serving and trying to help lead the direction of the State through multiple administrations and various Governors.

I will tell you this though, Mr. Speaker, the thing that Matt is especially known for is his Michigan political trivia. Now, I can tell you that if you had been wondering who the Lieutenant Governor was in 1923, all you had to do was ask Matt. He would be able to tell you, and he is probably telling and saying the name right now to his colleagues as he is watching this.

So here is what I need to say today: Congratulations, Matt, and thank you. Jane is going to enjoy that time together with you. I know that you have got more coming. Even though you may not have quite figured it out, I know you are fighting to the very end for Grand Valley and for that budget period that is in Lansing right now.

But here is something that we all need to know: Matt is a Laker for life, and I thank him for his service.

PELL GRANT ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Federal Pell grant. Created in 1972, the Pell targets students with a demonstrated financial need. It helps cover the cost of tuition, fees, room and board, and many, many other expenses.

Now, unlike loans which can burden low-income students, Pell grants do not need to be repaid. The Pell actually helps students focus on school rather than have them wondering about how to pay for it.

The Pell has benefited more than 80 million students in the past 50 years and is an absolute lifeline for students at colleges in my district on the central coast of California. Currently, there are close to 16,000 students receiving $68 million in Pell grants to pursue their higher education goals at our local colleges and universities.

Now, clearly, support for the Pell is widespread and bipartisan. I am proud to say that we here in Congress actually increased the Pell by $400 for 2022. That is the largest increase, Mr. Speaker, to the Pell in 10 years, but I think you would agree with me that this is not enough. As we celebrate this anniversary, Mr. Speaker, the Pell now only covers less than one-third of average attendance costs. So we must do everything we can to strengthen the Pell. I believe we can do that by doubling the Pell.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that that happens and ensure that students, regardless of need, can afford college and attain a brighter future.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OTTUMWA'S COLLINS CLINGMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Ottumwa's Collins Clingman.

Collins recently won gold in the men's 100-meter walk and the bronze in the 50-meter run while representing

Team Iowa at this year's Special Olympics USA Games.

Collins is used to the competition after participating in Special Olympics for the past 25 years, competing in multiple track and field events and bowling.

As a fellow Hawkeye and Indian Hills fan, I applaud Collins' accomplishments in Orlando and representing Ottumwa and Iowa in the Special Olympics. I cannot wait to cheer him on in future USA Games.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MAXWELL RANTILLA OF BETTENDORF, IOWA

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Maxwell Rantilla of Bettendorf, Iowa.

Maxwell is currently a junior at Bettendorf High School. This past year, Maxwell joined millions of students across the country in taking the ACT test. This test is used by colleges to help with admissions decisions and tests students on their knowledge of English, reading, math, and science.

Maxwell's commitment to studying paid off when he got a perfect score on the ACT. Out of the millions of high schoolers who take the standardized test, only 0.5 percent receive a perfect score.

Maxwell is very involved at Bettendorf High School, qualifying for the national tournament the past 3 years in the speech and debate club. He is a member of the school band and the president of Bettendorf High School's National Honor Society.

I congratulate Maxwell on this outstanding accomplishment. I know that this is just the beginning of his journey, and I cannot wait to hear about his future accomplishments and endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JESUS RODRIGUEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Jesus Rodriguez, a La Habra resident, a dear friend, a community leader, a Korean war veteran, and a Silver Star recipient who recently lost his fight against cancer.

He joined the Army after dropping out of his junior year of high school, deploying to Okinawa and then to the Korean war. At age 19, he was discharged as a corporal and came back home to begin and raise his family. Jesus moved up the ranks from janitor to plant manager and worked really hard.

Throughout his entire life, however, he never forgot his time in war, and neither did his 29th Infantry Regiment. After sharing his story at a reunion, Jesus accepted every invitation to speak to area veteran groups, ROTC units, and the local Korean community.

Although Jesus is no longer with us, I know his story and his sacrifice will live on and inspire others.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ESHOO) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, give us eyes of faith. Like little ones who live with open hearts, open minds, and open hands, remind us that, as Your children, You welcome us into Your arms and hear our prayers.

Restore to us if not the innocence of the young—for we have seen, heard, and experienced too much to be that naive—then grant us the ability to trust You and the people and purpose You put before us. Dispel our cynicism and hurt and open our hearts to Your movement in our lives.

Enable us to be respectful of differences of opinion. Relieve us of our need to dismiss people who disagree with us with labels and stereotypes, and open our minds to find not only our shared passions but the value of diversity in the health of our society.

Then encourage us to reach out in ways that will bolster up the other. For woe to the one who is alone and has no one to lift him up. Woe, too, to the one whose helping hands are bound by fear and contempt. Open our hands that we would be a strength and encouragement to those around us.

We give You thanks for the blessings You bestow on each of Your children. And we pray Your blessing that through what we seek to accomplish today, all would feel Your loving embrace.

In the name of the one who gives us life that we may live it abundantly, 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 Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois 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 SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 671. An act to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3510. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance with respect to natural disaster resilience, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 117–81, the Chair, on behalf of the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on the National Defense Strategy: Mr. Thomas G. Mahnken of California.

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.

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH ALLEVIATES SUFFERING

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, biomedical research can accelerate discoveries to alleviate human suffering due to illness if we allow it.

The speed with which the COVID–19 vaccines were developed using groundbreaking messenger RNA technology is one of the most important biomedical advancements in 100 years.

By establishing the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Health, otherwise known as ARPA-H, we can harness those lessons for new discoveries in many other diseases.

The potential for lifesaving treatments for devastating conditions like ALS, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and cancer is right in front of us. For millions of Americans suffering and the people who love them, this can't come soon enough.

THE ONLY CHOICE IS LIFE

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, we always hear Democrats preach about choice when it comes to the issue of abortion. However, we never hear them discuss the other side of the coin, choosing life instead of death.

We do not hear them condemn criminal acts, such as the defacing of

churches or crisis pregnancy centers being firebombed and vandalized by radical progressive activists.

If they believe choice is so important, why don't they respect the people who refuse to choose death and instead choose life?

Democrats use ''choice'' as a subjective term. They agree with choice as long as you agree with them—choice on their terms.

Madam Speaker, Americans overwhelmingly choose life. We would all do well to remember that.

CONOR FRYER HAS BEEN AN INVALUABLE ASSET

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

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise to thank my communications director, Conor Fryer, for his commitment to the 11th Congressional District of Ohio and his invaluable contributions to my team and that of my predecessor.

Conor joined the office in 2019 under the leadership of then-Congresswoman and now Secretary Marcia L. Fudge and was pivotal in my transition in 2021. He consistently raised the bar and that of those around him.

When we arrived in Congress, we had a skeleton crew of a staff. Conor always stepped in and stepped up, filling those gaps, from legislation to transportation and everything in between.

His boundless energy, strategic creativity, and Ohio pride has served my constituents well. I wish Conor well as he moves closer to reaching his long-term professional goals. He will be missed.

BIDEN MUST ADDRESS OPEN BORDERS FOR TERRORISTS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, American families are at greater risk of mass murder terrorist attacks than ever before due to the failing border policies of President Biden.

Intentionally opening the southern border, nearly 3 million illegal aliens from over 160 countries have intruded since Biden took office.

American jobs are destroyed. Deadly drugs are smuggled by cartels, leading to over 100,000 deaths last year, devastating American families. Most gruesome is the imminent danger of known terrorists from the Terrorist Screening Database crossing into America.

Last year, in Del Rio, Texas, officials would not reveal to me the number of terrorists crossing. Now, we see the threat is real, with 50 terrorists just this year. These terrorists are skilled, well-financed, fully equipped, and maniacally motivated mass murderers.

Open borders for terrorists must be addressed. Biden should now take every action to protect American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years in the global war on terrorism, as it continues, moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

EXPANDING BENEFITS FOR VETERANS EXPOSED TO TOXINS

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

Mr. KAHELE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Honoring our PACT Act.

The PACT Act will finally expand benefits and comprehensive healthcare for millions of veterans who have been exposed to toxic substances while serving their country.

Included in this bill is the Mark Takai Atomic Veterans Healthcare Parity Act, championed by my dear friend, the late Congressman Mark Takai, who served his country admirably as a lieutenant colonel in the Hawaii Army National Guard and as Hawaii's First Congressional District Representative.

The United States conducted 43 nuclear tests on Enewetak Atoll, located in the Marshall Islands. In the 1970s, U.S. servicemembers risked their lives to clean radioactive material from Enewetak Atoll.

Without the PACT Act, veterans who served at Enewetak are not eligible for much-needed benefits.

I am honored to continue Congressman Mark Takai's legacy by proudly casting my vote for the Honoring our PACT Act to ensure that we improve on our sacred obligation to care for our veterans and their families.

RECOGNIZING MUSICAL PRODIGY TAYTE CHOUDHURY

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

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true musical prodigy with the kind of gift that many of us may only come across once in a lifetime, my constituent Tayte Choudhury.

At only 17 years old, Tayte is internationally recognized for his outstanding ability in piano. He is a first-place winner of the American Protege award and is performing a winning piece at the world-renowned Carnegie Hall in New York City on June 26.

Despite a physical disability that left him 70 percent deaf in both ears, Tayte has achieved great success in both music and scholastics. I was sent a video of Tayte playing this week and was completely blown away to be hearing and seeing such talent that can only be handed down by God himself.

But the thing about talent like that is that it is meaningless without hard work, sacrifice, resilience, and an entire village to get you where you need to go.

From myself and all of Texas 22, we are extremely proud of you, Tayte, and can't way to see how high you fly.

JOSEPH HART'S PASSING LEAVES A VOID

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, local journalism is the lifeblood of our democracy and the backbone of our communities. I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a constituent who dedicated his career to that very American public service. Joseph Hart, an award-winning local journalist who spent his career telling the stories of our community, most recently as executive editor of the Delaware County Daily Times, tragically passed away this week.

He leaves behind a void in the hearts of his colleagues and readers across PA–5 who have relied on his insightful and dependable reporting for decades.

Joe grew up with the Delco Times, starting as an intern 40 years ago and rising to executive editor in 2020. His friends and colleagues describe an incredible friend, mentor, and journalist, calling him kind, witty, principled, enthusiastic, knowledgeable, professional, and passionate.

In the words of retired Delco Times editor Phil Heron, ''The institutional knowledge Joe had of the county, you can't replace that. He was the walking encyclopedia of Delco politics.''

Our hearts go out to Joe's family, friends, and his team at the Delco Times as they mourn this tremendous loss.

COMBATING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

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

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, my district in central Indiana represents a cross-section of our Nation, cities, suburbs, and rural farmland, none of which have proven themselves immune to the devastating possibility of opioid addiction.

Americans know that we must use every tool at our disposal to combat the opioid pandemic killing young and old. Unfortunately, the Federal Government ties the hands of doctors, limiting their ability to hold long-acting injectable addiction treatment to just 14 days after receipt from pharmacy.

To remedy this problem, last November, I introduced the IMPACT Act with Congresswoman DEAN, which passed the House as part of H.R. 7666. I am grateful to my colleagues for their support of this legislation, and I urge the Senate and administration to do the same.

BRING HOME ILLEGAL DETAINEES IN RUSSIA

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

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, for 126 days now, Brittney Griner has been wrongfully detained by Russia.

Every single day that goes by is a lifetime for her wife, Cherelle, her family, friends, and teammates on the Phoenix Mercury.

As mayor of Phoenix, I was so lucky to watch her develop and grow as a professional athlete and also as a respected leader in the Phoenix community. One of the best basketball players of our generation, she has won gold medals representing the United States twice at the Olympic Games. Like many WNBA players, she needed to supplement her income by playing professional basketball in Russia, and she was proud to do so.

But, now, Brittney finds herself a prisoner of the Russian Government. Her legal hearings continue to be delayed without good reason. It is unacceptable.

It is time for the House to speak with one unified voice and call for Brittney's safe return and to show support for every American wrongfully detained in Russia.

□ 1215

BIDEN'S BABY FORMULA CRISIS

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, in the past 18 months, President Biden has shown the American people that he and his administration are not prepared to lead.

According to a new whistleblower report, problems at the Michigan baby formula plant were actually reported to the U.S. Department of Labor in February of 2021. Instead of addressing this crisis head-on, the Biden administration squandered precious time. As a result, American families were unable to buy the formula that their infant children so desperately need.

As a father, I think back on shopping for children's formula for my own children, and I am saddened by the thought of parents arriving today at the grocery store and seeing empty shelf after empty shelf.

The longer President Biden remains in office, one thing continues to become clear: Americans cannot afford the failed leadership that has allowed this crisis and so many crises to continue.

SUPPORTING THE SECOND AMENDMENT

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, today is a historic day as the Supreme Court upheld the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms.

I thank President Trump for appointing Justices who defended the constitutional rights of gun owners.

It is unfortunate that at the same time the Supreme Court is upholding our Second Amendment rights, Congress is working behind closed doors to push unconstitutional red flag gun confiscation.

I strongly oppose efforts by the House and Senate to infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of my constituents, and I urge this body to reject the gun control legislation.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF THE McGOVERN-DOLE FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILDHOOD NUTRITION PROGRAM

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

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of the McGovern-Dole Food for Education and Childhood Nutrition Program, named in part after a Kansas legend, the late Senator Bob Dole.

The McGovern-Dole program has provided 5.5 billion school meals benefiting 31 million school-age children in 48 countries over the last two decades, improving the food security, nutrition, literacy, and primary education of these children and their families. When schools closed due to COVID, the program distributed 23,000 metric tons of commodities to more than 1.7 million children and their families. This program is a success story of public-private partnership.

Representative MCGOVERN and I have a resolution before the House expressing this body's commitment to building on the success of the McGovern-Dole program and supporting the American farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers who provide the commodities required for it to function.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution, submit appropriation requests for funding, and ensure that this program can continue to support nutrition and education for children around the world.

A GAS TAX HOLIDAY IS AN ELECTION-YEAR GIMMICK

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, Tennesseans are fed up with prices at the pump. They are paying double what they were a year-and-a-half ago because of the attacks on American energy that began on day one of the Biden administration. Now, the President has asked Congress to consider a gas tax holiday. How curious.

This is what Washington does when there is a big problem. Politicians pretend they are looking out for you, but they are just looking out for their own poll numbers.

Those aren't my words, Madam Speaker. That is a quote from President Biden's former boss, Barack Obama, on the campaign trail in 2008. He said a gas tax holiday would threaten Federal highways and possibly cost jobs while only saving families pennies a day. He called the idea an election-year gimmick, not a real solution. I agree.

A real solution would be supporting policies that return our Nation to energy independence.

REMEMBERING DONALD WAYNE PORTER

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, God's Word says, To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord.

On June 21, 2022, after 76 years, Donald Wayne Porter went home to be with his Lord.

Despite a battle with Parkinson's that may have overcome his body, it never conquered his spirit.

Wayne Porter represents the very best of America, the epitome of west Texas, and a true cowboy spirit.

He was a third generation cattle rancher, grocery store owner, deacon in the First Baptist Church, and a decorated combat veteran of the Vietnam war.

But his greatest legacy, Madam Speaker, was his fierce love and commitment to his God and his family. Wayne had just celebrated 50 years with his beloved wife, Edith, and is survived by his 6 children and 11 grandchildren.

His only son, John Porter, served as my chief of staff.

While I didn't know Wayne Porter, they say the apple doesn't fall too far from the tree, so I felt like I knew the man. It was clear to me that Wayne Porter was a man of immense character, quiet strength, with a Texas-sized heart for God and people, the proudest of family men, and a patriot to his core.

God has blessed America with men like Donald Wayne Porter, and may God continue to bless John, Madison, Duke, and the entire Porter family in their great loss but in heaven's gain.

Go west Texas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2089) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2089

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 ''Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TEMPORARY LUNCH REIMBURSEMENT.—Each lunch served under the school lunch program authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) shall receive an additional reimbursement in the amount of 40 cents.

(2) TEMPORARY BREAKFAST REIMBURSEMENT.—Each breakfast served under the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) shall receive an additional reimbursement in the amount of 15 cents.

(3) LIMITATION.—The additional reimbursement amounts authorized under this subsection shall only be available for the school year beginning July 2022.

(4) TEMPORARY GUIDELINES.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), for the school year beginning July 2022, the income guidelines for determining eligibility for free lunch under the school lunch program authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and free breakfast under the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) shall be 185 percent of the applicable family size income levels contained in the nonfarm income poverty guidelines prescribed by the Office of Management and Budget, as adjusted annually in accordance with section 9(b)(1)(B) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(1)(B)).

(5) APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

(B) DISBURSEMENT.—A State agency shall disburse funds made available under subparagraph (A) to school food authorities participating in the school meal programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) EXTENSION OF WAIVERS.—Section 2202 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''due to the COVID–19 pandemic'' after ''(42 U.S.C. 1760(l))'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon and inserting ''or''; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) ensuring continuity of program operation under a qualified program.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking ''the following:'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through ''A summary'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''a summary''; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) SUNSET.—

''(1) NATIONWIDE WAIVERS.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2022.

''(2) WAIVER RESTRICTION.—After June 30, 2022, a waiver established or granted under subsection (a) shall only apply to schools or summer food service program food service sites—

''(A) operating—

''(i) the qualified program described in subsection (f)(1)(D); or

''(ii) the option described in section 13(a)(8) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(8)); and

''(B) not operating the qualified program described in subsection (f)(1)(A).

''(3) OTHER WAIVERS.—

''(A) CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM WAIVER.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (b) shall expire on June 30, 2022.

''(B) MEAL PATTERN WAIVER.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (c) shall expire on June 30, 2023.

''(4) LIMITATIONS.—A waiver authorized by the Secretary under this section shall not be in effect after the date on which the authority of the Secretary to establish or grant that waiver under this subsection expires.''.

(c) APPROPRIATION.—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to provide waivers under section 2202(a) of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127) that apply—

(1) only during the months of May through September in 2022; and

(2) to—

(A) the summer food service program for children under section 13 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761); or

(B) the option described in section 13(a)(8) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(8)).

(d) NATIONWIDE WAIVER FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2022–2023.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of school year 2022–2023, the Secretary of Agriculture may establish waivers under section 12(l) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(l))—

(A) on a nationwide basis; and

(B) without regard to the requirements under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of such section that a State or eligible service provider shall submit an application for a waiver request.

(2) SUNSET.—A nationwide waiver established by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 12(l) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(l)) pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not be in effect after June 30, 2023.

SEC. 3. CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR 2022–2023 SCHOOL YEAR.—Each meal and supplement served under the program authorized by section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766) shall receive additional reimbursement in the amount of 10 cents.

(2) LIMITATION.—The additional reimbursement amount authorized under paragraph (1) shall only be available for the school year beginning July 2022.

(b) TIER DETERMINATIONS FOR 2022–2023 SCHOOL YEAR.—For the school year beginning July 2022, a tier II family or group day care home described in subsection (f)(3)(A)(iii) of section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766) shall be considered a tier I family or group day care home for purposes of the program authorized under that section.

(c) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 4. RESCISSIONS AND SUNSET.

(a) RESCISSIONS.—

(1) USDA.—

(A) Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture in section 1001(a) of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (7 U.S.C. 7501 note; Public Law 117–2), $1,000,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(B) Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture in section 751 of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2105), $400,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Education in section 2003 of title II of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 23) and allocated to institutions of higher education as defined in section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(b)), $400,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(3) SBA.—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Small Business Administration in section 5005 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 91) and in section 323(d)(1)(H) of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2021) to carry out section 324 of such division of such Act (15 U.S.C. 9009a), $1,500,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(b) ADDITIONAL RESCISSION.—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture under the heading ''Agricultural Programs—Office of the Secretary'' in title I of division B of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116–136; 134 Stat. 505), $600,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(c) SUNSET.—Section 756 of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (7 U.S.C. 2254c), is amended by striking ''for fiscal year'' and all that follows through ''thereafter'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022''.

SEC. 5. OPERATIONALLY READY.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that technical assistance is made available to States and school food authorities for purposes of assisting parents and school leaders with respect to the transition of operating school meal programs not pursuant to a waiver under section 2(d) or section 2202 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2089.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, S. 2089 was amended to replace the language of that bill with the language of H.R. 8150, the bipartisan and bicameral Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022, in order to send the bill to the Senate for expedited passage.

Roughly 2 years ago, our communities experienced an unprecedented surge in child hunger, spurred by the COVID–19 pandemic. Just weeks into the pandemic, more than one of every three households with children, and nearly half of all mothers with young children, struggled with food insecurity.

In response, Congress took decisive action to ensure that child nutrition programs, our best tools for addressing child hunger, could continue feeding hungry children during the pandemic.

One of the most important steps we took was providing child nutrition programs with the flexibility they needed to expand access to school meals and address the challenges of serving students who are not physically in the school buildings.

This relief made a measurable difference in our fight against child hunger. By expanding access to child nutrition programs, we allowed an additional 10 million students to receive free school meals each day. From January 2021 to April 2021, food shortages among households with children fell by more than 40 percent.

Regrettably, unless Congress acts, these key flexibilities would expire at the end of this month.

The bipartisan and bicameral Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022 is likely our best and last opportunity to preserve relief for child nutrition programs. This legislation would:

Maintain school meal flexibilities that do not increase costs;

Continue flexibilities to support summer food programs this year;

Provide additional support for child and adult care feeding programs; and

Increase school meal reimbursement rates for this upcoming school year.

As we continue to recover from the pandemic, the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022 would take a critical step to support child nutrition programs and prevent children from going hungry during the ongoing public health emergency. This is a step well worth taking.

I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Dr. Foxx, and Senators STABENOW and BOOZMAN for working with me on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support this bipartisan legislation that will help ensure students receive healthy school meals. Students need access to nutritious meals so that they can be their best, both in and out of the classroom. Today's bipartisan legislation does just that.

During pandemic lockdowns, school food programs were critical to those in need. These programs play an important role in non-pandemic times, too.

It is important that we ensure this program is sustainable for schools, and that means responsible oversight and a return to regular order.

We want to make sure that students who rely on school meals have access to them and that schools can continue to supply them, even in the face of skyrocketing, record-high inflation.

As our constituents know, the price of just about everything has increased. The average family is spending $450 more per month. Eggs are up 32 percent, milk is up 16 percent, and bacon is up 15 percent. Our school meals programs are no exception to these rising costs.

This measure will help schools cope with rising food prices by temporarily providing supplemental reimbursements as these programs transition back to normal operations.

I do think it is very important to emphasize that these increases are temporary and will last 1 year.

I appreciate the Democrats and the Senate for working with us to ensure these are temporary, supplemental funds to address inflation specifically. They are not an arbitrary increase in spending. Using the inflation crisis or the supply chain problem to increase Federal spending permanently would be especially unwise and irresponsible.

I also am glad the legislation requires USDA to provide school leaders and parents with support and guidance as the program transitions to normal operations.

It is Congress' job to ensure these programs are working as efficiently and effectively as possible. It is our duty to make sure these programs are fulfilling their intended purpose, which is to help students.

I am happy to see this legislation put these school nutrition programs back on the right track.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor and a leading advocate to reduce and eliminate child hunger.

□ 1230

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this legislation and for working tirelessly to negotiate a solution.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Keep Kids Fed Act. As food costs continue to soar, this critical legislation is a lifeline for millions of American families struggling to make ends meet.

In my home State of Minnesota, one in nine children are food insecure. This bipartisan legislation builds on my bill, the MEALS Act, to ensure children continue to receive school meals this summer. I am proud to have been part of this fight.

While I wish this agreement could have provided a permanent solution, this is a vital step to prevent millions of children from going hungry throughout the next few months. In the meantime, I will continue to fight for the passage of my bill, the Universal School Meals Program Act, to ensure that no child in the richest country in the world goes hungry.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and chair of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today for the millions of children who will go hungry next week if Congress does not extend child nutrition waivers.

No student or child should ever go hungry in our country. At the start of the pandemic, Congress authorized waivers to help make it easier for schools to deliver meals to kids, and we gave 10 million more children access to healthy food.

Given the reality of higher prices at the grocery store, children and their families can't afford to lose the free, nutritious meals available at schools across the country. As a 40-year educator, I know hunger has been a crisis in our schools and our communities since long before the pandemic.

Madam Speaker, one in seven households today has a child struggling with food insecurity. In my home State of North Carolina, food insecurity has been a tragic fact of life for our kids and our students.

Before the pandemic, in North Carolina, 92,000 students were participating in the Summer Food Service Program, and 441,000 children were receiving SNAP assistance.

These numbers have only gone up. Our choice is clear: We can choose to act, or we can let millions of children go hungry.

Madam Speaker, as always, I am standing with our students, and I urge all of my colleagues to support S. 2089, as amended.

Mrs. STEEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), Republican leader of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, evidence is clear that students are able to focus more at

school if they are receiving adequate nutrition. Too many students are still suffering from the harmful effects of school closures, and we cannot afford to let students fall further behind.

The rise in food prices is putting most Americans in a tight spot. The same is true for schools. The bipartisan Keep Kids Fed Act will empower schools to meet the crises our country is facing, from supply chain problems to record-high inflation.

It is, however, extremely important to emphasize that the support provided in this legislation is both targeted and temporary, as all aid should be. We also worked hard to ensure that this legislation was budget-neutral so it does not put additional burden on taxpayers. Importantly, this legislation will return our Nation's school meal programs to regular order. This is the primary reason I support this legislation.

For over 2 years, Democrats used a permanent pandemic narrative to increase Federal spending across the board, including within school meal programs. This has fueled inflation. This is not only irresponsible but ignores the narrow limits Congress purposefully placed on these programs.

Congress never intended to provide universal free breakfasts and lunches to all K–12 students regardless of need. By returning these programs back to normal, we can uphold our responsibility to taxpayers and the principle that aid should be targeted and temporary.

The Keep Kids Fed Act offers a viable solution to the problems facing school meal programs while also refocusing these programs on their purpose: helping students in need.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN), the distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keep Kids Fed Act, which will aim to ensure our communities, schools, and daycares can provide healthy meals to children this summer.

At a time when parents are struggling to put food on the table and prices at the grocery store are at an all-time high, I am grateful for this bicameral, bipartisan effort to address food insecurity.

Throughout my career, I have focused on making sure to stay in touch. I had the opportunity to sit with over 60 nutritionists for the school lunch programs, who had a sense of urgency and concern not about their jobs, but about the rising costs and their ability to make sure that young people, K–12, are able to have the meals in a dignified matter, to be able to be educated and overcome obstacles, and to make sure that they were fed and ready for class.

That being said, today, I thank Chairman SCOTT and all my colleagues for their example to solve this immediate and pressing challenge, and I look forward to continuing to work with all of my colleagues to ensure that we create the ideal environments that allow all students to learn and thrive.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters from No Kid Hungry and the Food Research and Action Center, better known as FRAC.

[From Share Our Strength]

SHARE OUR STRENGTH'S LISA DAVIS ON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE 'KEEP KIDS FED' ACT TO EXTEND CHILD NUTRITION WAIVERS

WASHINGTON, DC.—This afternoon, leadership from the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and the House Committee on Education and Labor announced an agreement to extend nationwide child nutrition waivers, which are set to expire on June 30. The Keep Kids Fed Act would extend some of these waivers through the 2022–2023 school year and provide school nutrition programs with additional funding to help address food price inflation and supply chain challenges. The following is a statement from No Kid Hungry Senior Vice President Lisa Davis:

''We are grateful that a deal has come together to help address the immense challenges facing schools and community organizations working tirelessly to feed kids this summer and during the school year. This issue couldn't be more urgent with waivers expiring in nine days and summer meals programs already up and running.

''Time is of the essence, especially for those operating summer meals sites without the certainty and flexibility of the waivers who will face difficulties turning on a dime. We know these waivers are needed and that they work. The reach of the summer meals program increased dramatically with them, doubling in 2021 and even tripling in 2020.

''While these waivers don't solve supply chain issues, lower the rising cost of food and gas, or solve our nation's inflation problem, they do help soften their impact on schools and community organizations and, ultimately, keep kids fed and nourished.

''As we know with legislation like this, there can be miles to go before it gets across the finish line. We urge Congress to move quickly on the Keep Kids Fed Act before nationwide child nutrition waivers expire on June 30.''

[From Luis Guardia, president, Food Research & Action Center (FRAC)]

HUNGRY CHILDREN CAN'T WAIT: CONGRESS MUST ACT QUICKLY TO PASS CRITICAL LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, June 21, 2022.—FRAC commends the bi-partisan legislation introduced today by Senate Agriculture Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow (D–MI), Ranking Member John Boozman (R–AR) and House Education and Labor Chairman Bobby Scott (D–VA) and Ranking Member Virginia Foxx (R–NC), to help support children, families, schools, and child care providers as they struggle to recover from the fallout of the pandemic. Provisions in the Keep Kids Fed Act would increase reimbursements to schools and child care, support access to summer meals by extending the summer waivers, allow children eligible for reduced-price school meals to receive free school meals, and streamline access to healthy meals for children in family child care.

We and our network of anti-hunger advocates all across the country call on Congress to pass this legislation immediately as time is running out. The child nutrition waivers that have been available since the onset of the pandemic are set to expire on June 30. This legislation would help mitigate the impact of the loss of the waivers and also would be critical to supporting children's access to summer meals and meals at childcare. The provisions in the legislation are only temporary and do not go as far as we would like, but they are a critical first step to help shield some of the impact of inflation, supply chain disruptions, and labor shortages.

Still, more must be done. FRAC looks forward to working with Congress to make much-needed, long-term improvements to the child nutrition programs to more fully address our nation's hunger crisis.

Hungry children can't wait.

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

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

Madam Speaker, the Keep Kids Fed Act is a bipartisan, budget-neutral bill that supports students and protects taxpayers. This bill will return our school nutrition programs back to normal, pre-pandemic operations. I appreciate the majority working with us to ensure this is a true transition back to regular operation, which is fully paid for and includes a requirement to support parents and school leaders.

This legislation will also support schools dealing with the supply chain and inflation crisis. This allows our Nation's schools to focus on delivering healthy meals for students so they can focus on being successful in the classroom. I am pleased we were able to come to a bicameral and bipartisan solution, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Keep Kids Fed Act.

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

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

Madam Speaker, as I said at the beginning of the debate, the legislation before us is likely our last and best opportunity to protect millions of students' access to nutrition programs, which have been critical to feeding hungry children during the pandemic.

The simple reality is that schools, children, and families are still dealing with the impacts of COVID–19. As school meal programs continue to endure supply chain disruptions, inflation, and other challenges, the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022 would provide school meal programs that are urgently needed for stability and will help continue providing students with nutritious meals that they need.

We know this bill alone will not end all hunger in America, but it will be an important step to stand up for our Nation's children and fulfill our basic responsibility to keep them from going hungry.

Again, I thank the ranking member of the committee, Dr. FOXX, and I thank the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. STEEL, for helping to bring

this bipartisan, bicameral legislation to the floor. I also thank Senators STABENOW and BOOZMAN for their work in bringing this legislation to reality.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2089, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Keep Kids Fed Act, which provides vital funding to ensure our children are fed healthy meals over these next few summer months—and that schools and daycares are supported throughout the school year.

As one of the wealthiest nations in the world, no child should go hungry. Yet far too many children struggle with hunger in this country. This is a tragedy. For more than 22 million children who rely on school breakfast and lunch programs, summer vacation means worrying about when they will eat next.

We all know that hunger can have lifelong consequences for children—making it more difficult to learn . . . play . . . and connect with kids their age. Kids who go hungry during summer often start school behind, which can lead to serious health concerns like developmental delays . . . chronic illness . . . and mental health issues. They are at higher risk for anemia, asthma, diabetes—and more likely to experience anxiety and depression.

So, I am pleased that we have reached a bipartisan agreement on extending school meal waivers until the summer's end and continues to support schools and daycares throughout the year. These child nutrition waivers are a lifeline to schools, children, and hardworking families across the country.

During the pandemic, school meals were a lifeline to students—providing them with healthy meals whether they were attending school in person or virtually. They have been a critical component of our nation's response to this pandemic. But schools continue to face a variety of challenges, including supply chain disruptions, labor shortages, serving meals safely, and rising food prices. Waivers have been vital this school year to support school nutrition. And extending the waivers is the path forward to ensure all children have access to nutritious school meals over the summer months that they need to learn and thrive.

As I have said from the start—failure is not an option. And we need to get a deal across the finish line. It is our responsibility to ensure that our children do not go hungry. School meal waivers have given stability to hundreds of children who prior to this program, likely did not know where their next meal was coming from.

I am disappointed that House Republicans insisted on an offset. We need to feed children in this country—and that should never be up for debate.

With that, I am proud of this bill and the impact I know it will have—providing school workers . . . parents . . . and caregivers with the security of knowing that the children they care for will be fed through the summer.

So, I am voting in favor of this critical legislation—and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Keep Kids Fed Act.

I want to thank Chairman SCOTT for his steadfast leadership and determination to work to get something worked out to help ensure that our school meals are available to as many of our students as possible.

The school meals provisions were an effective response by this Congress to the COVID–19 pandemic. Schools, children and families were disrupted as this deadly disease raced through our country. Congress acted to make sure that we provided flexibility to ensure that no child would miss a meal that they would otherwise have received in school.

Why is that important? Because Congress has long recognized that hunger and learning do not mix well, if at all. This isn't some theoretical or academic debate. I know what its like to be hungry and in school. And I am saddened that decades after I went through that experience as a student, many other children still must deal with that reality each and every school day.

Food is not a luxury. So hearing that the USDA COVID waivers that had allowed millions of kids to stay nourished were expiring was an emergency for me. And I know the Chairman shares that sentiment.

Frankly, it has been hard to sleep thinking of what happens in communities like Milwaukee when families find this lifeline cut off arbitrarily even while the pandemic that spawned these provisions, continues.

The reality is that hunger and food insecurity did not take a break during this pandemic. In fact, reports indicate it got worse. Hunger doesn't take a summer vacation even though our schools do.

It shouldn't have taken all of this to get us to agree on this: Feed our kids so they can concentrate on learning and being kids. These waivers have done a great deal to help us achieve that and I hope we can continue to work to ensure that we can take the great lessons learned about how to effectively reach and nourish school children during this pandemic and use them to put in place permanent provisions that will ensure that all of our children can go to school and focus on their education

That includes taking up and passing bills like the Universal School Meals Program Act which I have joined with Rep. OMAR in introducing that would provide the most cost-effective and inclusive model for ensuring all students have access to nutritious meals during the school day without facing barriers such as stigma or burdensome paperwork.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of the House Amendment to S. 2089, the "Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022."

Today's bill is a matter of urgency.

If Congress does not act now to pass this emergency legislation, millions of children will spend their summer hungry. Millions of children may be forced to spend their school days not learning and growing but feeling the pangs of empty stomachs.

Hungry children cannot focus their attention on their studies and learning. They simply cannot thrive while trying to survive.

Free and reduced breakfast and lunch waivers are lifelines for families across the nation.

I think of the struggling families in my district who have battled against the COVID–19 pandemic for the past two years.

Families who now face record high inflation rates, skyrocketing gas prices, and the rising cost of food.

Families who are stretching dollars to pay for rent, to get to the doctor, to keep the lights on.

Families for whom every penny counts.

I think of how these families must have felt when they learned that the aid on which they had relied to feed their children was suddenly going to be taken away.

I imagine they felt helpless.

It is in our power to feed these children.

The "Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022" would allow schools to feed children throughout the upcoming school year. This bill would extend free meals and snacks for children during the summer months, and it would provide enhanced supports to Child and Adult Care programs—all without disrupting the budget.

In the summer of 2020, hungry children were provided with more than 10 million meals via the federally supported Summer Meal Program.

195,000 children were fed.

195,000 children were given apples, sandwiches, yogurts, juice boxes.

They were given the opportunity to enjoy a summer free of hunger.

That is reason enough to act.

The "Keep Kids Fed Act" would also increase reimbursements to school nutrition programs for both breakfast and lunch meals.

American families are not the only ones struggling to put food on the table amidst the current economic crisis.

School nutrition professionals have expressed deep concern over the impacts that supply-chain issues and inflation have had on their ability to provide quality meals to their students.

With the end of pandemic-relief nutritional aid fast approaching, and the cost of labor rising, some schools could see their yearly budgets decrease by 40 percent this year.

School cafeterias cannot produce meals out of thin air.

They need our help.

The House Amendment to S. 2089 would increase the reimbursement rates for the 2022–2023 school year by an additional 15 cents per breakfast and 40 cents per lunch—money that our nation's schools desperately need.

This bill would not fix the inflation problem, lower the cost of gas, or unclog the supply chain. But it would put food on the plates of hungry children across America.

That is why I rise in support of the House Amendment to S. 2089, the "Keep Kids Fed Act" and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2089, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. 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 motion are postponed.

ENHANCING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE PREVENTION THROUGH CAMPUS PLANNING ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (H.R. 5407) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5407

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 ''Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act''.

SEC. 2. ENCOURAGING CAMPUS COMPREHENSIVE MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PLANS.

Part L of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1161l et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 826 as section 827; and

(2) by inserting after section 825 the following new section:

''SEC. 826. ENCOURAGING CAMPUS COMPREHENSIVE MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PLANS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make efforts to encourage institutions of higher education to develop and implement evidence-based comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans. Such efforts—

''(1) shall be conducted in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (acting through the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use);

''(2) shall align with—

''(A) the efforts and approaches recommended by the Suicide Prevention Resource Center;

''(B) the programs authorized under section 9032 of the 21st Century Cures Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–36b note; Public Law 114-255), the amendments made by section 9031 of such Act to section 520E–2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–36b), and the amendment made by section 9033 of such Act to part D of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd et seq.); and

''(C) the programs authorized under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act (42 U.S.C. 201 note; Public Law 108–355);

''(3) shall take into consideration existing Federal and State efforts to address mental health and suicide prevention at institutions of higher education; and

''(4) may be carried out in collaboration with nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations that partner with institutions of higher education, and other experts and stakeholders in the field of campus mental health and suicide prevention.

''(b) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate on the efforts of the Secretary carried out under this section—

''(1) not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act; and

''(2) three years after the date of enactment of such Act.

''(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as creating new statutory requirements for institutions of higher education or granting the Secretary new regulatory authority.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, over the last 2 years, our Nation's college students have grappled with a mental health crisis that was significantly worsened by the COVID–19 pandemic. A national survey last year found that 65 percent of students reported having poor or only fair mental health. And according to the CDC, suicide attempts amongst females aged 15 to 23 increased by 87 percent from 2007 through 2020.

The surging mental health needs of students on college campuses have further strained campus-based mental health care providers. Since the start of the pandemic, campus counseling centers have been forced to respond to an increased demand for services without the funding, staffing, and resources that they need.

Regrettably, insufficient access to mental health care during the pandemic has exacerbated preexisting mental health inequities. A 2015 survey indicated that students of color are significantly less likely to be diagnosed or treated for mental health conditions than White students. The gaps between the increased mental health needs of students and the limited capacity of institutions to address them demand urgent action.

In response to this crisis, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), introduced a bill, Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act.

This bill will help institutions of higher education develop comprehensive mental health and suicide prevention plans to better support mental health needs of college students.

Specifically, the legislation directs the Department of Education to build on existing mental health programs to create evidence-based approaches to suicide prevention and mental health care. And it would encourage the Department to collaborate with State agencies, nonprofit organizations, and stakeholders to help ensure that these programs fully meet the needs of students.

□ 1245

In other words, the Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act is a critical opportunity for each of us to stand up for the healthcare needs of our Nation's students and ensure that we care for their well-being.

I thank Ms. WILD and Mr. KELLER for their work on this critical priority, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5407, the bipartisan Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act.

The mental health of our Nation's students is on the minds of many Americans. According to a study by Boston University, mental health issues increased steadily over the past 8 years among college students. In fact, 60 percent of students met the criteria for at least one mental health problem, including increased rates of anxiety, depression, and thoughts of suicide.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, approximately 25 percent of 18-to-24-year-olds surveyed in 2020 had seriously considered suicide. Unfortunately, these issues were made only worse by the pandemic. Clearly, something needs to be done.

That is why I joined my Pennsylvania colleague, Representative WILD, in introducing H.R. 5407. This legislation will encourage institutions of higher education to develop comprehensive mental health and suicide prevention plans to support college students.

H.R. 5407 directs the Secretary of Education to encourage institutions of higher education to develop and implement comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans. The bill also directs the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services to work together in a way that will allow the institutions to draw from existing evidence-based approaches and programs enacted by the 21st Century Cures Act, the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act, and the Suicide Prevention Resource Center, as well as other existing Federal and State programs.

We all want to see our Nation's students thrive and succeed. Yet, many students are battling severe depression and contemplating suicide. We must all come together to prevent such tragedy. The best way to do this is to ensure that students know safe resources are nearby, so they can get the mental health support they need.

It is time to break down barriers to mental health access. This means breaking down the stigmas and the practical barriers associated with seeking mental health services. That is what this bill seeks to do.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 5407, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about this bipartisan

bill, H.R. 5407, the Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act, which will be taken up for consideration today.

Supporting the young people of our country is not a partisan issue. I thank the co-lead of this bill, Representative FRED KELLER, and the original cosponsors, Representatives FITZPATRICK, RASKIN, STEVENS, TRONE, SCANLON, MOULTON, GRIJALVA, ROYBAL-ALLARD, DEAN, HARDER, and DESAULNIER for their support.

In the last several years, young Americans have faced unprecedented challenges resulting in a rise in mental health needs. College campus counseling centers have been tasked with responding to this increased demand for mental health services with limited staff, funding, and resources.

The mental health effects of the pandemic are widespread, with a study conducted by Pennsylvania State University reporting that 94 percent of students seeking mental health services said that COVID–19 negatively impacted at least one area of their life and 72 percent reporting that the pandemic's main impact has been on their mental health.

To help institutions of higher education better serve students, once passed, this bill will encourage colleges and universities to develop and implement mental health programs in concert with both State-level programs and community-based organizations.

During my visits to colleges in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, even before the pandemic, students shared with me the importance of improving mental health care access on campus.

Today, I am proud that the Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act will receive a vote, and I look forward to casting mine in support.

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

In closing, I want to discuss the importance of what we are doing. COVID–19 burdened young people with more anxiety, stress, and isolation than ever before. Now, they need support that works.

According to one study, mental health problems among young adults rose 50 percent over the past 10 years. Many of us have seen the young people in our lives struggling, and it is devastating to watch.

I am dedicated to serving the needs of students nationwide. To me, this bill is a no-brainer.

Empowering postsecondary institutions to develop comprehensive suicide prevention plans and partner with community-based mental health organizations will do much to solve this mental health crisis. This critical investment in the mental health of our young people is an investment in the future of this country.

Lastly, I express my gratitude to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together on this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5407, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the evidence is clear that our Nation's students are continuing to grapple with an ongoing mental health crisis. Even as we continue to recover from COVID–19, we are still seeing far too many students suffer from depression, anxiety, and stress without the support and services they need to get back on their feet.

Madam Speaker, students in this country should not have to grapple with serious mental health challenges on their own. However, we cannot expect campus mental health care providers to support students if we do not support them with the resources that they need.

The Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act is legislation that we need to help ensure that our institutions of higher education are equipped to support students' mental health, both during the pandemic and into the future.

I, again, thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) for their leadership and cooperation on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5407—to amend the "Higher Education Act of 1965" to promote comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans within the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The mental health crisis plaguing our Nation is astounding. Particularly in our Nation's institutions of higher education, we see higher reported rates of anxiety and depression, which have unfortunately led some students to suicide.

According to studies done in the year 2020, suicide was the 12th leading cause of death within the Unites States. Within this year, 45,979 Americans died by suicide, and an estimated 1.2 million Americans attempted suicide.

Within the reported suicide rates of 2020, people ranging from ages 15–34 made up 32.59 percent of the total.

The COVID–19 pandemic exacerbated the mental health crisis showing a 25 percent increase in the number of depression and anxiety cases recorded globally.

In my home state of Texas 34.2 percent of adults reported symptoms of anxiety and depression between September 29, 2021, and October 11, 2021.

The transition period into institutions of higher education can be difficult for numerous reasons. Some of the leading triggers for anxiety and depression are the constant pressure for success, homesickness, adjustment to workload, or even the social aspects of the collegiate environment.

No matter the cause, it is our job as elected officials of the United States to ensure that we are putting our time and resources into ensuring that we are providing outlets for those struggling with mental health issues to seek refuge.

I want to be very clear when I say that providing these resources alone will not ensure that zero lives are taken at the hands of mental health struggles.

However, taking the steps to ensure that there are proper resources and parameters in place on the campuses of our college campuses will aid in helping our young adults receive the assistance they need to lead healthy lives.

We cannot sit idly as our Nation stares down the barrel of an all-time low for mental health.

By invoking comprehensive mental health and suicide prevention plans across higher education institutions, we are pouring into our next generations.

H.R. 5407 allows for collegiate institutions to draw on the expertise and resources provided by the Suicide Prevention Centers nine strategy model, while also working with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to create a comprehensive approach to mental health concerns and suicide prevention.

This mental health assistance model will allow for all institutions throughout the Nation to collectively pool together and ensure each campus is administering the highest level of care for students with mental health struggles.

I urge for each of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 5407 to help us get our college students across the stage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5407, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. 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 motion are postponed.

CAMPUS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY SERVICES FOR STUDENTS ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6493) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6493

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 ''Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE MISUSE PREVENTION.

Section 120 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011i) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE**'' and inserting ''**ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE MISUSE**'';*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''a program to prevent the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol by students and employees that,'' and inserting ''an evidence-based program to prevent alcohol and substance misuse by students and employees that,'';

(B) by amending paragraph (1)(D) to read as follows:

''(D) a description of any alcohol or substance misuse counseling, treatment, rehabilitation, recovery, re-entry, or recovery support programs provided by the institution (including in partnership with a community-based organization) that are available to employees or students; and''; and

(C) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking ''that the institution will impose'' and inserting ''of the policies of the institution regarding'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) compliance assistance to assist institutions in complying with the requirements of this section.'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall enter into an interagency agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to—

''(A) develop best practices that inform criteria which satisfy the requirement under subsection (a) that an institution of higher education has adopted and has implemented an evidence-based program described in such subsection;

''(B) establish a process for disseminating the best practices for adopting and implementing such an evidence-based program; and

''(C) establish a process that promotes coordination and collaboration between institutions of higher education and the respective State agencies that administer the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grants pursuant to subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–21).

''(3) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, issue guidance with respect to the criteria described in paragraph (2)(A).''; and

(4) in subsection (e)—

*(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''**DRUG ABUSE**'' in the heading and inserting ''**SUBSTANCE MISUSE**'';*

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''other organizations'' and inserting ''community-based organizations that partner with institutions of higher education'';

(ii) by striking ''programs of prevention, and education (including treatment-referral) to reduce and eliminate the illegal use of drugs and alcohol and the violence associated with such use'' and inserting ''evidence-based programs of alcohol and substance misuse prevention and education (including programs to improve access to treatment, referral for treatment services, or crisis intervention services) to eliminate illegal substance use, decrease substance misuse, and improve public health and safety''; and

(iii) by striking ''alcohol and drug abuse'' and inserting ''substance use disorder'';

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL USES.—In addition to the activities described in paragraph (1), a grant or contract awarded under paragraph (1) may be used to carry out one or more of the following evidence-based programs or activities:

''(A) Providing programs for recovery support services, and peer-to-peer support services and counseling for students with a substance use disorder.

''(B) Promoting integration and collaboration in campus-based health services between primary care, substance use disorder services, and mental health services.

''(C) Promoting integrated care services for students related to screening, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of mental, behavioral, and substance use disorders.

''(D) Providing re-entry assistance for students on academic probation due to their substance use disorder.

''(E) Preventing fatal and nonfatal overdoses, including restoring existing mental health and substance use disorder services after a natural disaster or public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d).

''(F) Providing education to students, faculty, or other personnel on—

''(i) recognizing the signs and symptoms of substance use disorder, and how to engage and support a person in a crisis situation;

''(ii) resources available in the community, within the institution of higher education, and other relevant resources for individuals with a substance use disorder; and

''(iii) safely de-escalating crisis situations involving individuals with a substance use disorder.''; and

(E) by amending paragraph (6), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), to read as follows:

''(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2023 and each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.''.

SEC. 3. PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AGREEMENTS.

Section 487(a)(10) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(10)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(10)'' and inserting ''(10)(A)'';

(2) by striking ''a drug abuse prevention program'' and inserting ''an alcohol and substance misuse prevention program in accordance with section 120''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The institution shall be considered in compliance with the requirements of subparagraph (A) unless there is a showing that the institution knowing and willfully did not implement a prevention program described in such subparagraph.''.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

The Secretary of Education shall report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate on the efforts of the Secretary carried out under the amendments made by this Act, and best practices from institutions receiving a grant under section 120(e) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011i(e)), as amended by section 2 of this Act—

(1) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) three years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by sections 2(2) and 3 shall apply to institutions of higher education beginning on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, across the country, students on college campuses are facing an increased incidence of substance misuse.

Even before the pandemic, there was a rising demand for substance prevention and recovery programs on campuses. Unfortunately, the pandemic has only exacerbated the mental health and student well-being crisis.

In fact, as a result of the COVID–19 pandemic, a study found that 89 percent of college students experienced increased anxiety, and one in four students surveyed said their depression significantly increased.

College-aged students misuse substances more than any other age group. In a lot of cases, substance misuse in college can lead to lower academic performance and unemployment after graduation. Tragically, in the worst cases, substance misuse can lead to illness and death.

That is why the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) acted and introduced the bipartisan Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act.

This bill brings together the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services to encourage institutions to develop evidence-based substance misuse prevention and recovery programs for students with substance use disorders.

This bill also encourages institutions to holistically address substance use and mental health concerns. Importantly, it reauthorizes grants to help institutions carry out these efforts.

Madam Speaker, if we want to tackle the mental health crisis head-on and help our students reach their full potential, then we must invest in their well-being. This legislation will help deliver on that goal.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for leading this effort, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I stand today in support of H.R. 6493, the bipartisan Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act of 2022.

Sadly, college students were not exempt from the tremendous pressure brought by the COVID–19 pandemic. For many students, these escalating

pressures have resulted in behavioral and mental health challenges, such as substance abuse.

Even before the pandemic, studies found that young adults were turning to dangerous substances as 18-to-25-year-olds were reported to have the highest percent of opioid use of all age groups.

This is why I am proud to join my colleagues in support of this bill today.

H.R. 6493 promotes evidence-based prevention and recovery efforts on college campuses by providing colleges and universities the tools they need to support students struggling with substance abuse.

Specifically, this bill requires institutions of higher education that receive Federal funding to adopt an evidence-based program to prevent alcohol and substance misuse by both students and employees. The bill also ensures that the institutions are equipped with proven, evidence-based methods by directing the Secretary of Education to coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop best practices for colleges and universities when implementing substance abuse programs. Such coordination and cooperation are crucial.

For those colleges and universities that may need additional help for student recovery services, the bill updates an existing Federal grant for these uses. We know that colleges and university staff can serve as a critical support system for students suffering from an addiction or mental health issue. This bill will also empower staff to do so.

With college students experiencing increased loneliness, isolation, and depression, it is important that these students have access to alcohol and substance misuse prevention programs.

H.R. 6493 will keep students from falling into substance abuse, thus ensuring they start their future out on the right foot and on a path to a successful career. I urge my colleagues to support this bill today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is the sponsor of the legislation.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT and Ranking Member KELLER from the State of Pennsylvania for their support of this much-needed legislation.

Alcohol and substance misuse is a devastating issue across the country and on college campuses. It steals the dreams and futures of too many of our community.

I lost two brothers to addiction—alcohol and drug misuse. That misuse began during their time in college. My family has never recovered from the loss of those two beautiful brothers of mine, and I understand all too well the pain substance misuse inflicts on students, their families, and their communities. Sadly, my family's story is not unique in New Mexico or across this country.

Since the start of the pandemic, States have reported increased numbers of drug overdoses. Campuses have reported increased mental health concerns in students as well. College students who deal with substance misuse and addiction often find themselves isolated and without a support network.

Congress has an opportunity to address this serious issue by making sure that colleges and universities support students through strong prevention and recovery programs. I don't want to see another headline or obituary of a promising young person lost to overdose.

That is why I introduced the bipartisan Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act along with Representatives DUSTY JOHNSON, LUCY MCBATH, JOHN JOYCE, and MICHAEL GUEST. I would also like to acknowledge Representative DAVID TRONE who is co-chair of the Bipartisan Mental Health and Addiction Task Force of which I am also a member. He led this bill during last Congress.

Our bill will help to cut the chains of addiction and unlock access to treatment and prevention for countless students across the United States. Specifically, it will reauthorize the drug and alcohol abuse prevention provision of the Higher Education Act to promote evidence-based prevention and intervention strategies on college campuses. I have met with college students across my district to hear from them what is needed. What is needed is what is in this bill.

It encourages campus collaboration and service integration to address substance use and mental health concerns in a holistic manner. The bill also authorizes $15 million to implement those grants for fiscal year 2023 and the 5 following years.

I was pleased to see my bill pass unanimously during its markup in the Education and Labor Committee. I thank Chairman SCOTT and his staff for working to get this bill to the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 6493 and to vote ''yes'' in support of our students.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Through this commonsense bipartisan legislation, we will support institutions of higher education in their work to address the health and well-being of students and employees.

The isolation brought on by the pandemic exacerbated the mental health challenges students in this country were already facing. Data shows that substance abuse is a serious problem on college campuses. Some students may feel anxious about pursuing a degree in higher education and moving away from home for the first time, the challenges surrounding the pandemic have exacerbated those feelings.

Current and future generations of college students will be well-served with access to high-quality mental health and substance abuse disorder treatment services. The best thing postsecondary institutions can do is give students tools to handle those pressures in a healthy way.

Today, I am honored to stand in support of this legislation, H.R. 6493, as I believe it will give vulnerable students the assistance they desperately need.

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

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

Madam Speaker, as lawmakers, we have an opportunity to make a difference in students' lives and protect their health, including their mental health. The benefits of doing so are clear. Students with higher rates of well-being have higher GPAs and are more likely to graduate and be engaged in our community. Unfortunately, mental health issues and substance misuse are rising, and that is a concern for our college campuses.

The Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act will provide both guidance and funding to help make sure that students have the tools that they need to reach their full potential.

Again, I thank the chief sponsor of the bill, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ; the lead cosponsor of the bill, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON); and Mr. KELLER for their leadership on this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6493, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6493, the Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act. As we are coming out of a two-year pandemic, taking care of individuals with mental health and substance use disorders, especially college students, is crucial.

H.R. 6493, requires schools to develop evidence-based prevention and intervention strategies for college students and employees. H.R. 6493 requires both the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services to identify and promote successful programs.

As a physician and former Iowa Director of Public Health, I know just how critical evidence-based practices are for prevention of alcohol and substance use disorders and how life saving these practices can be for any student. It is equally important for college campuses and the medical community to come together to do what is best for our nation's students.

I look forward to voting in support of H.R. 6493 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6493—to amend the "Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act of 2022" to promote substance misuse treatment rehabilitation and reentry within institutions of higher education.

Today substance misuse targets our nation at a volatile rate. Specifically, when looking at our institutions of higher education our students are much more susceptible to being victims of substance misuse.

Common triggers for substance misuse include peer pressure, stress, social organization, and mental health issues.

Currently the "Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act of 2022", seeks to ensure that our public institutions are using funding given to them to provide the necessary outlets for recovery and re-entry into campus life.

Solutions the original bill provides include models for "prevention of the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol" by students and staff through connecting them with campus intervention, and rehabilitation resources.

As it stands the bill targets many of the necessary areas it needs to promote rehabilitation of substance abuse, but what it fails to do is provide the necessary funding allocations in ongoing to ensure the longevity of keeping our students safe.

Students who are struggling with substance misuse issues deserve to know that they are receiving the best possible care that they can, and we can foster that by making sure that our institutions of higher education have the resources they desperately need to be able continue to serve their student populations.

Through H.R. 6493 it will further push campuses to ensure that they are working with organizations both on and off campus.

Campuses will now be required to work with the Secretary of Education in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that each campus is using their funding for the highest quality of rehabilitation and re-entry services.

H.R. 6493 will grant $15 million to institutions annually from to 2021–2028 to aid in funding public institutions' recovery, rehabilitation, and re-entry programs.

I ask that my colleagues join me in support of H.R. 6493—the Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act of 2022.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6493, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. 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 motion are postponed.

SUPPORT THE RESILIENCY OF OUR NATION'S GREAT VETERANS ACT OF 2022

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6411) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6411

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Support The Resiliency of Our Nation's Great Veterans Act of 2022'' or the ''STRONG Veterans Act of 2022''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—TRAINING TO SUPPORT VETERANS' MENTAL HEALTH

Sec. 101. Mental health and suicide prevention outreach to minority veterans and American Indian and Alaska Native veterans.
Sec. 102. Expansion of Vet Center workforce.
Sec. 103. Expansion of mental health training for Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 104. Expansion of scholarships and loan repayment programs for mental health providers.

TITLE II—VETERANS CRISIS LINE

Sec. 201. Veterans Crisis Line.

Subtitle A—Veterans Crisis Line Training and Quality Management

Sec. 211. Staff training.
Sec. 212. Quality review and management.
Sec. 213. Guidance for high-risk callers.
Sec. 214. Oversight of training of social service assistants and clarification of job responsibilities.

Subtitle B—Pilot Programs and Research on Veterans Crisis Line

Sec. 221. Pilot programs.
Sec. 222. Authorization of appropriations for research on effectiveness and opportunities for improvement of Veterans Crisis Line.

Subtitle C—Transition of Crisis Line Number

Sec. 231. Feedback on transition of crisis line number.

TITLE III—OUTREACH TO VETERANS

Sec. 301. Solid Start program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 302. Designation of Buddy Check Week by Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 303. Improvements to Veterans Justice Outreach Program.
Sec. 304. Department of Veterans Affairs Governors Challenge Program.

TITLE IV—MENTAL HEALTH CARE DELIVERY

Sec. 401. Expansion of peer specialist support program of Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 402. Expansion of Vet Center services.
Sec. 403. Eligibility for mental health services.
Sec. 404. Mental health consultations.

TITLE V—RESEARCH

Sec. 501. Veterans integration to academic leadership program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 502. Improvement of sleep disorder care furnished by Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 503. Study on inpatient mental health and substance use care from Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 504. Study on treatment from Department of Veterans Affairs for co-occurring mental health and substance use disorders.
Sec. 505. Study on workload of suicide prevention teams of Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 506. Expansion of suicide prevention and mental health research.
Sec. 507. Study on mental health and suicide prevention support for military families.
Sec. 508. Research on brain health.
Sec. 509. Study on efficacy of clinical and at-home resources for post-traumatic stress disorder.

TITLE I—TRAINING TO SUPPORT VETERANS' MENTAL HEALTH

SEC. 101. MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE PREVENTION OUTREACH TO MINORITY VETERANS AND AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE VETERANS.

(a) STAFFING REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that each medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs has no fewer than one full-time employee whose responsibility is serving as a minority veteran coordinator.

(b) TRAINING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Indian Health Service and the Director of the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention of the Department of Veterans Affairs, shall ensure that all minority veteran coordinators receive training in delivery of mental health and suicide prevention services culturally appropriate for American Indian and Alaska Native veterans, especially with respect to the identified populations and tribes within the coordinators' catchment areas.

(c) COORDINATION WITH SUICIDE PREVENTION COORDINATORS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention, shall ensure that the suicide prevention coordinator and minority veteran coordinator of each medical center of the Department have developed and disseminated to the director of the medical center a written plan for conducting mental health and suicide prevention outreach to all tribes and urban Indian health organizations within the catchment area of the medical center. Each such plan shall include for each tribe covered by the plan—

(1) contact information for tribal leadership and the tribal health facility or Indian Health Service facility serving that tribe;

(2) a schedule for and list of outreach plans (including addressing any barriers to accessing Department mental health care);

(3) documentation of any conversation with tribal leaders that may guide culturally appropriate delivery of mental health care to American Indian or Alaska Native veterans;

(4) documentation of any progress in incorporating traditional healing practices into mental health and suicide prevention protocols and options available for veterans who are members of such tribe; and

(5) documentation of any coordination among the Department, the Indian Health Service, urban Indian health organizations, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration for the purpose of improving suicide prevention efforts tailored to veterans who are members of such tribe and the provision of culturally competent mental health care to such veterans.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on outreach efforts to minority veterans and American Indian and Alaska Native veterans. Such report shall include each of the following:

(1) The number of minority veteran coordinators within the Department.

(2) The number and percentage of minority veteran coordinators who are women.

(3) The number and percentage of minority veteran coordinators who are persons of color.

(4) The number and percentage of Department medical centers with minority veteran coordinators.

(5) The number and percentage of Department mental health providers who are enrolled members of a federally recognized Indian tribe or self-identify as Native American.

(6) The number and percentage of Department mental health providers who speak a second language.

(7) A review of the outreach plans developed and submitted to all Department medical centers for outreach to American Indian and Alaska Native veterans.

(8) A review of mental health care provided annually by the Department to American Indian and Alaska Native veterans for the past three years, including number of appointments, and an assessment of any barriers to providing this care.

SEC. 102. EXPANSION OF VET CENTER WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall hire an additional 50 full-time equivalent employees for Vet Centers to bolster the workforce of Vet Centers and to provide expanded mental health care to veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and their families through outreach, community access points, outstations, and Vet Centers.

(b) VET CENTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Vet Center'' has the meaning given that term in section 1712A(h) of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 103. EXPANSION OF MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention and the Office of Academic Affiliations, shall add an additional 250 paid trainee slots in covered mental health disciplines to the workforce of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) COVERED MENTAL HEALTH DISCIPLINES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered mental health disciplines'' means psychiatry, psychology, advanced practice nursing (with a focus on mental health or substance use disorder), social work, licensed professional mental health counseling, and marriage and family therapy.

SEC. 104. EXPANSION OF SCHOLARSHIPS AND LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAMS FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDERS.

(a) EXPANSION OF HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—Beginning in academic year 2022, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall include not fewer than an additional (as compared to academic year 2021) 50 awards per academic year under the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Professional Scholarship Program under subchapter II of chapter 76 of title 38, United States Code, for applicants otherwise eligible for such program who are pursuing degrees or training in mental health disciplines, including advanced practice nursing (with a focus on mental health or substance use disorder), psychology, and social work.

(b) EXPANSION OF EDUCATION DEBT REDUCTION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in fiscal year 2022, the Secretary shall provide not fewer than an additional (as compared to fiscal year 2021) 200 debt reduction awards per year under the Department of Veterans Affairs Education Debt Reduction Program under subchapter VII of chapter 76 of title 38, United States Code, to be used to recruit mental health professionals to the Department of Veterans Affairs in disciplines that include psychiatry, psychology, advanced practice nursing (with a focus on mental health or substance use disorder), and social work.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs $8,000,000 per year to carry out the additional awards under paragraph (1).

(c) OUTREACH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a public awareness campaign to encourage veterans and mental health professionals to choose the Department for their mental health career.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The campaign required under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall advertise the paid trainee, scholarship, and loan repayment opportunities offered by the Department; and

(B) may highlight the new graduate medical education residencies available at the Department for medical students entering residency.

TITLE II—VETERANS CRISIS LINE

SEC. 201. VETERANS CRISIS LINE.

In this title, the term ''Veterans Crisis Line'' means the toll-free hotline for veterans established under section 1720F(h) of title 38, United States Code.

Subtitle A—Veterans Crisis Line Training and Quality Management

SEC. 211. STAFF TRAINING.

(a) REVIEW OF TRAINING FOR VETERANS CRISIS LINE CALL RESPONDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into an agreement with an organization outside the Department of Veterans Affairs to review the training for Veterans Crisis Line call responders on assisting callers in crisis.

(2) COMPLETION OF REVIEW.—The review conducted under paragraph (1) shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—The review conducted under paragraph (1) shall consist of a review of the training provided by the Department on subjects including risk assessment, lethal means assessment, substance use and overdose risk assessment, safety planning, referrals to care, supervisory consultation, and emergency dispatch.

(4) UPDATE OF TRAINING.—If any deficiencies in the training for Veterans Crisis Line call responders are found pursuant to the review under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall update such training and associated standards of practice to correct those deficiencies not later than one year after the completion of the review.

(b) RETRAINING GUIDELINES FOR VETERANS CRISIS LINE CALL RESPONDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop guidelines on retraining and quality management for when a Veterans Crisis Line call responder has an adverse event or when a quality review check by a supervisor of such a call responder denotes that the call responder needs improvement.

(2) ELEMENTS OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall specify the subjects and quantity of retraining recommended and how supervisors should implement increased use of silent monitoring or other performance review mechanisms.

SEC. 212. QUALITY REVIEW AND MANAGEMENT.

(a) MONITORING OF CALLS ON VETERANS CRISIS LINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall require that not fewer than two calls per month for each Veterans Crisis Line call responder be subject to supervisory silent monitoring, which is used to monitor the quality of conduct by such call responder during the call.

(2) BENCHMARKS.—The Secretary shall establish benchmarks for requirements and performance of Veterans Crisis Line call responders on supervisory silent monitored calls.

(3) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not less frequently than quarterly, the Secretary shall submit to the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention of the Department of Veterans Affairs a report on occurrence and outcomes of supervisory silent monitoring of calls on the Veterans Crisis Line.

(b) QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROCESSES FOR VETERANS CRISIS LINE.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the leadership for the Veterans Crisis Line, in partnership with the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention of the Department and the National Center for Patient Safety of the Department, shall establish quality management processes and expectations for staff of the Veterans Crisis Line, including with respect to reporting of adverse events and close calls.

(c) ANNUAL COMMON CAUSE ANALYSIS FOR CALLERS TO VETERANS CRISIS LINE WHO DIE BY SUICIDE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary shall perform a common cause analysis for all identified callers to the Veterans Crisis Line that died by suicide during the one-year period preceding the conduct of the analysis before the caller received contact with emergency services and in which the Veterans Crisis Line was the last point of contact.

(2) SUBMITTAL OF RESULTS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention of the Department the results of each analysis conducted under paragraph (1).

(3) APPLICATION OF THEMES OR LESSONS.—The Secretary shall apply any themes or lessons learned under an analysis under paragraph (1) to updating training and standards of practice for staff of the Veterans Crisis Line.

SEC. 213. GUIDANCE FOR HIGH-RISK CALLERS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF ENHANCED GUIDANCE AND PROCEDURES FOR RESPONSE TO CALLS RELATED TO SUBSTANCE USE AND OVERDOSE RISK.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with national experts within the Department of Veterans Affairs on substance use disorder and overdose, shall—

(1) develop enhanced guidance and procedures to respond to calls to the Veterans Crisis Line related to substance use and overdose risk;

(2) update training materials for staff of the Veterans Crisis Line in response to such enhanced guidance and procedures; and

(3) update criteria for monitoring compliance with such enhanced guidance and procedures.

(b) REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR EMERGENCY DISPATCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) review the current emergency dispatch standard operating procedure of the Veterans Crisis Line to identify any additions to such procedure to strengthen communication regarding—

(i) emergency dispatch for disconnected callers; and

(ii) the role of social service assistants in requesting emergency dispatch and recording such dispatches; and

(B) update such procedure to include the additions identified under subparagraph (A).

(2) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall ensure that all staff of the Veterans Crisis Line are trained on all updates made under paragraph (1)(B) to the emergency dispatch standard operating procedure of the Veterans Crisis Line.

SEC. 214. OVERSIGHT OF TRAINING OF SOCIAL SERVICE ASSISTANTS AND CLARIFICATION OF JOB RESPONSIBILITIES.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) establish oversight mechanisms to ensure that social service assistants and supervisory social service assistants working with the Veterans Crisis Line are appropriately trained and implementing guidance of the Department regarding the Veterans Crisis Line; and

(2) refine standard operating procedures to delineate roles and responsibilities for all levels of supervisory social service assistants working with the Veterans Crisis Line.

Subtitle B—Pilot Programs and Research on Veterans Crisis Line

SEC. 221. PILOT PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENDED SAFETY PLANNING PILOT PROGRAM FOR VETERANS CRISIS LINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Commencing not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to determine whether a lengthier, templated safety plan used in clinical settings could be applied in call centers for the Veterans Crisis Line.

(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to Congress a briefing on the findings of the Secretary under the pilot program conducted under paragraph (1), which shall include any recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the continuation or discontinuation of the pilot program.

(b) CRISIS LINE FACILITATION PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Commencing not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall carry out a pilot program on the use of crisis line facilitation to increase use of the Veterans Crisis Line among high-risk veterans.

(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to Congress a briefing on the findings of the Secretary under the pilot program under paragraph (1), including any recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the continuation or discontinuation of the pilot program.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) The term ''crisis line facilitation'', with respect to a high-risk veteran, means the presentation by a therapist of psychoeducational information about the Veterans Crisis Line and a discussion of the perceived barriers and facilitators to future use of the Veterans Crisis Line for the veteran, which culminates in the veteran calling the Veterans Crisis Line with the therapist to provide firsthand experiences that may counter negative impressions of the Veterans Crisis Line.

(B) The term ''high-risk veteran'' means a veteran receiving inpatient mental health care following a suicidal crisis.

SEC. 222. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVENESS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF VETERANS CRISIS LINE.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal years 2022 and 2023, a total of $5,000,000 for the Mental Illness Research, Education, and Clinical Centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct research on the effectiveness of the Veterans Crisis Line and areas for improvement for the Veterans Crisis Line.

Subtitle C—Transition of Crisis Line Number

SEC. 231. FEEDBACK ON TRANSITION OF CRISIS LINE NUMBER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall solicit feedback from veterans service organizations on how to conduct outreach to members of the Armed Forces, veterans, their family members, and other members of the military and veterans community on the move to 988 as the new, national three-digit suicide and mental health crisis hotline, which is expected to be implemented by July 2022, to minimize confusion and ensure veterans are aware of their options for reaching the Veterans Crisis Line.

(b) NONAPPLICATION OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to any feedback solicited under subsection (a).

(c) VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''veterans service organization'' means an organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

TITLE III—OUTREACH TO VETERANS

SEC. 301. SOLID START PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER II—OTHER OUTREACH PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

''§ 6320. Solid Start program

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a program, to be known as the 'Solid Start program', under which the Secretary shall—

''(1) build the capacity of the Department to efficiently and effectively respond to the queries and needs of veterans who have recently separated from the Armed Forces; and

''(2) systemically integrate and coordinate efforts to assist veterans, including efforts—

''(A) to proactively reach out to newly separated veterans to inform them of their eligibility for programs of and benefits provided by the Department; and

''(B) to connect veterans in crisis to resources that address their immediate needs.

''(b) ACTIVITIES OF THE SOLID START PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall carry out the Solid Start program of the Department by—

''(A) collecting up-to-date contact information during transition classes or separation counseling for all members of the Armed Forces who are separating from the Armed Forces, while explaining the existence and purpose of the Solid Start program;

''(B) calling each veteran, regardless of separation type or characterization of service, three times within the first year after separation of the veteran from the Armed Forces;

''(C) providing information about the Solid Start program on the website of the Department and in materials of the Department, especially transition booklets and other resources;

''(D) ensuring calls are truly tailored to the needs of each veteran's unique situation by conducting quality assurance tests;

''(E) prioritizing outreach to veterans who have accessed mental health resources prior to separation from the Armed Forces;

''(F) providing women veterans with information that is tailored to their specific health care and benefit needs;

''(G) as feasible, providing information on access to State and local resources, including Vet Centers and veterans service organizations; and

''(H) gathering and analyzing data assessing the effectiveness of the Solid Start program.

''(2) The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, may carry out the Solid Start program by—

''(A) encouraging members of the Armed Forces who are transitioning to civilian life to authorize alternate points of contact who can be reached should the member be unavailable during the first year following the separation of the member from the Armed Forces;

''(B) following up missed phone calls with tailored mailings to ensure the veteran still receives similar information; and

''(C) striving to reach out to veterans who separated prior to the initiation of the Solid Start program to provide similar services to those veterans, as feasible.

''(3) In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'Vet Center' has the meaning given that term in section 1712A(h) of this title.

''(B) The term 'veterans service organization' means an organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of this title.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 63 of such title, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by inserting before section 6301 the following:

''Subchapter I—Outreach Services Program'';

and

(2) in sections 6301, 6303, 6304, 6305, 6306, and 6307, by striking ''this chapter'' each place it appears and inserting ''this subchapter''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting before the item relating to section 6301 the following new item:

''SUBCHAPTER I—OUTREACH SERVICES PROGRAM'';

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new items:

''SUBCHAPTER II—OTHER OUTREACH PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

''6320. Solid Start program.''.

SEC. 302. DESIGNATION OF BUDDY CHECK WEEK BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall designate one week each year to organize outreach events and educate veterans on how to conduct peer wellness checks, which shall be known as ''Buddy Check Week''.

(b) EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During Buddy Check Week, the Secretary, in consultation with organizations that represent veterans, nonprofits that serve veterans, mental health experts, members of the Armed Forces, and such other entities and individuals as the Secretary considers appropriate, shall collaborate with organizations that represent veterans to provide educational opportunities for veterans to learn how to conduct peer wellness checks.

(2) TRAINING MATTERS.—As part of the educational opportunities provided under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide the following:

(A) A script for veterans to use to conduct peer wellness checks that includes information on appropriate referrals to resources veterans might need.

(B) Online and in-person training, as appropriate, on how to conduct a peer wellness check.

(C) Opportunities for members of organizations that represent veterans to learn how to train individuals to conduct peer wellness checks.

(D) Training for veterans participating in Buddy Check Week on how to transfer a phone call directly to the Veterans Crisis Line.

(E) Resiliency training for veterans participating in Buddy Check Week on handling a veteran in crisis.

(3) ONLINE MATERIALS.—All training materials provided under the educational opportunities under paragraph (1) shall be made publicly available on a website of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) OUTREACH.—The Secretary, in collaboration with organizations that represent veterans, may conduct outreach regarding educational opportunities under subsection (b) at—

(1) public events where many veterans are expected to congregate;

(2) meetings of organizations that represent veterans;

(3) facilities of the Department; and

(4) such other locations as the Secretary, in collaboration with organizations that represent veterans, considers appropriate.

(d) VETERANS CRISIS LINE PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that a plan exists for handling the potential increase in the number of calls into the Veterans Crisis Line that may occur during Buddy Check Week.

(2) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.—The head of the Veterans Crisis Line shall submit to the Secretary a plan for how to handle excess calls during Buddy Check Week, which may include the following:

(A) Additional hours for staff.

(B) The use of a backup call center.

(C) Any other plan to ensure that calls from veterans in crisis are being answered in a timely manner by an individual trained at the same level as a Veterans Crisis Line responder.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''organization that represents veterans'' means an organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of such title.

(3) The term ''Veterans Crisis Line'' means the toll-free hotline for veterans provided by the Secretary under section 1720F(h) of such title.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH PROGRAM.

(a) OUTREACH REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct outreach regarding the Veterans Justice Outreach Program to justice-involved veterans, military and veterans service organizations, and relevant stakeholders in the criminal justice community, including officials from local law enforcement, court, and jail systems and others as determined appropriate by the Secretary. Such outreach—

(1) shall be designed—

(A) to spread awareness and understanding of the Program;

(B) to spread awareness and understanding of veteran eligibility for the Program, including the eligibility of veterans who were discharged from service in the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable; and

(C) to improve the identification of justice-involved veterans; and

(2) may be conducted in person, virtually, or through other means, including by the dissemination of informational materials and contact information.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop a strategic plan for the Veterans Justice Outreach Program. In developing such plan, the Secretary shall conduct—

(1) an assessment of barriers to working with justice-involved veterans in rural, remote, and underserved areas, including potential steps to address such barriers; and

(2) a workforce gap analysis for the Program.

(c) INCREASE IN NUMBER OF VJO SPECIALISTS.—

(1) INCREASE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase the number of Veterans Justice Outreach specialists responsible for supporting justice-involved veterans in rural, remote, or underserved areas, including areas located far from Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers, as determined by the Secretary, through—

(A) the hiring of additional Veterans Justice Outreach specialists;

(B) the reallocation of existing Veterans Justice Outreach specialists; or

(C) such other means as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine the number of Veterans Justice Outreach specialists required, and the locations of such specialists, under paragraph (1) by taking into account—

(A) such number and locations needed to achieve the mission and strategic goals of the Veterans Justice Outreach Program;

(B) any gaps in the workforce of the Program, including such gaps identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2); and

(C) strategies to address such gaps.

(3) USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the use of virtual technology.

(d) PERFORMANCE GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish performance goals and implementation plans for—

(A) the Veterans Justice Outreach Program;

(B) Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists; and

(C) providing support for research regarding justice-involved veterans.

(2) CONSISTENCY WITH STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Secretary shall ensure that the performance goals and implementation plans under paragraph (1) are consistent with the strategic plan under subsection (b) and include—

(A) qualitative and quantitative milestones, measures, and metrics, and associated timelines for completion of the plans under paragraph (1) and barriers to such completion;

(B) an identification of relevant staff; and

(C) an estimate of resource needs and sources.

(3) PERFORMANCE DATA.—The Secretary shall establish a process to regularly collect and analyze performance data to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of implementing the plans under paragraph (1).

(e) TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that all Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists receive training not less frequently than annually on—

(1) best practices for identifying and conducting outreach to justice-involved veterans and relevant stakeholders in the criminal justice community; and

(2) veteran eligibility for the Veterans Justice Outreach Program, including with respect to consistently communicating changes regarding eligibility (including through the use of a script or other reference materials).

(f) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) FIRST REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(A) An assessment of implementing subsection (c), including—

(i) strategies to increase Veterans Justice Outreach specialists responsible for supporting justice-involved veterans in rural, remote, or underserved areas; and

(ii) the progress of the Secretary in addressing gaps in the workforce of the Veterans Justice Outreach Program identified pursuant to paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(B) The performance goals and implementation plans established under subsection (d)(1).

(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORT.—Not later than three years after the date on which the first report is submitted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of the Secretary in meeting the performance goals and carrying out activities under the implementation plans established under subsection (d)(1).

(g) REPORT ON VETERANS TREATMENT COURTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall submit to Congress a report on the engagement of the Department of Veterans Affairs with veterans treatment courts, including—

(1) the availability and efficacy of veterans treatment courts in meeting the needs of justice-involved veterans;

(2) best practices for Department of Veterans Affairs staff and justice-involved veterans in working with veterans treatment courts; and

(3) the ability of justice-involved veterans to access veterans treatment courts, including any barriers that exist to increasing such access.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''justice-involved veteran'' means a veteran with active, ongoing, or recent contact with some component of a local criminal justice system.

(2) The term ''Veterans Justice Outreach Program'' means the program through which the Department of Veterans Affairs identifies justice-involved veterans and provides such veterans with access to Department services.

(3) The term ''Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist'' means an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who serves as a liaison between the Department and the local criminal justice system on behalf of a justice-involved veteran.

(4) The term ''veterans treatment court'' means a State or local court that is participating in the veterans treatment court program (as defined in section 2991(i)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(i)(1))).

SEC. 304. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS GOVERNORS CHALLENGE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into agreements with States, territories, and American Indian and Alaska Native tribes for the development and implementation of veteran suicide prevention proposals through the Governors Challenge Program.

TITLE IV—MENTAL HEALTH CARE DELIVERY

SEC. 401. EXPANSION OF PEER SPECIALIST SUPPORT PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) EXPANSION.—Section 506 of the VA MISSION Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–182; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as subsections (e) through (g);

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Each such peer specialist shall be a full-time employee whose primary function is to serve as a peer specialist and shall be in addition to all other employees of such medical center.'';

(3) in the heading of subsection (b), by striking ''TIMEFRAME'' and inserting ''INITIAL TIMEFRAME'';

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''SELECTION'' and inserting ''INITIAL SELECTION''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''The Secretary shall'' and inserting ''In establishing the program at initial locations, the Secretary shall'';

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) TIMEFRAME FOR EXPANSION OF PROGRAM; SELECTION OF ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS.—

''(1) TIMEFRAME FOR EXPANSION.—The Secretary shall make permanent and expand the program to additional medical centers of the Department as follows:

''(A) As of the date of the enactment of the STRONG Veterans Act of 2021, the Secretary shall make such program permanent at each medical center participating in the program on the day before such date of enactment.

''(B) During the seven-year period following such date of enactment, the Secretary shall expand the program to an additional 25 medical centers per year until the program is carried out at each medical center of the Department.

''(2) SELECTION OF ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS.—In selecting medical centers for the expansion of the program under paragraph (1)(B), until such time as each medical center of the Department is participating in the program by establishing not fewer than two peer specialists at the medical center, the Secretary shall prioritize medical centers in the following areas:

''(A) Rural areas and other areas that are underserved by the Department.

''(B) Areas that are not in close proximity to an active duty military installation.

''(C) Areas representing different geographic locations, such as census tracts established by the Bureau of the Census.'';

(6) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''GENDER-SPECIFIC SERVICES'' and inserting ''CONSIDERATIONS FOR HIRING PEER SPECIALISTS'';

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''location selected under subsection (c)'' and inserting ''medical center'';

(C) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(D) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(2) female peer specialists are hired and made available to support female veterans who are treated at each medical center; and

''(3) to the extent practical, peer specialists are hired in demographic percentages that reflect the racial and ethnic demographic percentages of the overall veterans population.''; and

(7) by amending subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1), to read as follows:

''(g) REPORTS.—

''(1) PERIODIC REPORTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the STRONG Veterans Act of 2021, and annually thereafter for five years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the program, including the expansion of the program under subsection (d)(1).

''(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subparagraph (A) shall include, with respect to the one-year period preceding the submission of the report, the following:

''(i) The findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the program.

''(ii) An assessment of the benefits of the program to veterans and family members of veterans.

''(iii) An assessment of the effectiveness of peer specialists in engaging under subsection (f) with health care providers in the community and veterans served by such providers.

''(iv) The name and location of each medical center where new peer specialists were hired.

''(v) The number of new peer specialists hired at each medical center pursuant to this section and the total number of peer specialists within the Department hired pursuant to this section.

''(vi) An assessment of any barriers confronting the recruitment, training, or retention of peer specialists.

''(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the Secretary determines that the program is being carried out at each medical center of the Department, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report notifying such committees of such determination.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement section 506 of the VA MISSION Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–182; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsection (a), the following amounts:

(1) $3,600,000 for fiscal year 2022.

(2) $7,200,000 for fiscal year 2023.

(3) $10,800,000 for fiscal year 2024.

(4) $14,400,000 for fiscal year 2025.

(5) $18,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.

(6) $21,600,000 for fiscal year 2027.

(7) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2028.

SEC. 402. EXPANSION OF VET CENTER SERVICES.

(a) VETERANS AND MEMBERS USING EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.—Section 1712A of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''clauses (i) through (vi)'' both places it appears and inserting ''clauses (i) through (vii)'';

(2) by striking ''in clause (vii)'' both places it appears and inserting ''in clause (viii)'';

(3) in subsection (a)(1)(C)—

(A) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (viii); and

(B) by inserting after clause (vi) the following new clause:

''(vii) Any veteran or member of the Armed Forces pursuing a course of education using covered educational assistance benefits.''; and

(4) in subsection (h), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) The term 'covered educational assistance benefits' means educational assistance benefits provided pursuant to—

''(A) chapter 30, 31, 32, or 33 of this title;

''(B) chapter 1606 or 1607 of title 10;

''(C) section 116 of the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–48; 38 U.S.C. 3001 note); or

''(D) section 8006 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 38 U.S.C. 3001 note prec.).''.

(b) GAO REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report assessing—

(1) the mental health needs of veterans pursuing a course of education using covered educational assistance benefits (as defined in section 1712A(h)(6) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)); and

(2) the efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs to address such mental health needs.

SEC. 403. ELIGIBILITY FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1712A(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 402, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''and'';

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) in the case of a veteran or member who died by suicide, to the degree that counseling furnished to such individual is found to aid in coping with the effects of such suicide.'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i)(II)—

(A) in item (aa), by striking ''or'';

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

(C) by adding at the end the following;

''(cc) coping with the effects of a suicide described in subclause (III) of such clause.''; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)(vii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''or'' at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) veteran or member of the Armed Forces who died by suicide.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to family members of a member or veteran who died by suicide before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 404. MENTAL HEALTH CONSULTATIONS.

(a) MENTAL HEALTH CONSULTATIONS FOR VETERANS FILING FOR COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter VI of chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1167. Mental health consultations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a veteran submits to the Secretary a claim for compensation under this chapter for a service-connected disability relating to a mental health diagnosis, the Secretary shall offer the veteran a mental health consultation to assess the mental health needs of, and care options for, the veteran.

''(b) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) offer a veteran a consultation under subsection (a) without regard to any previous denial or approval of a claim of that veteran for a service-connected disability relating to a mental health diagnosis; and

''(2) ensure that a veteran offered a mental health consultation under subsection (a) may elect to receive such consultation during the one-year period beginning on the date on which the consultation is offered or during such longer period beginning on such date as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A consultation provided to a veteran under this section shall not be construed as a determination that any disability of such veteran is service-connected for the purposes of any benefit under the laws administered by the Secretary.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 11 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1167. Mental health consultations.''.

(b) MENTAL HEALTH CONSULTATIONS FOR VETERANS ENTERING HOMELESS PROGRAMS OFFICE PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter VII of chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code, is amended

by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2068. Mental health consultations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two weeks after the date on which a veteran described in subsection (b) enters into a program administered by the Homeless Programs Office of the Department, the Secretary shall offer the veteran a mental health consultation to assess the health needs of, and care options for, the veteran.

''(b) VETERAN DESCRIBED.—A veteran described in this subsection is a veteran to whom a mental health consultation is not offered or provided through the case management services of the program of the Homeless Programs Office into which the veteran enters.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 20 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2068. Mental health consultations.''.

TITLE V—RESEARCH

SEC. 501. VETERANS INTEGRATION TO ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department of Veterans Affairs. The report shall include the following:

(1) The number of medical centers of the Department, institutions of higher learning, non-college degree programs, and student veterans supported by the program, and relevant trends since the program began.

(2) The staff and resources allocated to the program, and relevant trends since the program began.

(3) An assessment of the outcomes and effectiveness of the program in—

(A) supporting student veterans;

(B) connecting student veterans to needed services of the Department or services provided by non-Department entities;

(C) addressing the mental health needs of student veterans;

(D) lowering the suicide risk of student veterans; and

(E) helping student veterans achieve educational goals.

(4) An assessment of barriers to expanding the program and how the Secretary intends to address such barriers.

(5) An assessment of whether the program should be expanded outside of the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention to support students veterans with needs unrelated to mental health or suicide.

(b) UNIFORM BEST PRACTICES, GOALS, AND MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish best practices, goals, and measures for the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department that are uniform among the medical centers of the Department.

(c) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach among the Armed Forces, veterans service organizations, institutions of higher learning, and non-college degree programs with respect to the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department.

(d) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall assess the feasibility and advisability of including the suicide rate for student veterans in the National Veteran Suicide Prevention Annual Report of the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention of the Department.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''institution of higher learning'' has the meaning given that term in section 3452 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term ''student veteran'' means the following:

(A) A veteran or member of the Armed Forces using educational assistance under any of the following provisions of law:

(i) Chapter 30, 31, 32, or 33 of title 38, United States Code, or chapter 1606 or 1607 of title 10, United States Code.

(ii) Section 116 of the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–48; 38 U.S.C. 3001 note).

(iii) Section 8006 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 38 U.S.C. 3001 note prec.).

(B) A veteran who is enrolled in an institution of higher learning or other training program, without regard to whether the veteran is using educational assistance specified in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 502. IMPROVEMENT OF SLEEP DISORDER CARE FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the analysis conducted under subsection (b), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall take such action as the Secretary considers appropriate to improve the assessment and treatment of veterans with sleep disorders, including by conducting in-home sleep studies for veterans.

(b) ANALYSIS.—The Secretary shall conduct an analysis of the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to treat sleep disorders among veterans, including—

(1) assessment and treatment options for such disorders;

(2) barriers to care for such disorders, such as wait time, travel time, and lack of staffing;

(3) the efficacy of the clinical practice guidelines of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense for such disorders; and

(4) the availability of and efficacy of the use by the Department of Veterans Affairs of cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the findings from the analysis conducted under subsection (b); and

(2) any actions taken under subsection (a) to improve the assessment and treatment of veterans with sleep disorders.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR IN-HOME SLEEP STUDIES.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs $5,000,000 to be used to conduct in-home sleep studies for veterans, as part of sleep disorder assessment and treatment conducted by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 503. STUDY ON INPATIENT MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE CARE FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall complete the conduct of a study on access of veterans to care under the residential rehabilitation treatment programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs to determine—

(1) if there are sufficient geographic offerings of inpatient mental health care, especially for veterans in rural and remote communities;

(2) if there are sufficient bed spaces at each location, based on demand and drive time from the homes of veterans;

(3) if there are any workforce-related capacity limitations at each location, including if beds are unable to be used because there are not enough providers to care for additional patients;

(4) if there are diagnosis-specific or sex-specific barriers to accessing care under such programs; and

(5) the average wait time for a bed in such a program, broken out by—

(A) Veterans Integrated Service Network;

(B) rural or urban area;

(C) sex; and

(D) specialty (general program, substance use disorder program, military sexual trauma program, etc.).

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO TREATMENT PROGRAMS.—Using the results from the study conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make recommendations for—

(1) new locations for opening facilities to participate in the residential rehabilitation treatment programs of the Department;

(2) facilities under such programs at which new beds can be added; and

(3) any additional specialty tracks to be added to such programs, such as substance use disorder or military sexual trauma, in order to meet veteran need and demand.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after completion of the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a) and the recommendations made by the Secretary under subsection (b).

SEC. 504. STUDY ON TREATMENT FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR CO-OCCURRING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a study examining—

(1) the availability of treatment programs for veterans with co-occurring mental health and substance use disorders (including both inpatient and outpatient care);

(2) any geographic disparities in access to such programs, such as for rural and remote veterans; and

(3) the average wait times for care under such programs.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) any recommendations resulting from the study conducted under subsection (a) with respect to improving timeliness and quality of care and meeting treatment preferences for veterans with co-occurring mental health and substance use disorders; and

(B) a description of any actions taken by the Secretary to improve care for such veterans.

SEC. 505. STUDY ON WORKLOAD OF SUICIDE PREVENTION TEAMS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, acting through the Under Secretary for Health and the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention, shall conduct a study evaluating the workload of local suicide prevention teams of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify the effects of the growth of the suicide prevention program of the Department on the workload of suicide prevention teams;

(2) incorporate key practices for staffing model design in determining suicide prevention staffing needs; and

(3) determine which facilities of the Department need increased suicide prevention coordinator staffing to meet the needs of veterans, with an emphasis placed on facilities with high patient volume and facilities located in States with high rates of veteran suicide.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report—

(1) on the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a); and

(2) indicating any changes made to the staffing of suicide prevention teams of the Department resulting from the determinations made under subsection (b)(3), including a list of facilities of the Department where staffing was adjusted.

SEC. 506. EXPANSION OF SUICIDE PREVENTION AND MENTAL HEALTH RESEARCH.

(a) RESEARCH ON MORAL INJURY.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, acting through the Office of Research and Development of the Department of Veterans Affairs, shall conduct suicide prevention and mental health care improvement research on how moral injury relates to the mental health needs of veterans who served in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and best practices for mental health treatment for such veterans.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs an additional $10,000,000 to be used by the Center of Excellence for Suicide Prevention of the Department and the Rocky Mountain Mental Illness Research Education and Clinical Center for purposes of conducting research on the factors impacting veteran suicide and best practices for early intervention and support.

SEC. 507. STUDY ON MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE PREVENTION SUPPORT FOR MILITARY FAMILIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, shall conduct a study on secondary post-traumatic stress disorder and depression and its impact on spouses, children, and caregivers of members of the Armed Forces.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to Congress, veterans service organizations, and military support organizations a report on the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) The term ''military support organization'' has the meaning given that term by the Secretary of Defense.

(B) The term ''veterans service organization'' means an organization recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 508. RESEARCH ON BRAIN HEALTH.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs an additional $5,000,000 for ongoing and future research at the Translational Research Center of the Department of Veterans Affairs for traumatic brain injury and stress disorders to provide better understanding of, and improved treatment options for, veterans who served in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and who have traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder.

SEC. 509. STUDY ON EFFICACY OF CLINICAL AND AT-HOME RESOURCES FOR POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.

Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, acting through the Office of Research and Development of the Department of Veterans Affairs, shall conduct a study on—

(1) the efficacy of clinical and at-home resources, such as mobile applications like COVID Coach, for providers, veterans, caregivers, and family members to use for dealing with stressors;

(2) the feasibility and advisability of developing more such resources;

(3) strategies for improving mental health care and outcomes for veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder; and

(4) best practices for helping family members of veterans deal with secondary post-traumatic stress disorder or mental health concerns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 6411, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6411, as amended, the Support The Resilience of Our Nation's Great Veterans Act, or STRONG Veterans Act.

Chairman TAKANO introduced this bill with Ranking Member BOST, and we are grateful to them and their staff for working together over many months to bring this vital package to the House floor. This represents a true bipartisan effort to address a pressing issue.

Although we all were glad to see the veteran suicide rate drop in the last year for which we have data, one death is one too many, and suicide is preventable. We must honor our veterans' service by getting them the care they have earned and deserve now.

Preventing veteran suicide and strengthening veterans' mental health and well-being remains a top priority not only of the Biden administration and the Department of Veterans Affairs but also of our committee. There are prevention approaches and treatments that work, and we must expand all veterans' access to these lifesaving and life-improving services.

Madam Speaker, while we are talking about access, I want to make sure everyone listening today has the Veterans Crisis Line phone number. If you or somebody you care about is in distress, call 1–800–273–TALK—that is 1–800–273–8255—and press 1 for responders with military and veteran expertise. There is no reason to suffer alone.

Along with our colleagues in the Senate, we have advanced bipartisan bills over the past year that now make up the 22 sections of the STRONG Veterans Act.

I want to especially thank our colleagues both on and off the committee for their individual legislative contributions to this omnibus package.

Congresswoman BROWNLEY, who chairs our Veterans' Affairs Health Subcommittee, introduced what we consider a cornerstone of STRONG—her American Indian and Alaska Native Veterans Mental Health Act. This provision mandates that VA hire full-time minority veteran coordinators at every VA medical center to provide culturally competent mental health and suicide prevention outreach to our Tribal veterans.

Congresswoman SLOTKIN's Solid Start Act is included in STRONG and will ensure that VA continues to contact and check in with veterans following their transition from Active Duty during what we know is a very high-risk time for stress, mental health challenges, and even suicide.

The committee also was pleased to include the Veteran Peer Specialist Act from Congressman SCOTT PETERS. This is an important provision directing VA to expand its peer specialist program which is extremely popular with veterans.

Although our colleague, former Congressman Delgado, recently left the House to become Lieutenant Governor of New York, I thank him for introducing the REACH for Veterans Act in the House. It is a critical component of STRONG and will strengthen VA's Veterans Crisis Line.

Finally, Chairman TAKANO's bill in STRONG, the VA Governor's Challenge Expansion Act, mandates, for the first time, VA-included Tribes in addition to States in the successful Governors' Challenge program to prevent veteran suicide. No sovereign nation should have to wait to be invited to a State Governor's Challenge team. Instead, Tribes selected for the program will work directly with VA to tailor innovative suicide prevention ideas to the needs of their own Native veterans.

Overall, STRONG will give VA important new authorities and resources to support veterans' mental health and well-being through increased training, outreach, mental health care delivery, and research in line with the committee's public health approach and President Biden's strategy to address veteran suicide.

It addresses gaps along the spectrum of prevention and care by expanding mental health outreach to traditionally underserved veterans, developing and delivering the most effective treatments, better equipping VA's workforce to provide care, and further strengthening VA's crisis response system.

With this legislation, we will help VA better meet veterans where they are—literally. STRONG directs VA to hire more mental health staff at vet centers close to where veterans live and work.

STRONG also directs VA to assess and improve how well it serves veterans on college campuses. It requires VA to more consistently and comprehensively reach out and provide mental health services to veterans who have been involved with the criminal justice system.

STRONG mandates that as the new three-digit crisis hotline number goes live across the country in July, VA further strengthen its Veterans Crisis Line to meet the predicted surge in demand for emergency care and followup.

STRONG lays out important guidance for VA's research program related to suicide, substance use challenges, and other mental health issues. While caring for veterans today, VA must always be investing in science and looking for tomorrow's innovative solutions to improve veterans' lives.

STRONG and its component bills are endorsed by too many veterans service organizations and health organizations to list, but, Madam Speaker, let me leave you with these words from Andrew Marshall, National Commander of Disabled American Veterans, ''There is simply no greater or more urgent challenge within the veteran community right now than addressing mental health concerns and ensuring our Nation's heroes have access to the support they need to both prevent and mitigate crisis.

''DAV is pleased to support the STRONG Veterans Act, and we urge its swift passage and signing into law.''

In closing, Madam Speaker, Chairman TAKANO and I support this important piece of legislation, and we urge our colleagues to support H.R. 6411, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6411, as amended, the Support The Resiliency of Our Nation's Great, STRONG, Veterans Act.

This bill would improve VA's mental health and suicide prevention strategies by doing a number of things. It would expand the Vet Center workforce, and it would also allow student veterans the opportunity to seek counseling at Vet Centers during what can be yet another stressful time in that period of transitioning into civilian life.

□ 1315

Additionally, the bill would allow family members of veterans who died by suicide to seek bereavement counseling at Vet Centers. This support, from counselors who know veterans and the challenges that their families often face, would be a valuable resource for those in mourning.

This bill would expand training, scholarship, and loan repayment programs for the VA mental health providers. It would direct a series of actions to improve the Veterans Crisis Line, including enhanced training and oversight. It would codify an existing VA program that reaches out to veterans in their first year out of the military to provide them with information about relevant resources.

This bill would require VA to conduct numerous studies with the goals of improving care for veterans with sleep disorders, refining inpatient care for veterans struggling with addiction, identifying treatments for veterans suffering from both mental health and substance use disorders, and assessing the possible secondary impacts PTSD and depression may have on veterans' families.

This bill is the product of bipartisan, bicameral negotiations between the Veterans Affairs' Committee leaders. I thank Chairman TAKANO for working with me to introduce this bill and move it forward today.

I thank Senate colleagues Chairman TESTER and Ranking Member MORAN for their work on this bill.

This bill contains many provisions that were in standalone bills introduced by many of our other Members, and I recognize them today. I send a particular thank-you to Dr. Murphy, Congressman ROUZER, and to two of my fellow committee members, veterans themselves, Dr. MILLER-MEEKS and Congressman ELLZEY. Each of them spearheaded vital pieces of this legislation that will help veterans and their families thrive for years to come.

I encourage any veteran listening to this who is struggling and in need of support to contact the veterans hotline by calling 1–800–273–8825 and pressing 1. Once again, that is 1–800–273–8825 and pressing 1. Or you can also get there by texting 838255. That is 838255. Or you can actually visit the Veterans Crisis Line at veteranscrisisline.net, all one word.

There is absolutely no shame in asking for help if you need it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), my good friend.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in enthusiastic support of H.R. 6411, the Support The Resiliency of Our Nation's Great Veterans Act, commonly known as the STRONG Act.

I am proud that this legislation includes language from my bill, H.R. 4233, the Student Veterans Counseling Centers Eligibility Act. I introduced this bill alongside Ranking Member BOST to aid veteran transition back to civilian life, especially for those looking to further their education.

Far too often, we see the tragedy of our selfless defenders losing their battle to mental health issues when returning from service. The intention of our provision is to aid more of our veterans who are readjusting to civilian lives by providing them with overdue access to vital mental health resources.

This is especially personal to my district, as I represent 89,000 veterans, many of whom are or will be receiving benefits via the Post-9/11 GI Bill.

Regardless of which side of the aisle we sit on, we have an obligation to make sure that our counseling services are more accessible for our veterans, and I am glad that the STRONG Act focuses on this obligation.

My provision would expand counseling and mental health support to student veterans through the VA's readjustment counseling centers, also known as Vet Centers. These centers provide individual, group, marriage, and family counseling, as well as peer support opportunities for Active-Duty servicemembers, veterans, members of the National Guard and Reserve, and certain military family members. Vet Centers are community based, confidential, and free.

A recent RAND study shows that 20 percent of veterans on the GI Bill face feelings of depression from PTSD. That 20 percent amounts to over 170,000 veterans, double the number of veterans in my district.

Currently, the option of student veterans using school psychologists, in actuality, provides very little relief for our veterans. The director of policy and advocacy for the National Association of School Psychologists has reported that the national ratio of school psychologists to students is anywhere from 1 to 2,000 to 1 to 5,000.

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

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. I have heard personal stories from student veterans who have had to wait weeks or even months for a mental health appointment if their mental health crisis was not deemed in need of ''immediate attention.'' Unfortunately, many of our veterans do not have the luxury of weeks or months to see a mental health provider.

In addition, many of our universities' mental health counselors are actually not licensed professionals but, instead, graduate or doctoral students. Our veterans deserve better than this. They deserve the best healthcare from qualified professionals.

Helping students succeed in school and their civilian lives is one of the most important ways we can thank them for their service.

Tragically, the suicide rate among our veterans now is estimated to be anywhere from 17 to 22 suicides a day. Forty-six percent of military students

have reported suicidal thoughts, compared with only 6 percent of their nonmilitary peers.

If we can provide mental health services that are able to assist just a single veteran who is contemplating suicide to choose to live, I believe it is our sworn duty to do so. We have that opportunity now.

I am proud to support the STRONG Veterans Act, and I am very grateful to Chairman TAKANO and Ranking Member BOST for including my bill, the Student Veterans Counseling Center Eligibility Act. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 6411 in support of our Nation's veterans.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, after hearing from my constituent whose veteran spouse tragically died by suicide, and learning of the obstacles they faced when trying to receive critical mental health support for themselves and their children following his death, I introduced a bill to ensure veteran families struggling from such a loss have access to the support they need and deserve.

My legislative language, included in this bill before us today, the STRONG Veterans Act, expands Vet Center eligibility for counseling and mental health services to families of servicemembers or veterans who died by suicide. This expansion of services is necessary so that these families can receive the critical mental health support needed to help them heal and move forward.

We all know that grief can be extremely isolating, and the families of servicemembers and veterans who have died by suicide should not have to worry about enduring this difficult journey alone.

Our military families who support a loved one who is serving, or has served, make a tremendous sacrifice for our country, as well. We must ensure they have access to the care that they deserve and the help that they need when trying to move forward after a suicide has devastated them and their family.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for working with me to include this very important piece of legislation in this package, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First off, I say thank you to all the people who have worked on this important piece of legislation for the support that it is has received.

The important thing is that we get the care, treatment, and support for all the veterans who are considering suicide and the families who suffer from the fact that they have done it.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, again, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 6411, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6411, known as the STRONG Veterans Act of 2022.

As a senior member of the House Committees on Judiciary and Homeland Security, I care deeply about our veterans.

I offer my deepest gratitude to our Nation's troops and reservists, their families, and the 21.6 million veterans, including 29,126 in the 18th Congressional District of Texas that I proudly represent.

In Congress, I have sponsored many legislative proposals and co-sponsored well over 50 pieces of legislation that will positively benefit our veterans and their families.

Veterans with mental health diagnoses have a significantly elevated suicide risk. Suicide rates of veterans are at an all-time high, rising 25 percent in 2021 over the previous year. Veterans continue to have a 50 percent higher risk of suicide than their peers who have not served.

More than 80 percent of post-9/11 veterans say that the public does not understand the problems that veterans face when transitioning to civilian life.

Current resources to help the mental health of our veterans are inadequate. Our veterans need our support when transitioning back to civilian life.

The STRONG Veterans Act will:

Open eligibility for more student veterans at Vet Centers;

Expand culturally competent suicide prevention at VA for native veterans;

Significantly increase mental health staffing and training at VA medical centers and Vet Centers;

Further strengthen the Veterans Crisis Line;

Allow more veterans to benefit from engaging with peer specialists; and

Collect data for VA to guide expansion of inpatient mental health and substance use treatment.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 6411.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6411, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 2089,
H.R. 5407, and
H.R. 6493.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022

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 (S. 2089) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 42, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—376

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
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
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
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
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
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
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Raskin
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
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
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
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth

NAYS—42

Banks
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Brooks
Buck
Burchett
Cawthorn
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Davidson
Fitzgerald
Franklin, C. Scott
Gaetz
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Greene (GA)
Guest
Harris
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Lesko
Loudermilk
Massie
Mast
McClintock
Miller (IL)
Moore (AL)
Nehls
Norman
Perry
Pfluger
Rosendale
Roy
Schweikert
Steube
Taylor
Tiffany
Williams (TX)

NOT VOTING—11

Boebert
Bowman
Conway
Gosar
Hice (GA)
Hollingsworth
Pence
Price (NC)
Spartz
Wittman
Zeldin

□ 1412

Mr. CLINE changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ESTES, KELLY of Mississippi, GREEN of Tennessee, ARRINGTON, BABIN, and WEBER of Texas changed their votes 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 290.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Bonamici (Manning)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Bush (Williams (GA))
Carter (LA) (Williams (GA))
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Cherfilus-McCormick (Williams (GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Connolly (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Dingell (Stevens)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Fletcher (Pallone)
Frankel, Lois (Kuster)
García (IL) (Beyer)
Guest (Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Huffman (Gomez)
Jacobs (NY) (Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA) (Manning)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Neguse)
LaMalfa (Rouzer)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Stansbury (Stevens)
Strickland (Neguse)
Suozzi (Neguse)
Swalwell (Correa)
Takano (Chu)
Tlaib (Gomez)
Walorski (Baird)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Williams (GA))

ENHANCING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE PREVENTION THROUGH CAMPUS PLANNING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). 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. 5407) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans, 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 16, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—405

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Clyde
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
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
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
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
Norman
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter

Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Raskin
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
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
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)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth

NAYS—16

Arrington
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brooks
Cloud
Davidson
Gaetz
Gohmert
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Greene (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Massie
Perry
Roy

NOT VOTING—8

Barr
Conway
Hice (GA)
Pence
Price (NC)
Westerman
Wittman
Zeldin

□ 1425

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. BARR. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 291.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 291.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Boebert (Bishop (NC))
Bonamici (Manning)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Bush (Williams (GA))
Carter (LA) (Williams (GA))
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Cherfilus-McCormick (Williams (GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Connolly (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Dingell (Stevens)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Fletcher (Pallone)
Frankel, Lois (Kuster)
García (IL) (Beyer)
Gosar (Gohmert)
Guest (Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Huffman (Gomez)
Jacobs (NY) (Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA) (Manning)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Neguse)
LaMalfa (Rouzer)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Stansbury (Stevens)
Strickland (Neguse)
Suozzi (Neguse)
Swalwell (Correa)
Takano (Chu)
Tlaib (Gomez)
Walorski (Baird)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Williams (GA))

CAMPUS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY SERVICES FOR STUDENTS ACT OF 2022

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. 6493) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse, 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 49, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—371

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Axne
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.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bush
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
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
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
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
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
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
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
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
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)
Womack
Yarmuth

NAYS—49

Arrington
Babin
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brooks
Buck
Burchett
Cammack
Cawthorn
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Davidson
Donalds
Estes
Fallon
Franklin, C. Scott
Gaetz
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Harris
Herrell
Higgins (LA)
Jackson
Jordan
Lesko
Mann
Massie
McClintock
Miller (IL)
Moore (AL)
Nehls
Norman
Perry
Pfluger
Rosendale
Roy
Rutherford
Steube
Taylor
Tiffany
Weber (TX)

NOT VOTING—9

Buchanan
Bustos
Conway
Grijalva
Hice (GA)
Pence
Price (NC)
Wittman
Zeldin

□ 1438

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:

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen scheduling circumstances, I was unable to vote on H.R. 6493, the Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students Act of 2022, as amended, when it was put before the House of Representatives today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 292.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Boebert (Bishop (NC))
Bonamici (Manning)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Bush (Williams (GA))
Carter (LA) (Williams (GA))
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Cherfilus-McCormick (Williams (GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Connolly (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Dingell (Stevens)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Fletcher (Pallone)
Frankel, Lois (Kuster)
García (IL) (Beyer)
Gosar (Gohmert)
Guest (Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Huffman (Gomez)
Jacobs (NY) (Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA) (Manning)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Neguse)
LaMalfa (Rouzer)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Stansbury (Stevens)
Strickland (Neguse)
Suozzi (Neguse)
Swalwell (Correa)
Takano (Chu)
Tlaib (Gomez)
Walorski (Baird)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Williams (GA))

LGBTQI+ DATA INCLUSION ACT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1191, I call up the bill (H.R. 4176) to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation and gender identity in certain surveys, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CICILLINE). Pursuant to House Resolution 1191, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–52, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117–381, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4176

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 ''LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Academies on Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM), in their 2022 report, found that complete and accurate demographic information on the LGBTQI+ community should be standardized and collected.

(2) Comprehensive statistics are needed to inform public policy and Federal programs.

(3) The availability of data also has a critical role in ensuring that any disparities in areas like health outcomes, housing, and employment can be addressed.

(4) As of the March release of the NASEM report, limited Federal surveys collect data on sexual orientation and gender, with none currently measuring intersex populations.

(5) The integrity of the Federal statistical system relies on the ability of agencies to determine the content of their statistical surveys based on considerations of relevance, timeliness, accuracy, objectivity, and ability to maintain confidentiality.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT TO COLLECT DATA ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, AND VARIATIONS IN SEX CHARACTERISTICS.

(a) SURVEY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 360 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of any agency that collects information through a covered survey shall establish data standards that require, with regard to the survey, the following:

(1) REVIEW.—The review of covered surveys to determine in which surveys information about sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics is not included.

(2) METHODS.—An identification of appropriate methods to include questions on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics in covered surveys that facilitate categorization and voluntary participation and preserve privacy and confidentiality.

(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The use of the appropriate methods identified in paragraph (2) to gather data on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics for any survey identified in paragraph (1).

(4) ASSESSMENT.—The implementation of a process to routinely assess needed changes in covered survey methods related to asking questions on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics.

(b) DATA REPORTS; WAIVER.—

(1) DATA REPORTS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, any report published by an agency that relies on covered survey demographic data shall include information on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics.

(2) WAIVER.—The statistical official (as described in section 314 of title 5, United States Code) of each agency, or the head of the agency, for any agency that does not have a statistical official, may waive the requirement under paragraph (1), on a case-by-case basis, if the standards and policies in subsection (c) can not be met, or if adding such information to the survey would impair the ability of the agency to preserve the utility, accuracy, or objectivity of the survey while also generating relevant evidence about the LGBTQI+ community.

(c) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Any information collected relating to the sexual orientation, gender identity, or variations in sex characteristics of a covered survey participant shall be maintained in accordance with applicable confidentiality and privacy laws, policies, and standards.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require an individual to disclose their sexual orientation, gender identity, or variations in sex characteristics to an agency.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the use of information collected under this section in a manner that would adversely affect any individual, or that is inconsistent with disclosure limitations established in any other law.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COVERED SURVEY.—The term ''covered survey'' means a survey that includes demographic data in which—

(A) a subject self-reports information; or

(B) a knowledgeable proxy provides information about the subject or responds for all individuals in a household.

(3) DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.—The term ''demographic data'' means information about the race or ethnicity, sex, and age of a survey participant or population.

(4) GENDER IDENTITY.—The term ''gender identity'' means the gender-related identity, appearance, mannerism, or other gender-related characteristic of an individual, regardless of the designated sex at birth of the individual.

(5) SEXUAL ORIENTATION.—The term ''sexual orientation'' means how a person identifies in terms of their emotional, romantic, or sexual attraction, and includes identification as straight, heterosexual, gay, lesbian, or bisexual, among other terms.

(6) SURVEY.—The term ''survey'' means a data collection activity involving a questionnaire for a sample of a population and includes the decennial census.

(7) VARIATIONS IN SEX CHARACTERISTICS.—The term ''variations in sex characteristics''—

(A) means a physical trait present at birth or naturally occurring at a later time (including genitals, gonads, hormone function, and chromosome patterns), that differ from normative expectations for male or female bodies regarding the development, appearance, or function of sex-related characteristics; and

(B) is sometimes referred to as intersex traits.

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 Oversight and Reform or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

□ 1445

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill before us.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4176, the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act. This historic bill takes the long overdue step of ensuring that Federal agencies collect data on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variation in sex characteristics so that the Federal Government can better understand and serve America's LGBTQI+ communities.

We are considering this legislation at a critical time. Across the United States, the rights of the LGBTQI+ people are under attack and the health and safety of LGBTQI+ people are under threat. From the limited data currently available, we understand

that LGBTQI+ people disproportionately experience poverty, housing insecurity, adverse physical and mental health outcomes, discrimination, and more. For example, according to the Williams Institute, more than one in five LGBTQI+ people live in poverty. According to the American Psychiatric Association, LGBTQI+ people are 2.5 times more likely to experience depression, anxiety, and substance abuse than people who are heterosexual.

There is also an epidemic of violence against transgender and gender-nonconforming people across the U.S.—an epidemic that killed more than 50 people last year.

The LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act, introduced by my friend and chair of the Natural Resources Committee, RAÚL GRIJALVA, would close many longstanding gaps in the collection of data pertaining to our Nation's LGBTQI+ communities. By ensuring that Federal surveys collect data on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics, this bill will equip Congress and Federal agencies with the information they need to better understand the specific challenges faced by the LGBTQI+ communities and help us develop equitable policy solutions.

This bill currently has 128 cosponsors. The legislation has also received overwhelming support from more than 200 civil rights, health, and scientific organizations and the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus.

This bill builds on the Biden administration's efforts to advance equity for LGBTQI+ populations, including by empowering Federal agencies to carry out the President's recently announced executive order to expand collection of Federal data pertaining to LGBTQI+ people.

The Biden administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy that strongly supports passage of the bill.

Importantly, under this bill answering questions about one's sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics would be entirely voluntary, and the bill also includes strong confidentiality and privacy protections. The design of this bill strikes a necessary balance between informing policymaking and protecting the personal information of LGBTQI+ people across the country.

Before I conclude, let me take a moment to acknowledge the importance of the House taking this historic step during Pride Month—a celebration of immeasurable contributions made by LGBTQI+ people in every aspect of American life and a reminder of our continued mission to ensure that every community in the United States is treated with equality and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act requires Federal agencies to collect highly sensitive information from the American people.

With Americans facing record inflation, record gas prices, supply chain shortages, and skyrocketing drug overdoses, it is unbelievable that this is a priority for the House Democrats.

Mortgage rates are at their highest levels since 2008. Inflation rates are at their highest levels in 40 years. Nationally, gas prices are averaging over $5 per gallon. There is a severe shortage of baby formula across our country. It has been a free-for-all at the southern border since President Biden took office both for illegal immigrants and deadly drugs.

The House majority is ignoring these issues. They have also ignored the botched withdrawal from Afghanistan, the origins of the COVID pandemic, and the impact of shutdowns and school closures on American children. Instead, today we are considering a divisive bill, a bill that does nothing to address Americans' problems.

H.R. 4176 requires Federal agencies to include questions regarding sexual orientation and gender identity on their surveys. There are over 130 such surveys across the Federal agencies. This also includes the Census. My colleagues across the aisle oppose asking whether someone is an American citizen on the Census because they say it could deter participation, but they want to ask about sexual orientation and gender identity.

This is information many Americans would not want to share with the Federal Government. This could certainly reduce response rates to the Census and a host of statistical surveys our government relies on to inform important policy decisions.

I would remind my House colleagues that asking these questions during a job interview is illegal. In fact, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act protects against employment discrimination on the basis of sex. This has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to include sexual orientation and gender identity. Yet, House Democrats want the Federal Government to ask Americans about this most private of information.

My Democrat colleagues claim this bill will expand funding and services for those who identify as LGBTQI+, but they haven't specified funding and for what services.

We also don't know how agencies will actually use this information, and we don't know how bad actors would exploit this information. Federal agencies are constantly the targets of cyberattacks and subject to leaks. A Chinese attack on the Office of Personnel Management exposed the data of millions of Americans. The Internal Revenue Service has leaked tax information on high-profile Americans to the press. This information could be used for harmful purposes, so Americans may be reluctant to risk answering a survey entirely.

House Democrats say that these intrusive questions will remain optional under the bill, but we all know the pressure respondents will feel to answer a Federal agency survey. In fact, the bill has been amended by the rule to strike the exemption from penalty provision which protected survey respondents from fine or other penalty if they refused to answer a question.

Why did this language need to be removed if the questions are optional?

Are they planning to penalize respondents for not answering questions about their sexuality and gender?

We do not know why, and that is because this bill hasn't gone through any due diligence.

Another troubling part of the bill is how it allows observers or proxies to fill out these surveys on behalf of others.

Should we really have other people asking highly personal questions about somebody else on a Federal agency survey?

Republicans don't think so.

A proxy could make a guess, or a person would have to tell this proxy their sexual orientation or gender identity—something they may not want to discuss.

When the House Oversight and Reform Committee considered the bill last week, committee Republicans supported an amendment offered by Representative MICHAEL CLOUD to strike this provision, but committee Democrats rejected it.

House Republicans also have concerns about presenting children with questions about sexual orientation or gender identity.

Why should a minor be confronted by such topics?

For instance, the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Recreation includes respondents as young as 6 years old. Federal surveys are no place to confront the American people or their children with intrusive questions and concerns about sexual orientation or gender identity, especially when parents are worried about this agenda with an ever-evolving list of identities. It is hard to keep up.

Many parents have grave concerns that advocates of this agenda are seeking to indoctrinate their children and drive a wedge within their families, and this bill confirms some of these concerns by allowing these questions to be directed to children. Democrats have not addressed or even acknowledged these concerns.

In the committee markup of H.R. 4176, my colleague, GLENN GROTHMAN, offered an amendment to prohibit the collection of this information from minors, but committee Democrats voted this sensible amendment down unanimously.

What is more telling is House Democrat leadership have refused to make either Representative GROTHMAN's or Representative CLOUD's amendments in order today. I wonder why the House majority refuses to consider an amendment aimed at protecting children.

These amendments address important issues. The American people's Representatives should be able to vote on them before sending this troubling bill to the Senate. The American people deserve better from this legislative body.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I point out to my good colleague that this year the National Academies put out a report which found that complete and accurate demographic information on the LGBTQI+ community should be standardized and collected. The report showed that only a limited number of Federal surveys collect data on sexual orientation and gender identity, and that none collect data on intersex populations.

This bill would greatly improve our data collection efforts. This would help ensure the Federal Government's programs and services can reach every person in the U.S. with the greatest effectiveness.

It would help us also to better address longstanding health and economic inequities for America's LGBTQI+ population. From the limited research currently available, we understand that LGBTQI+ people disproportionately experience poverty, housing insecurity, adverse physical and mental health outcomes, discrimination, and more. So collecting this data is critically important to ensure that our policies meet the needs of our LGBTQI+ constituents.

I will give one example of why this is so important. Without the collection of this data, States were not able to measure the impact of the pandemic on the LGBTQI+ individuals. They were completely left out of all medical surveys leaving pandemic response programs at risk of neglecting these individuals. It moves us to a more inclusive and equitable society.

Representative RAUL GRIJALVA is the distinguished and outstanding chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources. He is the author of the original bill. I was proud to work with him, with the committee members to bring it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. MALONEY, who is the chair of the House Oversight and Reform Committee, and the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus for their work and support for the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act.

As we celebrate Pride Month and remember the 53rd anniversary of the Stonewall riots, we recognize the progress, lived experience, and suffering of the LGBTQI+ community.

In many ways our Federal Government is falling short on the promise to craft and implement inclusive public policy, in part, because we lack the necessary data to address the issues affecting the LGBTQI+ community.

□ 1500

While some data is currently collected and Federal agents have made progress, far too many LGBTQI+ individuals remain overlooked in many Federal data collection efforts.

As the Center for American Progress has calculated, more than five in six LGBTQ adults cannot be identified by existing questions in non-experimental survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau such as the American Community Survey and the Census, which only accounts for cohabitating samesex couples.

That is why I introduced this legislation, the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act, to ensure we have robust and accurate data.

The bill would require Federal surveys to include data collection on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations of sex characteristics on a voluntary basis. Again, let me emphasize what the Chair emphasized, this bill would only collect voluntary, self-disclosed data.

An individual will not be required to disclose this information, nor would this information be used in a manner that would adversely affect any individual.

It would ensure that lawmakers and Federal agencies have the comprehensive data they need to address the LGBTQI+ issues.

We cannot craft policies that remedy the disparities faced by these individuals, particularly people of color, in issues of discrimination, unemployment, healthcare, housing instability, and more if we do not have the adequate and correct data.

We have seen how the pandemic has impacted many Americans, and we are still learning how the LGBTQI+ community were disproportionately affected by the COVID–19 crisis. This is just one of many areas that our Federal Government lacks knowledge in how to respond to these issues.

In many ways, the tireless work of LGBTQ organizations in gathering this information has provided a better scope of the problems and disparities than the Federal Government itself.

The LGBTQI+ community deserves to be visible and heard so public policy can better reflect their needs. It is critical to close the data gap that often invalidates their lives.

Perhaps more importantly, this bill comes at a time when Republican State legislatures across this country have introduced more than 300 anti-LGBTQ bills that target youth and their families. This bill would force those individuals focused on denying rights to LGBTQ individuals to have a reckoning.

It will allow the community to be counted and, therefore, heard.

Not only is this bill necessary, it is a top priority of President Biden.

During his first day in office, President Biden issued numerous executive orders to strengthen the rights and improve the lives of LGBTQI+ people across this country.

He directed all Federal agencies that enforce Federal laws prohibiting sex discrimination to also prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Just last week, he established a new Federal coordinating committee on sexual orientation and gender identity for data which will lead efforts across agencies to identify opportunities to strengthen this data collection, while safeguarding privacy protection and the civil rights of individuals.

These are all great initiatives, but we need to go further and codify them into law. This is why this bill is so important.

In addition, this bill includes implementation of a process for Federal agencies to routinely assess changes needed in the collection of this data. This will provide enough flexibility for Federal agents to use the most effective data collection methods for their agency.

We are grateful for the invaluable support and input of more than 200 LGBTQI+ groups and allies that have helped get this legislation to where it is today. It could not have been done without them.

This is an important piece of legislation for each and every LGBTQI+ individual in our Nation. As a proud ally, I urge my colleagues to support this bill so that all our constituents are seen, heard, and counted.

We are not ignoring the current challenges facing Americans. They are not being ignored, as was brought up. Rather, we are treating all Americans equally and being inclusive.

And in this great legacy of our Nation, one of the great legacies that all of us who take pride in being part of this Nation, who take pride in being Americans, one of the great legacies is that this Nation offers, under the rule of law, an inalienable right of equality; an inalienable right of access, and for public policy to reflect the needs and respond to the needs of all individuals.

This bill takes us one step further in this direction. This bill is not punitive; it is inclusive. This bill is not mean-spirited; it is welcoming. And this bill, above all, is American for all Americans.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4176. This horrifying bill would require all Federal agencies that collect demographic data to ask Americans about their sexual orientation or gender identity; and that goes all the way to including the Census, ultimately, affecting every American.

I realize the majority party will claim that you don't have to fill out this form. But we all know, as a practical matter, almost all people presented with a form will fill out the whole thing. There are very people who have the gumption or whatever to say,

I refuse to fill out such and such a question.

Now, honestly, this bill affects adults. And I am old enough to remember when the gay rights movement was supposed to be about, we are not going to poke around and see what people are doing in the bedroom. Now we are kind of going in the opposite direction. We are going to require everybody to talk about their sexual orientation which, by itself, is a little bit offensive.

But I am also going to focus more on the fact that this bill requires—doesn't require but asks for responses from people under 18 years of age, which is just almost beyond belief.

If a parent gets randomly selected to fill out the National Survey on Children's Health, Democrats want the Federal Government to ask parents to disclose if their 3-year-old son is attracted to boys or girls. That is why we should call this, steal our children's childhood act.

When public schools report data to the U.S. Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection, schools will ask kindergartners through 12th graders what their sexual orientation is or which gender they think they are.

What exactly are you supposed to respond if you are an 8-year-old child?

What are they supposed to do with this question?

Johnny, here we have a question for you. And what is he going to say? I am gay because my favorite cartoon character is gay. I'm trans because I like my mother's dress.

I don't know what they are supposed to do with this question, and I think it is absurd that we would ever expect anybody to ask these questions of a little child. But clearly, that is what the majority party wants.

And we hear about today like people you couldn't tell what they are when they are 6 years old or 5 years old. I mean, really beyond belief.

And like I said, our corrupt popular culture today, we are told people are identifying as something or other when they are 7 or 8 years old.

So in any event, I think it is obvious to vote ''no'' on this bill. I don't know how, as a country, we got to a place where we are asking 7- or 8-year-olds to declare a sexual preference, but that is where we are today; and the majority party thinks it makes perfect sense.

The Democrats must know this is wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I guess we can about wrap this up.

I want the American public, though, to stop and think where we are today. We are going to pass a bill in which 7- or 8- or 9-year-olds are supposed to declare a sexual preference.

I will close by saying, the clergy of this country should ponder how we got this far and what they want to do about it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

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

Obviously, in order to serve the American people and to serve their needs, we take in a lot of information—in this case, voluntary information, to determine what we can do to assist and make better the lives of people and the challenges they face.

This Pride Month we celebrate all the progress we have made over the years to help LGBTQ Americans express themselves more openly, to help their community become more visible, and to be free from the danger of violence perpetrated against them because of who they are.

We must acknowledge, however, that the Federal Government does not do enough to ensure that that community is seen and considered when making key policy decisions.

Although there is evidence that LGBTQ Americans, especially transgender people, still face substantial prejudice in areas such as housing, employment, and education, we need more data to determine the scope of these challenges and to devise a policy solution that works for all.

To promote visibility, foster inclusion, and build equity and equality for LGBTQ Americans, this legislation would ask the Federal agencies to collect voluntary information on orientation and gender identity whenever they ask for other demographic data.

I want to emphasize, as I know has been emphasized, that although this data will be processed anonymously, submission of this information will always be and continue to be completely voluntary.

Americans should never be forced to disclose their sexual orientation or gender identity to the government, period. To that extent I think we all agree.

I thank Representative GRIJALVA for introducing this legislation, as well as Chairwoman MALONEY and her colleagues on the Oversight and Reform Committee for their efforts to advance this bill.

Although we still have much to do to address the disparities and marginalization of the LGBTQ people and what they face in America, this bill will help equip policymakers with the tools and information needed to make further progress.

Our vote today is a continuation, frankly, of the efforts of Johnson, Milk, and other leaders who showed courage in the LGBTQ community to come forward and to say that we are people and we need to be treated as equal under the law. And this will, I think, help us meet that responsibility.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today we have heard impassioned arguments from House Democrats about the need to gather better data on the American population. In fact, the majority leader just said: Obviously, we take information to better provide services to Americans. That is what he said.

As required by the Constitution, the decennial Census is carried out every 10 years to conduct an actual enumeration ''in such manner as Congress shall by law direct.''

It is well past time—it is well past time that Congress, again, directs the Census Bureau to collect data on the citizenship of respondents.

I realize that many of my colleagues do not believe that there is a crisis on our southern border. But just last month, CBP had 239,416 encounters along the southern border. And what that means is every encounter is either a surrender or an arrest of somebody who is illegally in the country.

Of those, 25 percent involved an individual who had at least one prior encounter in the previous 12 months. This does not include the number of known and unknown getaways which, last year, are estimated to have been a million individuals we don't know anything about.

So whether someone is a U.S. citizen is an important data point that should be recorded in the Census and on other Federal data surveys. If we are going to get information, as the majority leader said, this should be in that panoply of information.

As we have heard today from my colleague across the aisle, data from these Federal surveys inform policy decisions. For instance, decennial Census data informs Federal funding and enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

□ 1515

I believe we should know whether the Federal Government is serving its citizens well, but how can we do that when we do not know how many citizens there are, how many actual citizens there are, or where they live?

Today, I will offer a straightforward solution to this problem as a motion to recommit. If we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Oversight and Reform to consider an amendment to require the Federal surveys covered by the bill—including the U.S. Census—to also ask respondents whether they are U.S. citizens.

In contrast to asking intrusive questions about sexual orientation that serve no legitimate purpose, the Federal Government should have a better understanding of the U.S. citizens residing in America and those who are not citizens.

This information will better inform lawmakers and ensure the government is working to better the lives of Americans, which is what I have heard is the stated goal of the Democrats.

It is time that the U.S. Government—and U.S. Congress, especially—works to protect the prosperity of the American people. Such serious work starts with strong borders and a sound immigration policy that is actually enforced.

Contrary to what the chairwoman stated in the Rules Committee, the Supreme Court has not decided it is unlawful to inquire about citizenship on the Census.

The Supreme Court—let me reiterate that—has not said you cannot inquire about citizenship. That is false. It has been done historically.

In the prior case before the Supreme Court, the process leading up to putting the question on the Census was flawed. Upon that basis, the question was decided.

But the decision states, ''The Enumeration Clause permits Congress, and by extension, the Secretary, to inquire about citizenship on the Census questionnaire.''

That is what we are doing. We are following the Constitution as has been recognized by the Supreme Court. It is critical to ensuring an accurate apportionment of Representatives in the House based on the Census—in this House—unlike the information this bill seeks to collect. Similar to your underlying bill, this information will be voluntarily gathered.

Today, the American people will finally get to see their Representatives take a vote on this important matter.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I respond to his statements on the citizenship status in saying that it should be collected with LGBT data.

I want to make it very clear that the citizenship question should not be part of this bill. Requiring that citizenship questions be included in this bill is a duplication and totally unnecessary.

The Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics already ask about citizenship status in two different surveys: the American Community Survey, and the Current Population Survey.

This data is collected in addition to the volumes of citizenship records collected and maintained by the Department of Homeland Security.

The Trump administration's efforts to add the citizenship question to the Census was a fear tactic, intended to discourage specific people from participating in the Census, and to exclude them from the count.

Requiring citizenship data collection on Federal surveys was, and always will be, about suppressing data sets and denying U.S. citizens and residents the representation and resources they need to contribute to their communities.

Now, the Supreme Court ruled that the Trump administration's stated reasoning for adding the citizenship question was ''pretextual.''

Unlike the citizenship question, collecting data on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics will allow individuals to receive the proper care and resources they need to thrive, while helping to combat the discrimination they face every day.

Unlike the citizenship question, these questions will be voluntary, and respondents' privacy will be vigorously protected.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), Chair of the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act. I will say it is troubling for me to hear of the ongoing effort by our Republican colleagues to cancel the LGBT community.

Efforts are underway to be sure that you are not allowed to speak about members of the LGBTQ community, the ''Don't Say Gay'' laws that are percolating in State legislatures and that have been passed in some; efforts underway to ban books that include depictions of members of our community; and now, today, an effort to oppose collection of data so you can pretend we don't exist.

We are not going to tolerate that because LGBTQ+ members have existed in this country for a very long time, and for far too long, Federal surveys have failed to collect critical data on our community.

But we know even with the limited data that we have that the LGBTQ community is facing many, many great challenges. LGBTQI+ people face higher rates of unemployment, poverty, and housing insecurity and have worse physical and mental health outcomes than their peers. That is a fact.

These adverse experiences are not just a consequence of who they are, but they are a consequence of the way the LGBTQI+ community is treated in our country and in society.

They are disparities that are a result of a society where discrimination, rejection, harassment, even bullying of LGBTQI+ people is still common. They are the result not of our identities, but of how society treats members of our community.

Unfortunately, we are in particularly perilous times for our community because in the last year alone, State legislatures have enacted more than two dozen anti-LGBTQI+ laws. Is it any surprise that our community still has so many obstacles to overcome?

While we know of some of these obstacles, we lack clear, comprehensive Federal data on our community and our experiences. The LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act will change that.

Good policy comes from good data. If we are going to better serve the LGBTQI+ community, we need to be represented in Federal studies and surveys so that we can better tailor policy solutions and address the most pressing issues facing LGBTQI+ Americans.

As States move to codify discrimination into law, it is even more critical than ever that the Federal Government collect this data on our experiences so that we will have better data to be able to develop better tools to tackle the many obstacles that face our community.

You know, the whole purpose of this is a recognition that particularly for LGBTQ+ youth, which seems to be the real target of this effort to cancel, this cancel culture, that they deserve to be treated with respect and kindness and empathy like every other kid.

It is imperative that we collect data so that young people can understand that they matter, and that when we think about mental health strains and housing instability and more, that we are going to develop solutions that address their issues.

This legislation is about making us better as a country, more inclusive, making us better policymakers, while preserving the privacy of all people in the United States, including children.

You know, some people in this Chamber want to deprive LGBTQ youth of the care and the resources they need to live healthy, authentic lives. They are making inaccurate claims about today's legislation for that reason.

Let me remind you: The Trevor Project just released a report. Madam Speaker, 45 percent of LGBTQ youth seriously considered suicide in the past year. Almost half of these kids in the LGBTQ community seriously considered killing themselves.

Madam Speaker, 25 percent of LGBTQ youth experience homelessness or housing insecurity. If you are an LGBTQ youth, you are four times as likely to attempt to kill yourself, and 43 percent of trans kids report being bullied in school.

So these are real challenges. Nobody should be okay with that. We want to make sure, as so many leading medical organizations have already affirmed, the importance of providing safe, supportive environments for LGBTQI youth and young people to grow up.

By ensuring that we have robust, exclusive data, today's legislation will help to ensure that our policies provide every family in this country and every LGBTQI+ young person access to the resources they need.

We should all want that. You just can't cancel a group of folks because you don't like them. This is America. Every single person deserves to be counted, deserves to be respected, deserves to have access to their government, and the collection of data does a critical part of that work.

I will end by thanking Chairman GRIJALVA for introducing this legislation, thanking Chairwoman MALONEY for

helping shepherd this bill to the floor and for her strong advocacy, and I urge my colleagues: Think about those statistics. Think about the young people who are being impacted when you vote, and vote ''yes.''

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his extraordinary statement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I just want to cover and address some of the statements made by the chairwoman regarding my previous statement.

She admitted in her statement that several surveys already gather the info that they seek in the underlying bill. Yet, that was a rationale for not asking the citizenship question.

What is good for the goose is good for the gander. You are already collecting some of this information, as you admitted, from 5 different agencies, and you want to expand it to 130. You said, well, you guys get it from the Department of Labor statistics on the question of citizenship. Hey, let's get it all across the board. Let's do it all across the board. Same rationale.

The chairwoman said the LGBTQ question will be voluntary, but the citizenship question is not. That is simply untrue. If you look at the amendment, that would be there.

We discussed this in the committee. All you are doing is you are adding, in some cases, just the word ''citizenship'' to the questions that you are already asking, or you are asking whether or not the respondent is a citizen of the United States.

That is voluntary. It is not mandatory. That is just untrue to say that.

Then the argument was made that the Supreme Court used a rationale that was inaccurate. The Supreme Court rationale for not allowing the Trump administration, through an executive agency, to ask the citizenship question on the Census was this: It was because the process was not initiated by Congress.

The Supreme Court specifically stated, ''The Enumeration Clause permits Congress, and by extension, the Secretary, to inquire about citizenship on the Census questionnaire.''

It had not been done by Congress. It had been done by a lower-level agency. So all of those things should now dispel the arguments against including this amendment. That is why I am going to encourage everyone in this body to support the motion to recommit.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the distinguished chief deputy whip.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, Chairwoman of the Oversight Committee, for her leadership, and Chairman GRIJALVA for his dynamic leadership, as well.

I rise today because I just feel moved by the moment to really talk about truth in the moments that I have. I started this morning by citing the Declaration of Independence that said, we all are created equal—a portion thereof—with the unalienable rights of life and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is important that today in Pride Month, as I recognize my constituents in Houston, all of them, and the caucus that has been a steadfast advocate in Houston for the rights of all people in the LGBTQI community.

It is important to be counted, to be recognized, and I want to emphasize, again, the distortion of how punitive this will be. It is voluntary.

I know my constituents. Some of them don't even fill out the Census because they are free. They know they don't have to do it. Some of them don't answer questions on the Census.

□ 1530

For anyone to suggest that this would be punitive and that people would be fearful and they would think not to do it, it is voluntary. And I can assure you that this community, LGBTQI+ Americans, remains vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis.

Only 21 States have laws that explicitly prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation in employment, housing, and public accommodations, and only 20 States have such protections for gender identity.

H.R. 4176, the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act, is to include and affirm and to be counted.

Do you realize that in most States a same-sex couple can get married on Saturday, then be legally denied service at a restaurant on Sunday, be fired from their jobs on Monday, and evicted from their apartment on Tuesday?

We thought we would be past that after years of working and fighting, but it is important to note that this bill will provide us with the appropriate information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is high time that we provide equal protection for all members of the LGBTQI community in accordance with the 14th Amendment.

H.R. 4176—again, not punitive—will take us one more step forward in the decades-long journey toward equality by creating a tool kit through which our LGBTQI community members can be represented and the demographic data can be taken.

Let me just simply say that the numbers speak truth. I said I wanted to discuss a moment of truth. When we have the data, we can help with housing, healthcare, schooling, or special needs that this community would have, representation as it relates to them being counted in Federal funding that may be necessary to aid in their circumstances.

I am reminded of tragedies that have happened before. Does anyone remember a young man being assailed against a fence just because he was part of the LGBTQI+ community?

I met with Matthew Shepard's mother. I remember these atrocities.

I see in a State like mine that transgender families are threatened over trying to find resources for their children. We love our children. We love our families.

The only thing I can see in this legislation is the importance of affirming, counting, treating with dignity, and recognizing that this wonderful community, the LGBTQI+ community, they, too, are America. We, too, are America.

This is a moment of truth, and it is simply collecting data, punishing no one but uplifting all Americans. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4176.

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

Madam Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives should focus on helping the American people survive economic turmoil and defending our borders and national security.

I urge House Democrats to get back to what the American people elected us to do: conduct oversight over the Federal Government and the Biden administration, which is on a path to destroy America.

We need to hold hearings, conduct oversight, and pass legislation addressing the crises affecting Americans today. That is our constitutional responsibility. That is the responsibility of the House Oversight Committee.

Instead, we are spending valuable resources and time on divisive political messaging bills, and that is what this is. I oppose H.R. 4176, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for introducing this important legislation. I am pleased that we were able to bring this bill before the House during Pride Month to show that we care about everyone in our country. We think everyone should be counted, everyone should be surveyed, and everyone's needs should be listened to.

I particularly thank the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus for their attention and work on this bill and the Committee on Oversight staff for all the work required to make this happen.

I am also very grateful to the more than 124 cosponsors, my colleagues here in this body, and more than 200 civil rights, health, and scientific organizations that have supported this bill

and affirm the need for comprehensive Federal data collection on members of the LGBTQI+ communities.

This bill, H.R. 4176, moves this country one step closer to equality and gives us the tools to see and support all of our communities, all of our constituents.

I again urge my colleagues to support this bill. I thank the leadership of this body, our Speaker, our majority leader, and our Caucus chair, all of whom have played a role in supporting this legislation and moving it to a vote today.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of H.R. 4176, the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act, and to discuss my amendment to this legislation.

Despite significant legal advances over the past several years, including marriage equality, LGBTQI+ Americans remain vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis.

Today, only 21 states have laws that explicitly prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation in employment, housing, and public accommodations, and only 20 states have such protections for gender identity.

In most states, a same-sex couple can get married on Saturday, then be legally denied service at a restaurant on Sunday, then be fired from their jobs on Monday, and evicted from their apartment on Tuesday.

Our country is comprised of trans people of color, lesbians living with a disability, gay immigrants, and those experiencing all other manners of intersecting and layering levels of oppression and privilege.

H.R. 4176 would make note of these stories and add their voices to the mosaic of our country.

The data available through these newly developed federal surveys will allow federal agencies to create better policies and practices designed to accommodate the needs of all our Nation's people.

I am conscious of the fact that if Congress expects the LGBTQI+ community to trust the federal government with their information, we must ensure their privacy and protection.

It is imperative that this data not be used to exclude, discriminate against, vilify, ostracize, or in any other way negatively impact anyone in this already vulnerable community.

That is a promise we make today.

Again, I remind you of the long path to full equality we walk. Let it be known, however, that one day our Nation will find itself knocking on equality's door.

When that happens, future LGBTQI+ Americans will look back and see themselves not hidden in shame, but present.

Present in our census, in our housing surveys, in our employment surveys.

They will be present in our metropolitan cities and in our rural towns, from the Atlantic beaches to the Pacific Northwest. From the forests of Alaska to the plains of my own Texas.

Through the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act, LGBTQI+ Americans will be able to say—I was there. I am here.

It is high time that we provide equal protection for all members of the LGBTQI+ community in accordance with the 14th Amendment, which ensures equal protection for ALL Americans.

H.R. 4176 will take us one more step forward in the decades-long journey towards equality by creating a toolkit through which our LGBTQI+ community members can be represented in demographic data collection—and ultimately protected under the law.

This bill will require federal agencies to assess the ways in which they document sexuality, gender identity, and gender variance in surveys and provide new opportunities for LGBTQI+ individuals to self-identify themselves—all while ensuring the privacy and dignity of the people involved.

Though this legislation enacts a simple change on federal surveys, it represents a great gesture for our future.

We are not just talking about numbers today.

We are not just talking about percentages and ratios and clusters.

We are talking about the documentation and legacy of the great diversity of this Nation, and about enacting tools through which that diversity can be represented and protected.

As you all know, representation is the bedrock of American democracy.

If the government does not see you, how can it serve you?

As we discuss this Act, I especially want to keep in mind the members of the LGBTQI+ community who experience the fluidity and intersectionality that are aspects of gender and sexual identity.

Of course, gender and sexuality are just two facets of personhood.

Race, religion, socio-economic status, geographic region, disability status, and culture all play a part in crafting identity.

Madam Speaker, all of this is true about H.R. 4176, and yet, I encourage my colleagues in Congress to push for more.

That is why I believe my amendment is very important.

My amendment would direct the Comptroller General to issue a report to Congress about the impact of the implementation of this Act on the provision of services to LGBTQI+ persons.

It would assess the impact of H.R. 4176 by ensuring transparency into the correlation between the provision of services and one's gender identity, sexual orientation, and variations in sex characteristics.

Data collected through this Act would be used to monitor the flow of social services to LGBTQI+ communities. This will encourage the provision of services to the LGBTQI+ community, and if there are shortcomings, Congress and the public will be informed of them so that they can be remedied soon thereafter.

Despite our many gains, the United States is not always a welcoming place for individuals across the spectrum of genders and sexualities.

This is especially true for those coming from un-affirming communities and families—those for whom living their authentic lives may come at the cost of social ties and support systems.

For some, authenticity can be isolating.

As my colleagues know, the depression and suicide rates of LGBTQI+ individuals are horrifically high.

LGBTQI+ youth in particular are at greatest risk.

In Texas, The Trevor Project saw nearly 15,000 crisis contacts from LGBTQI+ youth in 2021.

Research consistently shows that trans and gay youth are more likely to experience depression when living in un-affirming or discriminatory environments.

Alternatively, the presence of supportive close friends and family in the life of an LGBTQI+ youth has a direct positive impact on that youth's self-esteem and overall health.

That supportive person could be a teacher, an athletic coach, a mental health counselor, or a troop leader.

The data available in H.R. 4176 could be used to help put more of these mentors in the lives of LGBTQ+ youth every day.

The LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act would enable agencies that provide mental health and other social services to gain access to a wealth of information about the communities they serve, so that they can better serve the LGBTQI+ community.

My amendment would allow us to see if they then use this data and their resources to safeguard the well-being of some of our Nation's most vulnerable individuals.

Ultimately, the Comptroller General study required by my amendment enables Congress to monitor the progress of H.R. 4176 in action.

It is with that in mind that I urge my colleagues to step forward in support of the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act and my amendment.

Our lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex communities deserve to be documented in our Nation's history. They deserve to have their stories collected and used for their well-being. I am honored to be a part of that aim today.

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

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–381 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 117–381.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 9, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(e) REPORT.— Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall provide a report to Congress on the implementation of the requirements of this Act by agencies, including how the implementation of such requirements by agencies affected the provision of services to persons according to the gender identity, sexual orientation, and variations in sex characteristics of the persons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1191, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON

LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the sponsor of this legislation and the chairwoman of the Oversight and Reform Committee for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Data collection is an indispensable tool to understand and address changes facing the LGBTQI community and other sexual- and gender-diverse communities.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from American Progress dated May 24, 2022.

[From American Progress, May 24, 2022]

COLLECTING DATA ABOUT LGBTQI+ AND OTHER SEXUAL AND GENDER-DIVERSE COMMUNITIES

Data collection is an indispensable tool to understand and address challenges facing LGBTQI+ and other sexual and gender-diverse communities. Although strides have been made in recent years, a persistent lack of routine data collection on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics (SOGISC) is still a substantial roadblock for policymakers, researchers, service providers, and advocates seeking to improve the health and well-being of LGBTQI+ people. More comprehensive and accurate point-in-time and longitudinal demographic data on SOGISC are crucial to:

Advance research agendas;

Evaluate population trends;

Identify community-based needs;

Provide high-quality services;

Track and address discrimination;

Equitably distribute funding and other resources; and

Shape evidence-based policy solutions to promote equity and reduce disparities faced by LGBTQI+ populations.

As the size and diversity of LGBTQI+ populations in the United States continue to expand, particularly among youth and young adults, the importance of collecting data on these communities only continues to grow. Failing to collect these data can create harms by hindering the ability of researchers, policymakers, service providers, and advocates to understand the experiences of LGBTQI+ communities, identify disparities, generate policies that promote equity, and evaluate the effectiveness of those policies. Yet currently, the number of federally funded surveys that include questions to identify LGBTQI+ respondents is limited.

While there are many kinds of data relevant to the experiences of LGBTQI+ communities, this report focuses specifically on data collection to capture SOGISC in two types of settings: general population surveys and surveys of LGBTQI+ communities. General population surveys assess a large sample of the entire population, of which the majority identify as cisgender and heterosexual and will not have intersex traits. In contrast, LGBTQI+ community-based surveys sample a population predominantly comprising sexual and gender minorities. Community-based surveys can provide important opportunities to learn more about even smaller or less-studied sexual and gender minority populations, such as people who are asexual, same-gender-loving, or Two-Spirit. Because of their specific focus on sampling LGBTQI+ populations, community-based surveys may also be more likely to reach larger proportions of groups such as LGBTQI+ people of color, older adults, youth, people with disabilities, people receiving social welfare support services, people whose primary language is not English, and people interacting with the criminal legal system.

When designing questions to accurately and effectively survey either the general population or a predominantly LGBTQI+ population, researchers must carefully weigh a number of key considerations that are explained in this report. Regardless of the type of survey, however, it is imperative to ensure the following:

Entities collecting demographic data, including data related to SOGISC, do so with a specific and well-defined goal, such as collecting statistics on health experiences or understanding the performance of a government benefit program.

Data are collected, used, maintained, and shared only with strong privacy, confidentiality, and ethical standards in place to minimize the risk of data disclosure and misuse.

Entities collecting data adopt and post clear nondiscrimination and confidentiality policies. These policies should identify relevant legal nondiscrimination protections; state why the data are being collected and how they will be used; share contact information for resources to enforce protections; and provide assurance that confidentiality will be respected and that participation is voluntary, allowing respondents to provide well-informed consent with the knowledge that disclosure is voluntary and that they have the right to opt out of responding.

Research and researchers comply with and are certified through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative and consult community-based resources about how to conduct effective and ethical research with LGBTQI+ populations that ensures minority populations have a voice and role in the design of survey questions.

LGBTQI+ people are meaningfully involved in question development, testing, and the evaluation process.

This report examines best practices and key considerations for collecting data on SOGISC in both general population surveys as well as LGBTQI+ community-based surveys. The first section of the report highlights evidence related to asking these questions in general population surveys and examines critical considerations, as well as avenues of future research that policymakers and researchers should support. The second section of the report compiles both evidence from existing survey designs and interviews with LGBTQI+ individuals to create new suggestions and recommendations for SOGISC question design in surveys of LGBTQI+ communities. Ultimately, improving SOGISC data collection through these kinds of general population and community-based instruments is crucial to identifying disparities and crafting policy solutions that promote more equitable outcomes for LGBTQI+ communities.

General population surveys are used to collect data from representative samples of the population, allowing researchers to create population estimates, describe population demographics, assess disparities, compute statistical weights for survey analysis, and develop policy, program, and funding priorities. Federal, state, and local governments rely on data from general population surveys such as the decennial census, the American Community Survey (ACS), and the Current Population Survey (CPS) for everything from allocating budget resources to deciding where to locate hospitals.

The persistent lack of routine data collection on SOGISC remains a significant challenge for policymakers, researchers, service providers, and advocates seeking to improve the health and well-being of LGBTQI+ people. Currently, most surveys, including those fielded by the U.S. federal government and many state governments, do not collect SOGISC information. While some surveys, such as the census and the ACS, now invite people to answer questions about their marital status or living arrangements in ways that allow researchers to identify same-sex couples, this only captures a small segment of the LGBTQI+ population. By not asking specific questions about SOGISC, these surveys fail to account for single LGB people or LGB people who are in a relationship but not cohabitating with their partner(s), as well as transgender people and intersex people altogether. For example, according to the latest Gallup data, just 10 percent of LGBT adults in the United States are married to a same-sex spouse, while an additional 6 percent live with a same-sex domestic partner. This means that more than 5 in 6 LGBT adults cannot be identified by existing questions in nonexperimental surveys conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau such as the ACS and the census, which only account for cohabitating same-sex couples. Failing to collect SOGISC data creates real harms—hindering the ability to fully understand the experiences of LGBTQI+ communities; to craft sound policies that are inclusive of LGBTQI+ people and their needs; and to evaluate the effectiveness of policies to address disparities and promote more equitable outcomes.

More than 5 in 6 LGBT adults cannot be identified by existing questions in nonexperimental surveys conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau such as the ACS and the census.

As recommended by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in their 2020 report, U.S. population surveys must routinely collect, analyze, and report demographic data that include SOGISC questions. The information gathered by general population surveys shapes major policy decisions and allocations of critical resources related to health care, housing, employment, education, and other services and benefits, affecting the everyday lives of LGBTQI+ people and making the need to adopt SOGISC measures even more urgent. Notably, expanding data collection on SOGISC through government population-based surveys will result in a larger sample size than in privately conducted surveys. This is important because larger samples allow for better, more reliable study and a richer understanding of the diversity of the LGBTQI+ community. Moreover, having larger samples will facilitate analysis and provide greater comprehension of the experiences of populations that are living at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities.

Expanding and enhancing SOGISC data collection also provides critical tools necessary to craft policy solutions to improve outcomes and advance equity. By improving data collection on LGBTQI+ populations, government agencies can take meaningful steps to fulfill the directives set out by executive orders 13988 and 13985, which President Joe Biden signed on day one of his presidency.

LGBTQI+ advocates have long called for the federal government and researchers to add SOGISC questions to major surveys and other data collection efforts as a way to begin addressing the deficiency of data on LGBTQI+ populations and gaps in knowledge and policy affecting LGBTQI+ people. Government officials, researchers, and others have questioned whether the general population, composed mainly of non-LGBTQI+ people, would understand these questions, answer them accurately, or even refuse to answer them. The answers to these questions are important because they affect the quality of data gathered about LGBTQI+ people and, by extension, the resources allocated, decisions made, and policies created that affect LGBTQI+ communities.

Importantly, numerous federally supported entities and other expert bodies have issued reports to determine methodological best practices and improve measurement of SOGISC in federal surveys. These groups have contributed to a robust and continually growing body of research providing evidence that SOGISC questions can be readily deployed in federally funded and other surveys. For example, evidence indicates that:

Sexual orientation and gender identity data are not considered especially difficult or sensitive for survey respondents to report, meaning that people generally understand what the questions are asking and are willing to answer them.

Securing participation of sexual minorities in surveys does not require higher levels of effort, meaning it will not create added costs or obstacles that would prohibit the government or other researchers from conducting more inclusive data collection.

People with intersex traits appear willing to disclose their status and support collecting data on this measure in research.

People will answer sexual orientation and gender identity questions even across a variety of modes (for example, telephone surveys and paper surveys) and via both self-reporting and proxy reporting (for example, when a single household member responds on behalf of all household members) in federal large-scale general population surveys.

In other words, existing evidence addresses many of the major hesitations or questions posed by government researchers and others. Put simply, while more research is needed to continue improving SOGISC measures, evidence suggests these questions can function well in major general population surveys, and they should be asked. For example, in 2021, the Census Bureau updated its experimental data collection effort on the COVID–19 pandemic to include questions about sexual orientation and gender identity in the Household Pulse Survey. This historic step marks the first time a Census Bureau-sponsored survey has asked sexual orientation and gender identity questions and highlights the ways in which these questions can—and do—work in large, nationally representative surveys. Expanding LGBTQI+-inclusive data collection by asking SOGISC questions on general population surveys is paramount to advancing equity for LGBTQI+ communities.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the National Education Association, ''New Survey Data Shows LGBTQ+ Youth Mental Health Crisis.''

[From the National Education Association, May 25, 2022]

NEW SURVEY DATA SHOWS LGBTQ+ YOUTH MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS

Last year, nearly half of LGBTQ+ youth seriously considered killing themselves, including more than half of trans youth, according to new data from The Trevor Project.

These figures reveal a deadly, mental-health crisis among high school and college-age LGBTQ+ youth of all races, which has been worsened by the Covid–19 pandemic and by recent, political attacks on LGBTQ+ students by state legislators across the nation.

''The [Trevor Project] study is actually on my computer screen right now to send it to my colleagues,'' says Florida high school teacher Michael Woods, whose state recently passed a law that enables parents to sue school districts for teaching LGBTQ-positive curriculum. ''Especially here in Florida, with the 'Don't Say Gay' law, which should also be called 'Don't Say Trans,' we have a lot of kids in stress,'' he says.

The study, which involved 35,000 LGBTQ+ high school and college-age youth, of various races and identities, also shows how schools and colleges can help. A little more than half of LGBTQ+ youth identified their school or college as ''an LGBTQ-affirming space''—and those students reported lower rates of attempted suicide. Even something as simple as using the correct pronouns—the ones that match students' gender identify—can decrease suicidal ideas.

''Small steps can make a big difference,'' says Joe Bento, a Seattle high school teacher who also is chair of the Washington state chapter of GLSEN, a national organization that helps educators make schools more affirming for LGBTQ+ students.

The Trevor Project data shows how things have gone from bad to worse for LGBTQ+ youth in the past two years. In 2019, 40 percent of LGBTQ+ seriously considered suicide; in 2021, the rate hit 45 percent.

And it's even scarier among students of color. About one in five Black LGBTQ+ students attempted suicide last year, as did a slightly higher rate of Indigenous LGBTQ+ students.

Meanwhile, mental-health care is scarce. Nearly half of LGBTQ+ youth—and more than half of Latino LGBTQ+ students—told the Trevor Project that they wanted counseling and didn't get it.

The pandemic is an obvious factor, educators say. When colleges and schools switched to virtual learning, many LGBTQ+ students were closeted in homes where their identities are hidden. (Only 1 in 3 LGBTQ+ youth said they have LGBTQ-affirming homes.) These students may have lost access to counselors or other supports, like a Gay-Straight Alliance or GenderSexuality Alliance (GSA) club.

''For a lot of queer students, school is their safe space,'' says Bento. ''For a year and a half, they weren't in that safe space.''

Now, students are back on campuses, in school buildings—but that doesn't mean everything is okay, notes Bento. After two years of pandemic-related isolation and trauma, students desperately need mental-health support ''When we got back, that didn't necessarily happen,'' he says. ''Suddenly it's state testing! And it's this, this, this! Everything is 'back to normal,' but normal was garbage.''

Many students are suffering. But it's almost always the most marginalized students who have the least access to mental-health supports, Bento points out.

It's not just the pandemic. Making matters worse for LGBTQ students, nearly 240 anti-LGBTQ+ bills have been filed this year in state legislatures, most of them targeting trans people, according to an NBC News analysis.

Many of these bills have been signed into laws that ban trans women and girls from participating in high school sports, prohibit trans students from using school bathrooms and locker rooms that match their gender identity, and restrict LGBTQ-positive school curriculum. For example, Florida's new law enables parents to sue districts if they think their child has had inappropriate instruction on gender and sexuality. The cost of litigation will be borne by districts, which already are removing curricula.

LGBTQ+ students are very aware of laws that seek to harm them, educators say—and it causes them anguish. ''They're just coming back to the rigors of school [after the pandemic]—and now this!'' says Woods.

NEA and its affiliates strongly oppose these laws. This spring, NEA President Becky Pringle wrote an open letter to Florida students, published in the Sun-Sentinel newspaper. ''From protests to walkouts, you are bravely showing these politicians that you aren't afraid to stand up for yourselves . . . To our students in Florida and elsewhere: We see you! We hear you! We are with you!''

For his part, Woods, an educator of 29 years, isn't afraid either. He wears his ''We're All Human'' t-shirt and answers his students' distressed questions. But he worries about younger teachers with less job security, living in more conservative areas. Many may feel like they can't be the educators that students need.

''When young people don't feel like they have anywhere to turn or anyone to talk to . . . well, I know why the stats are the way they are,'' he says.

NEA members and their unions are working hard to get more supports for students. In St. Paul, Minn., educators went to the brink of striking this spring to protect the presence of mental-health teams in every St. Paul school. Other K12 unions—like in Natrona County, Wyo.—are making sure federal pandemic-relief funds are spent to hire more school counselors and other professionals.

Recently, the Biden administration urged colleges and universities to do the same with their money.

But it's also possible for individual educators to create affirming spaces in their offices, classrooms, buses, and other spaces. ''Words matter,'' says Bento, who introduces himself to his students like this: ''My name is Mr. Bento. I use he/him pronouns.''

Safe space posters are great at signaling that you support your LGBTQ+ students but may not be allowable in all places. ''In those places, you can still put something on your body, like a lanyard,'' says Bento. (The NEA LGBTQ+ caucus, of which Bento is a member, offers ''Safe Person, Safe Space'' cards for educators to put in their lanyards.)

Bento uses the word ''partner,'' instead of boyfriend or girlfriend, a subtle nod to the fact that not every relationship looks the same and that some students may not identify as male or female. ''Think about who is not represented [in your words, in your curriculum],'' urges Bento.

Yes, curriculum matters, too. (See GLSEN's inclusive curriculum resource.) ''Students need curriculum that reflects who they are, they need positive representation,'' says Bento. ''And not just Harvey Milk! Not just the AIDS epidemic! Where's the joy?''

In fact, The Trevor Project asked LGBTQ+ youth the same question: ''Where do you find joy?'' The responses can guide educators in creating better spaces for all students. Answers include:

Learning about LGBTQ history;

Learning I'm not alone and there are more people like me;

Supportive teachers;

Having a safe space to express gender, gender identity, and sexuality;

LGBTQ clubs on campus; and

Living as their authentic self.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from National Public Radio titled ''The Census Bureau's first ever data on LGBTQ+ people indicates deep disparities.''

[From National Public Radio, Sept. 24, 2021]

THE CENSUS BUREAU'S FIRST EVER DATA ON LGBTQ+ PEOPLE INDICATES DEEP DISPARITIES

The U.S. Census Bureau in July began asking Americans about their sexual orientation and gender identity—a watershed moment that marks the first time the federal government has tried to capture data on LGBTQ+ Americans in its large real-time national surveys.

The results so far are preliminary, but they do indicate that the disparities queer

Americans experienced prior to the pandemic have continued to endure 18 months in. For some, those disparities have grown deeper.

According to the data, which captures results from July 21 to September 13, LGBTQ+ people often reported being more likely than non-LGBTQ+ people to have lost employment, not have enough to eat, be at elevated risk of eviction or foreclosure, and face difficulty paying for basic household expenses, according to the census' Household Pulse Survey, a report that measures how Americans are faring on key economic markers during the pandemic.

While think tanks like the Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law and advocate-led research groups have previously studied LGBTQ+ poverty, no large government population surveys, like those conducted by the census or the Treasury Department, have attempted to capture the realtime economic experiences of LGBTQ+ people.

Previously, those analyses were limited to studies of ''same-sex couples,'' a question the census began analyzing with limited success in 1990, but that leaves out significant portion of LGBTQ+ people. Lack of accurate data on the population as a whole—and particularly on transgender people, a group that has been chronically under surveyed—hampered any federal response to persisting inequities, advocates say.

''Having this on [the Pulse survey], both as a way to understand what's going on during the pandemic, but also hopefully as a starting point to more federal data collection, is really an important moment,'' said Bianca D.M. Wilson, the senior scholar of public policy at the Williams Institute.

The data has only begun to be collected, and it's still too early to tell whether the differences between groups are representative of the LGBTQ+ population overall or just those who were surveyed by the census at a given moment in time.

While researchers cautioned against drawing major conclusions, the trends that emerge in the data are consistent with what other surveys have found prior to the pandemic as a result of employment discrimination, underpay, discriminatory lending practices and other policies that have limited economic mobility for queer people.

According to The 19th's analysis of the first four releases of data from the census survey, as much as 23 percent of LGBTQ+ people and 32 percent of trans people reported having lost employment in the month before the census conducted its questionnaire. About 15 to 16 percent of non-LGBTQ+ people reported the same.

About 12 percent of LGBTQ+ people said they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat. For non-LGBTQ+ people, the figure was between 6 and 7 percent, and for trans Americans, it was as high as 24 percent. About 31 percent of queer people also said they had difficulty paying for basic household expenses; for non-LGBTQ+ people it was 23 percent.

Housing insecurity was prevalent across all groups, with more than 40 percent of people—both LGBTQ+ and non-LGBTQ+—saying they were very or somewhat likely to face eviction by the end of September or October.

It's unclear how accurate the data for transgender Americans is because the sample sizes are much smaller. But it does follow what is already known: Roughly 29 percent of respondents to the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey, done by the National Center for Transgender Equality and seen as the only comprehensive study of its kind, said they lived in poverty. About 30 percent said they had experienced homelessness in their lifetimes.

''These are sort of the systemic disparities that we observed pre-pandemic, that the pandemic has not only deepened for both groups, but also sort of widened,'' said David Schwegman, assistant professor of public policy and administration at American University, who has conducted research on ''same-sex couples'' and housing discrimination.

Wilson at the Williams Institute said that absent this kind of large-scale data collection about LGBTQ+ people, policymakers couldn't truly answer big questions about whether attempts to address economic stress exacerbated by the pandemic—like the now-expired federal eviction moratorium—were working for everyone.

But data collection is only one step toward equity.

Dean Spade, an associate professor at Seattle University School of Law who has also advised the upcoming National LGBTQ+ Women's Community Survey by think tank Justice Work, said that real change requires more than just counting trans and LGBTQ+ people at the federal level.

Counting marginalized people to better understand the issues they face doesn't necessarily mean their suffering will be addressed through policy, he noted—and trans people are accustomed to social services leaving them out or not being designed with them in mind. It's why trans people, for example, are helping each other pay for medical procedures that aren't covered by insurance, housing those experiencing homelessness and creating mutual aid networks, Spade said.

''We're helping each other survive right now,'' he said.

And there are still significant challenges with the data as it is. Samples sizes are small, an issue that has barred marginalized communities, including Asian women, Native Americans and Pacific Islander women, from representation in real-time data on some national surveys.

Those small sample sizes make it difficult to draw big conclusions from the data until months down the line. The Census Bureau said in a statement that it currently doesn't have additional analysis to offer on the data, though it did publish a report on the first set of LGBTQ+ data this summer, finding that LGBTQ+ people are more likely than non-LGBTQ+ people to face economic hardship.

''The primary focus has been on collecting and releasing data in a timely manner but there are plans in the future to release data products that will provide additional context,'' the bureau said in a statement.

The other challenge has been crafting questions in a way that takes into account knowledge gaps people may have about what terminology best describes them.

The census survey, for example, asks respondents to choose which best represents how they think of themselves: ''gay or lesbian''; ''bisexual''; ''something else''; ''I don't know''; or ''straight, that is not gay or lesbian.'' In past attempts to phrase these questions, heterosexual people have been found to incorrectly mark themselves, economists said, so additional phrases have been added to improve clarity.

The survey also asks if people describe themselves as male, female or transgender, and some transgender people may not want to identify themselves given the rise in anti-trans bills across the country, Schwegman said.

Spade pointed to smaller studies led by advocates as important pools of information that can't be found anywhere else, since they ask questions about daily threats like over-policing and poverty.

''I think that those kinds of studies can be, to a lot of us, more valuable than something larger that didn't ask the questions or that missed whole groups of people in our community,'' he said.

The real-time data from surveys like the current census one, which will be collecting responses from July 21 to October 11, could help impact policies in real time. The problem for pandemic-related policies being negotiated in Congress this fall is that this data may be coming too late, Wilson said.

''It's 18 months into the pandemic, and had that been the starting place, we would not be looking at a sample size that would create problems for all the analyses that we want to do to understand a trans-specific experience,'' Wilson said.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, my amendment would direct the Comptroller General to issue a report to Congress about the impact of the implementation of this act on the provision of services to LGBTQI+ persons. It would ensure the impact of H.R. 4176 by ensuring transparency in the correlation between the provision of services and one's gender identity, sexual orientation, and variation in sex characteristics.

Again, I have emphasized, we want to have truth and discussion here. We want to be helpful. We want to affirm people and have them counted. Data collection through this act will be used to monitor the flow of social services to LGBTQI communities.

This will encourage the provision of services to the LGBTQI+ community, and if there are shortcomings, Congress and the public will be informed of them so that they can be remedied soon thereafter.

Despite our many gains, the United States is not always a welcoming place for individuals across many spectrums. This is essentially true for those coming from unaffirming communities and families, those for whom living their authentic lives may come at the cost of social ties and support systems.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment because it affirms children, families, our fellow colleagues, our soldiers, law enforcement, first responders, firefighters, teachers, people who see us in the retail area. It affirms America. This knowledge about who we are can be enormously helpful to being a better America.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Congresswoman JACKSON LEE.

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, the amendment admits that the ultimate purpose of this bill is to steer taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to yet another demographic subgroup.

The amendment requires GAO to report on how the bill will impact Federal agency provision of services to individuals—in other words, how Federal

grant programs and financial assistance will be provided based on people's sexual orientation and gender identity.

House Republicans believe that all Americans deserve equal treatment and respect. In fact, that is guaranteed under our Constitution. We oppose the continual dividing of Americans for political purposes. This amendment is pure identity politics and an abuse of taxpayer dollars.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the distinguished chairwoman of the full committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

This amendment would require reporting to Congress on the impact of data collection on the LGBTQI+ populations, facilitated by this act, and the provision of services extended to those groups.

As the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, I am committed to ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of government operations for all Americans. Reporting on the impacts of H.R. 4176 will provide transparency into the data collection and help inform our policymaking efforts.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me offer what we are living in. There are more than 300 laws that have been passed across the Nation that are discriminating against the LGBTQI+ community. In addition, we find that less than half of these 50 States are protecting this community. That means that there is a half loaf for many in this community.

How do we remedy and educate States and local communities? We do so by ensuring that information is given. That is how you protect taxpayer dollars, that you are constructive in the use of dollars.

This is only to help with better implementation of social services that are already rendered, but such social services may not be geared toward addressing some of the populations here in the United States.

My amendment, which is what we always ask for, is making sure that we are accountable when we are addressing the concerns that have not been addressed in the LGBTQI+ community.

That is what I hope most people will see. But at the same time, I hope my amendment characterizes what America is: a compassionate, with passion, caring, and humanitarian Nation.

We go all over the world to fight for human rights, justice, and equality. Our soldiers put on the uniform to dignify our Constitution. Why not here in America?

Do my friends on the other side of the aisle realize how many men and women in the United States military come from the LGBTQI+ community? They didn't ask questions; they put on the uniform. I know they fought really hard not to have questions asked.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment for accountability and fairness and to recognize all of us are Americans.

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

□ 1545

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1191, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Mr. COMER. 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. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 117–381.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, Representative SEAN PATRICK MALONEY has an amendment at the desk, and I am his designee.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 22, insert after ''proxy'' the following: ''(including a proxy of a deceased individual, if applicable)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1191, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of this amendment that clarifies the Federal surveys governed by this bill can and should collect data on deceased LGBTQ individuals when applicable.

As we know, due to mistreatment and being stigmatized, LGBTQ+ youth are over four times more likely to attempt suicide than their peers.

In recent years, the number of violent fatal attacks against transgender people have hit record highs. But importantly, the actual number of fatal attacks is widely believed to be undercounted. Allowing a proxy of a deceased person to respond to a Federal survey can right this wrong.

Federal surveys often do not collect key demographic information on those they study, such as the gender identity or sexual orientation of a deceased person. As a result, we as policymakers do not have the full picture and cannot accurately identify disparities or create policy solutions that serve each person we represent.

For example, the Justice Department's National Crime Victimization Survey only asks questions about the victim's sexual orientation but not about their gender identity.

This potentially severe undercount of targeted violence against the transgender community has left us making policies with one hand tied behind our backs.

This amendment ensures that researchers and policymakers can understand the experiences of deceased LGBTQ individuals and make more informed decisions as we fight for equality and justice under the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Madam Speaker, this amendment stoops to the lowest level possible—in fact, 6 feet under.

It is bad enough that under H.R. 4176, House Democrats seek to subject living people, including children, to intrusive and inappropriate questions related to their private sexual orientation and gender identity. It is especially troublesome that House Democrats would allow proxies to answer such sensitive questions on behalf of others, as this bill allows. But shockingly, this amendment expands that authority to allow proxies to answer survey or Census questions about sexual orientation and gender identity on behalf of dead Americans.

If someone claims to be a ''knowledgeable proxy,'' this amendment permits that individual to answer a Federal survey on behalf of a deceased person who can no longer answer for himself or herself.

With this amendment, someone who has guarded their personal privacy their entire life will have to worry that sensitive aspects of their personal life will be shared with the Federal Government after they die or worry that it could even be made up. How is collecting this information even useful at all?

It is hard to imagine making the underlying bill much worse, but this amendment succeeds with flying colors.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and vote to protect Americans' ability to simply rest in peace.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1191, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

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

Mr. COMER. 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. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 117–381.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise as designee for Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB's amendment made in order by the rule.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 20, insert after ''confidentiality'' the following: '', including protocols for anonymizing data collected and destroying personally-identifiable information at the appropriate time and not later than three years after the date on which the information is collected''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1191, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this straightforward amendment requires the agencies collecting information through this bill to create standards and protocols for anonymizing and destroying personally identifiable information at the appropriate time.

This amendment is a strong addition to the underlying bill, as it ensures that the necessary demographic information collected will be responsibly destroyed to fully protect an individual's privacy.

Complete and accurate data collection is essential to informing policies, laws, and programs that address the needs of our communities.

Individuals who identify as LGBTQI+ have been underrepresented in Federal data collection efforts for generations. This critical information has been missing from this community in all areas of data collection and has led to worsened outcomes compared to individuals who are fully counted in Federal data collection.

I am proud to support this commonsense pro-privacy amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment which ironically highlights the underlying bill's serious intrusion into Americans' privacy.

When the government collects very personal and sensitive information, as H.R. 4176 seeks to recklessly expand, Americans' data regrettably becomes the target of malicious actors.

Too often, we see this story play out in our government, the over-collection of Americans' private information being hacked or improperly disclosed.

From the leaking of Americans' tax records to the breach of Federal employees' entire background investigation files, the Federal government does not have a very good track record of securing private data. Yet, this amendment allows government agencies to place Americans' most private data at risk for up to 3 entire years.

Republicans will not stand for subjecting Americans' most private information to cyber hackers and other wrongdoers, information that should not even be collected in the first place.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1191, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4176 is postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI) at 8 p.m.

LGBTQI+ DATA INCLUSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4176) to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation and gender identity in certain surveys, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Amendment No. 1;

Amendment No. 2;

Motion to recommit, if offered; and

Passage of the bill, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 1, printed in part B of House Report 117–381 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—216

Adams	Bush	Cohen
Aguilar	Bustos	Connolly
Allred	Butterfield	Cooper
Auchincloss	Carbajal	Correa
Axne	Cárdenas	Costa
Bass	Carson	Courtney
Beatty	Carter (LA)	Craig
Bera	Cartwright	Crist
Beyer	Case	Crow
Bishop (GA)	Casten	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Davids (KS)
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny K.
Bonamici	Cherfilus-McCormick	Dean
Bourdeaux	Chu	DeFazio
Bowman	Cicilline	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Brown (MD)	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Brown (OH)	Cleaver	Demings
Brownley	Clyburn	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
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
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
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—200

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
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
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)
Kustoff
LaHood
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
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
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
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Womack

NOT VOTING—13

Barragán
Conway
Gonzalez (OH)
Hice (GA)
Kinzinger
LaMalfa
Murphy (FL)
Pence
Price (NC)
Roybal-Allard
Turner
Wittman
Zeldin

□ 2046

Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BERA changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 293.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Babin (Weber (TX))
Boebert (Bishop (NC))
Bonamici (Manning)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Bush (Williams (GA))
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (LA) (Williams (GA))
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Cherfilus-McCormick (Williams (GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Reschenthaler)
Connolly (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Soto)
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Fletcher (Pallone)
Frankel, Lois (Kuster)
García (IL) (Beyer)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gosar (Weber (TX))
Gottheimer (Neguse)
Grijalva (Gomez)
Guest (Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Huffman (Gomez)
Jacobs (NY) (Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA) (Manning)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Neguse)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
McEachin (Beyer)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (Beyer)
Obernolte (Steel)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Trahan)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz (Harshbarger)
Stansbury (Stevens)
Strickland (Neguse)
Suozzi (Neguse)
Swalwell (Correa)
Takano (Chu)
Tlaib (Gomez)
Torres (NY) (Williams (GA))
Underwood (Neguse)
Walorski (Baird)
Waltz (Gimenez)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Williams (GA))

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 2, printed in part B of House Report 117–381, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 201, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—213

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
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
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
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
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neguse
Newman
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
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
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—201

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
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
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
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
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
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Womack

NOT VOTING—15

Barragán
Conway
Gonzalez (OH)
Hice (GA)
Joyce (OH)
Kinzinger
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Norcross
Pence
Price (NC)
Spanberger
Turner
Wittman
Zeldin

□ 2056

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Babin (Weber (TX))
Boebert (Bishop (NC))
Bonamici (Manning)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Bush (Williams (GA))
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (LA) (Williams (GA))
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Cherfilus-McCormick (Williams (GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Reschenthaler)
Connolly (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Soto)
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Fletcher (Pallone)
Frankel, Lois (Kuster)
García (IL) (Beyer)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gosar (Weber (TX))
Gottheimer (Neguse)
Grijalva (Gomez)
Guest (Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Huffman (Gomez)
Jacobs (NY) (Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA) (Manning)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Neguse)
LaMalfa (Rouzer)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
McEachin (Beyer)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (Beyer)
Obernolte (Steel)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Trahan)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz (Harshbarger)
Stansbury (Stevens)
Strickland (Neguse)
Suozzi (Neguse)
Swalwell (Correa)
Takano (Chu)
Tlaib (Gomez)
Torres (NY) (Williams (GA))
Underwood (Neguse)
Walorski (Baird)
Waltz (Gimenez)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Williams (GA))

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Biggs of Arizona moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4176 to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BIGGS is as follows:

Page 2, beginning on line 3, strike ''**SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, AND VARIATIONS IN SEX CHARACTERISTICS**'' and insert the following: ''**SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, VARIATIONS IN SEX CHARACTERISTICS, AND CITIZENSHIP**''.

Page 2, beginning on line 13, strike ''sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, and whether or not the respondent is a citizen of the United States''.

Page 2, beginning on line 16, strike ''sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, and whether or not the respondent is a citizen of the United States''.

Page 2, beginning on line 23, strike ''sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, and whether or not the respondent is a citizen of the United States''.

Page 3, beginning on line 4, strike ''sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, and whether or not the respondent is a citizen of the United States''.

Page 3, beginning on line 11, strike ''sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, and whether or not the respondent is a citizen of the United States''.

Page 3, beginning on line 18, strike ''sexual orientation, gender identity, or variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, or citizenship''.

Page 4, beginning on line 1, strike ''sexual orientation, gender identity, or variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, or citizenship''.

Page 4, beginning on line 6, strike ''gender identity, sexual orientation, or variations in sex characteristics'' and insert the following: ''sexual orientation, gender identity, variations in sex characteristics, or citizenship''.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 218, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

YEAS—202

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
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
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)
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
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
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
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Womack

NAYS—218

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
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
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
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
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
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
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Conway
Gonzalez (OH)
Hice (GA)
Kinzinger
Pence
Price (NC)
Turner
Wittman
Zeldin

□ 2110

Mr. MASSIE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Babin (Weber (TX))
Barragán (Correa)
Boebert (Bishop (NC))
Bonamici (Manning)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Bush (Williams (GA))
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (LA) (Williams (GA))
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Cherfilus-McCormick (Williams (GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Reschenthaler)
Connolly (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Soto)
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Fletcher (Pallone)
Frankel, Lois (Kuster)
García (IL) (Beyer)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gosar (Weber (TX))
Gottheimer (Neguse)
Grijalva (Gomez)
Guest (Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Huffman (Gomez)
Jacobs (NY) (Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA) (Manning)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Neguse)
LaMalfa (Rouzer)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
McEachin (Beyer)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Trahan)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz (Harshbarger)
Stansbury (Stevens)
Strickland (Neguse)
Suozzi (Neguse)
Swalwell (Correa)
Takano (Chu)
Tlaib (Gomez)
Torres (NY) (Williams (GA))
Underwood (Neguse)
Walorski (Baird)
Waltz (Gimenez)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Williams (GA))

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

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

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 201, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—220

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
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
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
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
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
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
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
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—201

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
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
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
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
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
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Womack

NOT VOTING—8

Conway
Gonzalez (OH)
Hice (GA)
Pence
Price (NC)
Turner
Wittman
Zeldin

□ 2120

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to improve Federal populations surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics in certain surveys, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Babin (Weber (TX))
Barragán (Correa)
Boebert (Bishop (NC))
Bonamici (Manning)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Bush (Williams (GA))
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (LA) (Williams (GA))
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Cherfilus-McCormick (Williams (GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Reschenthaler)
Connolly (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Soto)
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Fletcher (Pallone)
Frankel, Lois (Kuster)
García (IL) (Beyer)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gosar (Weber (TX))
Gottheimer (Neguse)
Grijalva (Gomez)
Guest (Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Huffman (Gomez)
Jacobs (NY) (Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA) (Manning)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Neguse)
LaMalfa (Rouzer)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
McEachin (Beyer)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Trahan)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz (Harshbarger)
Stansbury (Stevens)
Strickland (Neguse)
Suozzi (Neguse)
Swalwell (Correa)
Takano (Chu)
Tlaib (Gomez)
Torres (NY) (Williams (GA))
Underwood (Neguse)
Walorski (Baird)
Waltz (Gimenez)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Williams (GA))

HONORING SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL'S LEGACY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Pell grant, a Federal program named after my mentor, role model, and friend, the late Senator Claiborne Pell, who proudly served Rhode Island for 40 years in the United States Senate.

Senator Pell was one of Rhode Island's finest statesmen who embodied the highest ideals of public service. He was also a fierce advocate of education and deeply believed in supporting the next generation of American leaders. In fact, one of the reasons I am here today is because of Senator Pell.

When I interned in his office as a 19-year-old college student, Senator Pell placed his faith in me, and it was one of the things that inspired me to run for office myself.

It is only fitting that the grant program which bears Senator Pell's name is now the single largest source of Federal grant aid for undergraduate students.

Last year, over 6 million students received $27 billion in Pell grants to help them complete a college degree. Pell grants have made higher education accessible and affordable for tens of millions of Americans, which I know made Senator Pell enormously proud.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 13 years since we lost Senator Pell, but his remarkable legacy lives on.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PELL GRANTS

(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, today is the 50th anniversary of the Pell Grant Program.

This program was authorized in 1972 to provide direct financial aid to low-income students for access to higher education and the opportunity to pursue their full potential.

The effort that year was bipartisan, and the program maintains bipartisan support today, 50 years later.

More than 80 million students have received the Pell grant to attend college, and currently, 7 million students, about 40 percent of undergraduates, are utilizing the Pell grant to earn a degree today.

At Pennsylvania's land-grant institution, Penn State University, annually, about 18,000 students are using the Pell grant to access and afford a great degree at 20 undergraduate campuses throughout the Commonwealth, including two Penn State campuses in the counties I serve.

Mr. Speaker, for individuals, this program is critically important to access and affordability, but it also encourages degree completion, on-time graduation, and lower levels of student debt. For the Nation, this program is an essential investment to maintaining and strengthening our Nation's skilled workforce and enhancing global economic competitiveness.

RECOGNIZING AND CONGRATULATING SKEEK FRAZEE

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a great Mainer, Skeek Frazee.

Skeek is retiring this month after 12 dedicated years of constituent service to the people of Maine's First District.

I believe the great majority of us who work in this institution do so because we want to make life better for our neighbors. Skeek exemplifies that spirit.

For over a decade, she has committed herself to some of the most challenging and sensitive cases that come through my office. She has fought for asylum seekers and refugees who have lived through horrors in their home countries. It is no exaggeration to say that new Mainers can build thriving new lives because of her help.

She is known across the country for her work advocating for survivors of military sexual trauma bravely seeking benefits that they deserve from the VA.

Beyond her considerable skill as a caseworker, she has also mentored countless interns; been an unfailingly generous, hilarious, and kind colleague; and become a treasured friend to so many of us in and outside of our office.

Skeek, the people of Maine are infinitely better for having you as an advocate, a neighbor, and a friend. We will miss you dearly, and we wish you the very best in your next chapter.

□ 2130

HONORING PAT COOPER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pat Cooper for her achievement of being named the 2022 M.H. ''Woody'' Woodside Community Champion of the Year. Pat Cooper is the owner of a not-so-small business known as Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices Hodnett Cooper Real Estate in St. Simons, Georgia. The M.H. ''Woody'' Woodside Community Champion of the Year is given out to a small business that gives back to local nonprofits, events, and organizations through their time and resources to better their community.

The founder of the company and Pat's father, Roy Hodnett, built this company and made giving back to his community the foundation of his business. Pat has continued that passion for service with her team of Realtors,

staff, and leadership helping give back both financially and with their time through the organizations they support, including Hospice of the Golden Isles, Boys and Girls Club of Southeast Georgia, the American Cancer Society, and many more.

Among their service to organizations, members of the company have also given back to their community by playing roles in community initiatives such as SPLOST and zoning issues to enhance the quality of life in the Golden Isles.

Congratulations to Pat. I commend her for her incredible service to her community.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HOUSTON PRIDE COMMUNITY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Houston pride community and the 44th annual pride parade in Houston and to celebrate the caucus that has fought against HIV/AIDS, political empowerment, educating the public, and helping those in the LGBTQI community who could not help themselves.

I congratulate them for a stupendous commitment to civic participation in our State and in our community.

Let me also say that I rise again to raise the Protect Our Kids Act, an act passed by this House really dealing with gun safety and protecting our kids by raising the age for assault weapons, by banning magazines, by ensuring they are stored, by stopping trafficking, stopping ghost guns, and stopping bump stocks.

Yes, we did a magnificent job in the House. We look forward to moving forward with legislation that we hope will make a difference. We are a part of the change, and I hope that we will move some elements of the Protect Our Kids Act as we go forward to make sure we do, in fact, protect our kids.

ENCOURAGING THE PRESS TO REPORT ON EVENTS REGARDING UKRAINE

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, not a lot has been said about the conflict in Ukraine right now, but it doesn't mean we should take our eye off the ball. There is a division, I think, on elected officials between two groups, and it is important for the press to identify which one of these two groups has the upper hand, not only in Congress but in the Biden administration.

Some people feel that it would be good to wrap up this war, including me. Ukraine has the second-lowest birth rate of any sizeable country in the world, and the population of Ukraine has sunk about 5 percent in the last few years. Russia also has a low birth rate and is having a lot of people leave their country. So we have two countries that should be primarily concerned about keeping the few young people they have alive rather than engaged in a war. For that reason, I would like to believe that if an off-ramp is provided for Mr. Putin then we could end the war before we have more people dying.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the press corps to weigh in a little bit and find out where the Biden administration stands on this.

PENDING ECONOMIC DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIEU). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, just because we are doing some organization and because we are all up against the tyranny of the clock, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

RUGBY WORLD CUP

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, as a competitive college rugby player at Dartmouth College, I picked up a love for the game of rugby. I continue to enjoy watching the sport as a Member of the U.S. Congress. I proudly serve as the co-chair of the Congressional Rugby Caucus, and I am honored to be an advocate for the Rugby World Cup. I am thrilled to rise today to celebrate that the United States has been named the host site of both the 2031 Men's Rugby World Cup and the 2033 Women's Rugby World Cup, a monumental accomplishment that brings the third largest sporting event in the world to our shores.

Earlier this year, my caucus co-chair, Democrat ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and I introduced a bipartisan concurrent resolution to recognize and support the efforts of USA Rugby and its partners to bring upcoming Rugby World Cup tournaments to the United States. Rugby is one of the fastest growing sports in the United States with more than 100,000 USA Rugby members playing in over 2,500 clubs nationwide.

The United States possesses all the necessary state-of-the-art infrastructure in its stadiums and potential host cities to ensure that the tournaments set a new standard of quality, comfort, security, and safety for players, fans, and sponsors. The eventual location of U.S.-based Rugby World Cup events will be chosen from a group of over one dozen cities in the United States.

Rugby is about so much more than the tailgaiting and tackling. At its core, rugby teaches comradery, resilience, and respect for the opposition. It is also a sport with a massive international reach. With rugby boasting 405 million fans across the globe, the Men's Rugby World Cup has become among the most popular sporting events in the world. I congratulate all the hardworking individuals at USA Rugby who have spent a huge amount of time and effort on the lengthy and involved bid process. I would also like to recognize the efforts and vision of the leadership from World Rugby and the World Rugby Council.

This moment marks a pivotal turning point for the sport of rugby in the United States and around the world. This will be the first time a Men's Rugby World Cup has been held in North or South America. A new hosting concept has been put in place as the United States stages consecutive men's and women's events within the same organizational structure.

A projected 4.1 million fans will attend both the men's and women's Rugby World Cup events in the United States. Recent Rugby World Cup tournaments have brought more than 242,000 international fans from around the world into the host countries and seen more than 1.7 million spectators flock to the stadiums, generating significant revenue at the local and national level.

USA and World Rugby will now lead a multi-year effort to build anticipation for 2031 and 2033 while developing infrastructure to guarantee successful tournaments. Additionally, USA Rugby will use the next decade to drive significant investment in the game at the youth level, increase access to and diversity in rugby, take rugby to the next level at the high school and college levels, and grow USA Rugby membership to 450,000 members.

Bringing this event home is great news for our country and for the future of the great sport of rugby in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try something tonight because I am very, very concerned this place isn't paying attention to the numbers and how much trouble I believe we are in. My argument and my thesis is very simple: If I am wrong, I am wrong; but if I am right and this place didn't prepare because of the numbers we are seeing, then we will damage the people, we will damage the economics, we will damage the country, and we will damage our future. We are not taking it seriously enough on how the numbers are eroding and how fast—how fast—the numbers are eroding around us economically.

Now, originally, this was going to be a 1-hour presentation. Now it looks like I have 22 minutes because of the tyranny of the clock, so I will try not go too fast, and I promise I will dispose of some of the boards. As always, wave at me if I start rambling at high rates of speed.

□ 2140

This is our baseline. The problem is this chart is now a year and a half old and the numbers are much worse. The reality, 29 years from now, CBO—this

isn't some off group; this is our Congressional Budget Office—functionally says we have $112 trillion. My back of the napkin now says $120 trillion of publicly borrowed debt in today's dollars, not inflated dollars.

Functionally, 75 percent of that debt is Medicare. Twenty-five percent is Social Security. The rest of the budget is in balance.

Well, what happens to Medicare particularly when you start having inflation like we do?

And I represent a district that has had over 11 percent inflation. I represent the district with the highest inflation in America.

Let's actually start to walk through what many of the experts are saying. And remember, I am trying to make a very simple point here. I am worried about my country. I am worried about our debt and the ability to pay, and it is skyrocketing; and then the cascade effect of how many people are getting poorer.

Remember, in the first 15 months of Democrat control here, Americans are dramatically poorer today than they were a year ago.

So let's actually walk through this. When Larry Summers—when I am coming to the floor using quotes for Larry Summers—you have got Larry Summers. In order to do what is necessary to stop inflation, the Fed is going to raise interest rates enough that the economy will slip into recession. That is one of the Democrats, at least up until he had heresy of telling the truth on Democrats' $1.9 trillion spending last year, and then you put him on the outs. But up till that moment he was Democrats' favorite economist.

But now he is basically telling us we have structurally built in so much inflation, we are going to have to have the Federal Reserve force us into recession.

Do you know what happens to people, what happens to poor people, the working middle class, the working poor when you are in a recessionary cycle, and how many years it takes for the public to get their lives back?

The economy is heading for a hard landing when we are now starting to see over and over and over the very economists that, a month ago, were saying we might be able to negotiate a soft landing. Oh, we may just tip a little bit of growth and unemployment and come back.

And now those same economists, a month later, are saying, no, we are heading toward a hard landing. We are going into recession.

By the love of the Dear Lord, I hope they are wrong. But if they are right, have you seen a single thing this body has done to prepare?

The U.S. economy is heading for a hard landing, and this one is important. We have got to understand. We are starting to see numbers now that—and we had a Member of the majority here, I think a couple of days ago, come and somewhere they threw out, oh, but there is all this excess money in the people's savings accounts. That isn't true anymore.

You do understand, the personal savings rate has plummeted from 26.6 percent a year ago, functionally, a year ago, to 4.4 in April, and it continues to vault. And understand, that personal savings rate of 4.4 is below where we were before the pandemic.

If we start to hit recession right now, our brothers and sisters out there don't have that cash reserve in their bank accounts.

Do you understand the concept of fragility?

And now we actually start to see the other thing that really genuinely terrifies me, and we are going to do a couple of slides on this. And I know I am going fast but we are up against the clock here. We have a mandatory shutdown in about 20 minutes.

Treasury yields are really starting to decline. And you have got to understand, we basically had budget projections, Congressional Budget Office and others, who had been basically building analysis of what will the debt look like? And they were using remarkably historically low interest rates.

A year ago we had expert after expert coming in front of the Ways and Means Committee and other places, Joint Economic Committee, oh, we are going to be in historically low interest rates because we are getting sold as a society. We have all these people saving. We are going to be more like Japan. Turns out they are wrong.

Remember the previous slide? The savings rate from the largesse of the giveaways, just structurally we are getting demographically older. We should be retaining. It is gone. The savings are gone.

And now we are going into an interest rate cycle where they are having to start to raise interest rates on Treasuries and everything else to attract capital from around the world. If you have been watching the U.S. dollar, you understand what is going on with this.

What happens when U.S. sovereign debt—if interest rates are 2 points historically—so we go a 30-year run, and if we are just 2 percent higher than what CBO modeled last year, 2 points, in about 25 years, I believe the math is, every dollar of tax receipts, tax revenues, goes just to pay interest. There is no more government. We are just covering our debt.

Do you understand the fragility we have done to ourselves with this inflationary cycle?

The average interest rate being paid on Federal debt—and this, I know this board is a little hard to read and hard to see. But historically, go back to the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, the period that we have modeled is way down here. This was not normal.

God forbid, if we go back to normality in U.S. sovereign interest rates, and then we are functionally running $30 trillion of debt, do you understand how much of—the left wants to spend money on these things. The right, we want to defend the military. There is no money.

And you saw the first board that basically said the massive, massive shortfall in Medicare. Remember, Medicare is mostly a general fund expenditure. It is like only 20 percent of it really is a part A trust fund, and that is gone in 5 years. And it has begun. It has begun.

And the other thing, it is more than what we borrow today. It is the amount of U.S. sovereign debt. And I didn't bring that board, and I probably should have, that has to be refinanced every month. So you may borrow $1 trillion this year, but you had to refinance 5 or 6 or $7 trillion, and every dime of that now is reset at the new interest rates.

And the higher interest costs—and I am going to do a couple of variations of this. But this is functionally, 9 budget years from now. If it is going where we think it is going, publicly held debt—you are now in the 126 percent of GDP. And most of this movement here, when you start to see this movement, it is the financing costs. It is the financing costs of this government. Because the real explosion of our demographic spending, you know, the fact that in 7 years, 22 percent of our country is 65 and older, that explosion of the baby boomers costs—it really starts—it has already begun, but it really, that curve really starts to take off at the end of the decade; at the very time we are already pushing 126 percent of debt to GDP.

□ 2150

Does anyone understand the level of fragility? It is this inflationary cycle. Democrats did something horrible March last year. They didn't listen to their own economists because they were so busy living in this fantasy world of free money. Give it away. People will love us. Don't require them to participate in the economy. Now we are paying the price.

If you are trying to save for retirement; if you are a young couple trying to get ready to buy your first house, there is a technical form for it in economics. You are screwed. Because every single day that savings you have is worth less.

If you are a saver, your savings today is functionally about 7 percent less valuable than it was a year ago.

I mean, those of you who intend to retire one day, have you actually started to think about that the value of the savings you had, if you put it in safe things like bonds or savings accounts, is substantially less valuable today. Its purchasing power is less today than it was a year ago.

If this continues for a couple years, do you understand how many more years you really need to work? Do you understand how much more savings you have to have? Do you have an understanding of how much you are going to have to help your kids buy that first house? This is not a game.

Two weeks ago, I came here, and we tried to do some of the math on the board of how many seniors. If the current inflation cycle lasts for about 24 months, we basically were trying to do the math of, okay, here is what happens to seniors' savings. It falls, the value of it. It is functionally transferred to government.

What happens to the COLA? Well, the COLA and Social Security never gets close to keeping up to the actual inflation rate because of the lag problem.

That 20 percent copay you have on your healthcare, and if healthcare inflation is almost double the CPI rate, and you've got to pay that 20 percent, we were looking at math that said you could potentially double the number of seniors in poverty in a decade.

Has anyone here actually wanted to dig into that math and start to understand? This is not a game.

I know there is a desperate attempt by the administration and my Democrat colleagues, oh, this is inflation because of a war in Ukraine. This is greedy oil companies.

No, it is not. You believed in modern monetary policy, and it blew up.

Remember, much of this inflation was structurally built in before the war in Ukraine. You see it in these sorts of numbers.

By the end of 2021—and remember, that is before Russia's invasion, right?—credit card debt climbed to $856 billion. It is a 28 percent annualized increase in the fourth quarter of last year.

It had already begun. People were already borrowing on their credit cards because prices were going up so fast. So the way they were supplementing their consumption is they were building up debt.

I have showed you the board before. Savings rates have collapsed. We are now seeing credit card debt explode. When those hit up the wall—you see what happened 3 weeks ago—consumer sentiment collapsed.

It is because all of a sudden I can't keep financing my lifestyle by using up my savings and chewing up credit card debt.

This is going on right now. Where is the concern? Does anyone here care about people and what is going on to them economically out there, outside the walls of this building?

The U.S. economy is heading for a hard landing, and this is just functionally that same thing, once again, by other sources talking about the growth of credit card debt—or, excuse me, the collapse of savings rates.

Credit card balances, once again, really, really—from other sources, saying the growth. This is a real problem.

If we were in a time of prosperity—a couple minutes ago, I was in the back room. I saw the spokesperson for the White House. These are fine economic times. Have they lost their minds? Do they own, like, a subscription to any economic journal?

To say things are fine at the same time you can see the aggregated data of savings collapsing, credit card debt exploding, interest rates going up, interest rates and sovereign debt, and now start to understand what that is going to mean in the financing of this government.

Now you have got to deal with the Democrats' policy set. The fact of the matter is, thank God, the Senate has a couple Democrats that actually may have saved the country—it is hard to say that—by stopping the Build Back Better and the just stunning amount of debt the left wanted to build on.

When you start seeing numbers saying that if the Democrats' package had passed, we functionally would have gone from about $17 trillion of publicly-held borrowing before the pandemic to $44 trillion by the end of the decade. This is if the Democrats' spending plans and borrowing plans had passed.

An absolute, absolute lie, and we have shown it over and over, oh, it is all paid for; except it wasn't. It wasn't even close.

I think in the Build Back Better, the best estimate we were able to come—and we used their math—was they were covering about 30 percent of the expenditures, and they were covering it in a way where they were going to raise certain taxes that would have actually slowed down the economic growth that we are desperate for.

Now you start to see my fear for the country. When we start to model what happens to the projected Federal debt under various interest rate scenarios—and I know I am sounding like a highly caffeinated accountant on steroids, but this is the stuff we are paid to read and understand.

We are not paid to stand behind these microphones and virtue signal. But, God, that seems to be what we do here. We do policy by virtue signaling.

Let's come here for just one moment. Here is functionally where we are at. If you start to say, okay, the mean of U.S. sovereign debt, the 30 years, the 10 years, the 20s, you know, up and down, CBO's baseline basically says we are at 202 percent of debt to GDP.

With a small increase going back to almost normality, with the historic average over the last 30 years, we are starting to hit numbers close to 300.

If we actually were slightly above historic normal, you are at 357 percent of debt to GDP. Does anyone believe this economy doesn't collapse long before that?

People run from the U.S. dollar. They dispose of U.S. debt. Can you imagine what the chaos, what the misery, what the dystopian nature of economics would be in this country if you start to run up these levels of debt.

You already saw in a previous chart we are heading toward 126 percent of debt functionally at the end of the decade. Debt to GDP. That is publicly held borrowed money.

At the same time, you are going to be up against the Social Security trust fund running out of money. Social Security recipients are heading toward a 25 to 27 percent cut. The Medicare trust fund will have already been gone for 5 years, so we still haven't figured out what is going to happen to the payments to doctors and hospitals within that.

This is not a game, and it is in front of us. If we get here a couple years from now, and all this is blowing up on us, and this place pretends they didn't know, maybe I could sit them in front of the hours I have spent behind this microphone going over the math. The math is in those binders that are sent to us two times a year.

Here is one of the things that truly terrifies me, as you start to get into the new interest rate scenarios. This isn't long term. This is basically, yeah, we start to think of what mean rates mean, and you start to add in just a 2 percent change.

That 2 percent—and this is within the current 10-year window—you start to basically add $13.4 trillion additional—well, debt, and this marginal here is just the marginal increase because you start to chase your tail.

I have a chart, and I need to actually have it graphically made so it is easier to see. We will be financing the debt that we are financing. We will be chasing our tail, and that is where we are heading.

Now the cruelty.

Mr. Speaker pro tem, may I ask, because I am looking at the clock above. Can you tell me how many minutes I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. About a minute and a half.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I promise you, I am going to use all 5 minutes.

This is the cruelty now to poor people, to the working poor, to that hardworking middle class, to those retirees. When you come to them and say, all right, let's take a look here.

Forgive the colors, but the green would have been if we had hit the 2 percent sort of Federal Reserve benchmark inflation goal. This here is where we seem to be annualizing right now, and this is some of the newest projection for the next couple years. It is about 7.4.

But when you see this bar come down, it basically means the $100 you had in 2022, if you get to 2032, so a decade, that $100 you have, if we stay at this sort of inflation rate, functionally, you have lost half of its purchasing value.

So you have saved and saved and saved and saved and saved, and if you start running—if the current interest or current inflation environment were to hang around for a decade, at the end of that decade, half the value is gone. You have lost half of your savings.

This is what is going on. What if it is just for 2 years? You start just doing it for 2 years, and you start to realize you have lost almost a quarter. Then you compound that out to you want to retire one day. You want to finance your kids' school. You want to do these things.

Do you understand how the difference of your earning power has to change just to make up for the loss of the value? I represent a community that is going through 11 percent inflation rates.

Then the last one in the last how many seconds I have. Please. Please. Someone hire an economist to talk to the White House. A gas tax holiday? I mean, you can hear the economists rolling on their backs laughing right now.

Mr. Speaker pro tem, thank you for your tolerance tonight. I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 24, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2022, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CLAUDIA MARCONI, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 27 AND JUNE 5, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Claudia Marconi	5/27	6/5	Germany		1,640.00		4,126.47				5,766.47
Committee total					1,640.00		4,126.47				5,766.47

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, June 13, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO POLAND AND UKRAINE, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 29 AND MAY 2, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/29	5/2	Poland		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Jim McGovern	4/29	5/2	Poland		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	4/29	5/2	Poland		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Adam Schiff	4/29	5/2	Poland		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	4/29	5/2	Poland		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Bill Keating	4/29	5/2	Poland		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Jason Crow	4/29	5/2	Poland		616.00		(3)				616.00
Dr. Brian Monahan	4/29	5/2	Poland		616.00		(3)				616.00
Gen. William Walker	4/29	5/12	Poland		2,046.00		1,768.60				3,814.60
Wyndee Parker	4/29	5/2	Poland		616.00		(3)				616.00
Terri McCullough	4/29	5/2	Poland		616.00		(3)				616.00
Kate Knudson	4/29	5/2	Poland		518.00		(3)				518.00
Emily Berret	4/29	5/2	Poland		518.00		(3)				518.00
Kelsey Smith	4/26	5/2	Poland		961.00		2,842.90				3,803.90
Shana Mansbach	4/29	5/2	Poland		518.00		(3)				518.00
James Marrow	4/29	5/2	Poland		518.00		(3)				518.00
Sophia Lafargue	4/29	5/2	Poland		518.00		(3)				518.00
Erin Kolodjeski	4/29	5/2	Poland		518.00		(3)				518.00
Committee total					12,815.00		4,611.50				17,426.50

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, June 6, 2022.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

(Omitted from the Record of May 16, 2022)

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 6376, the Student Veteran Work Study Modernization Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 6376

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2022–2026	2022–2031
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	*	3	3	4	4	4	0	0	0	−20	14	−1

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–4399. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Findings in Support of a Sustainable National Flood Insurance Program''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4400. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs,

Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Borrowing Authority''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4401. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Establishing Financial Resilience''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4402. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Risk-Informed Approach for a Modern NFIP''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4403. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Disclosure of Flood Risk Information Prior to Real Estate Transactions''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4404. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Use of Replacement Cost Value in Determining Premium Rates''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4405. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Consideration of Cloastal and Inland Locations in Determining Premium Rates''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4406. A letter from the Deputy Assitant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Multi-Year Reauthorization''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4407. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Excessive Loss Properties''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4408. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Flood Compliance and Mitigation Coverage''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4409. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Inrease Maximum Coverage Limits''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4410. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Study the Efficacy of the Mandatory Purchase Requirement''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4411. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Prohibit Coverage for New Construction in High-Risk Areas/Commercial Properties''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4412. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Clarify Period to File Suit''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4413. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Reduce Reporting Complexity''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4414. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Remove Barriers to Switching to Private Policies''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4415. A letter from the Policy Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Occupant Protection for Vehicles With Automated Driving Systems [Docket No.: NHTSA-2021-0003] (RIN: 2127-AM06) received April 26, 2022, 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–4416. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislaive Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum entitled ''Regional Actions to Manage, Mitigate, and Reduce Irregular Migration''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4417. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the 6-month period of October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4418. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual reports to Congress from the Treasury Inspector General and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration covering the reporting period of October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4419. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting three (3) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4420. A letter from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Inspector General Report for the period October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4421. A letter from the Director for Legislative Affairs, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), transmitting the Council's final rule — National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Regulations Revisions (RIN: 0331-AA05) received May 17, 2022, 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–4422. A letter from the Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the administration's final rule — Reducing Burden on Families Acting as Representative Payees of Social Security Payments [Docket No.: SSA-2021- 0046] (RIN: 0960-AI52) received June 16, 2022, 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–4423. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting notification of a projection that the asset reserves held in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will become inadequate under the meaning of Section 709 of the Social Security Act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 910(a); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title VII, Sec. 709 (as added by Public Law 98-21, Sec. 143); (97 Stat. 102) (H. Doc. No. 117—128); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

EC–4424. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting The 2022 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 910(a); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title VII, Sec. 709 (as added by Public Law 98-21, Sec. 143); (97 Stat. 102) and 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title II, Sec. 201 (as amended by Public Law 100-647, Sec. 8005(a)); (102 Stat. 3781) (H. Doc. No. 117—127); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

EC–4425. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal to reform the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) entitled ''Means-Tested Assistance Program''; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Ways and Means.

EC–4426. A letter from the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting The 2022 Report of the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(i)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1893(i)(2) (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 6402(j)(1)(B)); (124 Stat. 762) (H. Doc. No. 117—126); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of communities were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 5407. A bill to amend

the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 6493. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse; with an amendment (Rept. 117–384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 8195. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to raise public awareness for skilled trade programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia (for herself, Mr. HARRIS, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.R. 8196. A bill To deem certain conduct of members of the groups ''Jane's Revenge'' and ''Ruth Sent Us'' as domestic terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. MACE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 8197. A bill to authorize Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers to provide recommendations and opinions to veterans regarding participation in State marijuana programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 8198. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the process by which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines whether an educational institution meets requirements relating to the percentage of students who receive educational assistance furnished by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 8199. A bill to ban certain small, high-powered magnets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. RESCHENTHALER):

H.R. 8200. A bill to amend any applicable federal law to permit access to community development, small business, minority development, and any other public or private financial capital sources for investment in and financing of cannabis-related legitimate businesses, and to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to create a safe harbor for national securities exchanges to list the securities of issuers that are cannabis-related legitimate businesses; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CHU (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 8201. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase funding for quality measure endorsement, input, and selection under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 8202. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require a recall of electronic nicotine delivery systems that have not been subject to premarket review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRADY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H.R. 8203. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 651 Business Interstate Highway 35 North Suite 420 in New Braunfels, Texas, as the ''Bob Krueger Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 8204. A bill to amend section 262 of the Museum and Library Services Act to authorize the Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Service to award grants to institutions of higher education for courses that use only publicly available digital resources for required reading assignments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 8205. A bill to require certain reports relating to defense access roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. ROSENDALE, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 8206. A bill to repeal Executive Order 13988 and prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from carrying out certain requirements relating to sexual orientation and gender identity for participation in school meal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 8207. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself, Mr. MEIJER, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 8208. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a program of the Department of Defense to promote early literacy among certain young children as part of pediatric primary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Mr. BACON, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 8209. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program with respect to 24-7 sobriety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BUSH, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 8210. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting disinformation in the advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 8211. A bill to require the return of amounts loaned under the Paycheck Protection Program of the Small Business Administration used for illegal activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 8212. A bill to rescind the Executive Order on Advancing Equality for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Oversight and Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 8213. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. HERN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H.R. 8214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain provisions of Public Law 115-97 affecting individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 8215. A bill to improve cybersecurity practices and improve digital literacy among

veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 8216. A bill to promote digital citizenship and media literacy; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIFFANY (for himself, Mr. STEIL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 8217. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 South Knowles Avenue in New Richmond, Wisconsin, as the ''Captain Robert C. Harmon and Private John R. Peirson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. TIFFANY (for himself, Mr. STEIL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 8218. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 619 Hewett Street in Neillsville, Wisconsin, as the ''Corporal Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. HERN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BOST, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 8219. A bill to transfer certain funds from the Da Afghanistan Bank to the United States Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 8220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to assist local educational agencies with ensuring that each elementary and secondary school has at least one registered nurse on staff; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures with respect to Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TRONE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MENG, and Mr. CASE):

H. Res. 1200. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 40th anniversary of Vincent Chin's death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY:

H. Res. 1201. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 8th as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'' and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H. Res. 1202. A resolution affirming, commemorating, and celebrating the 50th anniversary of the enactment of title IX, applauding the increase in educational opportunities available to all individuals, regardless of sex or gender, and recognizing the tremendous amount of work left to be done to further increase those opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SWALWELL (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 1203. A resolution congratulating the Golden State Warriors for their historic championship victory in the 2022 National Basketball Association Finals; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8195.

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 Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 8196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 8197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 8198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states ''[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 8199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana:

H.R. 8200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 8201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 8202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 8203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 8204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 8205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 14 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 8206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 8207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 8208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ''necessary and proper'' clause of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 8209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 8210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 8211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 8212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 8213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the US 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 Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 8215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 8216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. TIFFANY:

H.R. 8217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TIFFANY:

H.R. 8218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 7: The Congress shall have Power to establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 8219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 8220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.J. Res. 89.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 194: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 344: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 504: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 608: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 825: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 959: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1004: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1005: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1006: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1007: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1008: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1025: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1026: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 1164: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1179: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 1282: Mr. PENCE and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1330: Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 1401: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1417: Mr. POSEY and Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 1441: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1504: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1596: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 1627: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1661: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 1769: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1919: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1978: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 2145: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 2154: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2187: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2335: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 2466: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2566: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2568: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 2600: Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 2814: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2920: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2924: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3015: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3183: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3244: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 3287: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 3483: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3775: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 3932: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 3962: Ms. OMAR and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3982: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 4249: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4366: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4390: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4436: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4624: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 4794: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 4826: Mr. CASTEN and Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 4917: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 4934: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4943: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 5427: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5518: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 5562: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 5602: Ms. ROSS, Mrs. AXNE, and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 5611: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5699: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5734: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 5743: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 5766: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5801: Mr. AGUILAR and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 5919: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 6026: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 6057: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 6161: Mr. EMMER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 6165: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 6214: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 6331: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 6448: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 6571: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 6629: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 6654: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 6913: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 6965: Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 7018: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
H.R. 7036: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 7116: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 7121: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 7151: Mr. BANKS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 7194: Mr. OWENS and Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 7213: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 7223: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 7465: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 7482: Mr. WELCH and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 7534: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 7773: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 7814: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 7826: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 7890: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 7945: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 7949: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 7951: Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 7961: Ms. MENG and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 7975: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 7987: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. MANN.
H.R. 7991: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 7995: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 8006: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 8008: Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 8040: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BUSH, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.
H.R. 8050: Mr. MANN, Ms. MENG, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 8051: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 8062: Mr. FALLON and Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 8072: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8100: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 8106: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 8145: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 8146: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 8150: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. MFUME, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 8160: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 8167: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 8168: Mrs. STEEL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 8179: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 8187: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 8190: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 8192: Mr. BARR.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.J. Res. 87: Mr. KEATING, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
H. Res. 174: Ms. PORTER.
H. Res. 891: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 892: Mr. SUOZZI.
H. Res. 1132: Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CROW, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MEIJER, and Ms. BROWNLEY.
H. Res. 1156: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 1161: Ms. WATERS and Ms. DEAN.
H. Res. 1165: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 1178: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 1193: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 1196: Mr. TRONE.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 2022 No. 107

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.

Mighty God, the source of all life and the light of all seeing, lift our thoughts to the greatness of Your majesty. May we strive to do right by trusting You completely.

Lord, judge our thoughts and desires, leading us with Your love and faithfulness. Today, teach our lawmakers to love in the presence of hate, to forgive in the presence of injustice, and to illuminate in the presence of darkness. Lord, may the promise of Your love be experienced in all of their relationships. Be for us all a helper and a shelter in the time of storm.

We pray in Your righteous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2022.

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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—Resumed

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge Jessica G. L. Clarke, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York from the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BIPARTISAN SAFER COMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as we approach the conclusion of a truly consequential work period, the Senate this morning will take the next major step toward accomplishing something that hasn't been done in decades, passing a strong gun safety bill.

The bill can be described simply in three adjectives: common sense, bipartisan, lifesaving. And if Republicans work with us, we could very well finish the job in its entirety before the day is done.

Later this morning, the Senate will vote to invoke cloture on the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and I expect that vote to have robust bipartisan support, just as we saw earlier this week.

We are not going to leave until we pass this bill. After this morning's vote, it is my intention to work with Republican colleagues to reach an agreement to secure a vote on final passage before the day is out.

As the author of the Brady bill nearly 30 years ago, the last legislative effort to fight gun violence, I am so pleased that we are at last on the precipice of taking action once again. It has been a long time, but this breakthrough is welcome. So I urge my Republican colleagues, let's get this bill passed and pass it today. Let's pass it so we can send it to the House; they can send it to the White House; and the President can sign it. Americans have waited long enough. Let us finish our job today.

As we take the final steps in this process, few could have anticipated we would reach this point just a few weeks ago. The morning after the tragedy in Uvalde, the U.S. Senate faced a choice: We could surrender to gridlock, and we could swiftly vote on a bill with provisions many of us would have wanted, but because of rigid opposition from the other side had no hope of passing the Chamber—it would have failed—or we could choose to try and forge a bipartisan path forward to pass a real bill, as difficult as that may have seemed to many.

Over the past 4 weeks, we chose to try and get something done. Immediately after Uvalde, I spoke with Senator MURPHY, who asked me to give negotiators time and space to do their work. With his deep experience in this area, he believed that given the opportunity, maybe, maybe, maybe these

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

Printed on recycled paper.

talks could succeed; although, of course, there was no guarantee.

I was happy to agree because I knew that even if there was a chance to get something positive and tangible done on gun safety, it was worth the effort. So I told Senator MURPHY I would give him the space he needed. That quickly became the consensus of our caucus and the consensus of many of our gun safety advocates who pressed us to secure real progress. Senator MURPHY and I called them the day after Uvalde, and they agreed, get something done, even if it wouldn't be everything we would all want.

We were all on the same page. Instead of voting on a bill that would fail, we would try and get something real passed in the Senate. In the end, it was the right decision because before long we had a bipartisan guns framework. A week later, we had legislative text. A few days ago, that bill came before the Senate with strong bipartisan votes. And today—today—we can take final steps to passing the first major gun safety bill in nearly 30 years.

As I said, this is not a cure-all for all the ways gun violence affects our Nation, but it is a long overdue step in the right direction. It is significant; it is going to save lives; and it is my intention to get it done as soon as we can.

I want to thank all of my Democratic and Republican colleagues for working together to reach this point, and I want to thank the leaders of the effort: Senators MURPHY and SINEMA, Senators CORNYN and TILLIS, as well as all of our colleagues on the bipartisan working group, all of our chairs and Members who contributed their expertise and their leadership in shaping the bill. I also want to thank every single survivor of gun violence, every family who has spoken up, every advocate who has organized, and every voter and concerned citizen who has pushed this body to take action for so many years. Even with the holes in their heart, the lost loved ones through needless, cruel gun violence, so many advocates persisted and persisted and persisted. And without them keeping that candle burning, even in the darkest of moments, we wouldn't have gotten this done. I salute them. I thank them. America thanks them. And I say to all of them, all the advocates who worked so hard and so long on this, very soon your efforts will bear real fruit.

We are going to keep going until we finish the job. So I urge my colleagues to reach an agreement with us to do precisely that.

REMEMBERING LEONA I. FAUST

Now, Madam President, on a different and sadder subject, I wish to offer a few words this morning in honor of Leona Faust, the Senate Librarian, who passed away after decades of working to serve in this body.

In Psalm 19, it is written:

> Day after day they pour forth speech;
> Night after night they reveal knowledge.

This Chamber is well accustomed to long speeches from many Members day after day, but for a century and a half, it has been the responsibility of one person, the Senate Librarian, to help reveal, preserve, and safeguard the knowledge and work of this body. For 44 years, that was the work Leona dedicated herself to with intelligence and grace.

Leona's first day on the job was very different from what library employees might encounter today. When she was first hired in 1978, her responsibilities were primarily to manage hundreds of calls that came every day inquiring about the status of this or that piece of legislation.

In time, Leona, who became the Librarian in 2010, worked dramatically to improve the efficiency of the Library. She modernized it, digitized it, and made it far more accessible for Members and their staffs. Her accomplishments forever changed the way information flows across the Senate and democracy—democracy itself—is better off for her work.

But most of all today, we pay tribute to Leona not for what she did but for what she was—a beloved member of the Senate community, a friend to so many, and someone whom we will miss very, very dearly.

Today, all of us keep her memory permanently in our hearts and her family in our prayers.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM WALSH

Madam President, I want to congratulate our Journal Clerk Billy Walsh on his retirement from the Senate.

The Senate could not function without the hard-working staff here in the Chamber. Billy began his career as assistant bill clerk, and he has been with us for 19 years. A native of Cumberland, MD, he is retiring as the 21st Journal Clerk of the U.S. Senate.

We all wish him a happy and healthy retirement. And as Billy has said, ''Those umbrella drinks by the ocean aren't going to drink themselves.''

Enjoy your libations and your retirement—to the wonderful, wonderful, wonderful and always smiling Billy Walsh.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

BIPARTISAN SAFER COMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the American people do not have to choose between safer schools and the Constitution, and neither does the U.S. Senate.

The American people want their constitutional rights protected and their kids to be safe in school. They want both of those things at once, and that is just what the bill before the Senate will help accomplish.

Thanks to the leadership and dedication of Senator CORNYN, Senator TILLIS, and several of their counterparts across the aisle, we are considering a bipartisan bill that will make our country safer without making it any less free. This is the sweet spot: making America safer, especially for kids in school, without making our country one bit less free.

The legislation before us would make our communities and schools safer without laying one finger on the Second Amendment for law-abiding citizens. Its key provisions are hugely popular with the American people. This bill supplies significant new funding to law enforcement and police, to school security, and to mental health treatment both in school and in the wider community.

Under this bill, if a teenager has been convicted of a crime or adjudicated to be mentally ill, even before their 18th birthday, that important information will show up in a firearms background check until they are 21. This strengthens the existing background check system without expanding it.

States will receive new money for crisis intervention programs of their own choosing, and if they choose to use the money for so-called red flag laws, those laws will have to meet a new, higher standard for due process.

This is a commonsense package. Its provisions are very, very popular. It contains zero—zero—new restrictions, zero new waiting periods, zero mandates, and zero bans of any kind for law-abiding gun owners.

Police and law enforcement support the bill strongly. The police chiefs' association and the Fraternal Order of Police say: ''This bipartisan measure is . . . one that will save lives,'' according to the FOP and the police chiefs' association.

The National Sheriffs' Association calls it:

> A bill that can actually save lives . . . that allows the States to craft their own unique answers to the questions raised by gun violence.

After years—literally years—of liberal demands that would make war on citizens' constitutional rights, our Democratic colleagues have finally accepted that we can make schools and communities safer without impeding on the Second Amendment.

We can do more to protect innocent Americans, schoolkids especially, without—without—eroding the Bill of Rights 1 inch, and that is just what the Senate will do when we pass this bill.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Madam President, speaking of public safety, as the Supreme Court prepares to issue its final opinions of the term, far-left activists are openly calling for riots and violence in the streets.

For months, many of the country's most prominent Democrats have indulged in reckless talk and irresponsible rhetoric, fanning the flames of fear and rage among their supporters. This poisonous climate has illegal mobs assembling outside Justices' private family homes and has prompted one unhinged person to travel across the country for the purpose of committing an assassination.

The far left is promising that all of this will only be the prelude—the prelude—to the main event if they don't like the rulings coming down the pike. One activist group is promising that our cities will be submerged in—listen to this—''a night of rage.''

Well, yesterday, the Senate unanimously passed some supplemental funding for law enforcement to protect the rule of law and to keep the Court, its staff, and the Justices safe from all this. This noncontroversial funding passed here unanimously last night—zero objections. The House of Representatives needs to pass this urgent bill without delay.

BORDER SECURITY

Madam President, on another matter, in 2021, on President Biden's watch, each monthly total for illegal migrant apprehensions was higher than the same month's number the previous year. The same thing is happening in 2022. Every month has topped the total from 12 months prior. In fact, this past May didn't just eclipse May of 2021; it set a new alltime record. Border Patrol officers conducted nearly 240,000 apprehensions in May, and 25 percent of them—an ''unusually high'' rate—involved migrants they had apprehended before in just the past year.

These jaw-dropping numbers are a clear and direct symptom of failed leadership. The Biden administration is making a conscious decision—a conscious decision—to fumble the ball.

Last spring, right after apprehensions hit a 20-year high, President Biden claimed:

> It's way down . . . We've now gotten control.

Look, no reasonable person could have looked at the facts and concluded that things were under control, but that is exactly what President Biden and his team insisted. Apparently, a functionally open border is how they define success. A functionally open border is how, apparently, they define success.

Senate Democrats rubberstamped the Biden nominees who are presiding over this failure. The Biden DHS swiftly issued internal guidance encouraging ICE and CBP personnel to use more politically correct terminology when referring to the border crisis. They were quicker to police employees' language than to actually police the border.

Vice President HARRIS spent her time as the administration's supposed border czar, staying as far away as possible from the border itself.

Just this spring President Biden submitted a budget request that would cut funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention. He also promised to cut out the emergency authorities that border officials were relying on—in the absence of a coherent strategy from his administration—to turn away thousands of illegal migrants every single day.

Their response to a functional open border is just to hit the gas pedal.

Stable prices, public safety, and secure borders are three of the most fundamental duties of any government. Sadly, for our country, the Biden administration has swung and missed three times.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM WALSH

Madam President, today, I have the honor of acknowledging a longtime Senate staff member who is proceeding to a well-earned retirement at the end of this month.

Billy Walsh has been with the Secretary of the Senate's office for 19 years. He spent several years as an assistant bill clerk before moving to the Journal Clerk's office and working his way up to that top post.

As the Senate's Journal Clerk for the last 4 years, Billy has brought both good humor and professional dedication to his work in serving the Senate.

So, Billy, congratulations on your retirement, and thank you for your service.

REMEMBERING LEONA I. FAUST

Madam President, yesterday was a sad day for the Senate. We learned that we had lost a distinguished, long-serving staff leader in our institution.

Leona Faust had served her country as Senate Librarian for the past 12 years, and that key position was the capstone of a long and storied Senate career that had just entered its 45th year.

Everyone who knew Leona had sterling praise for her work. I have heard our Librarian described by her friends and colleagues as being devoted to the institution—as a true Senate all-star, as the first to volunteer whenever a task needed tackling.

Leona was a beloved colleague. She was also an expert whose professionalism and institutional knowledge filled an essential niche in the Senate's day-to-day functioning.

As leader of a talented team, Leona was constantly looking for new ways to expand the resources the Library offers to Senators and to our staff. She was instrumental in expanding the references and databases of the Senate's information system, especially as the pandemic left big chunks of the institution to working and researching remotely for a while. Year after year, she demonstrated her devotion, often without much fanfare.

The Senate Library staff pull long hours attending to pressing questions here on the floor. Leona led by example. She made herself available at all hours. So the Senate hasn't just lost a talented Librarian who helped people find resources they needed, we lost a true steward of the institution who had become a resource herself in her own right.

Our prayers today are with Leona's family and with her colleagues at the Senate Library and with everyone across the Senate who spent decades admiring Leona's commitment and her expertise and who are now joined together in mourning her loss.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

E-CIGARETTES AND VAPING PRODUCTS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, if you look at the marketing plan of Big Tobacco in America over the last half-century, it is very obvious: Tobacco companies sell an addictive product. There is a chemical included in the tobacco—nicotine—which is highly addictive. To be successful, they have to convince people to take up smoking, even though it is dangerous to their health and is a product that is difficult to quit. How do they achieve that goal? They prey on children, and they always have. Kids start smoking at an early age, and if the tobacco companies have their way, it leads to an addiction for a lifetime—a compromise on a person's health and even their death.

Over the years, I have done battle with Big Tobacco. The first, I guess, exchange was over banning smoking on airplanes. It seems so long ago, but we were successful, and we really changed the national conversation on tobacco. More and more people became sensitive to the fact that tobacco companies were, in fact, exploiting our children, addicting them to their product, and steps were taken at every level—local, State, and Federal—to stop that from happening, and it worked. The number of children in America who are addicted to tobacco-related products began to decline precipitously.

Big Tobacco was in a panic. They were losing their market share. Kids weren't taking up tobacco smoking the way they had in the past, and so they devised and invented new products. The most obvious one, I want to address this morning: e-cigarettes, vaping.

The nicotine inside these vaping devices is the same nicotine as in the tobacco cigarette, and it is just as addictive. Where have these companies directed their marketing? To children. Once again, to children.

We believe that 2 million or more children in America are currently using vaping products and e-cigarettes. Many of them believe that they are harmless, that they cause no damage to you from a health viewpoint. These children are wrong.

The Agency that is responsible for regulating this product—vaping products, e-cigarettes—is the Food and Drug Administration. They have written a sad and sorry record when it comes to regulation of this deadly product.

Over the years, we have begged them, pleaded with them, argued with them over why they didn't show more leadership in banning this product from the shelves across America because so many children were becoming addicted. It reached the point where a Federal court—after years of delay by the Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland ordered the Food and Drug Administration to finally begin regulating these addictive, kid-friendly vaping products, giving a deadline of September 9, 2021, to finalize review of e-cigarette applications.

You see, the law requires the company to prove that the product is not dangerous to the public health before it can be marketed. The FDA really dropped its guard and allowed them to sell the product without that proof, and it took a Federal court setting a deadline to get the FDA back into the business of regulating this deadly product that was addicting millions of children across America.

I have had my ups and downs with the Food and Drug Administration over this issue. I think they could have been much more aggressive. They could have protected more children. But, unfortunately, they did not. During the entire Trump administration, we backpedaled, came up with excuses, did nothing, and so vaping products became more prolific across America, and more children became addicted.

Now we have a new head of the FDA, Dr. Califf. We had our back-and-forth exchanges over this issue, and I made it very clear to him that there was no possible explanation or justification for not regulating this product when the lives and health of so many children were at stake. As I said, we had our good days and bad days in that exchange.

I am happy to report that the Food and Drug Administration has announced this morning a dramatic, historic step forward to protect the children across America from e-cigarette and vaping products. They are finally—finally, the FDA is starting actions to remove from the shelves products produced by the JUUL company—J-U-U-L, JUUL company—that, in fact, endanger our children. This is long overdue.

You won't be surprised to learn that Big Tobacco has a major investment in these companies. They believe this is the future, their new product that they can addict children with—the nicotine—and hook them, perhaps for life, on their products.

The Food and Drug Administration has taken a bold step today. It is going to be a battle royal in court—you can just bet on it—but finally they have stood up and said they are ready and prepared for the battle. I want to join them in that effort.

I also want to say that taking these products off the shelves across America will invite the possibility of contraband or black market sales. We are calling on all those entities which could supply those black market products, including internet sources, to stand up for children across America and join the FDA in stopping the sale of these products.

We estimated that if the Food and Drug Administration did not take action to do this today, did not initiate this effort to stop the sale of this product, we know more children would be addicted. As many as 750,000 to a million children have started since the FDA defied a court deadline in September. That just gives you an idea of the reach of this product and how serious it is.

If you don't know the story behind e-cigarettes and vaping, ask a high school student in America. If that doesn't work, ask their parents when they discover that their kids are addicted to these products. They are innocuous-looking little delivery systems that look like they belong in a computer, while they end up damaging the health of children and people across the United States.

When I spoke to Dr. Califf this morning and he told me about this historic announcement by the Food and Drug Administration, he made it clear that tobacco and smoking and nicotine products were a major threat to the health of children across this country and to Americans. Tobacco regulation, as he noted, is a major step forward in reducing the number of cancer deaths in America and heart disease. It is still a problem. It is still a challenge. And Big Tobacco and their new Big Vaping allies are determined to once again get their hooks in our kids at an early age.

I am heartened by this decision by the Food and Drug Administration. They are in for a legal battle, for sure, but it is worth the effort.

In the end, make sure that you come down on the side of children when we are talking about tobacco and nicotine. It is an issue that I have been involved in for years. I see the Senator from Oregon on the floor, and I know that he was involved in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in the same battle. But our efforts against vaping and e-cigarettes are going to mean that children have a healthier life and better future.

I commend the Food and Drug Administration for this decision removing JUUL products from the shelves of America, and I hope we can do more.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we begin the vote scheduled for 11 a.m. this morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cramer

The motion was agreed to.

(Ms. CANTWELL assumed the Chair.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session to resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 2938, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Message to accompany S. 2938, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the ''Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building'', and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Schumer (for Murphy) amendment No. 5099 (to the House amendment), relating to the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Schumer amendment No. 5100 (to amendment No. 5099), to add an effective date.

Schumer motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with instructions, Schumer amendment No. 5101, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5102 (to the instructions (amendment No. 5101) of the motion to refer), to modify the effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5103 (to amendment No. 5102), to modify the effective date.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S.

2938, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the ''Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building'', and for other purposes, with amendment No. 5099.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Kyrsten Sinema, Martin Heinrich, Jack Reed, Debbie Stabenow, Jeff Merkley, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Tim Kaine, Edward J. Markey, Patrick J. Leahy, Alex Padilla, Patty Murray, Mazie K. Hirono.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 2938, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the ''Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building'', and for other purposes, with amendment No. 5099, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Leg.]

YEAS—65

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

NAYS—34

Barrasso	Hoeven	Rounds
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Boozman	Inhofe	Sasse
Braun	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lankford	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Lummis	Thune
Fischer	Marshall	Tuberville
Grassley	Moran	Wicker
Hagerty	Paul	
Hawley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—1

Cramer

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 34.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer the amendments thereto fall.

The Senator from New Mexico.

S. 2938

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, like many of my constituents in New Mexico, I am a gun owner. I have a sincerely held respect of law-abiding gun ownership.

Many of my own most cherished memories involve the responsible use of a firearm to feed my family and to forge memories with my sons and my closest friends. But those same sons grew up doing active shooter drills in their classrooms, something that would have been absolutely unimaginable when I was their age. And just this spring, my son's high school was on lockdown when I arrived, due to a nearby shooting that actually involved students from that high school. That type of experience has become all too common in our country.

The gun violence our communities are experiencing is appalling, and it is unacceptable. It is evident from the unthinkable mass shootings that we have witnessed in Uvalde and Buffalo and Tulsa and Vestavia Hills and El Paso. And it is evident in the mounting number of gun homicide and gun suicides that have taken tens of thousands of lives each year.

My home State of New Mexico continues to struggle with one of the highest rates of gun deaths in the country; and in recent years, far too many New Mexicans have lost friends and family members to this epidemic of violence.

I personally refuse to accept the idea that we are so divided in this country that we can't do something to make this situation better. That is why I join my good friend Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut and a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to try and chart a meaningful path forward. Over these past weeks, we have engaged in challenging but productive conversations. We found areas of agreement on real solutions that we can and we will pass here in the U.S. Senate.

Our bipartisan negotiations and the legislation that they have produced prove that we can work together in this body. And they show that when we set aside the vicious politics that have held us back for too long on this particular issue, we can actually create policies that save lives.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act includes Federal resources to help States and Tribes implement crisis intervention programs.

New Mexico passed a law to establish one of these programs just last year. The goal was to ensure that deadly weapons were kept out of the hands of those that a court, with due process, determined to be a significant danger to themselves or others. But as of last month, New Mexico had only used our law nine times, primarily due to a lack of funding and resources and training.

Just last month, on Mother's Day, New Mexico tragically lost two teens, shot and killed by a man who very likely could have had his firearm removed using New Mexico's crisis intervention law.

The alleged suspect had been issued a temporary restraining order at the request of his former girlfriend and the mother of one of the victims. The restraining order showed that he was in possession of two firearms. Unfortunately, the local sheriff's office failed to recognize the threat that he posed and didn't use our State's law to remove the firearms that he used to take the lives of two young New Mexicans.

If we can provide our law enforcement officers and courts the funding and training they need to make crisis intervention laws effective, we can protect our communities and ensure that future lives are not lost. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will help us do just that.

Our legislation also enhances the review process for firearms buyers under 21 years of age. This new process will require an investigative period to review criminal and mental health records, including checks with State databases and local law enforcement.

Over the last 4 years, six of the nine deadliest mass shootings were by people who were 21 or younger. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act ensures we respond to this deadly trend in a meaningful way.

Our legislation also makes clear who the Federal firearm licensing requirements apply to, leading to more firearm sales that require a background check.

We are finally making sure that convicted domestic violence abusers and individuals subject to domestic violence restraining orders are included in the Federal background check database, whether or not the abuser is married to the victim. That has long been a major failure in Federal law, and it has allowed dangerous abusers, who are dating but not married to their partners but whom we know pose a violent threat, to acquire deadly weapons. This provision alone will save an enormous number of lives.

Our legislation will also make historic investments in community behavioral health and school-based mental health services, and it will increase access to behavioral health services through telehealth.

The bill will help support school violence prevention efforts and provide training to school personnel and students so that they can recognize the signs that so often precede some of these violent shootings events.

Over the course of our negotiations, I worked especially hard on a few key provisions with my colleague from Maine, Senator SUSAN COLLINS. Our provisions will crack down on straw purchasing and trafficking of firearms. These provisions will directly reduce gun violence in our home States and internationally. Let me take a moment to explain how.

Under current law, it is a minor paperwork offense to buy a gun for someone else. And even then, that only applies if you buy the gun from a Federal firearm licensee. Under the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, we are making it a serious crime to buy a gun for someone else when you know that person will use the gun to commit a felony or that they are not allowed to buy a gun themselves. That applies whether you buy the gun from a Federal firearm licensee or not.

The consequences of this simple change will be real. It will keep deadly weapons out of the hands of people who would use them to hurt others, and it will level serious consequences for those who break the law.

Just last year, a New Mexico State Police officer was tragically killed during a traffic stop in Deming, NM. Officer Darrion Jarrott was shot and killed by a convicted felon whose wife had allegedly purchased the gun for him. She is now being prosecuted under the paperwork offense that is currently on the books. But under the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, she would be facing more severe and deserved consequences for her role in the death of a State police officer.

This legislation will also stop the type of organized straw purchasing and trafficking that we have seen too often in New Mexico and elsewhere. Right now, law enforcement has to watch as an organized chain of straw purchases happen one after another, intended to protect the person most at fault—the mastermind of the operation—by keeping them far removed from the purchase that happens at an FFL, at a Federal firearm licensee.

Our law enforcement watched this happen, but they can only go after the person who walked into the FFL and made the very first of that series of straw purchases—that is usually the person least involved in the scheme. But that is about to change. Soon, these ringleaders won't be able to distance themselves from the law anymore.

With our new straw purchase provision, law enforcement will be able to go after every link in the illegal chain of purchases to take down the entire ring, not just the vulnerable individuals these rings sometimes rely on to make the initial purchase.

There is more. While trafficking firearms into the United States is a major Federal crime under existing law, trafficking firearms out of the United States has not been. For years, this has meant that firearms trafficked out of the United States are the primary supply of guns used to commit violent crimes in Mexico, in El Salvador, in Honduras, and in Guatemala.

It has also invited dangerous firearm trafficking into communities on both sides of our Nation's southern and northern borders. We saw this in my home State about a decade ago when a major firearms trafficking ring was uncovered in Columbus, NM. This trafficking operation involved the chief of police, the mayor, a village trustee, and an estimated 190 firearms, including large numbers of handguns and assault rifles. And the crime they were charged with? Lying on their paperwork.

Not anymore. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act takes this violence on with the severity that it deserves. It gives law enforcement the tools they need to stop this activity and the violence it directly and indirectly creates in our communities and within our borders. By taking on the violence that families are fleeing in their home countries—violence that our inadequate gun laws have actually contributed to—we are also taking meaningful action to address a root cause behind so many refugees coming to our country.

Now, I fully recognize that the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is a compromise. Many of the parents and students who have raised their voices to demand action on gun violence would like us to go further. But progress has to start somewhere. The hardest part of every negotiation is letting go of the perfect for the possible, and I am confident that the legislation we are voting on will make a real difference in reducing gun violence—a difference that will be measured in lives. It will boost public safety, it will invest in mental health, and it will keep more firearms out of the hands of those who would use them against their communities.

The painful truth is that we can never bring back those precious children whose lives were cut short in Uvalde, TX; in Parkland, FL; in Newtown, CT; or Aztec High School, West Mesa High School, Deming Middle School, and Washington Middle School in my State. We can never offer enough words to heal the grieving families all across the country who have lost their sons and daughters and their brothers and sisters and their fathers and mothers to gun violence. But what we can do by voting to pass this legislation in the Senate is to honor their memory—not just with condolences and hopes and prayers but with concrete action.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. Each life that we save by passing this legislation will mean literally everything to that person's loved ones, and that is what this is all about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 251

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, today is a great day. Today marks the 50th anniversary of title IX. For half a century, we have witnessed the impact title IX has had on generations of women in sports. Title IX provided women the long-denied platform that had always been afforded men. It ensured female athletes have the same access to funding, facilities, and athletic scholarships, but it also gave young women the opportunity to compete, to learn the life lessons of hard work and perseverance, to go to college on an athletic scholarship, to overcome obstacles in order to reach their God-given potential.

Since 1972, female participation in sports at the college level has risen more than 600 percent, and today, 43 percent of high school girls participate in some competitive sports, compared to 50 years ago—only 3 to 5 percent. What a turnaround.

For all these reasons, decades later, we have proof that title IX has worked. Sports can transform lives. I have seen it. I began my coaching career as a high school girls basketball coach just a few years after title IX was enacted, and now, 50 years later, America's female athletes are not only the best performing on the world stage in team and individual sports, but they also are the leaders in our communities and in our country.

Title IX sent an incredible—an incredible—message to female athletes across the Nation, which is, you can compete, you can win, and you will be afforded a fair and level playing field to do so.

I have personally witnessed how title IX protections allowed young women to gain all the opportunities and life lessons that participating in sports has to offer. That is why, just 3 months into my time as a U.S. Senator, I introduced an amendment to prohibit Federal funding to schools that allow biological males to compete in women's sports. And I, along with 23 of my colleagues, introduced the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. This bill would make it a violation of Federal law for a recipient of Federal funds who operates or sponsors athletic programs to permit biological males to compete in women's sports activities. The bill also establishes the long-needed definition of ''sex'' in title IX to be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

Democrats have turned their backs on these efforts, and by doing so, they have turned their backs on female athletes all across our country. Just last month, I sent a letter to U.S. Department of Education Secretary Miguel Cardona warning the administration to rethink their rule change.

On this 50th anniversary, we should be asking ourselves how we can preserve title IX and preserve fairness for all female athletes across our country, but unfortunately, women's athletics are currently under attack by the Biden administration. Just this morning, we learned that the Department of Education will publish a proposed rule to change title IX to align with the administration's progressive agenda. These proposed changes would allow biological males to compete in women's sports. What a tragedy. It would take a wrecking ball to the five decades of title IX success for women. The Biden administration's proposed rule flies in the face of the so-called science that Democrats are quick to pledge their allegiance to by ignoring the scientific

differences in the biological makeup of male and female athletes. Apparently, science only matters when it conforms to Democrats' partisan agenda.

Allowing biological males to compete in women's sports will set women's rights back 50 years, to a time before title IX. It will discourage young girls from entering the court, jumping in the pool, or walking onto the field, knowing that they have to compete with the deck stacked half against them, and the winner will already be determined. With the proposed rule change, female athletes can only hope—can only hope—to finish in second or third place. There is no pregame speech or halftime talk that you can give a woman or girl who feels like they aren't competing on a fair playing field.

The Biden administration should do the right thing and rethink their decision to disenfranchise female athletes of the future.

This fight is far from over. The very least the Senate can do for the future of female sports is to reinforce the protections already afforded women in title IX.

Mr. President, that is why I call up S. 251, the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2021. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 251 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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 Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise today in opposition to S. 251, legislation that would ban transgender women and girls from participating in sports consistent with their gender.

My Republican colleagues falsely claim that allowing transgender women and girls to play sports is harmful to cisgender women and girls. They continue to hurl insulting lies about transgender girls dominating sports, but what is true is that these bans are deeply harmful to transgender girls, particularly transgender girls of color, girls who are gender-nonconforming or born with intersex traits, as well as cisgender girls.

These sex tests invade every girl's privacy and open the door to harass anyone who is perceived as different.

If my Republican colleagues were actually worried about women and girls in athletics, they would join in our efforts to address unequal athletic opportunities in school, unequal pay, sexual abuse and harassment, and more. But this isn't about supporting women and girls; this is about discrimination.

Earlier today, I stood in Statuary Hall as we unveiled the portrait of the late Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink on today's 50th anniversary of title IX becoming law. Title IX, which was renamed the Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act, says:

> No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefit of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Thirty-seven words that are just as relevant today as they were 50 years ago.

Patsy fought for equal opportunities for all, and this bill stands in direct opposition to her work. And to listen to my colleague talking about title IX as being that act that is going to support his bill, I can tell you, as someone who knew and was friends with Patsy T. Mink, she would be standing right next to me to say that title IX in no way or shape supports what my colleague is attempting to do.

Republicans have the wrong priorities. We shouldn't be banning anyone from playing sports; we should be fighting the discrimination that all women and girls continue to face in athletics, in the classroom, and in workplaces.

I am proud to stand up and oppose this harmful legislation and continue to advance Patsy Mink's legacy of equal opportunities for all.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, what I would like to say about equal opportunity is that over the last few years, biological males playing in women's sports have won 22 championships. The girls—other girls—were playing for second and third.

I am disappointed that my colleague thinks this is not about equal rights. I am disappointed that my colleague won't stand up for women and women's rights. We should all be here fighting for the same thing.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUPREME COURT SECURITY FUNDING ACT OF 2022

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the Supreme Court Security Funding Act of 2022, which I introduced with Senator WARNER just last week. Yesterday evening, the Senate approved by unanimous consent this bipartisan legislation, which provides emergency security resources to the Supreme Court of the United States and to the U.S. Marshals Service.

The House of Representatives must approve this bill without amendment or delay and send it to the President's desk before adjourning this week. The need is urgent and obvious. There is no question the Supreme Court, its Justices, their families, and Court employees are under unprecedented and unexpected threat. This includes recent highly publicized threats against Justice Kavanaugh and Justice Sotomayor. These threats may well become more acute in the coming weeks as the Court concludes its term.

There is no question that protecting the Court from these threats requires additional resources in Fiscal Year 2022 because unexpected resources are being deployed. This legislation provides those necessary resources.

More specifically, the U.S. Marshals Service has been providing around-the-clock security for the nine Justices at their homes and needs 10.3 million in emergency funding to cover these costs for the remainder of this fiscal year. The Supreme Court needs 9.1 million to cover its increased security costs for this fiscal year. These include overtime pay for Supreme Court Police officers, mutual aid payment to assisting law enforcement agencies, and increased physical security around the Supreme Court Building.

If Congress doesn't immediately provide this funding, the Court and Marshals Service may be forced to transfer funds from other critical functions and entities, like the U.S. District Courts and U.S. Courts of Appeal. That is an unacceptable outcome given the obvious and urgent need for this security funding and the gravity of the threat against one of our three constitutional branches.

Congress recently passed—and the President signed into law—legislation by Senators CORNYN and COONS to increase the scope of authorized Supreme Court Police protection to include the Justices' immediate family members. Congress rightly provided this additional security authorization to protect the Court.

These expanded authorities are important, but there should be no question regarding whether Congress will separately provide the resources necessary to protect the Supreme Court during its hour of need.

I thank my colleague from Virginia, Senator WARNER, for working with me on this legislation. I also want to thank the senior Senator from Alabama, Vice Chairman SHELBY, and his staff, as well as the senior Senator from Vermont, Chairman LEAHY, for their help and their guidance. Finally, I thank my Senate colleagues for their cooperation in ensuring the swift passage of this legislation in the Senate.

Now, I urge the House of Representatives to promptly send this bill to the President's desk before it adjourns later this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from South Dakota.

GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, June is Great Outdoors Month. It is a theme

that definitely speaks to me. I am an outdoors guy through and through. I love pheasant hunting, boating, swimming, running. I will shoot hoops whenever I get the chance, indoors or outdoors, but this is nothing better than doing it outdoors.

When I was a kid, my dad attached a basket to a pole in our backyard, and there was nothing my siblings and I liked better than spending long summer days and sometimes fall days and spring days shooting hoops in our backyard in Murdo.

The outdoors was a huge part of my life as a kid. We spent the long summer days outside, barring the hour every day my mother made us come inside to read. On summer evenings, my dad would take us to get ice cream cones, and then we would drive down to the White River to watch the sunset.

Another outdoor pastime we embraced was hunting. My dad taught my siblings and me to hunt, and I loved going out with him. Pheasant hunting remains one of my favorite outdoor activities, and I get excited every year as the third Saturday in October—the official start to pheasant season—rolls around.

It is a tradition that I am happy to be able to share with the next generation, as my dad shared it with me. There is nothing better than a day spent outdoors with friends and family, followed by a communal meal, sometimes involving pheasant.

Being in the outdoors isn't just enjoyable; I think it is a part of the good life. The health benefits of time spent outdoors are well-established, and I know a day—or even an hour—out in the fresh air always clears my mind and refreshes my spirit.

With more and more of our life spent in front of screens, I think time spent outdoors and disconnected is even more important than ever. I am grateful for all those hours we spent as kids running around outside and for family activities outdoors, like our summer trip to the Black Hills. We used to go out there for Labor Day, stay in this little non-air-conditioned cabin and just enjoy the outdoors.

We would hike, and we would visit caves. We would go to Mount Rushmore, head to the lake—I loved and still love visiting Sylvan Lake in South Dakota.

I loved being there with my parents and siblings, and I loved taking my daughters there on trips like the ones I took growing up. Nobody who visits South Dakota should miss the Black Hills.

I am not sure there is a more beautiful place on Earth—the interplay of light and shadow on the trees and rocks late on a summer afternoon, the endless South Dakota sky reflected in the blue of Sylvan Lake and other lakes in the Black Hills, the Milky Way carpeting the night sky with millions of diamonds. There is no better place to spend time in the great outdoors than South Dakota.

Our State is filled with natural wonders, the Missouri River, Jewel Cave and Wind Cave, two of the longest caves in the world. Together, they offer hundreds of miles of underground passageways to explore, filled with glimmering crystals and remarkable rock formations.

We have the magnificent Black Hills National Forest in Custer State Park, rolling prairies, and, of course, the Badlands. If you haven't experienced the rugged beauty of the Badlands, you are missing out—extraordinary layered rock formations that look like they might have come from another planet, a wealth of fossils.

Everybody should see the sunset over the Badlands at least once in their life, turning the tops of the rocks to a sea of fiery orange.

And, of course, no mention of South Dakota's great outdoors would be complete without a mention of Mount Rushmore, one of our national treasures. Nature got a little help from man here, and the result is magnificent. You can't help but be awed when you see Mount Rushmore soaring up in front of you. And you can't help but feel a little prouder to be a citizen of this great land.

Our Nation's great outdoor spaces need to be cared for so that we can preserve them for future generations—from wildlife enthusiasts to hikers and runners to farmers and ranchers. I am a longtime supporter of the Conservation Reserve Program.

Agricultural producers are familiar with the Conservation Reserve Program, or what we call CRP, which provides incentives for farmers, ranchers, and landowners to take environmentally sensitive land out of production for 10 to 15 years.

The Conservation Reserve Program helps the environment by improving soil health and water quality and providing habitat for wildlife, including endangered and threatened species. I pushed for an increase in the CRP acreage cap in the 2018 farm bill, and the final bill raised that acreage cap to 27 million acres.

Currently, I am working on further improvements of CRP that I will work to get included in the 2023 farm bill. Based on my conversations with farmers and ranchers, I developed the Conservation Reserve Program Improvement Act, which I introduced in March. This legislation would make CRP grazing a more attractive option by providing cost-share payments for all CRP practices for the establishment of grazing infrastructure, including fencing and water distribution.

It would also increase the annual payment limit for CRP—which has not changed since 1985—to help account for inflation and the increase in land value.

This would enhance the appeal of CRP for farmers and ranchers, improving their bottom line while helping to protect the environment and increase wildlife habitat.

Another priority of mine is improving forest management in the Black Hills National Forest to reduce the risk of wildfires and damaging insect infestations.

I have introduced two pieces of legislation during this Congress to help improve management of our national forests, including the Black Hills. Currently on-the-ground management activities, including timber thinning, are significantly lagging in the Black Hills National Forest and other forests throughout the country.

My Expediting Forest Restoration and Recovery Act would require the U.S. Forest Service to expedite treatment of more than 70 million acres of National Forest System lands to reduce the threat of insect and disease infestations and catastrophic wildfires.

My Black Hills Forest Protection and Jobs Preservation Act is also designed to help expedite forest management projects in the Black Hills and elsewhere. The bill, which I introduced with my Wyoming colleague, Senator JOHN BARRASSO, would require the U.S. Forest Service to quickly issue National Environmental Policy Act decisions that are necessary to carry out forest management projects, including thinning of overly dense timber stands in the Black Hills National Forest.

Our bill would also expedite timber production projects in the Black Hills National Forest and neighboring national forests to help maintain the timber sale program that plays a critical role in keeping these forests healthy while also supporting the regional economy.

I am grateful to live in a State that has so much to offer when it comes to the great outdoors. And I will continue to work to protect and preserve our national treasures, and I hope every American will take advantage of Great Outdoors Month to get outside and enjoy our natural world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

FIXING OUR REGULATORY MAYHEM UPSETTING LITTLE AMERICANS ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, for months, American moms and dads have endured an unprecedented baby formula shortage.

All of us know someone that this crisis has personally affected. In May alone, reports showed that the out-of-stock rate jumped from 43 percent to 74 percent nationally. In my home State of Utah, that out-of-stock rate is much higher.

And while the Biden administration made ambitious attempts to invoke the Defense Production Act and fly in formula from other countries, these efforts ultimately provided less than 2 days' worth of formula for our country's hungry babies—less than 2 days.

So yesterday, I took to the floor asking that this body take immediate action to address our Nation's massive

formula shortage by unanimously passing my FORMULA Act, something that I have come repeatedly to the Senate floor in an effort to pass and it has been met with objections so far.

My bill included three measures to accomplish this goal. The first was a regulatory component, one that would remove certain FDA requirements for imported formula, mostly dealing with labeling. And I will explain more about that one in a moment. The second removed the restrictions that limited the availability of formula brands available to WIC recipients. And, finally, the bill temporarily suspended import tariffs on formula, increasing supply and decreasing consumer costs.

These three components would provide immediate relief to anxiety-ridden parents who were forced to scour supermarkets, make dangerous homemade formula, or, even worse, hospitalize their infants.

I need not explain why a problem of this magnitude is so deserving of our immediate attention.

After addressing the Senate on each of these topics, I engaged in a lengthy and substantive debate with my friend and distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator BOB CASEY. I listened intently to his objections regarding his concern for the safety and quality of formula crossing over our borders.

And while I appreciate my colleague's concerns, I still believe that this body can and must fix this problem, a problem that is, no doubt, the sole creation of the Federal Government. It is no accident, for example, that we are the only country facing this particular shortage.

No other country is dealing with this because our country and our own Federal laws in this area and the way they have been enforced and implemented have caused it.

So I am determined to provide relief to families dealing with this inexplicably, unnecessarily prolonged crisis.

For far too long, the people enduring this mess have gone without answers. And so in the spirit of comity and compromise, I have modified my request by removing the FDA regulatory component of the bill. I hoped that this would resolve any reservations that my colleague from Pennsylvania may have had regarding the safety of these products.

And I should add here, those concerns are not concerns that I agree with for the simple reason that the countries that, under my bill, we would have allowed to produce formula, to have that formula introduced into the United States, they are countries that we have already identified as having safe regulatory systems.

They are countries with regulatory systems that are strong enough, in fact, that we allow imports of their pharmaceutical products produced in those countries because their standards are as rigorous as those imposed by our own FDA.

Nonetheless, I offered to remove that and made that a request for passage by unanimous consent. Still, my friend objected to expanding the range of products available to WIC recipients. Remember, this component to the bill would have simply allowed American moms and dads who were beneficiaries under the WIC program to use their vouchers to purchase any form of formula they would prefer, or more commonly these days, any form of formula that is available. Whereas, right now, the WIC vouchers require you to stick to the brand specified on the vouchers in question.

My distinguished colleague objected also to that version of what I offered, despite the retention of FDA regulatory authority and the fact that wealthy Americans are personally importing these products already from Europe.

And while I find this unfortunate, I was still determined to make an argument and to, ultimately, formulate an agreement consistent with that argument to fix a problem that our Federal Government has made and has created and in which it has made no discernible progress in its attempts to resolve it.

So, again, in the spirit of comity and compromise and a willingness to do absolutely whatever it takes to provide whatever relief we can provide to hungry babies throughout America suffering from malnutrition, I modified my request yet again. This time to include only the provisions related to the tariff suspension.

And while I am hopeful that we will be able to come together to address the concerns of my colleagues and pass the first two provisions of my bill as well, I hope to report today to families across the country that my legislation has achieved unanimous support and passed the Senate.

This would be an incredible win for families and for hungry babies nationwide. My bill would make meaningful headway in dealing with an issue that some doctors call ''the worst crisis of their careers.''

By suspending the import tariff on formula imports or providing cheaper access to formulas to individual consumers and to retailers alike, no longer will access to these safe formulas be limited to a select group of wealthy individuals because, again, wealthy individuals have been able to pay the higher prices and suffer the inconvenience of going online or otherwise making a special order on their own of these European formulas.

Again, these European formulas from the countries that we are talking about—countries covered by the bill—are countries that produce safe, effective formula and that are regulated by regulatory bodies that are every bit as stringent as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. And on that basis, in fact, we import pharmaceutical products from those same countries.

Currently, formula is produced in those countries, countries like France and Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Babies there do just fine on those formulas. In fact, they do great. And some American families have been able to benefit from those formulas as they have ordered it online, but they pay higher prices, and they have to deal with restrictions that make it more difficult to access those things. So this bill will open that up.

This is relief that really is long overdue, particularly for Utahns who have the largest families, the most children per capita, and, also, the highest birthrate.

Not coincidentally, those are some of the same reasons why the baby formula shortage is felt so acutely in Utah, but it is being felt acutely throughout the United States.

I hope that we can come together and pass even more meaningful reforms that will help solve the problem completely and once and for all.

I am grateful, however, that the countless hours of behind-the-scenes work and successful negotiations with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis have resulted in a win for the most vulnerable Americans. Passing my FORMULA Act is a victory for families and for babies in Utah and everywhere else in the United States.

And so, to that end, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 372, S. 4261.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4261) to suspend duties and other restrictions on the importation of infant formula to address the shortage of infant formula in the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the Lee substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 5130), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fixing Our Regulatory Mayhem Upsetting Little Americans Act'' or the ''FORMULA Act''.

SEC. 2. DUTY-FREE TREATMENT OF IMPORTS OF INFANT FORMULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, infant formula shall enter the United States free of duty and free of quantitative limitation.

(b) INFANT FORMULA DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''infant formula'' has the meaning given that term in section 201(z) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(z)).

The bill (S. 4261), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING—Continued

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

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

The Senator from Colorado.

S. 2938

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, next month marks an anniversary that nobody wants to celebrate: 10 years since 70 people were shot and 12 killed while sitting in a movie theater in Aurora, CO.

At the time, it was the largest mass shooting in American history. Since then, several shootings, like the Pulse Nightclub and the Las Vegas shooting, have surpassed that grim milestone.

Most Senators have a similar story of some sort of a mass shooting in their State that killed people who were trying to enjoy a movie or worship God or shop for groceries like the 10 people murdered last year in a supermarket in Boulder or sitting in a fourth grade classroom. Mass shootings have become uniquely American, a problem that has grown consistently in the 23 years since the Columbine school attack shook us all. There were seven school shootings that year. Last year, there were 42.

The Aurora shooting happened when I was Governor, and it has stayed with me, as those things do. Friday, July 20, 2012, almost 10 years ago—it was a local premiere of ''The Dark Knight,'' and it was a packed house. Every seat had a person in it, a person with loved ones and ones who loved them who expected them to come home that night.

I arrived the next morning at the scene and walked into the command center that the FBI and the police were using. Aurora Police Chief Dan Oates showed us a video of the crime scene that had been taken by police shortly before, using a hand-held camera. The images haunt me still: popcorn everywhere mixed with bullet casings, random clothing, and blood. There was blood all over the seats and the floor.

Aurora Mayor Steve Hogan and I spent the afternoon visiting hospitals all over town. We visited almost every surviving wounded victim. In the days and weeks and months after that day, we had the gun debate in Colorado. Of course, we had the debate. What kind of a State would we be if we were too scared to go to a movie? The debate was difficult and hard to find agreement.

Guns are a tradition in the West, and Colorado is no exception. We became the first purple State to successfully pass gun safety laws. Coloradans, including the vast majority of gun owners, wanted to get something done. That led to universal background checks and a ban on high-capacity magazines; not everything—not everything—that we wanted but steps that made a real difference. We didn't want dangerous people to have guns.

One night while I was Governor, I came home tired and cranky in the midst of working on these gun laws. I made the mistake of complaining to my 11-year-old son Teddy. Teddy couldn't find it in him to understand why it was so hard. He asked me: Dad, why don't you just make the decision? It is easy. Get the facts, make a decision, check, next.

I started to explain, and he repeated: Get the facts, make a decision, check, next.

He said: Every day I go into school, and I have to learn something completely new that I didn't know existed the day before. If I don't get it completely right, the next day is misery because everything is based on the day before.

Teddy was right about one thing: The facts do matter. Part of our problem has been not having good data. Many assume passing new laws like background checks or magazine limits wouldn't work because crooks don't buy guns from legal dealers. The facts proved that they very much do. In 2013, 2,782 convicted felons tried to buy a gun in Colorado and were stopped. Even last year, nearly a decade later, 3,539 convicted felons were blocked from buying a gun. Laws can work to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

The solutions are often straightforward. Nonpartisan facts and basic data help us cut through the noise of division. Guns can be a divisive issue, to say the least, but we don't accept that there is no room to get things done.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act proves that. For the first time in three decades, Congress is poised to pass gun legislation that will make Americans safer, and it is based on the very simple principle: We all agree we should keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

The bill will give States the resources to implement red flag laws to prevent people who are a danger to themselves or others from buying or having guns. It will finally close the boyfriend loophole that allows convicted domestic abusers to get firearms. It will strengthen background checks for 18- to 21-year-olds and take mental health into account and will crack down on strawman purchases that allow criminals to dodge background checks altogether.

Now, these are commonsense proposals, and I am heartened to see that they are going to pass with bipartisan support, but we all know there is more that needs to be done to reduce gun violence in America.

The question is, What is next?

For that, we can turn to Teddy's wisdom as an 11-year-old. What we need is a common set of facts that both sides can accept and can act on.

In 1970, Congress created the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to respond to the public outcry over fatal vehicle crashes. By 2019, there were 60 percent fewer vehicle fatalities than in 1970. So in that period from 1970 to 2019, fatalities were reduced 60 percent, even though there are now 2½ times as many cars on the roads.

The Agency's strength is in its strictly nonpartisan research. It conducts a survey and a detailed analysis of vehicle fatalities across the country and forms an objective basis to evaluate vehicle safety standards and procedures—things like whether airbags and seatbelts can make a difference or what size and shape child restraints should take, essentially every safety feature in our cars today.

Why can't we have something similar for guns? We now have more gun deaths in America than we have deaths from car crashes, and yet for years, we could barely discuss possible solutions.

So while this Chamber is working together, let's make sure we measure the success of these bills that we are about to pass. Let's think about establishing a research body that will create an objective baseline of hard facts, not conventional wisdom. The path forward is as simple as my 11-year-old son knew it to be a decade ago: Get the facts, make a decision, check, next.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as Senators are preparing to return home to their home States over the Fourth of July, it is frustrating to me that we once again kick the can down the road on providing needed funding to address the ongoing COVID pandemic.

For months, the administration, scientists, and healthcare experts have raised the alarm that we don't have the resources we need to stay ahead of this virus. And actually with COVID, if you are not staying ahead of it, you are slipping behind, to the detriment of all Americans.

To keep our recovery afloat, we have robbed Peter to pay Paul. Earlier this month, the administration announced that it is repurposing $10 billion that we appropriated in Congress—$10 billion—to purchase additional vaccines and additional therapeutics because our stocks are running low.

The action by the administration, unfortunately, was necessary. Projections indicate that as many as 100 million Americans—100 million Americans—nearly 1 in 3, will be infected or reinfected with COVID this fall and winter as our immunity from this disease wanes.

The President requested COVID funding. President Biden requested that 3 months ago. Republicans have blocked this funding. Without new funding appropriated by Congress, the administration is left with no choice but to repurpose that $10 billion. Even that, experts across the board agree, is totally insufficient to prepare for the coming surge.

But even this necessary choice has consequences. To pay for these vaccines and therapeutics, the administration had to take funding from research for the next generation of vaccines and to sustain our testing capacity. It was not, as some Republican Members have indicated, excess cash that was simply there for the taking. This means that as the next surge crashes over the country, we will not have the resources necessary to assure that people can get tested.

Have we already forgotten the mad scramble driving from pharmacy to pharmacy to get a rapid test so we could safely spend the holidays with our friends and families just 6 months ago? It means that as new variants will emerge, we are not going to have the necessary resources to adequately continue the groundbreaking research we have supported for next-generation vaccines.

And fueled by our waning immunity and insufficient vaccination efforts abroad, new variants could emerge, and those will impose new threats to us here at home.

The desperate measures taken by the administration, which they had to do in the absence of congressional action, do nothing to support a global vaccination effort that is running on fumes. The U.S. Agency for International Development, which manages our global response to the COVID pandemic, has already obligated more than 95 percent of the funds they have available—95. Soon, they will have no choice but to start shutting down their vaccine delivery operations. That will mean more mutations, more variants, more infections, and more deaths abroad and at home.

Keep in mind what we are doing with USAID. We are trying to stop this pandemic outside our borders because we realize that every single one of these variants is one airplane trip away from crossing our borders even as we have to do things to stop it within our borders.

Finally, I want to make clear that we don't have time to say, ''Well, we can act later on,'' as this is not a problem that can be solved by flipping a switch, or to produce the tens of millions of doses of vaccines and therapeutics necessary to prepare for a fall surge. The government and biotech companies need to begin purchasing supplies now.

They can't say: Oh, we have an epidemic. Golly, go out and buy some supplies.

Well, we have to make them first. Come back to us in a few months.

That doesn't do anything for the people who are getting hit with COVID.

The longer we wait, the further we will fall behind as other countries will place their orders ahead of ours.

I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle who are blocking this money: We can't wait and see what happens. That is why we were wholly unprepared for the pandemic in the first place. You will recall the last administration said: We will wait and see what happens.

We refused to invest and prepare for the worst. Let's prepare for the worst. We can hope for the best, but hope is not a vaccine. Preparation can create vaccines. I am frustrated, once again, that we are leaving town without addressing this looming crisis. Since March, I have called on us to act.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I will continue to make these calls, and I will fight for these urgently needed resources, but we have to wake up to the fact that we have to do it now. You don't do it after the epidemic hits. You don't do the research after. You try to do the research before and hope you can stop the pandemic from happening.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). The Senator from Colorado.

S. 2938

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, this morning, the Supreme Court weakened gun safety laws in America for the first time in over a decade. It gutted a century's-old law to make sure that people carrying concealed weapons actually needed them. The Court is taking us backward at a time when the American people are demanding that we do more, not less, to protect our communities.

The shooting at Columbine High School happened the year before my oldest daughter was born. She is now 22 years old. We have raised three daughters, and their entire generation has grown up in the shadow of gun violence. Since Columbine, my State has endured one tragedy after another.

In 2012, a gunman killed 12 people at a movie theater in Aurora.

In 2019, a shooter injured eight students at a STEM high school in Highlands Ranch.

Last March, a shooter killed 10 people at the King Soopers grocery store in Boulder. That was almost a year to the day, really, of the shootings in Buffalo, which took another 10 lives of people who had just gone to shop for their families.

Two months after that grocery store shooting in Colorado, a gunman killed six people at a birthday party in Colorado Springs.

Now, I remember back—it is hard because, over time, you lose track of things—in 2017, after a gunman in Las Vegas killed 58 Americans after shooting across the street from a hotel room. I came to work the following Monday, and I realized at about three-quarters of the way through the day that nobody had talked to me about the shooting. I don't know whether it was the shooting before that or the two or three or four before that when we became so desensitized that 58 people could be killed in Las Vegas, and it wasn't even mentioned the following Monday.

We cannot allow this to become normal in this country, and the people of Colorado have refused for this to become normal in this country. It is not just mass shootings; it is the daily shootings that stalk our communities like the West Side of Chicago, where I have spent time with my friend Arne Duncan who, after being the Secretary of Education, has gone back to his hometown to try to keep young men from killing. They can't afford for us to continue to just move on and forget that it ever happened. Communities, once they have been savaged by something like the Aurora movie theater shooting or the Columbine shooting, never move on.

The pages here are a little bit younger than my daughters are, but I can tell you that there is a whole generation of Americans that has grown up in this country savaged by gun violence and the prospect that it could happen to them when they go to school the next day or the next week. You can see it. You can see kids sitting on the couch, cringing, when they are watching the television reports, wondering whether that is going to be them or their classmates.

They have carried a burden that no generation of Americans has ever had to carry. No generation of humans living in the industrialized world has had to carry this particular burden. Today, our kids are growing up with a reasonable fear that they could get shot in their schools or in their temples or in their churches.

I didn't grow up in a country with more gun-related deaths than in virtually any country in the industrialized world. That was not the country I grew up in. I grew up in a country with a Second Amendment but not a country with more shootings than anyplace else in the industrialized world. Our attitude about this has changed. It is different from what our parents and grandparents believed, no matter what party they were in.

After a shooting, I heard somebody on the radio—some well-known talk show host—say that this was just the price of freedom, that being victimized in a mass shooting or being worried that your family members could be killed in a mass shooting was just the price of freedom. That is not what freedom meant to America when I was growing up. Partly what freedom means is being free from the fear that you are going to get gunned down. That is a freedom, and we have denied that freedom to the next generation of Americans. What a shame that somebody would say something like that after a mass shooting. What a limited view of what freedom is. What a surrender that represents to our children and the victims of these crimes.

In 2020, the leading cause of death for kids in America was guns—guns—not

car accidents, not drugs but guns. There was a study that looked at how many kids, ages 4 or younger, had been killed by guns across 29 industrialized countries. This was of kids 4 or younger in 29 industrialized countries. The United States accounted for 97 percent of the deaths. This country accounted for 97 percent of the deaths of kids who were 4 years old and under. What a disgrace. What an indictment. The entire rest of the industrialized world accounted for 3 percent. We accounted for 97 percent. We have nearly 200 times the rate of violent gun deaths as Japan or South Korea and nearly 100 times what they experience in the United Kingdom.

I can tell you, speaking as a father, it is not because we love our children any less or because we are uniquely violent or that somehow we have got a mental health problem that other countries don't have or that we are mentally more unwell, which I hear some people say. It is because we have a U.S. Senate, year after year after year, that has been paralyzed by the National Rifle Association, by the NRA. We have a Senate that has allowed our kids to get shot in schools, in movie theaters, in grocery stores, and at concerts but has offered nothing but thoughts and prayers. We have a Senate that, until now, has failed to respond to the overwhelming demand of the American people to protect our communities.

That is what I hear when I go home. I live in a Western State. As you will hear, we have been able to enact meaningful gun reforms in my State. If we can make progress in a Western State like Colorado, where people are demanding it—Democrats, Independents, Republicans, and most importantly, all of our children are demanding it—we can do it here. I have said it over and over and over again on this floor after we have had mass shooting after mass shooting across our country. Finally, for the first time in a decade, we have the chance to make progress.

I want to thank my colleagues. I really do. I don't mean that in the usual way that people do when they come out here and say, you know, ''I thank my colleagues.'' I want to thank my colleagues CHRIS MURPHY and JOHN CORNYN for leading this really important bipartisan effort.

I strongly support what they have put forward, which would strengthen background checks for young people buying firearms, so we are checking their mental health and juvenile records.

It would help States strengthen their red flag laws, which would help keep guns out of the hands of people who are a threat to themselves or others. We passed a bill like that already in Colorado.

It would make a historic investment in mental health and school security. I said a minute ago that sometimes you just hear people talking about how we have mental health, and I pointed out that we probably have got the same mental health that other countries in the world have, but that doesn't mean that it is not an issue. It is an issue. We are having an epidemic of mental health and behavioral health on the back end of this pandemic, especially among adolescents in this country and in the State of Colorado. There is $15 billion in this bill for mental health, and I am proud that that is in there. That is a historic investment, and it is both sides that are making it.

We are going to close the boyfriend loophole, which allows abusive partners to buy a gun. We are going to crack down on straw purchases, where people illegally buy guns on behalf of someone else. That is a big problem we are going to address in this bill.

Frankly, I don't know how anybody on this floor could object to any of those ideas. I don't know how anyone could go home and say they opposed investing in mental health or making sure they are not letting a troubled 18-year-old have access to an AR–15 or some other weapon.

On that point, this can't be the end of our work. There is more for us to do. We should raise the age for buying a semiautomatic weapon from 18 to 21. We should pass universal background checks. In Colorado, after Columbine, we passed universal background checks. I have said it over and over again on this floor. Every year, somewhere around 3 percent of the people who try to buy a gun can't buy a gun in Colorado. Do you know why they can't buy a gun? Because they are convicted felons, because they are murderers, because they are domestic abusers.

In the 10, 12 years that I have been coming down here talking about this, I have challenged people. I have said: Come tell me why Colorado is not safer with that law in place. There is nobody who has ever come here and said, ''Here is why you are not safer,'' because obviously we are safe. The country would be safer and Colorado would be safer if we pass background checks at the national level.

We should close the gun show loophole. We should limit the size of magazines, which we also have done in my Western State of Colorado. We should ban bump stocks. People in Colorado and across the country overwhelmingly support these steps. But in the meantime, let's pass this bipartisan proposal.

A few weekends ago—it was actually over the Memorial Day weekend—I had high school kids—not in the same place and not just one—literally coming up to me in tears out of desperation that we were not responding to what had happened in Texas and we hadn't done anything in this country about guns. I think we need to show them and the young people who are here today, the young people who are living all over America, that we aren't so broken that we can't respond to one more massacre of kids at a school. We need to show them when we have this opportunity to demonstrate that we are not going to fail again and that we can succeed in passing this bipartisan bill and that, after all these years, we can meet the American people's reasonable expectation to begin to protect our communities against gun violence that happens in the United States of America and only in the United States of America.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, our country is still mourning the tragic shootings in Buffalo and Uvalde in which a total of 31 innocent people were gunned down by teenagers using weapons of war.

While these terrible events get our attention and have in this case galvanized the Senate to act, they are only 2 of the 279 shootings that have taken place this year. So it is good that the Senate is now considering legislation to address the epidemic of gun violence.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which we are now considering, is a good, albeit modest, bill. I am particularly pleased to see that two issues I have prioritized are addressed in this bill. The first is grants to State red flag laws, like the law in my home State of California, which has proven effective at removing guns by people who have been found by a court to possess a threat, and a provision closing the boyfriend loophole, which has let too many domestic abusers continue to possess firearms.

However, while this bill is a step in the right direction, it is far from the bold action that we need to address mass shootings that occur on a daily basis. It remains too easy for private citizens to obtain weapons of war in this country. Sadly, this bill does very little to address that tragic reality.

Almost 30 years ago, in 1993, I stood on this floor and offered the amendment to ban the sale and possession of assault weapons. That goal was simple: Limit access to weapons of war that have no place on our streets. And guess what? It worked. In the 10 years the assault weapons ban was law, gun massacres dropped 37 percent. After the ban lapsed in 2004, gun massacres rose by 183 percent. That is a big difference.

Back then, a different shooting was on the minds of Americans: the 101 California Street shooting in my hometown of San Francisco, where a disturbed man entered a law firm and killed eight people. For many, this tragedy was a wake-up call that required action. And we did act.

Now, 30 years later, teenagers are able to purchase AR–15s, multiple high-capacity magazines, and shoot up a grocery store or elementary school, and we are left mourning the deaths of innocent people and asking, what is the solution?

I applaud the sponsors of the legislation now before the Senate, but I have to ask, what will it take for us to hear

the wake-up call and pass stronger gun legislation? Our Nation, our children, are under constant attack. Nowhere is safe. There are mass shootings at schools, at churches, in synagogues, newspaper offices, stores, movie theaters, on and on. It is simply too easy to get a weapon designed to kill as many people as possible. Today's legislation will help, but there is so much more we could and should be doing.

Our gun laws are lax, and they make it too simple for anyone—even those we know are prone to violence—to obtain a weapon. This is especially true of teenagers. Even though they can't buy a beer or a pack of cigarettes, they can buy an AR–15 assault rifle and thousands of rounds of ammunition once they turn 18 years old. The results are heartbreaking. In Uvalde, 19 children and 2 teachers were massacred last month because an 18-year-old was able to buy an assault weapon. Just 10 days earlier in Buffalo, 10 people were shot to death in a grocery store because an 18-year-old was able to buy an assault weapon. The common denominator in so many mass shootings today is assault weapons.

I understand the Senators who negotiated the bill couldn't reach agreement on this issue. Consequently, the bill fails to prevent teenagers—teenagers—from buying assault weapons.

Under current law, a Federal firearms licensee may not sell or deliver a handgun to a buyer younger than 21; however, this commonsense protection does not apply to purchases of assault weapons. This disparity actually costs lives.

It is simple logic: If you can't buy a beer, you shouldn't be able to buy an assault weapon. If you can't buy a handgun, you shouldn't be able to buy an AR–15. That is why I introduced, along with 13 of my colleagues, the Age 21 Act. I have also filed it as an amendment on the bill before us.

The bill would raise the minimum age to purchase assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition from 18 to 21. So before you have a powerful weapon, before you buy big bullets, you have to at least be 21 years old. I don't think that is too much to ask.

This commonsense reform has public support among both Democrats and Republicans. A recent POLITICO poll showed that 88 percent of Democrats and 68 percent of Republicans support requiring people to be 21 or older to purchase a firearm.

I believe that failing now to act and address the ease with which teenagers can buy assault weapons is really a grave mistake. And make no mistake about it, it will cost lives. So now is the time to act.

I urge my colleagues to support the Age 21 Act and pass it before the next massacre. I hope these words are heard. I hope people understand. I hope there is no more killing of young people this way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge the years of bipartisan hard work on one of the most challenging subjects we have here, which is gun violence, mental illness, and all the things that basically contribute to these horrible, horrible tragedies. Something has to be done, and something has been done.

There are going to be people who look at the piece of legislation we are about to pass in a bipartisan way and say that it is not enough. I can understand that. There are going to be other people saying that it is too much, that it is the camel's nose under the tent and they want to take my guns away. I can understand their concern because people have scared them. It is a constitutional amendment. That is not going to happen.

So what I want to reaffirm is, myself coming from a little town—Farmington, WV—being raised in a gun culture, growing up in a gun culture—my father was not a sportsman. He was not a gun person. But he wanted to make sure I had access to people who knew how and lived in this culture and who knew how to teach me properly.

So, growing up, they had what they called the Farmington Sportsman's Club. These were a lot of the men who worked in the mines who kind of took us under their wing, all us young kids. They taught us gun safety. They called it ''gun sense.'' We are going to teach you some gun sense, JOE. I said OK. And I understood it. Gun sense—it is the sensible thing you do with a gun. It is the law-abiding thing law-abiding gun owners do. The first thing they teach you is the safety of how to handle the gun. It is never loaded. It is always broken down before you go into the woods, before you prepare to hunt or if you are going to shoot, whatever you are going to do. They would teach us about that. They would teach us everything they possibly could, and then they explained to us why they were teaching us.

They said: First of all, the most important thing to know when you acquire a weapon—and it is a weapon—it is basically to feed your family, to defend your family, and basically the sporting of skeet shooting or target shooting.

I said: I got it. I understand.

They said: Do you understand this?

I said: What?

You never sell your gun to a stranger—never, ever, ever. If you don't know the person, that is not someone you want to sell to until you know exactly who they are and what their intent may be.

Fine. So that is part of my gun culture: You never sell your gun to a stranger.

He said: You never loan your gun—even to a family member who is not responsible. If you deem them to be not a responsible person and you have not trusted them by giving them your car or doing anything with them with any valuables you had, why would you loan them your gun? It is a dangerous—you know, they don't know how to do it. They won't, basically, take care of it and honor it and understand the gun culture that you do.

These are things I learned very young.

I am going to fast-forward to Sandy Hook. Never in my mind, never in my imagination, never in the United States of America could I believe that 20 babies would get slaughtered, that we had become so mentally disturbed that someone could feel that was something they needed to do or something drove them to it. I couldn't comprehend that. But what was even harder than that was, once I got to know all the families, knowing that most of the children were hard to identify or that they had to use DNA to identify them, that told me everything.

So I was on the floor of the Senate one time in 2013, and people were talking about, we have got to do something. Every time there is a horrific tragedy, we are all willing to start talking about, we have got to do something.

Mr. President, during that time I was here and we were talking, a person said we have got to ban this and ban that and take this off the streets and take this. I heard all those things.

I confronted one of our Senators at that time about the types of guns. They never—they didn't come from a gun culture. We were all raised a little differently. They never had the opportunity to learn as I did.

I said: I think what you are doing is taking a position right now that by me being a law-abiding gun owner—and I own guns—that I am going to do something criminally with them or abuse them. I am not. You have got to give me that certain amount of concern that I am a law-abiding gun owner the same as you buy—whether you buy a car or whatever you buy that may do danger to yourself or others in public, you have that right as a law-abiding citizen, and that is a product that is being sold. I understand all that.

They said: Well, JOE, if you know so much, why don't you write a bill?

I said: Well, the thing I see, where the loopholes are—I just told you. As a law-abiding gun owner, you can't infringe on me by saying I can't give it to my child or my grandson or I can't give it to my brother or my cousin—my family, immediate family. You have to give me that ability to make those decisions as a law-abiding gun owner with common gun sense.

But I said: What you do is—you have a problem at a gun show. You can go to a gun show anywhere—they are all over the country—and there will be somebody in that gun show selling

guns who doesn't do a background check because they are not a licensed dealer. That is the way the system is set up.

I said: That is not right. That person is either not a law-abiding gun owner or doesn't understand guns well enough of how we were trained. So that should be a loophole to be stopped.

Then we talked about, well, how about on the internet now? We have all these transactions on the internet anymore. So with the transactions that are happening on the internet, the way the law is set up today, if I buy from you in Maryland or you buy from me, then I have got to send my gun to a dealer, a licensed firearm dealer in Maryland, before, Mr. President, you can go pick it up, and they will do a background check on you. But if I sell my gun to somebody in my State of West Virginia—whether you are down in Bluefield, WV, or in Wheeling, WV—I can do that without going through any gun dealer, a licensed dealer, to do a background check. That should be stopped.

So basically we did a bill, and I got Senator PAT TOOMEY from Pennsylvania. That was the Manchin-Toomey bill we did back in 2013. It has probably been vetted longer than anyone else—any piece of legislation as far as on guns.

I would dearly love to have a commonsense background check bill that did not infringe on law-abiding gun owners' rights and protected the Second Amendment. We weren't able to get that in. But, you know what, I understand. I am OK. I would have loved to. But we got some other things in.

So what I am trying to point out, those of you who didn't think you got what you wanted, trust me, we need to start somewhere. This is a start.

The only thing I had—advice to the committee—we worked on a bipartisan group—was this: Whatever we do, we have got to make sure that we are able to say what we are doing today would have prevented this horrible Uvalde tragedy.

Again, we had young, young kids—babies, if you will, innocent—whose lives were taken away from them and their families.

Something has to be done. It is not open season on children. So if we do anything, it has to be towards the safety of children and the school system. If you can't, as a parent or a grandparent, see your child off to school, knowing full well they are going to return home safe or if you have that doubt in your mind or if that child has that doubt and they are scared to go to school, something is wrong with our system in America.

We are asking just basically for good, decent people to step up. This is a piece of legislation that will do an awful lot of good, and it is something we can build off of, and I think that is our purpose.

Support State crisis intervention orders. We are putting $750 million that will be available for States to create and administer laws that help keep weapons out of the hands of those determined by a court, with strong due process—now, they have been talking about what kind of a flag it is, what kind of a law. Forget about that.

What we are saying is, when we identify them—let me tell you something. The people who can do more good and help us more are the students who are going to school and have befriended their group of friends, and all of a sudden, this student goes dark. Something happens. They take you off of their social media page. They don't want to interact with you anymore. They have another group of friends. Something is wrong. But if you had a mental hygiene professional in that school system that you could go to as a student and say, ''I have a friend I am concerned about,'' then it is in the proper hands. We haven't had that. This gives us that chance. This gives us that chance to do it.

Protection of victims of domestic violence. We know, far too many times—and to tell you how rampant this is and the culture that we have, there are domestic violence shelters almost in every corner of the country. Wherever you live in America, you can find a domestic violence shelter. We are that committed to protecting people going through abuse.

This basically closes the boyfriend loophole, which is something that has been needed to be done for quite a while. I think that it is going to save lives. I really do.

Enhanced background checks for people under 21. Myself, I was very open. I think it should have gone to 21. Makes all the sense in the world.

I use this rationale: If you are less than 21 years of age and over the age of 18, you cannot go to a gun store legally and buy a handgun. It is the law. Not once have we ever had a strong position to where people are saying: Oh, you have got to have 18-year-olds go buy handguns—trying to retract that. We haven't. It doesn't make sense. But for some reason, we never have on the long guns. And I am going to tell you why. Rite of passage: my first long gun, single shot .22—it is considered long. It is one single shot, bolt-action .22. My next gun was a .410 shotgun to go squirrel hunting. Then I jumped over 16-gauge to a 12-gauge because I wanted to be big time. I wanted to show them I can shoot a 12-gauge and take the kick. But that is the reason.

So at 18, you know, you are out there—and they told me this: Well, wait a minute, 18-year-olds can go into the military, and they are going to be taught all these weapons.

I said: Let me make sure you understand. They are going to be properly trained, and they are not going to leave base with them. They are properly trained. And those weapons that you are talking about are used only for the military and defense of our country and does not leave base unless they are on duty. That is the difference in what you want to do.

So we opened it up, and this new product comes onto the market. And this product comes onto the market with a vengeance. The only thing I have said—and I have been very public about it—I don't own one, but I have friends and family members who do, and I trust they will do the right thing. They enjoy them, for whatever reason. So I haven't gone down that path.

But the bottom line is we have got to take a position that we are going to protect our children. And this is what it is about. It is a child protection bill, as far as I am concerned. And if you can't protect the children in America, if you can't protect the children in your neighborhood, in your school system, that go to school, the same school as your children and grandchildren, then God help us all. And if that is not at the front of every discussion on a PTO meeting today going on around the country, in every school board going on around the country, then something is wrong. How hardened is your school? How well are our children protected? If I am a parent or grandparent, that is what I am asking.

I have three young grandchildren in that age exactly in the school system, very close to where this happened. And you can imagine where my heart was when I heard about this horrible tragedy. So I can only imagine. My heart and prayers go out to these family members who will never bring back their children. I am still very close to the Sandy Hook parents and the movement that made people more aware. It has taken a long time, but we are going in the right direction.

I see my good friend Senator CORNYN, who has worked so hard on this.

This is something that is long overdue—long overdue. So what we are going to do, if you are 18 to 21, we want to make sure that we know what your juvenile record is. If there is a juvenile record, we are going to find it, and we are going to see if you are worthy or not to have this type of gun. And that is going to be a 3- to 10-day process for us to get the records back through the different systems to make sure that we have evaluated them properly and to review the juvenile and mental records, which are so important. I can assure you, a young person who maybe didn't have the family support they needed or the nurturing that was needed and they have been in the juvenile system for violence or behavior problems, it is going to be someone that more than likely is going to have a problem as they grow older, unless they can get help. Maybe now we can identify and get that person help so they don't harm themselves or anyone else in society. That is the purpose of what we are doing.

And then you have the investment in mental health funding: $11 billion we are investing in mental health. That is serious. For the first time, for us to put this type of money—of public money—towards something that is a public

tragedy that we are dealing with, I think the money is going in the right place. So when we said we want to be able to prevent—this bill should be able to prevent someone who shouldn't have a gun in that age group, and it gives us a little extra eyes and time to look into it, we have done it. To say that we basically are going to be able to identify this person and maybe help that person save themselves and a whole lot of other innocent people, we have done it.

We have started in the right direction. There is a lot more we can do. So for all of you that are out there saying, You didn't do enough, it is just not good enough—don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. This is a good piece of legislation, and it has bipartisan support. And I am so proud of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

It is time to move forward. We will be voting very shortly on that sometime today. It will be a historic vote, a very historic vote. And I am proud that the colleagues are standing tall on this. We have 50 Democrats and 15 Republicans, and that is a major accomplishment in today's atmosphere.

So I am proud to be a Senator that is going to take part in a historic piece of legislation to maybe correct a lot of the fears that people have right now of sending their children or grandchildren to school, of maybe relieving the fears of children who are saying, I am afraid to go to school today. That is something I have never heard growing up. It is something I couldn't imagine in the United States of America. I don't want my children or grandchildren and their children having to live through this. It is time for us to stop it.

This is a right start. It is a right piece of legislation. It is a good piece of legislation. And this is one time we have put our money where our mouth is and the mental health illness that goes on around in this country to make sure we are taking care of a problem that has been festering for a long time.

With that, I want to thank my colleague, Senator CORNYN, from Texas. I want to thank all of the group, if you will. We have 20-plus strong, equally divided—Democrats and Republicans—working for the right cause and the purpose for us being here, making sure we do something good for America and protect our children. We have done that in this bill.

With that, I say thank you to all of my friends, all of my colleagues, for a job well done.

With that, I see my friend is here, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I came to the floor to talk about the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. But first, let me just express my gratitude to the Senator from West Virginia for his longtime commitment to come up with a bipartisan solution. This is not easy.

And there are a lot of examples of good-faith attempts to try to come up with an answer that can get the requisite number of votes. And I know the Senator from West Virginia knows how hard that is. But it hasn't deterred him from contributing to our efforts, and I think our product that we are voting on is better for that. I want to say thank you.

Mr. MANCHIN. If I could say one thing, Senator CORNYN, if you give me a minute here.

The leadership you have shown is admirable. It really is. You come from a gun culture. I come from a gun culture. We know the challenges in a gun culture. I said: To a group of people, it is not enough; to other people, it is too much. Anything is too much because it is the camel's nose under the tent they are afraid of. We protected the Second Amendment. And we attacked the problem we have been identifying, which is mental illness. And you brought that to the forefront, took it. We put our money where our mouth is.

I think this is a great piece of legislation for us to start protecting the children of America. And I thank you again for that.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I thank my friend, our friend, from West Virginia for those generous remarks.

As we all know, a lot of people have been working on this issue, for the last few weeks especially, intensely. And this included, obviously, a lot of people beyond those that I have the time to name here. But we finally introduced our proposed legislation last Tuesday, exactly 4 weeks after the last terrible shooting in Uvalde, TX. I am not a patient person by temperament or personality. So I was hoping we would get here faster. But the truth is, since it requires consensus and persuasion, sometimes it takes a little longer than you hoped for. And I appreciate the space that both the majority leader and the Republican leader have given us to come up with something that will achieve a result.

So often around here, people do things and say things not with the intention of actually passing legislation but with the intention of making a political statement, or messaging, as it is sometimes called. That is not what we are doing here. We are not looking to posture or to try to embarrass anybody. We are trying to find a solution to a very real problem. And I think what we have come up with will, in the end, pass the test, which I know so many of us believe is the standard. And that standard is: Will it save lives? Will it save lives? And I believe the answer to that is yes. And that makes this worth doing.

Well, from the beginning, I was optimistic that we could reach a bipartisan agreement, but I know that on both sides of the aisle, there were some places that we could not go. As the Senator from West Virginia said—a proud defender of the Second Amendment, as am I—I was not going to go anywhere in this negotiation that jeopardized the rights of law-abiding Americans under the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Some people act as if the Second Amendment is somehow different than the rest of the Bill of Rights—the freedom of speech, the freedom of press, the freedom of association, the freedom of religion. Well, it is right there all in the same 10 first amendments to the U.S. Constitution, called the Bill of Rights. So it is entitled to no less respect than those other constitutional rights contained in the Bill of Rights.

But I think we have come up with a way to make good public policy and also to maintain that commitment to the Constitution. Some people want to create a false choice. I don't think we need to go there because there is not a false choice, as I said, between the Constitution and the Second Amendment and making good public policy. They don't have to overlap or interfere with each other. Both can stand on their own merits. Well, as I said, law-abiding gun owners are not the problem. And that was a redline for me.

During the course of our negotiations, our Democratic colleagues did push for a range of provisions that I believe stood no chance of becoming law, particularly in a 50–50 Senate. We know that if Democrats want to do everything their way or Republicans want to do everything our way, almost by definition in a 50–50 Senate, nothing will happen.

And to me, that was one of the most important things we are doing here. One is demonstrating that our institutions—in this case, the U.S. Senate—can actually work at a time when a lot of people are questioning whether our institutions can work and also questioning whether it is possible to come up with some bipartisan piece of legislation rather than fail as we have so many times before and each side sort of returning to their corner of a boxing ring and trying to message it to their base and not actually get a result.

So there were a lot of things that the President has asked for in this bill. For example, a ban on so-called assault weapons, which are a semiautomatic long gun, named, I guess, because of focus groups or polling assault weapons, but it is really a semiautomatic rifle. And there was also some discussion about high-capacity magazines. Neither of those are part of this legislation.

Now, I know there are Members who would perhaps love to have that, but they understand that to press that point to its logical extreme would mean we would not have anything at all. There is also no mandatory waiting period. There is no potentially unconstitutional requirement that gun owners store their weapons in a particular way.

Unless a person is adjudicated mentally ill or is a violent criminal, no one's Second Amendment rights will be impacted by this legislation, period. We know already that the National Instant Criminal Background Check System—which is the gold standard, in my

view, to make sure we draw the line in the right place between law-abiding gun owners and those who cannot, under existing law, purchase a firearm. For example, if you have been adjudicated in a mental institution, you can't buy a firearm. If you have been convicted of a felony, if you have been dishonorably discharged from the military, if you are addicted to drugs—all of those are current questions in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, which if you answer yes to, then you cannot legally purchase or possess a firearm.

Some wanted to include more categories, but we did not. We essentially are, by doing what we have done here, saying we are going to make sure that existing law is enforced but not add additional requirements.

Well, some of our colleagues like to say that to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous individuals, we need to limit the rights of law-abiding citizens. But as we know, the bad guys—the criminals—aren't going to respect the law; they are going to get the guns by any means they can, including illegally.

Frequently, they obtain firearms on the street or through straw purchasers. Background checks don't deter them because they don't buy them from a Federal firearms licensee, which does a background check. They buy it from a member of a street gang or someone else.

So we have rejected those attempts to add restrictions, as I say, on law-abiding gun owners, but we have added stiffer penalties for straw purchasers and gun traffickers. That, I believe, is the most effective way to deal with the problem of street sales of illegal guns through trafficking and straw purchasing. That is a way to improve public safety.

Following the shooting in Uvalde 4 weeks ago, I said I wanted to look at reforms that might have prevented this terrible tragedy from occurring.

To me, that is the best way to approach these cases because it is hard, sort of in the abstract, to say what it is we could do that might save lives. Frequently, we can look at the fact pattern of what happened and say: Here is where there was a failure, and here is another place there was a failure. Unfortunately, in Uvalde, there were multiple points of failure.

One is a lack of our access to juvenile records. This young man showed up after he had his 18th birthday. Right now, the criminal background check system doesn't look back before you were 18 to see whether you had a mental health adjudication or some disqualifying criminal conviction.

That is a problem because if somebody who we know, in retrospect, is sort of a ticking timebomb as a result of his troubled past, there is no way under the current system to get access to that information.

So one of the things we have done here is to say: Let's see if we can work with the States to make sure that they supply to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System information that had it occurred as an adult post-18 would clearly disqualify someone from purchasing a firearm. This is a little bit of a challenge because every State kind of does things differently, and there is no way we can compel the State to provide the information, but I would think that Governors and State legislatures would want to work with us to try to keep guns out of the hands of people who we know are a threat to themselves and a threat to public safety.

Our bill incentivizes the States to upload whatever juvenile records they have to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System to ensure that any disqualifying criminal convictions or mental health adjudications are available.

This is, to be clear, not an expansion but a clarification of the types of conduct and records that would disqualify somebody if you were an adult that are not currently available because we don't look past the 18th birthday—behind the 18th birthday to juvenile records.

So what we are doing is simply ensuring that those records, which would already disqualify somebody had it occurred if they were an adult, are available and could be considered as part of that background check.

If the background check for a buyer under 21 returns a potentially disqualifying record, what we have provided in this enhanced background check is an opportunity for the FBI to ask more questions.

And under our legislation, we don't change this part of it. The NICS system—the National Instant Criminal Background Check System—has 3 days to do a background check. But because it is computerized, 90 percent of them are done just in a matter of seconds, but on occasion the FBI has other information they need to investigate.

This was a real problem, for example, in Charleston, where Dylann Roof, somebody we know had a misdemeanor drug conviction—and on further inquiry, the FBI would have found out he was addicted to narcotics, which is also a disqualification. But because there was no opportunity to expand the background check beyond just the 3 days under current law, it wasn't part of the NICS system. And, unfortunately, he bought a gun and killed a lot of innocent people at Mother Emanuel Church there in Charleston.

So giving the FBI, for this cohort of 18- to 21-year-olds, an opportunity, if they come across something that needs further investigation, to give them up to an additional 7 business days to look into it.

I will give you another example. Let's say they come up with a record that demonstrates there was an assault. Well, there are different types of assaults against someone. It may be a bar fight or punching someone in the nose or it could be domestic violence. Well, the first is not a disqualifier under the law, but if the assault conviction actually turns out to be domestic violence, it would be. And so that is the kind of information that we are giving the FBI an opportunity to explore in this extension of the background check.

But this is not a mandatory waiting period, and it doesn't apply to gun buyers of all ages. For example, if somebody is 19 years old and they do the background check and they do what we require here, which is inquire of the juvenile record repository and the repository for mental health adjudications and local law enforcement, and they find nothing, then the transaction can occur in a matter of hours or a matter of days.

There is no mandatory waiting period. And this really addresses only that cohort of 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds, which has become a common profile for young shooters who have shot innocent people everywhere from Uvalde to Sandy Hook in Connecticut and other places.

The profile, unfortunately, is very sad and very tragic, people who are a danger to themselves and others, and that is the reason why we thought this enhanced process was important.

We also included comprehensive due process requirements relating to firearms. I have talked about the fact that this is a constitutional right, and of course the Constitution guarantees due process of law. And a lot of folks are, frankly, concerned about these red flag laws, these crisis intervention orders when somebody is demonstrated to be a danger to themselves and others.

And the concern is that not all of these red flag laws contain robust due process requirements. What are we talking about? Well, due process generally is understood to include notice, the opportunity to be heard, the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, and to present evidence in front of an impartial judicial officer.

So, in order to make sure that none of the grant funds would be available to States that did not have robust due process requirements and had red flag laws, as 19 States and the District of Columbia do, we have very strong due process conditions on the grants that are available.

But many States don't have red flag laws. For example, Texas does not, but we sure have a lot of crisis intervention programs that are sort of focused on the same sort of problem.

We have mental health courts, veterans courts, drug courts. We have something called assisted outpatient treatment for people who, under court order, can be an outpatient and be required to show up for their counseling or treatment but also to take the medications that their healthcare provider requires them to take if they are going to manage their mental health challenges. That is done under a court order but as an outpatient. So it is another way of sort of addressing this

problem of people having unmanaged mental health challenges and, in some cases, becoming a danger to themselves and others.

We firmly rejected the idea that the Federal Government would impose a national red flag law. And we did not view it as appropriate for the Federal Government to make the grant funds that are available through the Department of Justice be seen as an incentive to sort of nudge States or encourage States to pass their own extreme risk protection orders.

Those are decisions that are made at the State level, not here. But like I said, we provided robust due process requirements of any grants that go to those States. And it may be, as one of my colleagues said this morning, in his State, they have red flag laws, and he thinks that money could be used to ensure that the rights of law-abiding gun owners are protected by a robust due process.

And for States that don't have red flag laws, as I mentioned, there are other ways this money can go to help and address a similar problem. So all States will have access to these funds through the Department of Justice Byrne JAG law enforcement grant program.

So while some have said that taxpayer dollars are being used to violate someone's Second Amendment rights without due process, that is, clearly, a false accusation. Unfortunately, we know that when there is so much money to be made and so many people to be recruited to one cause or another when it deals with this general subject matter, that a lot of reckless and irresponsible and false statements get made, which is the reason I am here explaining what is in the bill and what is not in the bill.

One of the things that was very important to our Democratic colleagues is the definition of the ''boyfriend loophole.'' Just by way of explanation, under current law, before we passed this bill, if you are married to someone, if you are cohabitating with someone, if you have a child with someone and are not married or cohabitating or if you are in a relationship which is, for all practical purposes, similar to a marriage but not official, if you commit a domestic violence offense in your State and are convicted of that misdemeanor domestic violence, you are forever barred from purchasing or possessing a firearm.

One of the things we negotiated, frankly, because I think it just makes a lot of sense, is that for this category of boyfriends, so-called, roughly defined as recent or current serious relationship of a romantic or intimate nature, if you find yourself in one of those relationships and you commit an act of domestic violence, one of the things we negotiated is 5 years later, with a clean record, then you can have your Second Amendment rights restored.

And I think that is an important protection, again, of Second Amendment rights. Well, we would not agree that someone who was convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence against a girlfriend 30 years ago would be forever barred from their Second Amendment rights or someone who just had a casual dating relationship.

But as I said, we did include a provision to restore the Second Amendment rights to certain individuals who have a clean record of not committing any additional criminal acts, including domestic violence, for a period of 5 years.

We all know that there are plenty of people who make mistakes but then turn their lives around, and this legislation opens up the anatomy for individuals to have their Second Amendment rights restored if they do that.

We have worked throughout this process with a lot of different people, from the school safety portion to the mental health portion, and we have worked with law enforcement, and we have worked with a variety of groups, including some of the groups that represent gun owners as well as those who have advocated reform of our gun laws. I thought it was important for us to hear from everybody.

And now it may be that in the end, some of these outside groups do not love 100 percent of what we are doing here. We know that no piece of legislation is perfect. By definition, it is a compromise and a consensus to try to find that common ground. And so some outside groups may say: Well, we can't support that because it doesn't give us 100 percent of what we want, but frankly there is never a bill that passes that gives one side or the other 100 percent of what they want.

So just to conclude, just to repeat myself for emphasis, this bill does not infringe on law-abiding citizens rights under the Second Amendment. It doesn't actually expand the background checks system. It doesn't impose mandatory waiting periods or any other restrictions.

There is a lot of misinformation and, believe me, I think that is what social media was created for, for spreading misinformation or disinformation.

So there is a lot of misunderstanding about what is in this legislation, which is the reason I wanted to come to the floor and set the record straight.

This bill does, however, include important targeted reforms, complete with robust due process protections, that I believe in the end will keep our children and our communities safe while respecting Second Amendment rights.

Over the last couple of days, we have had a chance to have even further and more robust discussions among not only Republicans, but Democrats, and I appreciate those who perhaps may have been skeptical to what we were trying to do here—their willingness to keep an open mind, to ask us hard questions, and to force us to come up with good answers that will address their concerns. That is how we pass legislation here in the Senate; and my hope is that through those good-faith negotiations and debates and discussions, we can continue to build additional support for this legislation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. Madam President, we are on the brink of passing meaningful gun safety legislation, and it is regrettable that it took the deaths of 31 people, including 19 children, in the recent Buffalo and Uvalde mass shootings to provide the needed momentum to break the hold that the National Rifle Association and the gun lobby has had over Congress.

I commend my colleagues on both sides who have stepped forward to reach a compromise. This bill is a big accomplishment that can save lives, but I feel an inescapable dread that we will face the horror of another mass shooting if we do not take further steps.

As a veteran, I have shot many of the weapons we have heard debated on the floor this week. I know their power, and I know they were designed for killing people.

Now, I know that some of my colleagues hold the view that more firearms in the hands of more people is the antidote to gun violence, but I have to ask: Will more and more guns and more and more people carrying guns in public make our schools, our churches, or our streets safer? Is that really a vision for this country? I don't think so.

According to an academic study by the Council on Foreign Relations, the United States, with less than 5 percent of the world's population, has 46 percent of the world's civilian-owned guns, and it has the highest homicide-by-firearm rate of the world's most developed countries.

Indeed, Americans kill each other with guns at a rate 25 times higher than other high-income countries. In addition, Americans use firearms to harm themselves in alarming numbers. According to the CDC, in 2020, there were more than 45,000 firearm-related deaths in the United States, and roughly half of those deaths were suicides.

That is the academic data. But what grips me and so many other Rhode Islanders are the mass killings of Americans, particularly children, over the last quarter century: Columbine, Sandy Hook, Parkland, and now Uvalde. Hospitals, concert venues, houses of worship, and military installations have also been targeted. People have been targeted based on race, sexual orientation, and religious beliefs. Innocent lives have been taken again and again, and many more lives have been shattered. The common element

is a firearm; and while correlation isn't necessarily causation, these mass killings have become more and more common as more and more guns have been marketed and sold.

Roughly two-thirds of Americans do not own a gun, and the majority of Americans agree on a commonsense solution like expanding background checks. But groups like the NRA have lined up to block these efforts even in the face of devastating loss.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act before us today represents progress. It represents a momentary break in the NRA's stranglehold on reform. This bill will establish a 10-day waiting period for firearms purchases for individuals under 21 years of age. It will close the ''boyfriend'' loophole that allows abusers to access guns. It will strengthen requirements for gun sellers to obtain a Federal firearms license. It will establish clear penalties for straw purchases and gun trafficking, and it will invest in violence intervention programs and mental health solutions in communities across the country. Those are real changes that are worthy of support on their own.

I am also encouraged that the bill includes incentives for States to adopt extreme risk protection orders, or a red flag system, similar to the legislation I have introduced. State red flag laws have proven effective in keeping guns away from individuals who have demonstrated clear warning signs of danger to themselves and others, and we should be encouraging every State to adopt a red flag system.

I would also like to talk about the mental health aspects of the bill. First, it needs to be repeated that a person with a mental health condition is more likely to be a victim of violent crime, not the perpetrator. The most reliable predictor of future violence is actually a history of violent behavior, not a diagnosis of mental illness.

That being said, we do have a mental health crisis in this country that demands attention. In Rhode Island, families and providers have been asking for more resources for treatment and more training for mental health workers, particularly resources dedicated to children with mental health needs. I am pleased that the negotiations over the gun control package so far include new resources for mental health care, including a national expansion of the certified community behavioral health clinic model, which would provide sustainable funding to expand mental health and substance abuse treatment and services at the community level. I have worked with my colleagues Senator STABENOW and Senator BLUNT for over a decade to move this provision forward.

I am also pleased that this agreement invests new funding in a National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. Next month, the Lifeline will be making the switch to an easy to remember three-digit number: 988. We need to make sure that call centers have the staff and capacity to handle call volume and make sure people who reach out for help get appropriate follow-up care. As I mentioned earlier, half of all gun deaths each year are suicides, and firearms are the most lethal method of suicide. In addition to keeping guns out of the hands of people in crisis, we need to make sure we have well-funded and organized systems in place for people who reach out for help in these times of crisis, like the Lifeline. Again, I would hope every American, and particularly those who face these mental health challenges, remember 988. It could be a lifesaver.

I hope we are able to consider bipartisan efforts to strengthen our mental health care system over the coming weeks and months. For example, we should pass the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline Improvement Act, which I introduced with Senator MORAN last year. The HELP Committee reported the bill out of the committee unanimously nearly a year ago, but this bipartisan bill still has not yet come before the Senate.

The bill also includes critical resources for schools, not only to implement measures to address physical safety, but also to ensure that schools have the resources to address the social, emotional, and mental health needs of students and staff. Our educators have not just been on the frontlines of the pandemic. Too often—much too often—they are on the frontlines of the gun violence epidemic. And they are also on the frontlines of our mental health crisis. Finally, because of this legislation, some help is on the way.

The gun violence bill we are debating will hopefully prevent some tragedies going forward. Though we cannot help but celebrate any progress on gun violence, we should not lose sight of the fact that we need more comprehensive action than this bill if we are really committed to preventing gun violence in our Nation.

There is no single law or regulation that we can pass that would have stopped every single one of these tragedies we have seen over the past few decades. But in my view, Congress should do more, including reinstating the assault weapons ban, cracking down on illicit ghost guns, and, most importantly, eliminating the near total immunity of the gun industry, which has an unparalleled level of liability protection.

The gunman in Buffalo bought a semiautomatic weapon, but he was able to ''illegally'' transform it into a fully automatic weapon. If you go to your cell phone and get YouTube, put in something like ''transform AR–15 to fully automatic,'' you will have a host of videos. One of them lasts 1 minute and 38 seconds. Why is this happening? Well, when you have no liability for the consequences of building a weapon that can be easily transformed from semi to fully automatic and you can wink-wink to your potential market and say, ''Yes, this is semiautomatic,'' we need legislation to get that immunity removed.

Now, I am proud that in the days following the tragedy, my home State of Rhode Island took the decisive action of banning magazines that hold more than 10 rounds, raising the minimum age for buying shotguns and rifles from 18 to 21, and prohibiting loaded rifles and shotguns from being carried in public. Congress should do the same by passing the bill before us and then pressing on with additional reforms.

I will vote for this bipartisan bill. It is a significant step, but it cannot be the last step.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT PROGRAM

Madam President, I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Pell grant, which was named in honor of its author and my predecessor, Senator Claiborne Pell—I might add, a mentor, a friend, and a remarkable example to me.

Senator Pell believed in the power of education to transform individuals, communities, and our Nation. He worked to put the power of education in the hands of the people.

When Senator Pell introduced the legislation to create what would become the Pell grant, he said:

> There is no greater investment this country can make than in the education of its youth. Our young people, who are simultaneously our responsibility, our legacy, and our key to problem-solving in the future, must be enabled to pass easily into the realm of postsecondary education, and our institutions of higher education must be equipped to accommodate and train them.

His words were prophetic and profound. The Pell grant became the cornerstone for broadening access to postsecondary education. Because of the Pell grant, over 80 million students and counting have been able to attend college. In 1972, before the Pell grant, less than half of high school graduates immediately enrolled in college. Today, two-thirds make that transition. Since the establishment of the Pell grant, the percentage of people ages 25 to 30 with a bachelor's degree has doubled.

Today, the Pell grant supports nearly 7 million students across the Nation, including nearly 24,000 in Rhode Island. It remains one of the most effective Federal programs in assisting low-income families, with most recipients coming from families with annual incomes of $40,000 or less. It is one of our greatest tools to promote equity and opportunity in the United States. Yet, despite this success, today we find ourselves at a crossroads when it comes to fulfilling the promise of the Pell grant.

We have seen declining enrollment over the past 5 years. Even more alarming is that the institutions that enroll the lion's share of low-income and first generation college students—our community colleges and public 4-year colleges—have seen some of the most significant declines.

We have seen an explosion of student loan debt, now standing at more than $1.7 trillion—debt that threatens to foreclose on educational opportunity for this generation of Americans. We need to correct course.

We have made a start with the bipartisan, $400 increase to the maximum Pell grant in the fiscal year 2022 appropriations act, but we need to do much more. The Pell grant used to cover over three-quarters of the cost of a public 4-year college. Today, it covers less than a third.

When I was growing up and later with the passage of the Pell grant, it was relatively—I wouldn't say easy—but less challenging to go ahead and work your way through college with a summer job and a Pell grant, graduating with very little debt and moving on in the community and this society and this economy. Today, it is much, much more difficult. So it is time to double the grant.

We also need States and institutions to step up. Affordability is a shared responsibility. Fifty years ago, Senator Pell led the effort to ensure costs did not keep talented and committed students from pursuing a college education. In his farewell speech in the Senate, he called on us to continue his commitment to educational opportunity. He said:

> In education, I want us to be known as the nation that continually expanded educational opportunities, [the nation] that brought every child into the education mainstream, and [the nation] that brought the dream of a college education within the reach of every student who has the drive, talent, and desire. We should always remember that public support for education is the best possible investment we can make in our Nation's future. It should be accorded the highest priority.

So, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Pell grant, it is time to renew our commitment to college access and affordability. Let's work together to double the Pell grant, rein in college costs, and reduce the burden of student loan debt. Let's do our part to realize Senator Pell's vision for a country that continually expands opportunity.

One final point: Getting to know Senator Pell, it always impressed me that, I think, one of the formative periods in his life was the beginning of World War II. Senator Pell came from an old family. Pelham, NY, was named after his family. I was once with him when he informed me that his family once owned Fort Ticonderoga, but then they donated it to the State of New York.

He could have very easily, in 1941, gotten a promotion, gotten a rank, and served comfortably in some office. He chose not to.

He enlisted in the Coast Guard as a cook and sailed across the Atlantic in multiple convoys in dangerous waters. I think there, he learned the potential of the American people—those other cooks who would never be able to go to college because they didn't have the money, but they had talent and, in some cases, more talent perhaps than the Senator himself. I think that image, that impression, drove him in many respects to make the Pell grant a reality.

Now, of course, it is quite a tribute to a gentleman who could have avoided the difficulties and dangers of war and chose, just like other Americans, to go into the fight. And we have to have that same spirit as we address the Pell grant.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JEFF STREIT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, it is Thursday, and normally, when I am giving this speech, our ''Alaskan of the Week'' speech—you notice we have a new, pro-energy ''Alaskan of the Week'' diagram here—normally, when I give this speech, everybody has gone home. The pages love it because it is the most interesting speech of the week. Some of our reporters who like this speech, they are kind of viewing this as the end of the week.

Unfortunately, we are not at the end of the week. There is a lot more business to do for the next day or two or three—who knows?—important business, no doubt about it. But I still want to come down to the floor and talk about a really impressive man who has done incredible stuff for our State. His name is Jeff Streit.

Jeff has been a builder of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline—what we call TAPS—and then has helped run it for 48 years, almost half a century. We are going to talk about Jeff here in a minute. He has done an incredible job.

I always like to talk a little bit about what is going on in Alaska. All the people who watch this speech—we know there are millions who tune in every Thursday—come on up to Alaska. Come visit.

What is happening right now is really, really exciting. It is just a few days past summer solstice. Boy, did we celebrate in Alaska: parties, baseball games. The famous Midnight Sun Baseball Game took place in Fairbanks. I talked about that last week. It took place in Fairbanks on Tuesday. The Goldpanners, whom I talked about, the famous Alaskan baseball team, pulled out a 10-to-9 victory in the bottom of the 10th. The crowd of thousands went wild—Midnight Sun baseball.

So if you are visiting Fairbanks, as many tourists do right now, you might want to check out a baseball game. We have great baseball in Alaska, as I described last week.

You also might want to travel a couple of miles outside of Fairbanks to get a firsthand view of one of the engineering marvels of the world, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, what we call TAPS. That is it right there, a big, beautiful, incredible engineering feat: 800 miles of steel pipeline crossing 3 mountain ranges—one about 5,000 feet high—crossing more than 600 streams and rivers, and has transported over 17 billion barrels of oil to a thirsty America. That is energy security right there.

TAPS has provided countless benefits in terms of tens of thousands of jobs—good union jobs, I might add—not just to Alaskans but to Americans all over the country. I think even one of our Senate colleagues worked on this. It was the largest privately funded infrastructure project ever undertaken in America at the time it was built in the early seventies.

Here is the thing: It took 3 years to build—3 years; that is it—this mammoth, huge, important energy project.

By the way, we need to get back to that in this country. I and many other Senators are working on that. You can't do an EIS in 6 years. We have to get back to this can-do American spirit, building things that benefit our great Nation in a timely manner. I am going to talk a little bit about that.

Our Alaskan of the Week, Jeff Streit, was one who did this. He helped construct this incredible engineering feat, and then he stayed on, and he worked for a company in Alaska, a very famous company called Alyeska, which is a consortium of companies that own and run and built the pipeline.

This week, Alyeska celebrated its 45-year anniversary—45 years of supplying a thirsty America with billions and billions and billions of barrels of oil. Everybody should applaud that.

I know we have some, unfortunately, who think that if you work in the energy sector, somehow you are a bad guy. Actually, you are a hero.

America needs energy. Alaska has a lot of it. Alyeska has produced it and sent it 800 miles down this incredible pipeline to the whole country. So I want to first congratulate Alyeska for their incredible work.

Jeff, our Alaskan of the Week, is the longest serving employee there. He has been working for Alyeska all of those 45 years and, as I mentioned, started work on TAPS even longer, 48 years in total, because he is one of the Americans—by the way, there were over 30,000 who came up to build this incredible work of energy infrastructure. Forty-eight years, Jeff Streit, Alyeska, building TAPS—what an amazing career. He is our Alaskan of the Week.

So let me tell you a little bit about Jeff. Jeff's father came to Alaska after World War II, where he flew for the Army Air Corps.

That is another theme you may have seen on our Alaskan of the Week: a lot of vets, a lot of veteran families. Alaska has more veterans than any State per capita in the country.

Jeff's father worked on projects across the State, married Jeff's mother in 1952 when they were both working on

the Alaska-Canada Highway—the ALCAN Highway, as we call it in Alaska.

By the way, you want to talk about building something efficiently in terms of infrastructure that we need in America? The ALCAN Highway—1,600 miles through Canada, all the way to the lower 48—built in 8 months. We can do that, America. We can build great things—ALCAN Highway, TAPS—efficiently. We have just got to get back to it. More on that later.

Jeff's parents then moved back to Illinois, where Jeff was born, but he might have been raised in Alaska because his parents talked about the great State of Alaska so much—their adventures there, what they did there. So he wanted to go back.

He went to pre-vet school at Iowa State for 2 years, and the first chance he got, in 1973, he moved to Alaska to work on a farm and go to college at the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Now, Madam President, I am sure a lot of our Senate colleagues know this, but for the interns—the pages, I mean—you might remember in the early seventies, studying history, that we had this big energy crisis where energy prices were going up—a little bit familiar, unfortunately, today—going way up, primarily because there was an Arab oil embargo led by the Gulf Arab States, Saudi Arabia, against the United States and other countries. It was devastating. You couldn't get gas. There were lines at gas stations that stretched for blocks. States issued rationing based on odd and even license plates. Prices surged, a little bit like today. Motorists turned on each other. It was bedlam. By the way, it really hurt the economy, like today, in terms of inflation.

Enter the great State of Alaska and our vast, vast energy reserves for America. Congress said: We need to get Alaska moving. We need to get that Alaskan energy to the rest of the country.

So this body and the House debated the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act—what we call, as I mentioned, TAPS—to build this for the country, and we did it.

It was drama, Madam President. You are sitting right there in the President of the Senate's seat. The TAPS act in the U.S. Senate was deadlocked. It was a tie vote here in the Senate, and the Vice President of the United States had to come and break the tie so America could build this for a country that needed energy—American energy, by the way, not energy from the Middle East.

Another incredible story as it relates to legislation and TAPS was the late, great Congressman DON YOUNG, a freshman at the time. We just lost our dear Congressman a couple of months ago. He was a brandnew freshman in 1973. He got an amendment—and, boy, do we need amendments like this today—that said: On this big infrastructure project, we are going to stop any litigation. We are going to stop more studies. We are just going to build it.

We can do that here, by the way, the Congress. We can say: No more litigation; let's build. And that is what we did. That is what America did.

As the debate was happening here in the Congress, Jeff moved back up to Alaska, visited a local union hall, got on with the Teamsters, and his life's work in Alaska began.

As I said, Madam President, this was the largest private construction project in our country's history. At its height, we had over 30,000 Americans—great Americans, by the way—building this incredible piece of American energy infrastructure that transformed our State in Alaska, and it transformed America. At one point, this pipeline was producing 2.2 million barrels a day for our Nation. Over 17 billion barrels of oil have flown down that pipeline for America.

By the way, Madam President, Alaska has billions and billions of barrels of oil left, if our Federal Government would just help us produce it.

Eventually, Jeff got a job, after building TAPS, with Alyeska running TAPS, working at Pump Station 8. In the 48 years since, he has worked nearly every inch of that line as a technician at three pump stations, as a task force supervisor, as a project supervisor, as a pump station operations supervisor, and as a pipeline technician trainer. You get where I am going here, Madam President: He has done it all for Alyeska.

He has great stories and great memories. He remembers the mess halls filled with smoke and laughter and the hard work it took to build this pipeline. He remembers watching ''Jaws'' at a packed theater camp in the middle of the Alaska wilderness. He remembers the time a Russian delegation came to visit TAPS. The TAPS pump station was so clean.

By the way, Alaska has the highest environmental standards of energy production anywhere in the world.

He said: The Russians came, saw how we produced, saw pump stations, and thought that we were lying about how we produce and transport oil because it was so clean. They thought it was staged.

Jeff said: We were setting standards on the environment—cleanliness, environmental standards—that people across the world didn't think were possible. ''It made us proud.''

Well, guess what, we are still doing that in Alaska. Jeff still marvels at the engineers who designed one of the most complicated engineering projects ever built—before computers; using paper, pencils, slide rules. ''Every square inch of the system has to be intact to move even one drop of oil,'' Jeff said. ''If there is a leak anywhere, we shut the whole thing down.''

It is a testament to so many that this incredible system has kept oil flowing for America for 45 years. That is what Jeff just said about TAPS and Alyeska.

To keep it running, there are always upgrades, adjustments, installing enhanced monitoring, detection, surveillance, but, as Jeff said, ''The pipeline itself is still the same pipeline that was built in the '70s, still doing battle with the geological and meteorological forces,'' and still standing strong for our country.

Jeff has no plans to retire soon. He is still highly engaged. He is still highly curious. He is now taking on a greater mentorship role, including developing and teaching a hydraulics class, emulating those who taught him.

Jeff said: ''When I think about the last 48 years, I think about the thousands of people who have made a difference, who helped me and taught me. And I really think that that's what America is all about—passing on values and work ethic[s]'' to each other.

That is what America is all about. That is the best of our country: people who work hard, who are loyal to their jobs, to their communities, to their State, to their country, and importantly, who produce important things like American energy, which we need to this day. Jeff is exactly one of those kind of people. He built this, ran it, still runs it, and our Nation still needs it.

So, Jeff, thank you for all that you have done.

Thanks to the workers at Alyeska who are currently working right now, 24/7, to keep hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil a day, which we need, coming down the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

A big congratulations to Alyeska for 45 years and 17 billion barrels of oil for America.

That company, Alyeska, has produced many great leaders—Jeff being one and Tom Barrett, my good friend, being another. And I just want to say to him—to everybody at Alyeska but particularly to Jeff—congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week. You people who are producing American energy are American heroes. We need more of you, and we really appreciate all you have done for our great State and our great Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, before I get to my topic today, I would like to say that when Senator SULLIVAN first came to the Senate, I hadn't been here very long, either, and this was my presiding time every week. I loved the Alaskan of the Week. I don't think they are ever going to run out of Alaskans of the Week as long as Senator SULLIVAN is here. So I was right back in that chair, where you are, thinking of the many times I heard Senator SULLIVAN do the presentation on the Alaskan of the Week and how much I enjoyed it.

S. 2938

Madam President, I would say the topic today is tragic in so many ways but, I think, moving forward in others.

Last month, 19 kids were killed in their own school rooms and 2 teachers were killed in Uvalde, TX. It was a horrific act, an agonizing thing for family, an agonizing thing for community, and I think, along with the Buffalo, NY, event, an agonizing thing for our country.

One thing that almost all these mass shootings have in common is a perpetrator who had a mental health issue that wasn't dealt with properly.

Let me say before Senator STABENOW and I talk any more about mental health—and I believe I will repeat this again—be sure we know what we are talking about here. People with mental health conditions are not dangerous. Mental health is a health issue, and we ought to treat it as a health issue, but in rare and tragic occasions, people with a mental health issue not dealt with can become dangerous, and that is what we have seen in this and other similar circumstances.

So one of the responses is always, Well, we need to have a better mental health delivery system. That is true, but we should realize that, according to the National Institutes of Health, for at least a decade now, they have estimated that at least one in five Americans has a diagnosable and almost always treatable mental health or behavioral health issue. Frankly, the pandemic made that even greater.

A June 2020 survey by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that 41 percent of adults in the United States said they had had at least one symptom of a mental health condition in a recent time, and 11 percent said they had seriously considered suicide in the previous month. Now, those are extraordinary numbers, but even if half of those numbers were correct, you see the size of the problem we have and the importance of dealing with that problem.

Of course, we had even more alarming numbers with children and young adults during that. The lockdowns, months of virtual learning, time away from their friends, I would argue too much time on screens—the effect of the pandemic on close family members had a staggering toll on the country.

Children's hospitals saw mental health emergencies among 5- to 17-year-olds increase by 14 percent in the first half of 2021 compared to 2019 and a 45-percent increase in self-injury and suicide for children in that age group. Pediatric hospital needs and pediatric mental health care needs are greater than they have ever been.

We need to be sure that everyone who has a mental health crisis or has an ongoing mental health problem has the help they need when they need it. The bipartisan legislation we are debating today expands access to high-quality mental health and behavioral health through what Senator STABENOW and I will point out we believe to be a truly proven model of community-based care: the Excellence in Mental Health Program, a program that we brought to the floor in 2013 and then got passed and signed into law in 2014.

At the time, Senator STABENOW mentioned that bill marked the most significant expansion of community mental health and addiction services in decades.

When we pass this bill, it will be even more dramatic in its long-term impact. And we have worked on these issues together with pilot States. We worked on these issues together that brought projects in individual States that weren't part of that eight-State original and, eventually, nine-State pilot.

And so today we are able to come with 5 years of history in this program, a reimbursement model that matters, and results that we think make a big difference. And I am glad to be here with my good friend from Michigan. And we are going to kind of do this together for the next few minutes, talk about what can happen because of a critical piece of this community safety bill that is in so many ways a mental health and mental health delivery bill that we are going to see expanded in the country in unique ways.

Senator STABENOW, I would like to turn to her for a few minutes to talk about this, and then I have got some things to say, too.

Ms. STABENOW. All right. Thank you, Senator BLUNT.

Mr. President, I have to say this has been a wonderful partnership and a wonderful journey now for, gosh, almost 10 years, I think, since we originally started talking about the idea that we should be funding healthcare above the neck the same as healthcare below the neck as part of the healthcare system. And that is your ''stop and start'' grants, when we have community health centers that are so wonderful for physical health. And so we have done that.

I do want to, before going into the substance, give a shout-out, though—because we are not the only ones who have been working for almost 10 years—to our wonderful staff: Alex Graf, on my staff, who has been working on this legislation for 8 of those years, and Caitlin Wilson, on your staff, who was amazing, and I understand recently stolen by Senator CORNYN. And so she has continued her work. But so many people have worked with us that we are very grateful to, including the main authors and the folks who have put this bill together, like Senator CORNYN, who has been such a strong supporter of what has become an evidence-based quality initiative. We don't have to make something up. When folks say, ''What do you want to do about mental health care or addiction care,'' we actually have a proven model now. And also to KYRSTEN SINEMA and to CHRIS MURPHY and Senator TILLIS—so many people have been supportive of this as well.

And I just want to take us back for just a moment because when we came to the floor, Senator BLUNT, when he mentioned 2013, we actually came to the floor to mark the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy signing the Community Mental Health Act. As we know, that was the last bill he ever signed before his being shot. And part of that was to stop housing people in hospitals, just locking people in the hospitals, and create more quality care in the community—you know, shut the hospitals and open up services in the community.

As you have said so many times, half of that happened. The hospitals were closed, but we didn't provide the quality and the funding—permanent funding—for the community care. That was 1963. We are doing it now in this bill. That is what we are doing in this bill is completing what was promised in a national bill signed in 1963.

We know, again, that one out of five people in our country—and this is before COVID—will have a mental illness in their lifetime. So many leading causes of death—again, prior to COVID—for people under age 50 is a drug overdose, most likely opioid overdose. We know that the most likely gun death is a suicide, which, by the way, in this bill, there is an important piece on red flags that I think is so important because that means that if a family member, if those around someone feel that they are a danger to themselves and someone else and should not have access to a gun, they can go through a legal process to have that happen so that that person is not using a gun to commit suicide or a suicide-homicide through a mass shooting.

But what is so significant about this is that we know that across this country, certainly across Michigan, I know in Missouri, we have so many people—I mean, there are millions of people today who want to be able to get help for mental health or addiction as part of the healthcare system. And we want them to do that. We don't want there to be a stigma.

There used to be a stigma. People would whisper, ''He's got cancer,'' and now, we openly talk about that. We have wonderful programs and people get treatment, and there is no stigma related to that. It is very challenging, but there is no stigma. We want that for mental illness, for behavioral health.

So this isn't about saying every person with a mental illness is dangerous at all—at all. This is about saying we want everyone to get the help they need. And in that situation, that rare situation where somebody doesn't get help and then takes those next steps and is unstable and dangerous, we certainly want to address protecting them, their family, the school, the neighborhood, the community. And that is what the gun safety provisions of this are all about.

Let me just say one other thing and turn it back to Senator BLUNT. We now have—between the number of demonstration States we have had now for a number of years, we also have 435

clinics, many of them funded through what we developed as startup grants so that they can get started, develop the quality standards, be able to show what a difference it made.

But I think we were both pretty blown away when we saw the difference it made, when we saw those original numbers from Health and Human Services, the studies that were done—both in Democratic and Republican administrations, reinforcing that. The fact that right now, if you have a 24-hour psychiatric crisis services center, which is part of this, these clinics, people aren't going to jail—60 percent fewer people are going to jail because they are getting the help they need, which is why law enforcement so strongly supports this.

What has been happening is people go to the emergency room instead because there is no place—our jails, our emergency rooms have become de facto mental health treatment centers because there was no place else; 41-percent reduction in homelessness with comprehensive care in the community. And that is what is in this bill.

And it really is transformative; wouldn't you say, Senator BLUNT?

Mr. BLUNT. Yes. I think the point you are making here, too, are that these are—we now have 5 years of evidence in several States, multiple years in other States. So this isn't just assuming what will happen but looking at what we have carefully tried to keep track of, of what does happen. And as you pointed out, that de facto mental health system, mental health delivery system of the emergency rooms and police—nobody was well-served by that. Certainly, the police weren't well-served. The emergency rooms weren't well-served. And people had many mental health challenges that weren't served by that as well. And seeing those numbers go down dramatically of people having to go to the emergency room for mental health services or being kept in jail overnight or longer than overnight for mental health services, nobody benefits from that system.

And so we are seeing real numbers where the people who work at the emergency room, the people who are in the police department are among the biggest supporters of this system when it gets in place. Also, the whole idea of crisis intervention, there are opportunities in this law for that to happen.

In any of the new structures, whether that is drug court or veterans court or other places you would go to try to be sure somebody is getting the help they need when they need it, there also would be due process involved in anything added; that we use this bill to add to the system due process where people have a right.

If there is an emergency moment, obviously, you have to deal with that as an emergency moment. But people then have a right to have their day in court as well, if they are not part of that crisis intervention moment of seeing that happen. And so that is important.

But in Missouri, 150,000 people are now part of this excellence in mental health effort. That is about a 40-percent increase on what some of the same facilities were doing before, but now, they do it with more certainty that they are going to get their cost reimbursed. They do it with the right kind of staff, and 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, they have to be available. And the new States that enter the program will go through that same type of competition to be among the 10 States every 2 years that could enter the program and get us to all 50 States in that program and have the kind of staff they need, the kind of accessibility they need.

I think, originally in our bill, which was 8 years ago now—2014—24 States applied to be one of the first 8 States in the pilot program; 19 of them went through the whole process, and 8 States were selected. But in the other States, there are now 30 States that have big units that were able to qualify as individual demonstration grant units to show what they could do. And we really, I think, both believe that those units in those States will become both the models and the incentive to bring the whole State into that program now that that is possible and seeing what we are seeing with results and also results on the nonmental health side.

One of the unique things I think that this pilot did was—part of the pilot was to see what happens with the other healthcare issues that people have who have mental health concerns. And what has happened is that they have seen those costs go dramatically down. If you have a behavioral health problem that is being dealt with, you are much more likely to show up to your doctor's appointment. You are much more likely to show up to dialysis. You are much more likely to take the medicine that has been prescribed, whether it was for your mental health situation—and occasionally, that is the best way to deal with mental health—or your other health situations. And so those costs go down.

And even in the immediate healthcare space, we are seeing that States believe they are saving money in the immediate space of healthcare. There has never been any question that in the long run you would save money if you treat mental health like you treat all other health. There has never been any question, whether it is the prison system or law enforcement or your personal income capacity, that all those were good things to do.

I think what we have shown in these early States is that even in the immediate healthcare space, you save as much money or virtually as much money or even more money on the other health costs for the one in five adult Americans—and now big numbers among the younger Americans who have a mental health problem—you save as much space for their other health problems, and one in five adult Americans are going to have a lot of other health problems. It is a pretty big segment of our society.

And I think, Senator STABENOW, seeing what happened there has also been persuasive to States as they are beginning to think about making this part of their permanent program when these pilot projects are over.

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely. Senator BLUNT, as we know, in the end, this is all about people. And I think what has been most exciting for me, and I know for my friend and partner, is that people's lives are changing. Opportunities for them are changing.

When we look at this legislation broadly, it is about saving lives, whether it is through issues related to gun safety, whether it is through getting the help you need, mental health help and addiction services help, whether it is making sure our schools are safer, making sure laundry services are available in the schools. It is all be creating safety and a better quality of life.

I think it is also exciting—you know, we were talking about community behavioral health clinics with broader investments here on mental health as well. There is a strengthening of the suicide hotline, which is so connected to what we have been talking about today. Telehealth, we know during the pandemic how critically important that was for mental health services and so on. And that is strengthened.

There is about a billion dollars' worth of investments in some way in our schools—school health clinics and other opportunities.

What I think is exciting is that we are not only supporting schools and teachers in all of these areas that are so important, but we are making sure that when they find a child that needs help, there is somewhere to go because when you are talking about really investing in transformative, certified community behavioral health clinics, that means there is a service in the community.

So if a parent or if a teacher or the principal or the coach or somebody is saying, ''This young person needs some help,'' they won't only be trained to identify they need help, they will actually be able to get them help because there will be services available. And so I think that is the whole point of all of this.

And I would also finally say, when we talk about funding as healthcare, traditionally mental health and addiction services have been funded by grants to stop and start. And so you may need help or want your child to get help, but the grant that was doing that went away; or you may suddenly decide you want to deal with your own addiction, you are finally ready—it is so hard—you are finally ready to do that, and you reach out and the services aren't there anymore.

And so this is about funding this as healthcare through the healthcare system, so it doesn't stop and start. It becomes a way of looking at healthcare above the neck the same as healthcare

below the neck. And that is why we call it transformative.

And it is such an important commitment. I am so proud of everyone here that has been so wonderfully supportive and enthusiastic about taking this big step. This is an area of this bill that is a huge step that will really save lives and transform communities, I think.

Mr. BLUNT. Just one final thought, we want to be sure that we are encouraging people to get the healthcare they need. You know, if this system works like it should work, you really never know what you are doing in terms of how you have changed people's lives in the future or the lives of people they might impact.

We don't want to create any stigma here that a resilient, broad-based mental health system that is part of this bill means that you should be hesitant to seek mental health help. You know, if you have a mental health problem, you are more likely to be the victim of a crime than you are the perpetrator of a crime.

But if those problems get out of control—often suicidal thoughts first before you have homicidal thoughts—but if this system works the way it should, who knows what good you have done by just letting people go through their normal lives as contributing citizens with treating their mental health and talking about their mental health.

As Senator STABENOW said, being able to talk about somebody in your family that has a mental health challenge as readily as you talk about somebody in your family that has a cancer challenge or a dialysis trip that they have to make multiple times a week to go somewhere or medicine that they take for something else and talking about this in the context of the good it does in making our society safer should, in no way, be interpreted to mean that people with a mental health concern are unsafe.

But if you don't deal with that problem in the right way at the right time, it has the potential to be unsafe. Most of these shootings we have seen, the shooter goes into that shooting clearly anticipating that they will not come out of that shooting alive either. So it is suicide; it is homicide; it is things that if you dealt with that problem a decade earlier—and maybe in some cases, the specific problem even a week earlier—but if you dealt with it a decade earlier, as people began to see that, you know, We need to get you some help.

Just like if your hearing is going bad or your eyesight is going bad, people say, ''Let's get an appointment and go see what we need to do,'' and anybody can be seen at these certified community behavioral health centers. Anybody can be seen if you are covered by—it is very much based on the federally qualified health center model. If you have insurance that covers this, you can go there. If you have a government program that covers it, you can go there. If you need to pay cash, you can go there on a very affordable sliding scale. But people are seen, and nobody—in our State, at least, and I think this would be the case in all nine of the pilot States—nobody who needs to be seen that day is not seen that day. Nobody who needs to be seen that day is not seen that day.

And nobody who needs to be seen isn't seen pretty quickly as you have time to schedule that appointment. It changes people's lives; it changes communities; it changes the way we talk about mental health.

As Senator STABENOW said on the floor, the last 50 years after President Kennedy signed his last bill into law—now, here we are, almost 60 years after that bill was signed into law taking what would be, so far, the biggest step toward accomplishing what that Community Mental Health Act envisioned.

And Senator STABENOW, I will turn to her for any final comments.

Ms. STABENOW. I just want to say thank you to my friend and partner, and I really do mean friend and partner. And Senator BLUNT thinks he is retiring; I am not going to let him. We have really done so much important work together, and I am going to miss him dearly.

I am really seriously figuring out a strategy where we are not going to let you leave the building.

But I am very grateful and, again, for him, for all of the great staff work, and it is a day to feel good about the ability to come together and get something done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first of all, while Senator BLUNT and Senator STABENOW are still on the floor, I want to thank both of them for their extraordinary leadership on this mental health issue.

I am so pleased that the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act includes robust provisions to deal with community mental health.

I have worked with Senator STABENOW on the Senate Finance Committee. I know her passion on this issue. We have put together bipartisan working groups that are dealing with a lot of different issues in regards to mental health. A lot of that has to do with pediatric mental health, which is very much engaged in the bill that we have before us today. And a lot of those provisions have been incorporated into the legislation before us.

But what you have done on these certified behavioral health centers to be able to have the pilot programs and now to be able to expand them to more communities, to have a 24/7 facility that is available that is included in this legislation, that is going to make a real difference in people's lives.

So I just really want to thank both of you for your tremendous contributions on this issue. Senator STABENOW, I want you to know, through the Chair, I agree with you in regards to Senator BLUNT. We are going to miss his personal presence here on the U.S. Senate floor, but we know that we will be able to continue on having his friendship and counsel on so many issues that have affected us.

And if my friend from Kentucky would allow me just a few more minutes, I would like to make a couple comments about the underlying bill. I know that he is scheduled to speak.

Mr. PAUL. No. Go ahead.

Mr. CARDIN. After the horrific shooting in Uvalde where innocent children were murdered, inaction was not an option. Congress had to do something substantive to help stem the epidemic of gun violence that is scarring our communities daily. For this reason, for all the victims of gun violence who may not make the headlines every day, I was proud to vote today in favor of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

The Senate is taking an important step forward today to break the decades-long gridlock on gun safety. Legislation will save lives by boosting funding for community violence intervention and prevention initiatives like those underway in Baltimore.

It strengthens protection for victims of domestic violence by adding convicted domestic violence abusers to background checks.

It creates a new source of funding for States to implement red flag laws which help to keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous individuals who should not have access to a firearm.

It cracks down on criminals who tried to evade licensing requirements and makes clear which gun sellers need to register, conduct background checks, and keep appropriate records. It strengthens the background check process for those under 21 seeking to buy firearms, by ensuring that officials have access to juvenile and mental health records.

The bipartisan legislation also provides much needed mental health resources to communities by providing funding to improve and expand access to mental health services. It includes policies from the MENTAL Health for Kids and Underserved Act and the Senate Finance Committee Bipartisan Mental Health Working Group telehealth discussion draft led by Senator THUNE and me to improve telehealth services for students with Medicaid and CHIP.

Increasing resources for mental health services are critical, but it is important that we not conflate mental illness and gun violence. And I heard Senator BLUNT talk about that. Not every instance of gun violence is connected to mental illness, and not every mental health crisis prompts the use of a weapon.

To that end, the COVID–19 pandemic has made abundantly clear that our children need additional mental health resources offered in schools. We must

also significantly increase the pipeline of individuals willing to serve in those school-based mental health service positions.

This legislation addresses that challenge head on and provides supplemental funding to both train new school-based mental health service providers and provide students with the specific mental health services they require.

While not able to meet the needs of every school currently without counselors or mental health professionals, this bill will make significant strides to ensure that a significantly greater percentage of students have access to mental health services.

The legislation we pass in the Senate soon will save lives and help keep our communities safer, but there are many more reasonable steps we can and should take, consistent with the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

I will continue to strongly support the establishment of universal background checks for all gun purchases, the banning of assault weapons and high-capacity magazine clips from private ownership, and raising the minimum age to 21 to buy assault weapons, in the absence of a ban.

The Senate should also act quickly to confirm the nomination of Steven Dettelbach to be the director of Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. The ATF has not had a permanent Senate-confirmed director since 2015, and the Agency is sorely overdue for permanent leadership who can carry out its critical mission to stem the illegal use and trafficking of firearms, among other important priorities.

To that end, let me point out I am a cosponsor of the Background Check Expansion Act, which would require checks for all gun sales, including those by unlicensed sellers; the Assault Weapons Ban Act, which would generally ban the sale, manufacture, transfer, and importation of assault weapons; the Background Check Completion Act, which would eliminate the Charleston loophole that allows for a sale to go forward if a check is not completed within 3 days; the Keep Americans Safe Act, which prohibits the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of magazines that hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which we can and will pass, will save lives, but there is still more work that we should do to keep our students and our communities safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Jon Miltimore, who writes for the Foundation for Economics and Education writes:

> Red flag laws don't involve precogs seeing into the future. Yet, like precrime, they are designed to prevent a crime before it happens, even if it means violating civil rights in the process.

Miltimore asks several important questions: Can people who are flagged as threats be involuntarily committed? Are they appointed legal counsel? Will a Federal database be established to track flagged citizens?

These are questions that civil libertarians should be asking, especially since many people who are red-flagged will have committed no crime.

There will simply be, like Philip Dick's ''Anderton,'' people who might commit or might be a danger to someone. Miltimore reminds us that the idea of precrime didn't originate with ''The Minority Report.'' In ''1984,'' Orwell writes that Big Brother's ''endless purges, arrests, tortures, imprisonments, and vaporizations'' are not the result of people breaking laws, for there are no laws in Oceania. These punishments, readers learn, are merely the wiping out of persons who perhaps might commit a crime at some time in the future.

Red flag laws are well-intentioned. Everyone is searching for a way to prevent the senseless massacres of school mass shootings.

I think accessing the violent criminal records of juveniles is a reasonable way to try to prevent these killings. Though, really, most States have already laws on the books that criminalize threats of violence. The problem isn't a lack of laws to stop these killers, it is a lack of persistent application of existing laws.

The shooters at Parkland and Buffalo both committed criminal threats in advance of their killing sprees, and yet law enforcement did not vigilantly prosecute them. Instead of seeking to enforce existing laws, States have, one after another, instituted red flag laws to use gun confiscation orders to try to predict crime in advance.

The problem comes in trying to create such laws and still protect the constitutional right to bear arms for the innocent.

Basic aspects of the Constitution should not be abandoned, such as the right to confront your accuser. Some red flag laws allow anonymous accusers to initiate a gun confiscation order.

That is not just, and that is not constitutional.

We should not abandon the right to legal counsel, the right to confront the evidence. Many State red flag laws allow gun confiscation orders without the defendant even knowing they have been accused of anything. Many State red flag laws allow guns to be confiscated without hearing evidence from both sides.

Jacob Sullum, in Reason, writes of Colorado's red flag law that the standard of proof for the initial gun confiscation order when the accused does not have an opportunity to respond—see, for the initial order, the accused is not present or doesn't need to be present, and the evidence comes from one side. But the standard that is used is called the preponderance of the evidence, meaning the standard used is that the accused is more likely than not to pose a significant risk.

Historically, gun rights were only removed when the defendant was convicted of a crime using a constitutional standard of ''beyond a reasonable doubt.''

As Philip Mulivor writes at PJ Media:

> Because ''reasonable doubt'' has been long established as the standard of proof for criminal cases, it must naturally apply to judicial proceedings in which an individual, who has not even been charged with a crime, can be stripped of a constitutional right. Nevertheless, red-flag laws often rely on ''a preponderance of the evidence,'' a radically diminished standard of proof. This, above all other injuries—

According to Philip Mulivor—

> to due process, offends our system of liberty and [a] fair trial.

Colorado's red flag law, as well as many other States', confiscates guns using a less-than-constitutional standard.

Using a preponderance-of-evidence standard, which is a standard lower than the Constitution uses for criminal cases, allows a gun confiscation order when a judge decides that it is a better than 50–50 chance of a person being a ''significant risk.''

Think about that. It is a little better than 50–50 that the person who has come before me, whom I have heard evidence only from the person who doesn't like that person—it is 50–50, maybe it is 51–49, but I am going to take away a constitutional right, whereas in a court proceeding where you are convicted of a crime, where you lose your gun rights because of a felony, the standard is beyond a reasonable doubt.

In practice, the other problem with the red flag laws is that judges will be inclined to err on the side of caution. When the only evidence comes from someone who believes the respondent poses a threat, judges will rarely, if ever, decline to issue a temporary gun confiscation order.

One might ask if our laws should allow the abridgement of a constitutional right when only one side of the evidence is presented. Imagine if the proceeding is a complaint filed by an unhappy spouse in the midst of a divorce. Most cases of divorce involve one side cheating or at least one side lying. It is exceedingly difficult to ascertain the truth in a divorce proceeding even when both sides are heard. One can just imagine what mischief might occur if divorce proceedings only allowed testimony from one side.

If you think red flag laws will be easy to adjudicate, just imagine the case involving Johnny Depp and Amber Heard.

As Sullum points out, there is—from the judge's point of view, ''The possible downside of rejecting a petition''—a serious downside—''the death of a respondent or someone else—will weigh

heavily on the judge's mind, while the temporary deprivation of the subject's constitutional rights will seem trivial by comparison.''

The presumption will be, if the temporary order, where you only heard evidence from one side, was granted, that the judge is taking a real risk by overturning or not granting the permanent order when evidence is actually heard on both sides.

So you begin with a temporary order—it is ex parte; you don't have legal counsel; evidence is only heard from one side—but then you get to the next stage and you say: Well, the person gets justice later. They are going to get a lawyer. There will be a proceeding. There will be due process at a later date.

Yet the cards are stacked because think of the perspective of the judge, think of the predicament of the judge. He now has before him an emergency order that says this person is a dangerous person. For him or her to rule otherwise, they are taking a big risk because the first judge or the first ruling said this person is dangerous. Now the judge has to say and has to somehow attest and prove and live with themselves that he is now attesting this person is not a danger.

But the first hearing was only one side of the evidence. The first hearing may have been an aggrieved party in a divorce. It may have been an unhappy person who doesn't like you at work. It may have been someone who doesn't like your political views and is reading online and says, that so-and-so had a picture of a gun, or that so-and-so made some sort of violent innuendo. Read Twitter. Find out how much of that is going on. There is a danger to this.

It is not that anyone is downplaying the sad, awful nature of these massacres and that we don't want to stop them, but we should do it in a fashion consistent with the Constitution.

With the red flag law, the initial hearing has evidence only from those who accuse you of something. That cannot be justice. The bedrock aspect of justice in our country is that you get legal counsel, that there is a debate back and forth.

Go to family court—and you think some of this won't originate from family court? You think there is not going to be an angry spouse who says: My husband cheated on me. My husband is a hunter. I am going to accuse him of something so I can get his guns taken away from him.

You have to hear both sides. How could you only hear from the angry spouse? In divorce, we don't hear from one side. How could we have a hearing where you take away an amendment—or take away a constitutional right from the Bill of Rights without hearing evidence on both sides?

You say: Well, we will hear it at the second hearing 14 days later.

The problem with the second hearing is you now have a judge who feels the incumbent pressure of not changing an initial ruling, a feeling of, well, we have already decided this person is a threat, and now I have to take the responsibility of guaranteeing they are not a threat.

See, if you had the jurisprudence, if you had the due process in the first hearing, then you wouldn't have to worry so much about it being fair in the second hearing. If you have time to go before a judge, I see no reason why you don't have time to have your attorney present. They have time enough to have a hearing. They have time enough to hear the person accusing you. Shouldn't they have time enough to have someone defending you?

In Colorado, a temporary gun confiscation order lasts for about 14 days, at which point the judge has to schedule a hearing where the accused finally has a chance to challenge the claims.

At this second proceeding, the legal standard is a little greater—at least in Colorado. It goes from preponderance or 50–50—slightly better than 50–50—it goes from a standard of that to a standard that is ''clear and convincing evidence.''

Under Colorado's red flag law, though, the first gun confiscation order needs to show imminent risk, but when you get to the second order, interestingly—the order that is going to last a year—you don't have to prove that the person is an imminent risk; all you have to say is that they might be a risk at some point in time. So we have lost sort of the imminence to it.

In 14 days, the imminence is gone, and now we have a proceeding where we are going to hear evidence on both sides, and you can have counsel—not always guaranteed counsel, but you at least can have a lawyer present. In order to remove a gun confiscation order, though, and recover one's Second Amendment rights, the burden, though, is now placed on the accused.

So there is something that is very, very common and is throughout all of our jurisprudence: that you are innocent until proven guilty; the burden is on the government. But now, once you have gone through one of these gun-restraining orders, in order to get your rights back, you have to prove that you are not a risk. The burden is now on the accused to prove that either you are sane or that you are not a risk. It is proving a negative. If you never were a risk, how do you prove that you are no longer a risk? How do you prove you are the negative of something? How do you prove that you are not a risk? This turns typical jurisprudence on its head. Instead of innocent until proven guilty, the burden is for the accused to prove his or her innocence. This is the opposite of what our jurisprudence system was founded upon.

Sullum writes:

> If the judge issues a [gun confiscation order], it lasts for 364 days unless the subject seeks early termination and shows by clear and convincing evidence that he [or she] does not pose a significant risk.

Rhode Island's red flag law is similar, remaining in effect for about a year before the accused can challenge it.

For the accused to restore his Second Amendment rights, once again, the burden is on the accused to prove they are innocent.

The ACLU of Rhode Island asks an important question: How does one prove this negative, and how does one do it with such a high burden of proof? The ACLU concludes that in ending a gun confiscation order, ''the burden should be on the GOVERNMENT to prove by clear and convincing evidence that it should remain in effect, not on the accused to halt the continued imposition.''

This is the ACLU of Rhode Island saying the burden should be on the government the same way the burden is traditionally in any other court proceeding in our country. You don't have to prove you are innocent; the government must prove you are guilty.

If the government is going to take away your Second Amendment right, shouldn't the government have to prove that you are either a threat or that you are guilty of something?

Eagle County Sheriff James Van Beek notes that when the subject of a gun confiscation order tries to have it terminated, ''the burden of proof is not on the [government], as it is in every other legal case, but instead, is placed on the [accused] to prove that the accusations are wrong.''

Sheriff Van Beek explains that ''proving one's sanity could be very difficult, as it is highly subjective.'' But proof of one's sanity is not enough to remove a valid gun confiscation order since the accused can be a threat even if determined to be sane.

Van Beek also worries that ''if a person is truly in a mental crisis, this aggressive approach will create even greater stress, possibly resulting in a violent overreaction, as their personal property has been taken without a crime ever having been committed.''

In Maryland, this is precisely what happened. When police attempted to serve a gun confiscation order, a fight ensued. The person was startled by it. He had never heard there was a problem. They showed up at his house, and he ended up dying in the ensuing altercation.

When police seize guns from the subject of a gun confiscation order, Sheriff Van Beek notes, ''[t]here is no warning or ability to defend themselves against the charges.''

In addition, if troubled individuals understand that seeking care exposes them to the risk of a gun confiscation order, some may be inclined to avoid psychiatric help.

With the large universe of people who can initiate a gun confiscation complaint, from ex-girlfriends, to former roommates, to grandparents, to in-laws, to second cousins, Sullum concludes that ''the opportunities for malice or honest error are multiplied.''

In some ways, the process really is biased throughout because of the risk

aversion on the part of the judge. Once a gun confiscation order is issued and the accused has been labeled a threat, many judges will simply not want the responsibility of judging otherwise because of the deadly consequences if they are wrong.

Sullum concludes:

Given that bias, the indeterminacy of ''significant risk,'' and the difficulty of predicting [an accused's] behavior, it seems inevitable that the vast majority of people who lose their constitutional rights under this sort of law will [in actuality] pose no real threat to themselves or others.

Philip Mulivor, writing at PJ Media on the constitutional deficiencies of gun confiscation orders, points out another deficiency. He says:

The Void-for-Vagueness Doctrine, a cornerstone of American jurisprudence, requires laws to be written ''in a manner that does not encourage arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.''

He goes on to say:

By forcing a judge to predict a person's future criminal behavior in the absence of any violation of law, red-flag statutes descend to the most disreputable level of ''arbitrary and discriminatory'' legislation.

Mulivor concludes that ''due process is always denied when a law fails to comport with the Vagueness Doctrine's imperative for clear and consistent standards.''

Fortunately, the Vagueness Doctrine—

This is also Mulivor's point—

is most likely to prevail when an ambiguous law threatens a constitutional right, such as free speech or the right to keep and bear arms.

The ACLU of Rhode Island has written perhaps one of the best reasoned critiques of red flag laws.

The ACLU of Rhode Island writes:

We are deeply concerned about [the red flag law's] breadth, its impact on civil liberties, and the precedent it sets for the use of coercive measures against individuals not because they are alleged to have committed any crime, but because somebody believes they might someday commit one.

The ACLU of Rhode Island writes that the court order authorized by this legislation would be issued without any indication that the person poses an imminent threat to others. The order would be issued without any evidence that the person ever committed, or has even threatened to commit, an act of violence with a firearm.

The ACLU continues: The Rhode Island red flag law—that the standard for seeking and issuing an order is so broad it could routinely be used against people who engage in overblown political rhetoric on social media.

Realize what we are talking about here. We are talking about red flag laws being used against people for overblown political rhetoric. If you have been on social media, that is 90 percent of what is on social media.

This is, once again, the ACLU of Rhode Island: Without the presence of counsel, individuals who have no intent to commit violent crimes could nonetheless unwittingly incriminate themselves regardless of lesser offenses because, when they are brought in without a lawyer, they can be questioned as to other things that could possibly be illegal.

''The heart of the legislation''—Rhode Island's gun confiscation orders—''requires speculation—on the part of both the petitioner''—the accuser—''and judges—about an individual's risk of possible violence.''

Mulivor writes:

But psychiatry and the medical sciences have not succeeded in this realm, and there is no basis for believing courts will do any better.

He concludes that the potential impact on individuals subject to these gun confiscation orders involves much more than a long-term seizure of lawfully owned firearms.

This is once again from the Rhode Island ACLU. They point out that without a right to appointed counsel, respondents can be forced to submit to a mental health evaluation, be subject to fairly widespread notifications even before a court order has been used against them, face contempt proceedings and prison for failing to abide by any part of the order and unwittingly place themselves in danger.

So the Rhode Island red flag law actually requires that people be notified that you are a risk to them, that they are a potential victim, before the order is issued. So we are not talking just about the lack of due process in the sense that you don't have a lawyer there, you may not have been accused of a crime or informed that you might be potentially going to commit a crime, but, also, in advance of the judge even making the judgment, the police are told that if this accusation is being made, they must inform people.

So you have to imagine the innocent. We can all imagine the guilty. We say: Lock 'em up. Take away their guns.

But imagine the innocent. Imagine someone who is innocent and he is in a divorce proceeding and his angry spouse calls up and says, He's a threat. They go, and even before the judge makes the court order, the judge and the police say: We must inform those who he might be a threat to.

What if that involves his business place? Are we going to inform his boss? Are we going to inform his friends? We are going to call all the schools in the area.

What if they are innocent? You haven't even heard the evidence that is only coming from one side. What if they are innocent? Can you imagine a person's life—entire life—being ruined? How do you ever get employment again? Do you think he could be fired if the boss has now been called by the police and they say: We have a gun order against this guy because we think he's a threat. He might be a threat to his fellow employees; he might be a threat to his wife; he might be a threat to schools. We are going to do this, and we are letting you know so you can be aware.

Who wants that person to work with them?

If you are doing a background check years later and they have had a gun confiscation order in their background, who ever wants to work with this person?

So you have to imagine what happens to the innocent. We can all imagine the terrible, horrible murdering psychopaths who committed these massacres and how we want them locked up, how we want to prevent the killings.

But you have to imagine when you have sweeping laws, what are the potential abuses of the law. You have to imagine what it would be like to be an innocent person accused of something in a divorce proceeding where it escalates and they ask for a gun confiscation order and it is based on malice and it is based on lies and deceit and anger over a broken marriage.

This can and will happen. It happens in family court every day. The difference between a divorce and a gun confiscation order is that in a divorce, if it is very messy, you hear both sides. In a gun confiscation order, the initial order to take away a gun, in almost every red flag law, involves only the judge and the accuser. Nobody believes that to be justice. It has never been justice.

I mean, when people point out the injustice of systems in legal systems, they go back to Venice, and they point out the doge. They had a lion's mouth, and you could put your complaint in the mouth, and it was anonymous, and they would make people walk the Bridge of Sighs to prison or to death.

That wasn't justice. We point that out as the height of injustice—anonymous accusations, hearing only one side.

There are some people who argue that the bedrock of our jurisprudence is the adversarial process of the legal system. The adversarial process is: You get a lawyer, the other side gets a lawyer. And you know what? We go one step further in our system. The government has a lawyer. You have a lawyer. But you know what? The presumption is that you are innocent.

We start out with the presumption of the individual being innocent, and we add the hurdle to the government—the burden of proof that they must prove your guilt. And in the Constitution we say for a criminal offense, we must prove the guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And yet we are talking about taking away fundamental constitutional rights with only hearing the evidence from one side and the standard would be a preponderance of the evidence.

What is a preponderance? It is 50–50. And if it is 51–49, we think the person may be a threat. But we have only heard from their spouse, and we didn't hear from them. We only heard from their estranged spouse or we only heard from the person who is angry with them from work or we heard only

from the person from the opposite political persuasion that read their writings on the internet.

We can see. We can all see the mischief for this.

So I wish, in the middle of this, in the middle of these tragedies, that we would think of what we could do.

New York has already got these red flag laws. New York has got lots of them. New York has got a lot of gun control, and yet the shooting happened in Buffalo.

But the kid in Buffalo had made a threat. It is a felony to make a threat to kill others. He could have been prosecuted.

So I fear, even with this law, if we don't pay attention to the laws we already have, if we don't persist and persevere in prosecuting these kids that show this danger—we already had—it is not that we just had the signals they might; they are committing crimes. Why don't we prosecute them? Why don't we use the laws on the books? But I would say that there is a big risk today to encouraging, across the country, jurisprudence where you don't have legal representation, where the adjudication is based on evidence only from one side, and then you finally get your day in court and you get your lawyer, and everybody is petrified of reversing a decision where you have been named a threat.

I think we want the same thing in the end. My hope, though, is that people would be very careful because I would not want to see a day where we change and reverse justice in our system such that people are guilty until proven innocent.

The bedrock of American jurisprudence is ''innocent until proven guilty.'' The burden is on the government. And until we can make red flag laws consistent with innocent until proven guilty, we should reject them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO COLIN MCGINNIS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to honor a longtime member of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee staff, Colin McGinnis, as he moves on to a new, well-deserved chapter: retirement.

He will be spending more time with his beloved wife Claire—and with the first person he visited upon retirement—his 95-year-old mother Barb, at her peaceful lake home in Minnesota.

Colin is a lifelong public servant. He spent 33 years working in Congress. Even when he briefly left this institution, he remained in service, working for the Orthodox Relief Service.

To say the least, Colin's career is unparalleled. Colin grew up in Morris, MN, and attended Carleton College in Northfield, MN. He went on to earn his masters of divinity from Yale University—and we saw those divinity school values woven throughout his career.

Colin's congressional career began in service to his home State. He worked for Representative Jim Oberstar, Representative Bruce Vento, Representative Terry Sabo, and the former Carleton College professor, Senator Paul Wellstone. In each office, he made a positive difference for Minnesotans.

Colin was serving as chief of staff to Senator Wellstone at the time of his tragic death in 2002. It was a catastrophic loss for Minnesota and for our country. And for his staff, it was a heartbreaking personal tragedy. Colin took care of his colleagues and got them through an unimaginably difficult time. He was a rock for the office and led with composure and grace while grieving a mentor he met while he was a student at Carleton, then later worked with for a decade.

In 2008, Colin became the acting staff director of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee under Chairman Dodd. He led the committee through one of the worst financial crises in U.S. history.

As always, Colin stepped up. It was a scary time. The economy was in freefall. We had never seen anything like that in our lifetime. Colin was the steady hand that Senator Dodd and the committee needed. He was a trusted and an invaluable adviser to Chairman Dodd, Chairman Johnson, and to me.

For the last 9 years, Colin has served as the committee's policy director. I remember when I first took over as ranking member on the committee, meeting with the staff in our hearing room on the fifth floor of Dirksen in late 2014. I didn't know anyone yet, and these talented public servants were experts in their field. Many had spent years working for the committee.

Frankly, I was a little nervous. And at the end of the meeting, of course it was Colin who came up to talk to me, reassure me, break the ice. He could not have been more kind and welcoming.

Colin's many, many accomplishments with the Banking and Housing Committee include his instrumental work on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—the Obama administration's diplomatic success to limit Iran's nuclear program—the bipartisan Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act in 2017, and the historic Anti-Money Laundering Act and the Corporate Transparency Act in 2020.

That bill was the product of over a decade and a half of attempts and months of bipartisan negotiations—often expertly shepherded by Colin. Today, its passage is giving law enforcement new, modern tools to stop human traffickers and other criminals and root out shell companies.

In his 30-plus years on the Hill, Colin has seen administrations and majorities of both parties come and go. And through them all, he had an uncommon skill at fostering relationships across the aisle. Throughout his career, Colin also became known for his deep knowledge on international sanctions—he was the one that everyone wanted to work with. Sanctions have become one of our country's primary foreign policy tool over the last decade. And Colin was the expert. And of course, that expertise has probably never been more relevant than it has this year, as we have worked to unite this body in support of the President's strong sanctions on Russia.

But these wins are only a small part of Colin's lasting legacy on the Hill—he impacted everyone he worked with. He could work effectively with pretty much everyone—Republicans and Democrats alike, through Presidential administrations of both parties. Colin impressed all of us with that effectiveness, with his dedication to his work, and, perhaps most of all, with his kindness.

He worked toward big-picture goals—from mental health parity to international sanctions—but he never lost sight of the individuals: the people whom he worked with and the people whom we serve.

Those who were lucky enough to work alongside Colin describe him as someone who makes the hard things look flawless, day in and day out—an impressive feat in this line of work. Among staff, he was known for his love of language. Colin sometimes referred to his work as ''toiling in the legislative vineyards''—one of many examples that reflect his natural optimism. He is a voracious reader, and he made good use of the Library of Congress, often getting several books a week delivered to the office.

He always had time for his coworkers, regardless of their position—from the staff director to the interns. He carved out space for everyone to grow professionally and personally. He challenged us, too.

Colin had an open-door policy. His office was always tidy and decorated with pictures of friends and family. And most days, you could find a member of staff—sometimes Banking and Housing, but often from other offices—sitting on his couch asking for advice and counsel. Colin always had wisdom to share.

Colin commuted every day from Baltimore for 24 years—rain or shine. He came in to work early so that, most days, he could catch the 5 p.m. train back to Baltimore and sit down at the dinner table with his family.

To his wife Claire and their children Killian and Patrick: Thank you for sharing him with us.

Colin's dedication and commitment to public service made a difference for so many. Our country is a better place because of his service. And each of us are better because of his leadership.

On behalf of everyone in my office and on the committee and all those who had the honor of working with him, we congratulate Colin on his career, we wish him well in retirement, and we thank him for his service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

(The remarks of Mr. PADILLA pertaining to the introduction of S. 4480

are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. PADILLA. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

S. 2938

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the bill before us.

All too often, we very often applaud instinctively the concept of ''bipartisanship'' but fail to actually evaluate the policies underlying bipartisan legislation and the effect that our policies may have on law-abiding Americans.

Bipartisanship is a good thing. In fact, bipartisanship is an inevitability in any legislative body that contains multiple parties with significant representation. It certainly is an indispensable feature of this legislative body, as it is virtually impossible to pass any legislation—with only the rarest of exceptions arising at most once or twice in a year—except through bipartisanship.

The question isn't whether to achieve bipartisanship or whether it is good but what policies are produced through the bipartisanship in question.

Don't get me wrong—in this polarized climate, it is good when people of different political affiliations and different backgrounds, representing different parts of our great country, are able to come together and have productive conversations. These conversations occur with some regularity. In fact, they occur far more often than most people would assume based on depictions in the news and entertainment media in this country.

It is also good when those conversations lead to legislation that is further refined on the Senate floor through robust debate and an amendment process, one that refines the legislation in question to make sure that all viewpoints have been taken into account. But that is, tragically, not what happened with this legislation. No one—no one except a small ''gang'' of Senators and a few favored members of the news media—no one was allowed to view the legislation until Tuesday evening. Less than an hour later, less than an hour after it had been released to the public, released to us, the Senate was forced to vote on whether we should proceed to the legislation in question.

Immediately after that vote, the majority leader filled the amendment tree and filed the cloture motion to end debate on the bill without a single hearing held or a single amendment having been debated or considered or even offered. In fact, it couldn't be offered because prior to that time, there was nothing to amend.

Now, less than 48 hours after we received the text of this legislation for the very first time, the Senate has voted to end debate—a debate that never really started; a debate that involved not a single amendment passed—no, not one single one; a debate in which there was not a single opportunity for Members to offer improvements to the legislation. No. This small gang came together, materialized, and put together a bill. It released the bill, and all of a sudden, we were expected to vote on it up or down, yes or no, no changes, no questions asked.

Those of us who are not members of this particular gang were told, essentially: Too bad. We don't want your input. Your only option is to support this entire bill, warts and all, ambiguities and all, vagueness and all, without any changes; or, on the other hand, you can oppose it, and you would be accused of savagely not wanting to protect children from school shootings.

That is not what our Founding Fathers envisioned for the U.S. Senate. It is not how they imagined it working. It is also not how it worked for hundreds of years.

For more than two centuries, the U.S. Senate functioned in a way that has had as its distinguishing characteristic those procedures that earned it the title of being the world's greatest deliberative body. Chief among those features was the willingness and the ability of each Member to offer up improvements in the form of amendments and have those amendments considered, debated, discussed, and ultimately voted upon.

But, unfortunately, this is how the Senate has been run over the last few Congresses. Sadly, we have seen some of this under Democratic and Republican leadership alike. This isn't just bad news for the Senate; it is especially bad news for the American people, who deserve better from an entity that still calls itself the world's greatest deliberative body.

It is not without notice that this has become a problem. It is not without notice that we have deviated from this. The thing is, when we deviate from our own procedure and our own processes, the substance shows. The inadequacies of the substance are the natural, foreseeable result. They are the inevitable product of a defiant refusal to abide by our most time-honored procedures: rules and customs.

In this case, the substantive problems with this bill are pretty significant. The restrictions that it imposes on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans are significant, and those impositions come about in such a way that burdens the American people, while doing little or nothing to address actual gun violence committed by prohibited persons in many of our largest cities.

You would think that a bill that purports to be able to keep kids safe in schools would at least have some funding for school security measures or school resource officers, but if you felt that, you would be wrong.

I am very skeptical of Federal intervention in education. If Congress is going to provide billions of dollars of mental health funding to schools and claim to keep kids safe, we should at least allow States to use some of their funding for security measures, like reinforced doors, school resource officers, or training programs for teachers who are allowed to conceal and carry if they choose.

This bill provides Federal grant funding for State red flag laws without sufficient due process protections. This is a trick—a trick—often used by Congress, increasingly so of late. Congress does this sometimes when it has no constitutional authority and sometimes when it lacks political will.

Instead of passing the Federal law at issue—the Federal law that it wishes it could pass—Congress bribes the States with money to pass the laws that Congress wants, that Congress wishes Congress could pass but for whatever reason can't or won't. This allows Members of Congress to go to their home States and take credit for doing ''something,'' even if that ''something'' does nothing to address the problem.

That impulse to do something has been noticed. It has been noticed by Professor Robert Leider of George Mason University and the Antonin Scalia Law School. He penned an op-ed in today's copy of the Wall Street Journal. In that op-ed, he begins with the following words:

> When mass shootings such as Uvalde happen, a rallying cry emerges for Congress to do something—anything—to prevent such tragedies in the future. On Tuesday, senators introduced the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act—their effort to do something. But when your sole rallying cry is to do something, the thing you do may be worse than the status quo. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is a terrible bill, and in its current form, it ought to be defeated by a bipartisan coalition of Congress.

Professor Leider then goes on to explain why opposition to this legislation ought to be coming from the left and from the right. He explains in great detail why Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives alike, sometimes for similar reasons, sometimes for different reasons, should be outraged, should be upset by this legislation. It offends people at every end of the political spectrum. I will go more into some of those details in a moment from Professor Leider.

But, look, when the government seeks to deprive an American citizen—a law-abiding American citizen—of a constitutional right, we have protections in place, and those protections can be found among other provisions in the Constitution. They can be found in the 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution. In both provisions, you have a due process clause. In both the 5th and the 14th Amendments, it says that a person can't be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

What does ''due process'' mean? Well, ''due process'' means the right to be heard. You can't have a deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process. The word ''without'' has been interpreted and fairly does mean ''before.'' You have to have due process before they take it away from you. It

means meaningful review at a meaningful time. It doesn't—it can't mean they can take away life, liberty, or property and then ask questions later. It doesn't mean they can take away life, liberty, and property and thereafter demand that the person from whom they took it return to litigate his or her right to exercise that thing that was taken.

Red flag laws enacted in States thus far get this exactly backward—confiscation first; due process later. That is not how due process works. That is not what due process is. You can call that process, but it is not due process, not for these purposes. It doesn't work.

The confiscation before notice and a hearing, this model—this confiscation before notice and hearing model of red flag laws raises concerns of civil asset forfeiture, when a person is forced to forfeit her firearm pursuant to a civil order without a hearing.

This legislation places overly broad and undefined restrictions on Second Amendment rights—the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens—creating the risk that false allegations could and inevitably would lead to the deprivation of a constitutional right with no recourse afforded to address the harm suffered.

Now, when you look at the legislation, there are pieces of the legislation that pay lipservice to due process. While the legislation, you might say, draws near unto due process with its lips, its heart is far from it. When you read the fine print, the due process of which it refers is not due process at all; it is post-depravation due process.

The very specific procedural protections that we associate with due process—an opportunity to be heard before a fair, impartial tribunal; the opportunity to offer up evidence; the opportunity to cross-examine adverse witnesses, for example—things that we associate as inextricably intertwined with due process because they are, those things are all articulated at the back end of this due process paragraph of the bill.

And it makes reference to the fact that that is the type of due process that, in the view of the bill, can, according to State law, be made either before or after the constitutional depravation in question, depending on the dictates of the State law at issue. That is not due process; that is something else, and that creates a lot of problems.

There are other problems with the legislation dealing with juveniles, problems arising out of uncertainties that the legislation itself creates.

Now, I want to be clear about something: I could certainly consider supporting a measure prohibiting certain older juveniles who have been convicted of crimes as adults, crimes that if they had been committed by an adult would have been deemed felonies, and, on that basis, deem them prohibited persons. I could consider that. There are a lot of public policy questions surrounding that.

And I think there are a lot of people on the left and on the right who would have concerns with opening that up, with saying: We are going to allow—in fact, require—juvenile records to be entered into the NICS system. Remember, the NICS system is a database, a database that is used to identify prohibited persons, persons who are prohibited from buying or otherwise acquiring or even possessing firearms and ammunition, as defined by 18 U.S.C. section 922(g) or, alternatively, persons to whom one may not lawfully sell or otherwise transfer firearms or ammunition, as defined by 18 U.S.C. section 922(d). Both 922(d) that talks about those to whom you may not transfer a weapon and 922(g), those who may not acquire or possess a weapon—both provisions have nine paragraphs attached to them. In each instance, the nine paragraphs are virtually identical. In other words, the universe of those who may not buy or possess weapons is essentially the same as those to whom you may not sell them.

It is almost essential—in fact, the only distinction I can think of under existing law is that while under 922(g) you may not possess a firearm if you are a convicted felon, that same prohibition extends in 922(d) in such a way that you may not sell or otherwise transfer a firearm to a person who is either a convicted felon or has been indicted for a felony and is standing under indictment, under currently pending criminal charges. Other than that, as far as I can tell, 922(d) and 922(g) are coextensive.

This legislation changes that a little bit, and it prohibits the transfer of a weapon, under 922(d), to a person who, as a juvenile, stood convicted of a crime that would be a felony. Now, this creates all sorts of uncertainties in the law because, in many if not most States, juvenile proceedings—what we would consider juvenile criminal proceedings—are, in fact, not criminal proceedings. The defendant isn't entitled to a jury trial. And in the Federal criminal system, a juvenile criminal defendant may not have a jury trial; that even if they want one, even if all the parties were to agree, they can't allow them.

In many State systems, including the State system in my State, the State of Utah, juvenile criminal proceedings are not even criminal proceedings; they are civil proceedings, very often conducted under civil law procedures rather than criminal law procedures. So the same protections aren't in place.

Again, I am open to the idea of opening this up because I think there are some juveniles who commit some offenses, particularly in their later teenage years, that perhaps ought to be taken into account for purposes of 922(d) such that you can't give them a gun or under 922(g) such that they may not possess a gun without committing a felony.

I think we could have that debate and discussion. We should have that debate and discussion. That hasn't occurred here. Instead, what we have done is muddied the waters by creating a very significant difference between 922(d) and 922(g), between those prohibited from being given a gun and those who are prohibited from possessing a gun. But we haven't defined it well, and it is not really clear what it is that we are doing or what it is that makes it fair; nor is it clear, as I read the legislation—and, again, it has been less than 48 hours since we have had access to it. It is about 80 pages long. It doesn't read like a fast-paced novel. It is full of cross-references.

And even someone such as a former Federal prosecutor who is very familiar with these laws and prosecuted cases under them—even with that level of familiarity, it has taken me some time to get through it and understand what it means. In fact, to this moment, it is difficult for me to ascertain exactly how far these changes go.

It is not clear to me, for instance, which kinds of criminal records for juveniles will be added onto the NICS system. Remember, the NICS system is this database that identifies those prohibited from possessing firearms or being given firearms under 922(g) and 922(d), respectively. It is a database that keeps track of those prohibited persons. It is not clear to me which types of juvenile records can be taken into account in those proceedings.

This also allows for a prohibited—one can be a prohibited person under 922(d) and 922(g) if they have been adjudicated—and this is terribly awkward language—if they have been adjudicated as a ''mental defective'' or if they have been ordered institutionalized. No one really knows what that term means. It is a sloppy term. It is an offensive term to many, and it is full of uncertainty.

We have compounded the uncertainty by now saying that mental health records of older teenagers, those between 16 and 18, will now be uploaded onto the NICS system such that certain mental health crises one experiences as an older teenager could result in an older teenager later in life being unable to possess a firearm without committing a felony.

That raises some concerns—or at least those drafting the bill would probably interpret it differently, to say they may possess one in some cases but not necessarily be someone to whom a gun can lawfully be sold or otherwise transferred. That also raises additional questions. Sections 922(d) and 922(g) are currently nearly identical, except in the rare exception that I noted just a moment ago.

Yet we have had no conversations about these. We have had no conversations about what this does for juvenile criminal justice, about what this does to the rights of individuals who, as juveniles, may not fully understand the ramifications of the criminal proceedings against them or of decisions regarding their mental health at the

time those decisions are made and that might affect them later in life, including after they have become adults.

My point is not to say these things don't matter. They do. And I think there are a lot of these people who probably shouldn't have guns and should be prohibited persons, but we need to know what we are doing. We need to agree on what is actually happening because right now we take some areas of the law that are already fraught with some uncertainty, and we are magnifying that uncertainty manyfold.

I think that is dangerous, and I think it is dangerous in a way that both Democrats and Republicans ought to find offensive—sometimes for the same reasons, sometimes for entirely different reasons. My point is this. There is no reason why legislation like this—it does—it has got some good provisions in it. There is no reason why this couldn't be amended in such a way that would allow more Members of this body to vote for it or vote against it, depending on what it looked like at the end of the day.

But the way it is written, it has got a lot of problems with it. We have got the due process problem that I mentioned with the red flag laws. That is their distinguishing characteristic is due process problem. You have got the juvenile records problem that I mentioned just a moment ago. It is not fair to people to leave them in that state of uncertainty, especially juveniles. So that ought to be a concern to all of us.

Perhaps we might get to the place where these provisions do just what the proponents of the bill say that it does. But in this instance, as in so many other areas, the best way to get there is to go through the normal deliberative process, the process that long defined this institution as the world's greatest deliberative body, which includes a full opportunity to present and vote on amendments and to hear concerns and objections raised by Members of this body, Members of this body some of whom have experience with the statutory framework in question and can offer insights as to what might have been overlooked.

Now, look, I speak here of my colleagues who were part of this effort. I speak with great respect toward them and admiration for the fact that I think they are motivated, by and large, by a desire to help people. I don't think any Member of this body wakes up every day and says, ''I want to make America less safe'' or ''I want to make America less fair.'' I don't think that is what is going on.

But I do think we delude ourselves, we sell ourselves short, and we harm our constituents when we pretend that it is OK to pull the functional equivalent, the legislative equivalent, of running through a congested intersection with our eyes closed and think that that is not going to cause problems. That is exactly what we are doing here. This is the legislative equivalent of driving with your eyes closed through a busy intersection, and we are making some really big mistakes here. And a lot of these are mistakes that could be fixed with relative ease.

Now we will never know. We will never know what might have happened. It may be that this could have been something that, had we gone through the whole amendment process, could have been supported by nearly all or even all Members of this body, but we will never know of that now. We will never have that opportunity. Instead, we are going to push through this rushed piece of legislation that I am convinced no one had read in its entirety prior to its release and, essentially, no one was familiar with by the time we started voting on it.

And then we were told: No opportunity to make it better. If you notice a problem with it—and I have noticed several—we really don't care to hear about it. Expediency demands that we somehow just rush this through.

But the American people deserve better. There are, moreover, other provisions of the legislation that have raised some eyebrows in some corners. They are provisions of this bill that provide funding to encourage States to provide Medicaid and CHIP services in schools under the auspices of an effort to increase access to mental health, to mental health services in the schools.

While Federal Medicaid funding is, of course, something that cannot lawfully be used to perform abortions except in the case of rape, incest, or to preserve the life of the mother, some have pointed out that schools under this legislation easily could use the clinics established under the bill as a means of accomplishing the provision of abortions and also prescribe abortifacient drugs using State rather than Federal Medicaid funds. There has been some discussion even today about this. The fact that we still don't know this is troubling to many. I certainly would like to know what the definitive answer to it is. As far as I can tell, it does open the door to that, and we ought to at least have that discussion.

Now, there are some legislative options before us that address things that can be done practically to improve safety. One is the Luke and Alex School Safety Act, which is included in this bill. Like I said, there are plenty of things in this bill that are unobjectionable. And this is, certainly, first among them. And it codifies into law the Federal clearinghouse on school safety. I spoke in favor of this bill at a Judiciary Committee hearing just last week.

Additionally, I support the bill's provisions increasing penalties for straw purchasers who know or have reason to know that the gun they are purchasing for someone might be used in a crime. And I am open to other proposals that tackle safety in schools head-on.

Senator MARSHALL, from Kansas, has an interesting amendment that would use unspent COVID funds to improve school safety and school security.

Look, there are a lot of things in this legislation that really ought to be discussed in greater detail. And we haven't been able to discuss them. We haven't been able to debate them. We haven't been able to amend them because of the rushed process. It begs the question: Why are we in such a rush? Don't America's schoolchildren and America's teachers and America's moms and dads deserve better consideration than this?

Schools are out for the summer at the moment. It would actually be a good thing for us to take a few more weeks to debate and discuss these things and get to a better solution. Why are we rushing it?

I want to get back to the juvenile provisions for a minute. This is something that Professor Leider speaks about at some length. And he raised some observations that I hadn't entirely considered. And I would like to share some portions of that. At the end of this, I will be offering this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this op-ed submitted by Professor Leider.

Professor Leider describes one feature of the bill as particularly discouraging, particular troubling. I spoke of the juvenile provisions a moment ago. I identified some troubling features of them. Professor Leider gives additional commentary on this and provides additional observations, not all of which had been noticed by me. Here is how he puts it:

> The most significant provision in the bill is the prohibition against firearm possession by those convicted of a misdemeanor violent crime against a dating partner—closing the ''boyfriend loophole.''

He goes through this after he has discussed the problems with the juvenile provisions, noting that this will create disparities. It will cause uncertainties with juvenile offenders of one sort or another. And then he does go through a fuller explanation of how those operating under the boyfriend loophole provisions might be affected.

He continues:

> But the senators who negotiated this bill evidently couldn't agree on the definition of a dating partner. They define ''dating relationship'' as a ''relationship between individuals who have or have recently had a continuing serious relationship of a romantic or intimate nature.'' But relationships come in all forms, and this definition provides little guidance.

He continues:

> The senators provided three criteria for consideration: (1) the length of the relationship, (2) the nature of the relationship and (3) the frequency and type of interaction between the people involved in the relationship.

Professor Leider continues:

> This means that a ''continuing serious relationship'' will be some function of quantity of dates, length of time and physical intimacy. But these vague factors don't provide fair notice and are susceptible to inconsistent application.

We pause there to just note what he is referring to. The so-called boyfriend

loophole exists because two of the provisions in 18 USC 922(g), defining the prohibitive persons, paragraphs 8 and 9 respectively, apply to those individuals who have either been in receipt of a restraining order arising out of a domestic relationship, under paragraph 8, or those who have been convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence under paragraph 9 of 922(g).

In both cases, there has to be a relationship that makes it about a domestic situation, has to be an intimate partner of one sort or another. Current law tends to define that as a spouse—when you are dealing with a spouse or a live-in partner, for example. But this provision seeks to address what the sponsors of the bill referred to as the ''boyfriend loophole,'' meaning what about someone who is not married and who doesn't reside with or hasn't resided in the past, didn't reside at the time with the person but was nonetheless in a type of romantic relationship.

Now, here again, it is not a bad impulse to want to close some ambiguities in the law, but you have got to do it with language that makes sense. You have to do it with language that puts people on fair notice of what the consequences of a guilty plea might be or what the consequences of not litigating more aggressively in the context of a restraining order or something like that might be. Particularly in the context of 922(g)9, where we are dealing with a domestic violence misdemeanor, the person needs to know when that person is being asked to plead guilty what consequences that might have on the person later in life. And those questions aren't answered here.

Professor Leider continues:

By failing to define ''dating relationship''—

The term ''dating relationship''—

[A]dequately—

That is the term of art that they introduced into this legislation—

Congress is effectively delegating the critical question of who falls within this ban. To whom it is delegating the hard details remains to be determined. Perhaps it will be to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, which has regulatory authorities over firearms or the courts may decide as they resolve cases. Either way, Congress has yet again handed off its responsibility for defining crimes to unelected bureaucrats and judges.

Then he continues:

Until a specific definition exists, it is unclear how the federal government will implement this prohibition. Suppose a criminal-records check indicates that a potential purchaser has committed assault or battery. What next? Maybe the trial record will show that the defendant was in a relationship with the complaining witness. Or maybe it won't.

If such information is available, how is the examiner supposed to gauge the relationship? The available records likely won't provide the precise details of the relationship. Even if they do, the examiner still has to decide whether the relationship was serious enough to trigger the gun disability. The Senate compromise feeds many prospective gun owners to the bureaucratic wolves.

Professor Leider's point is an excellent one. When people are going through criminal proceedings, if they have been charged with a misdemeanor and they are deciding how aggressively to fight it—whether to take it to trial, whether to plead guilty, under what terms to plead guilty—it is nearly always going to be in State court. After all, very few criminal convictions are in criminal court, a tiny percentage of them. And the prohibited persons, as defined under sections 922(d) and 922(g), the underlying convictions can be either State or Federal.

These proceedings, nearly always taking place in State court rather than Federal court, are not going to be in a position, it is not knowing to be within their jurisdiction to decide whether, or to what extent, this will put them in that status, in that boyfriend status, in that status of a ''dating relationship.''

The fact that the term is so vague, the structure is so broad and undefined that it is not reasonably possible to know what consequences the law might attach to a guilty plea in that circumstance or to a conviction following a jury trial in that circumstance.

You know, James Madison said, in ''Federalist No. 62''—and I am paraphrasing here—something to the effect that it will be of little avail to the American people that their laws may be written by individuals of their own choosing. If those laws are so voluminous, complex, or ever changing that they can't reasonably know from one day to the next what the law requires of them, this is one of those moments. We are imposing a pretty significant restriction—a restriction on a constitutionally protected right, one that may well apply for the rest of their life in some cases without them even knowing what is happening.

This is the kind of rain that will fall on the criminal defendant of all backgrounds, of all political views. Every demographic could be harmed by this in one way or another. So it really would be better if we were taking the time to draft this legislation carefully. And that is my No. 1 complaint. That is why I can't vote for it.

There are some things in here I wish I could vote for, but they have lumped it all together. They said: Here you go. Take it or leave it.

But, look, you put red flag laws in here, knowing the red flag laws, the way we have now outsourced them to States and that we have now started paying the States, giving them money to adopt red flag laws whose distinguishing characteristic is to take away someone's constitutionally protected right without due process of law—that is a problem. And when you add to that complexity by adding uncertainty about the juvenile records problem that I identified, which ought to be concerning to many liberals as well as many conservatives, and when you add to that by coming up with this vague, broad definition of ''dating relationship,'' it has huge consequences with no reasonable ability to understand and ascertain how certain court proceedings might affect someone's rights, perhaps for the rest of their life, that is a problem.

It doesn't have to be this way. I look forward to the day when the Senate will operate the way that it was designed to, the way that it once did, the way that, in fact, it has operated in the not-too-distant past. But we have to demand it. As long as people continue to tolerate, continue to accept and condone and reward and encourage this type of sham process, we will be left with subpar legislation, sloppily written.

I will conclude with the words, once again, of Professor Leider, who says it well.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will likely pass because members of Congress feel enormous pressure to do something. But it is not a good bill, and it deserves further deliberation and refinement. The Senate's job is to help draft good laws by cooling the passions of the moment. Right now, it is failing.

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

(By Robert Leider)

''When mass shootings such as Uvalde happen, a rallying cry emerges for Congress to do something—anything—to prevent such tragedies in the future. On Tuesday senators introduced the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act—their effort to do something. But when your sole rallying cry is to do something, the thing you do may be worse than the status quo. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is a terrible bill, and in its current form, it ought to be defeated by a bipartisan political coalition of Congress.

Liberals should hate the bill because most of its gun-control provisions are antithetical to their criminal-justice reform agenda. The law expands the categories of those to whom it is unlawful to sell a gun or ammunition to include anyone convicted of a felony as a juvenile. This will ensnare many because the modern definition of a ''felony'' is exceptionally broad and includes offenses that aren't particularly serious. The bill also changes the federal prohibition on selling firearms to those who have been involuntarily committed to a mental institution. While it excludes involuntary commitments before age 16, the bill significantly strengthens the enforcement of the prohibition against those involuntarily committed between 16 and 18.

We should be cautious before we make it impossible for children to live normal adult lives. As liberals often point out (particularly when the death penalty is involved), children and teenagers lack maturity and impulse control. If this bill becomes law, a 12-year-old who joyrides in a car may find that he may never be allowed to purchase a gun or ammunition. Although liberals may not cry at the thought of fewer people being able to own guns, they should be concerned. A gun ban for youthful indiscretions means that these juveniles will become unemployable as adults in many security, law-enforcement and military positions that require firearm possession. And this ban will affect them no matter how much time has passed since their juvenile convictions.

The gun ban would have significant racial and socioeconomic disparities. Wealthy communities will find ways around the gun ban for their children: having robust pretrial diversion programs that don't result in technical convictions, accessing pardons through the political process, and hiring lawyers to

expunge convictions. In poorer communities, children will simply be forced to take pleas that will forever alter their futures. The same goes on the mental-health side: Wealthy parents can seek voluntary treatment for their children in circumstances that may cause poorer families to seek involuntary commitment. The bill also raises the maximum prison term for unlawful firearm possession from 10 years to 15, and these regulatory offenses—as liberals often complain—disproportionately affect poor and minority communities.

Conservatives and gun owners should hate the bill, too. Gun owners who have committed juvenile indiscretions will find that they are no longer able to purchase firearms or ammunition. The bill also has strange technical defects. It prohibits the sale of guns and ammunition to those convicted of juvenile offenses, but it doesn't explicitly ban possession—a loophole that someone will clamor to close later. For adults who had involuntary commitments before they were 16, the reverse is true:

The bill allows firearms to be sold to them, but it doesn't decriminalize their possession of a firearm.

The most significant provision in the bill is the prohibition against firearm possession by those convicted of a misdemeanor violent crime against a dating partner—closing the ''boyfriend loophole.'' But the senators who negotiated this bill evidently couldn't agree on the definition of a dating partner. They define ''dating relationship'' as a ''relationship between individuals who have or have recently had a continuing serious relationship of a romantic or intimate nature.'' But relationships come in all forms, and this definition provides little guidance. The senators provided three criteria for consideration: (1) the length of the relationship, (2) the nature of the relationship and (3) the frequency and type of interaction between the people involved in the relationship. This means that a ''continuing serious relationship'' will be some function of quantity of dates, length of time and physical intimacy. But these vague factors don't provide fair notice and are susceptible to inconsistent application.

By failing to define ''dating relationship'' adequately, Congress is effectively delegating the critical question of who falls within this ban. To whom it is delegating the hard details remains to be determined. Perhaps it will be the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, which has regulatory authority over firearms. Or the courts may decide as they resolve cases. Either way, Congress has yet again handed off its responsibility for defining crimes to unelected bureaucrats and judges.

Until a specific definition exists, it is unclear how the federal government will implement this prohibition. Suppose a criminal-records check indicates that a potential purchaser has committed assault or battery. What next? Maybe the trial record will show that the defendant was in a relationship with the complaining witness. Or maybe it won't. If such information is available, how is the examiner supposed to gauge the relationship? The available records likely won't provide the precise details of the relationship. Even if they do, the examiner still has to decide whether the relationship was serious enough to trigger the gun disability. The Senate compromise feeds many prospective gun owners to the bureaucratic wolves.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will likely pass because members of Congress feel enormous pressure to do something. But it is not a good bill, and it deserves further deliberation and refinement. The Senate's job is to help draft good laws by cooling the passions of the moment. Right now, it is failing.''

Mr. LEE. I yield the floor.

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

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the pending business on the floor.

The Presiding Officer and I both arrived in the Senate at the same time 10 years ago. When you and I had barely been here a few days, the country was shocked with a tragic shooting, the Sandy Hook shooting in Newtown, CT, when a deranged monster came in and murdered little children—elementary school children. Everyone across the country was horrified; and over the past decade, we have seen that pattern repeat itself over and over again.

Tragically, my home State of Texas has seen more than our fair share of horrific crime, of mass murder, most recently in Uvalde. I was there in Uvalde the day after the shooting where a deranged monster murdered 19 little children and 2 teachers.

Before that, I was in Santa Fe where yet another deranged monster murdered schoolchildren.

I was in Sutherland Springs, the worst church shooting in U.S. history. I stood in that sanctuary the day after the shooting, a beautiful, small country church. The pews had been flung aside in the chaos. There was shattered glass. There was a cell phone with a shattered screen covered in blood.

And I saw the pool of blood where an 18-month-old child was systematically murdered by that psychopath. I was in El Paso; I was in Midland-Odessa; I was in Dallas. Over and over again, we have seen the face of evil. We have seen horrific crimes. And let me be the first to say there are too damn many of these. And we need to stop them.

Unfortunately, I have also seen what inevitably follows these horrific crimes, which is a political debate that breaks out within seconds of the crime occurring.

There are two principal approaches one can take to try to prevent crimes like this. One is to target the bad guys, to focus on criminals, to focus on felons, to focus on fugitives, to focus on those trying to illegally buy guns, to put them in jail, to lock them up, to get them off the street so that they cannot terrorize and murder innocent people. That is the approach that actually works. That is the approach that is actually successful. That is the approach that is most likely to prevent subsequent mass murders.

There is a second approach, which is an approach that is disarming law-abiding citizens. Inevitably, Democratic members of this Chamber, minutes after an attack, move towards wanting to disarm law-abiding citizens. That approach is, I believe, No. 1, unconstitutional; but, No. 2, it doesn't work. It is ineffective.

Put simply, taking guns away from law-abiding citizens—disarming you or disarming me—is not going to stop a mass murder. And we know this. If you look across the country consistently, the jurisdictions with the strictest gun control laws over and over again have among the highest crime rates and among the highest murder rates.

When you disarm law-abiding citizens, what happens is the people who follow the law disarm. That is almost by definition if they are law-abiding citizens. But the criminals don't follow the laws.

And if you disarm all the victims, the result is it is easier for the criminals to commit their acts of mayhem.

Let me point out a statistic that many Americans don't know. It is a statistic that comes from the Barack Obama White House, so it is hardly a rightwing source. According to the Barack Obama White House, every year in America, firearms are used defensively to stop a crime between 500,000 and 1 million times each and every year.

What does that mean? That means that if Democratic proposals to disarm law-abiding citizens succeed, the result will be even more crimes. The result will be those 500,000 to a million crimes that are right now stopped every year won't be stopped.

That means more assaults. That means more sexual assaults. That means more murders. That means single moms riding home on the train, if they are not able to have a revolver in their purse to defend themselves from marauding criminals, then they are left defenseless.

In debates over how to approach violent crime, that 500,000 to a million people each year who are using a firearm to stop a crime, they get left out of a lot of these discussions. But they would be victims if Democratic Senators succeed in taking away their right to keep and bear arms.

When the Presiding Officer and I were brand new here in the wake of Newtown, CT, there was a Democrat majority in this body at the time. Harry Reid was the majority leader. Barack Obama had just been reelected President. And you will recall well Senate Democrats were exultant. Senator SCHUMER was on TV saying we were in the sweet spot to finally pass far-reaching gun control.

And I will tell you the colleagues on my side of the aisle were discouraged and demoralized, and many thought there was nothing we could do to stop the agenda that was being pushed forward.

Well, I can tell you, I didn't believe it then, and I don't believe it now. And so I sat down and drafted legislation designed to actually do what every person in this Chamber, I believe, really wants to do, which is stop violent crime, stop these murders, stop the next lunatic who would shoot up a school or shoot up a church or shoot up a mall or shoot up a grocery store.

The legislation I drafted was called Grassley-Cruz. I teamed up with my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa, CHUCK GRASSLEY. Grassley-Cruz focused on several things. First of all,

it focused on strengthening the background check system. It required the Department of Justice to conduct an audit of every Federal agency to make sure that any felony convictions are reported to the background check system.

It provided funding and incentives for States to report felony convictions to the background check system. Interestingly, many States have a lousy record of reporting felonies to the background check database. Ironically, many of those are blue States led by Democrats who talk about gun control, and yet the State governments and local governments often fail to report felony convictions to the database.

Grassley-Cruz provided strong incentives to get those felony convictions in the database. Secondly, Grassley-Cruz provided funding for prosecutors to prosecute those who commit violent crimes with firearms and put them in jail.

Third, Grassley-Cruz provided funding for the Department of Justice to create a gun crime task force to prosecute felons and fugitives who try to illegally buy guns.

Many people don't know this, but it is actually quite shocking. The Department of Justice has a consistent pattern of refusing to prosecute felons and fugitives who illegally try to buy guns.

In the year 2010, roughly 48,000 felons and fugitives tried to illegally purchase firearms. Of those 48,000, the Obama Justice Department prosecuted 44 of them—not even 50—44 out of 48,000. I think that is completely unacceptable.

So Grassley-Cruz provided funding and directed the Department of Justice: Prosecute them and put them in jail. And on top of that, Grassley-Cruz created grants for schools to enhance school safety, to enhance security, to make our schools and make our kids safer.

So what happened? Well, Grassley-Cruz, we voted on it here on the floor of the Senate. And Grassley-Cruz received a majority vote on the Senate floor, 52 Senators voted in favor of Grassley-Cruz, including nine Democrats. Remember, this was a Democrat Senate. Democrats had a sizable majority, and yet nine Democrats—we got the most bipartisan support of any of the comprehensive legislation that was considered on the floor.

So why didn't Grassley-Cruz pass into law? We got a majority vote in the Senate. Well, the answer is simple: Grassley-Cruz didn't pass because Senate Democrats filibustered it. They demanded 60 votes; and so even though it got a majority, it didn't get 60, and it didn't pass.

I am going to share something that is deeply frustrating.

There is a powerful argument that had Grassley-Cruz passed, had Senate Democrats not filibustered it, that multiple of these mass shootings in Texas could have been prevented.

Let's start with Sutherland Springs. Sutherland Springs should never have happened. The shooter was doubly ineligible to buy a firearm. He had a felony conviction. He had a domestic conviction. So under Federal law, existing Federal law, it was illegal for him to buy a gun.

So how did he get his gun?

Well, the Air Force, in the Obama administration, failed to report his felony conviction to the background check database. It wasn't in there.

So the shooter went to buy a gun. He filled out the background check form, and he lied. He lied on the form. The form asked: Do you have a felony conviction? He said: No.

The form asked: Do you have a domestic violence conviction? He said: No.

They ran the check, and it came up clean because the Obama Air Force never reported the felony and so it wasn't in the database and so it came up clean.

He bought that gun, and he used it to murder those innocent people in that beautiful sanctuary.

If Grassley-Cruz had passed, presumably, the mandated Department of Justice audit of every Federal Agency would have caught that felony conviction. The whole purpose of the audit was to make sure we catch every felony conviction that is out there, which would have meant his conviction would have been in the database, but that is where the second part of Grassley-Cruz matters because when he went in and lied on that form, he committed two more felonies. When he checked ''I don't have a felony conviction,'' that is the felony. Lying on that form is a felony. It is a crime.

When he checked ''I don't have a domestic violence conviction,'' that is the felony. And Grassley-Cruz would have directed the Department of Justice: Prosecute him, and put him in jail. And that monster would have been locked in a 6-by-8 concrete cell instead of murdering innocent people in the wonderful community of Sutherland Springs.

You also look at Santa Fe and Uvalde, and there is a possibility that both of those crimes could have been prevented by Grassley-Cruz.

Part of Grassley-Cruz was funding to enhance school security—grants to go to schools. One of the things that is frustrating about these school shootings is they follow predictable patterns.

In Parkland, FL, the shooter jumped over a fence and came inside. In Santa Fe, the shooter went in an unlocked side entrance.

Afterward—you know, the Santa Fe High School is less than an hour from my house. I was at home that morning, the morning of the shooting. I was on that campus about an hour after the shooting occurred. It was horrific. It was tragic. I grieved and cried with the parents who lost their children that day.

I remember sitting down afterward at a roundtable with the parents from Santa Fe and parents from other mass shootings that occurred and talking about what are the solutions we can do. How can we prevent this?

One of the solutions we discussed was best practices. How do you make a school safer? One of those best practices is limiting the number of entrances to a school—ideally, bringing it down to one single main entrance, the front entrance.

Now, that doesn't mean, as some on the Twittersphere have said, that you have no fire exits. Of course, you have fire exits. It means you do what we do in many other places—in Federal buildings, in banks, in courthouses. It is a standard security step to have one major entrance to a building if that building is at risk of violence, and that one main entrance is then much, much safer if you have armed police officers at that entrance.

When you go into a bank, there is a reason you see an armed officer at the entrance. When you go into a courthouse, there is a reason you see an armed officer at the entrance. When you go into the U.S. Capitol, there is a reason you see an armed officer at the entrance. Our kids are at least as valuable.

If the Santa Fe High School or the Robb Elementary School had been able to get a school funding grant to enhance security, those crimes could have been prevented because, I will tell you, when I was in Uvalde the day after the shooting, what was so infuriating is that monster got in the exact same way—through an open back door. Just like in Santa Fe, he got in through an open back door; he got into the classroom; and he began murdering children long before he encountered anyone from law enforcement.

If, instead, that door had been locked, if he had been forced to come around to the front main entrance, if at the front main entrance there were armed police officers, they could have shot that monster dead outside, and 19 children and 2 teachers would still be alive.

So, like millions across this country, I am angry. I am angry that these horrific crimes keep happening.

But I am also angry that this august Chamber plays political games. The bill that is before this body is being heralded in the press as a bipartisan bill because it has got every Democrat and some Republicans.

I think the chances that this bill will do anything meaningful to actually prevent the next mass murder are very low. That is not what this bill is designed to do.

This bill is designed, among other things, to satiate the urge to do something. After every one of these, the call comes out: Do something. I agree. Do something. But do something that works. Do something that will stop these crimes. This bill ain't that.

But it does have provisions that are troubling. It does have provisions that

satisfy the Democratic political priority to go after the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms of law-abiding citizens.

Most troubling in this bill is the funding of so-called red flag laws. Now, these so-called red flag laws have been implemented in multiple States, and they enable the State to take away the right to keep and bear arms from law-abiding citizens.

They render you vulnerable; that if you have a disgruntled coworker, if you have an angry ex-boyfriend, an angry ex-girlfriend, they can go and give the State the power to strip you of the right to keep and bear arms—not if you are a criminal, not if you have committed crimes, not if you have been adjudicated to be a danger to yourself or others. All of those are existing law. Red flag laws lower the threshold and make it easier to take away your right to defend yourself.

And in too many of these States, these provisions have little to no protections of due process.

If the Senate passes this bill, Federal dollars will be used to encourage more States to enact laws like this. That means Federal tax dollars will be used to implement programs that will strip away Americans' constitutional rights.

And mark my words, people will lose their lives over this; that we will see red flag laws that are abused and citizens who are disarmed—and, tragically, we are going to see a citizen who is disarmed who is subsequently murdered.

Look, the right to keep and bear arms—it is not about hunting. It is not about skeet shooting. Those can be a lot of fun to do, but that is not why it is in the Constitution. The Bill of Rights does not have an amendment devoted to recreational shooting.

The reason the Second Amendment is in the Bill of Rights is because you and I and every American have a God-given right to defend our life. There is no right more fundamental than the right to defend your own life and the right to defend your family. If a criminal comes into your house at night seeking to do harm to your children, you and I have a right, I believe that derives from God Almighty, to defend our kids, and whether any individual Member of this Chamber agrees with that right or not doesn't really matter because it is right there in the Bill of Rights. So the Constitution protects it whether you agree with it or not.

And the reason I say these red flag laws, we are going to see people lose their lives over it, is because often when people go and buy a firearm, it is because they are afraid. It is because maybe they have got an angry ex-boyfriend, an angry ex-girlfriend. Maybe they have got a neighbor whom they are scared of. Maybe they have got someone threatening them. And we are going to see these laws abused to disarm someone who is subsequently made the victim of a violent crime.

And none of the politicians in this Chamber who vote for this bill will take any responsibility for the people's lives that will be lost because of it.

You might say: Well, look, that is all fine and good, but if you don't like this bill, what should we do?

Well, it so happens I have an answer to that. This week, I filed legislation, along with Senator JOHN BARRASSO from Wyoming. The Cruz-Barrasso legislation builds on what already received a majority vote in this Chamber, the Grassley-Cruz legislation of a decade ago.

Let me tell you what Cruz-Barrasso does. It focuses on actually stopping this problem. So Cruz-Barrasso funds the Department of Justice to prosecute violent criminals who use firearms.

Mr. President, you are from the Commonwealth of Virginia, a wonderful State. As you know well, some of the most important work stopping violent crime and gun crime was pioneered in the Commonwealth of Virginia. During the Bill Clinton Presidency, an initiative was started called Project Exile in the Western District of Virginia. The U.S. attorney there laid out a policy that if anyone commits a crime with a firearm who is illegally possessing that firearm, meaning likely they are a felon in possession, that the Feds were going to prosecute them, put them in jail, and they are going to face mandatory minimum crimes.

And the U.S. attorney passed out to local prosecutors laminated cards saying: Here are all the Federal prohibitions on gun possession. They put up ads. They put up billboards in Richmond, VA. Richmond tragically had an incredibly high murder rate. They put up billboards: Carry a gun, do hard time.

And Project Exile worked phenomenally. The murder rate in Richmond, VA, plummeted, and we began hearing stories of criminals—criminals who would come to knock off a liquor store, criminals who would come to do a home burglary, who would leave their gun at home. They would say: Do you know what? Look, if I break into this house and I have got a gun with me, I am doing hard time in Federal prison. I think I will just go there without a gun. It worked.

What does Cruz-Barrasso do? It takes Project Exile national. It provides funding for U.S. attorneys to prosecute. If you commit a crime and you have got a gun, you are off the streets.

You want to stop these crimes? That is the step that will stop these crimes.

What else does Cruz-Barrasso do? It creates a gun crime task force at the Department of Justice to prosecute the felons and fugitives year after year after year who try to illegally buy a gun and whom DOJ won't prosecute right now.

If Cruz-Barrasso passes, the next Sutherland Springs can be stopped.

You know, there are some Democrat officials who say: We don't have time to prosecute people who try to illegally buy guns. I repeatedly heard testimony from Democratic witnesses on the Judiciary Committee saying that.

Let me tell you something right now. If a murderer or a felon is trying to illegally buy a gun, I don't think that is a paperwork offense; I think they should be prosecuted and put in jail.

What else does Cruz-Barrasso do? It provides major funding to make our schools safer. It provides much more funding than the Democrats' bill. All told, there is $36 billion in this bill.

It provides funding to double the number of police officers in schools across America—to double them. If you want to keep kids safe, the single best step you can do is have police officers on campus so that our children have the same protection that Members of Congress do; so that our children have the same protection that courthouses do; so that our children have the same protection that banks do.

Cruz-Barrasso will double the number of police officers in schools across America—not only that, let's talk mental health. We all know there is a problem. These deranged shooters over and over again follow similar patterns of being isolated, angry loners with a long pattern of struggling with mental health, often making multiple threats before they carry out a horrific crime.

Cruz-Barrasso provides $10 billion in funding for mental health counselors in schools across the country to help identify troubled youth and to stop them before they commit a crime like this.

(Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

Now, earlier today, there had been discussion that Majority Leader SCHUMER would schedule a vote on Cruz-Barrasso. Right now, it appears that may not happen. We are going to vote one way or another, and if I have to exercise the procedural avenues available to me as a Senator to force that vote, I am more than happy to do so. But let me tell you actually why we are not seeing the vote so far—because my amendment is drafted as a substitute. In other words, it would replace the pending bill on the floor, and an awful lot of Senators don't want to have to vote on that.

Now, I challenge any Senator in this Chamber to try to make the case that this Democrat bill on the floor would be even half as effective in stopping violent crime, in stopping mass shootings, in stopping criminals from murdering children in schools, as my legislation would be. The Democrat bill has a fraction of the funding for police officers. It has a fraction of the funding for mental health. The Democrat bill doesn't provide that violent felons who use guns should be prosecuted. The Democrat bill doesn't provide that people who illegally try to buy firearms, who are felons and fugitives, should be prosecuted. The Democrat bill is not focused on criminals. It is not focused on bad guys. It is focused on the Democrat priority of disarming law-abiding citizens. That is a political priority that too many Senate Democrats value more than keeping kids safe.

So if we don't see a straight-up vote on my amendment, it is because too

many Senators in this Chamber don't want to vote on a head-to-head choice between actually keeping kids safe versus achieving the political agenda of the left of disarming law-abiding citizens. That is wrong. It is cynical.

I have to say that in these debates—listen, this is a topic that is emotional. It is a topic that is personal. It is a topic where inevitably the rhetoric gets overheated. It gets overheated on both sides.

Some years ago, I found myself, curiously enough, in a Twitter debate with Alyssa Milano, the actress from Hollywood, the leftwing activist, over the question of guns. We began going back and forth over gun control and the Second Amendment, and at some point, she said something to the effect of, you wouldn't dare sit down and have this conversation with me in person. I said: Of course I would. I invited her to come to my office, and she did. She came to my office, and what proceeded is we had a 90-minute discussion and debate about violent crime, about gun control, and about the Second Amendment. We live-streamed it, so anyone who wants to see it can go and watch a 90-minute discussion. I will say, I commend Ms. Milano. I think the two of us managed to have a much more civil conversation on this than most of the interlocutors on this topic.

One of the things I said to her at the start of that discussion was, I said: Listen, if we start from the premise—if we sit in this room and look at each other and we both assume the other is evil, the other is lying, the other seeks to do harm, we are not going to have a very productive conversation. If each of us thinks of the other ''You want children to die; you want people to be murdered,'' you know what, that is not going to lead to a very productive conversation.

I suggested to her—I said: Why don't we start from the proposition that you and I both would like to see innocent people protected and safe; that you and I both, like anyone sane and rational, are utterly horrified at the depraved monsters who murder innocent people and especially those who murder children?

There is a special circle of Hell for the people who hurt kids.

If we start from the premise that even though we are of different political parties and even though we may believe different things politically, we both want to see human life preserved, then maybe we can have a productive discussion about what steps can be taken to be most effective in saving human life.

We agreed that we both want to prevent future murders, that we both want to protect our kids and your kids and kids across America. Then we can have a real discussion that is factual, that is empirical, that is based on evidence, that is based on data, as to what policies are actually effective in stopping violent crime.

There was a time when this august Chamber had discussions like that, had debates.

I would note, this particular bill—there have been no committee hearings on it. There has been no meaningful debate. This is an exercise of partisan power and political objectives.

So we are not engaged in a meaningful discussion of what policies are actually effective in stopping crime, preventing mass murder, and protecting children. If we were, I would challenge any Democrat in the Chamber to stand up and explain how on Earth this Democrat bill could be even half as effective in preventing school shootings as the Cruz-Barrasso bill. By any measure, the legislation that I am fighting for is stronger, it will put more violent gun criminals in jail, and it will double the number of police officers in schools across America. It will make our children safer.

If we were willing to have a discussion about substance, about the merits, that should be a pretty easy discussion, but, sadly, too many in this body immediately play politics and also give in to the overheated rhetoric on this issue.

Those who advocate gun control inevitably say: If you support the Second Amendment, blood is on your hands.

Well, let me tell you something: If you oppose the Second Amendment and you disarm people who become victims of violent crime, blood is on your hands.

Rather than either of us saying language like that, it seems to me we should come together and say: How do we stop the bad guys? What works? What is effective? What can we do together to make sure to maximize the chances that we prevent another Uvalde, another Santa Fe, another Sutherland Springs, another El Paso, another Midland-Odessa, another Dallas?

The stakes are too serious for political games.

The Presiding Officer wasn't serving in this body 10 years ago when we voted on Grassley-Cruz, but at the time, nine Democrats voted for it. It received the most bipartisan support of any of the comprehensive legislation before this body. It got a majority vote in the Harry Reid Democrat Senate, where the Democrats had a substantial majority.

I would urge you, Mr. President, and every other Democrat to demonstrate the same principle and the same courage that those nine Democrats did a decade ago.

Let's vote for legislation that will actually solve the problem, that will actually stop violent criminals, and that will actually keep our kids safe. Let's resist the political urge to try to attack and undermine the Second Amendment, to try to disarm law-abiding citizens.

I can tell you, as long as I am serving in this body, I will fight with every breath I can to defend the constitutional right to keep and bear arms of every American. It is in the Bill of Rights. It is a foundational right.

We can do both. We can stop criminals and protect the Second Amendment. This bill on the floor, the Democrat bill, does not. So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass Cruz-Barrasso and abandon the Democrat legislation that doesn't stop violent crime but does infringe on the Second Amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Once again, our Nation has been horrified by mass shootings, this time of shoppers killed in Buffalo, NY, and of schoolchildren and teachers murdered in Texas.

Twelve of us have come together to develop the bipartisan proposal before us to help address the gun violence that is plaguing our country. We were led by Senators CHRIS MURPHY, JOHN CORNYN, KYRSTEN SINEMA, and THOM TILLIS. I want to thank and recognize each of them for their efforts.

Our commonsense plan increases needed mental health resources, improves school safety and support for students, and helps ensure that dangerous criminals and those who are adjudicated as suffering from mental illness cannot purchase firearms. If enacted, our bill will save lives. At the same time, it steadfastly protects the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners. It is not hyperbole to say that this legislation represents the most significant gun safety legislation in decades.

I would like to highlight two specific provisions of this bill that I worked on and that will have a significant impact in Maine and across the country.

First, our bill will fund crisis intervention programs, like Maine's yellow flag law, which our State supreme court just upheld as constitutional this very week.

Maine's law, which has robust due-process protections, allows the court—following an assessment by a medical professional—to determine if individuals should temporarily lose possession of firearms because they pose a serious threat to themselves or to others. Maine's law was developed in consultation with the Sportsman Alliance of Maine, and it has likely saved lives.

This Federal legislation will provide Maine with more resources to fully implement this important program. It will help connect law enforcement, medical professionals, and people in crisis through telehealth services, as well as provide additional financial help to ensure that the law can be efficiently and effectively utilized when necessary.

Second, our bill will also help keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals. The bipartisan package includes the Stop Illegal Trafficking and

Firearms Act that I coauthored with Senator PATRICK LEAHY. It cracks down on straw purchasing and firearms trafficking.

I would like, particularly, to thank Senator HEINRICH, with whom I worked to further refine this proposal so that it could be included in this bipartisan package. Senator HEINRICH was a wonderful partner as we worked through all of the details of this provision.

The trafficking of firearms to violent criminals, gangs, and drug trafficking groups presents a serious threat to public safety in communities across America. Straw purchasers—individuals who purchase guns for other people who are prohibited by law from receiving such weapons—are the linchpin of most firearms trafficking operations, which are responsible for funneling firearms into our cities and across our southern border.

Currently, there is no criminal statute specifically prohibiting straw purchasing or firearms trafficking in the way that we need it to do. Instead, prosecutors rely primarily on paperwork violations that prohibit making false statements in connection with the purchase of a firearm.

Our bill establishes new, specific criminal offenses with significant penalties for straw purchasers and firearms traffickers, along with enhanced penalties when straw-purchased firearms are used in connection with serious criminal activity like terrorism or drug trafficking.

The danger presented by straw purchasers and firearms trafficking is not abstract. It is not theoretical. It is very real—a real and present danger.

Maine's U.S. attorney, Darcie McElwee, recently described how gun and drug trafficking in our State and elsewhere are often intertwined. ''Individuals would come to Maine for guns and leave us their drugs and go back,'' she explained. She added that in recent years, guns acquired in Maine represented ''7% of Massachusetts gun recoveries at crime scenes,'' while Massachusetts guns ''were responsible for 20% of ours. So, that means that both their guns and their drugs are coming into our state.'' I am quoting our new U.S. attorney.

In a recent example of gun and drug trafficking along the I–95 pipeline, a Massachusetts man was sentenced to 7 years in prison after receiving two pistols from a straw purchaser in Androscoggin County, while facilitating fentanyl sales in Bangor. What we have seen are gang members from Connecticut coming to Maine with heroin and swapping heroin for guns.

Gun trafficking is also a border security issue. Law enforcement has long been concerned about the flow of firearms from the United States into Mexico.

According to a recent report, more than 70 percent of all crime guns recovered and traced to Mexico between 2009 and 2014—and that represents more than 73,000 firearms—were traced back to the United States. And the Mexican Government has estimated that 200,000 firearms are smuggled from the United States into Mexico each year.

Our bill provides additional tools to law enforcement and prosecutors to prevent and prosecute these crimes. This is meaningful legislation that reflects input from gun safety advocates, gun rights groups, the U.S. Department of Justice, law enforcement officers, and others. Thus, in addition to helping keep our schools safe and our communities safer, this bill will help to address the gun violence and drug problems that are plaguing our communities, more generally.

Mr. President, I come from a State with a strong heritage of responsible gun ownership. This package reflects conversations that I have had with the Sportsman's Alliance of Maine, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, and other responsible groups. It is worth my emphasizing one more time that we are able to make these significant improvements without infringing on the rights of law-abiding gun owners.

Finally, it is important to note that this package demonstrates that Members of the Senate can come together and work in a constructive way to get important goals achieved on behalf of the American people. I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight sharing the concerns of every Member of this body, to find the best way to protect children who go to school, so that children can go to school in safety and parents can send their children to school feeling that the children will be safe.

And after we have seen the tragedies across the country, I think every Member is here trying to find the best solution, and I think that the one that Senator CRUZ and I have offered is one that will provide the kind of safety and security for our kids, for our schools, and for our communities; and that is why we have introduced this substitute amendment that we are bringing to the floor this evening in an effort to do just that. We bring this at a time when the Nation's attention is focused on what has happened at schools and communities across the country and how to best address it.

And as a physician, a doctor who served in a State legislature and now in this body, I have seen the devastating impact of mental health challenges and problems in families and how much that has contributed to what we have seen with these terrible acts. So what we bring here tonight is legislation focused on safe schools and mental health while protecting the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

And, with that, I would turn to Senator CRUZ to make a motion to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this body has a choice before it: Do we pass legislation that will be ineffective in stopping violent crime, that has very little prospect of preventing the next mass shooting, that will do very little to make schools safer but, at the same time, will undermine the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens? That is the Democrat bill that is currently on the floor.

Or do we, instead, move to pass real legislation that will stop violent crime, that will put gun criminals in jail, that will prosecute felons and fugitives who try to illegally buy guns, and that will provide serious funding for school safety?

The Cruz-Barrasso legislation provides funding to double the number of police officers in schools across America so our kids can be kept safe—$36 billion total in funding, repurposed from unspent Democrat emergency funds. This bill also provides $10 billion in funding for mental health counselors in schools to stop troubled teens before they go down a horrible road.

The Democrat bill has much smaller funding for cops and schools, much smaller funding for mental health, but much more infringement of the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

So it is a choice all of us have: Do we want to stop these crimes, or do we want to play politics?

And I would note, Mr. President, that the proponents of this bill at the outset swore up and down: There will be amendments. We will have amendments on this bill.

Well, right now, the majority leader wants no amendments. And how do we know that? Because the majority leader has filled the amendment tree, has blocked amendments.

This morning, the majority leader was saying that he would allow a vote on Cruz-Barrasso, a straight-up vote. But, for whatever reason, that has changed; and so, right now, amendments are blocked. But, fortunately, it is the right of any Senator to move to table that blocking amendment, and that is what I will do momentarily. And the reason I am moving to table this blocking amendment is to take up Cruz-Barrasso.

And so this vote is a straight-up vote: Do you support serious law enforcement? Do you support prosecuting violent criminals who use guns in their crimes? Do you support prosecuting and sending to jail felons and fugitives and those with serious mental illness who try to illegally buy firearms? And do you support getting serious about

protecting our schools? Do you support doubling the number of cops in our schools so that our kids are safe? Do you support funding mental health counselors so our kids are safe?

This is an opportunity for every Senator to decide if they support doing something that actually fixes the problem or if they put a higher priority on partisan politics. On the merits, this vote should be 100 to 0. We will see what the vote is in reality.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. President, accordingly, I move to table amendment No. 5100, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) would have voted ''Yea.''

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Leg.]

YEAS—39

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

NAYS—58

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

NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Cotton	Cramer

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives to accompany S. 2089; that the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 2089 with amendment No. 5133 be considered made and agreed to; the title amendment from the House be considered and agreed to; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

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

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2089) entitled ''An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes.'', do pass with amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues for supporting this effort in this legislation which we have dubbed ''Keep Kids Fed,'' because that is exactly what we are going to be able to do, to help our schools and churches and local providers provide meals for children this summer and help for the school year.

I want to thank my colleague and partner—true partner in this—Senator BOOZMAN for all of his efforts.

We know we are getting back to normal, but we are not there yet, and the folks who run our schools and summer meal programs need extra support through this coming year. And that is what we are doing right now.

So we just passed something fully paid for that will ensure that millions of children don't go hungry this summer and next school year, and I would just finally say this: You know, keeping kids fed is nothing new. We have been doing this on a bipartisan basis since the National School Lunch program was established 76 years ago. So we are just continuing a bipartisan tradition, and I want to thank colleagues for allowing us to be able to move forward on this bill.

And I would now yield to my friend Senator BOOZMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today for just a moment to discuss the Keep Kids Fed Act, which will help schools and summer providers operate as they return to normal, while facing supply chain problems and fighting food costs.

This bill is a result of a bicameral, bipartisan agreement that assists schools and students as they resume regular operations of the meal programs.

The waivers to provide higher reimbursement rates and universal free meals under these programs during COVID are no longer necessary.

However, schools still face unusual times with a 35 to 40 percent increase in food prices due to inflation and supply chain difficulties. This bill provides targeted and temporary relief for the 2022–2023 school year to help schools with higher food costs and is fully offset.

We all want to ensure that children in this country receive healthful and affordable meals to help them focus on their education.

This bill will help schools provide those meals as they return to normal, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill. And, again, thank you so much, Senator STABENOW, to you and your staff, and to my staff and everyone that has worked so hard to come to an agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, tonight, the Senate is passing bipartisan legislation that will keep America's schoolkids fed for the summer.

A hungry child is a horrible thing to see, and because of the amazing, persistent work of a great team, a great bipartisan team—Senator STABENOW, chairman of the Agriculture Committee and Senator BOOZMAN, ranking member of the Agriculture Committee—that won't happen.

The worst of the pandemic is hopefully behind us, but schools across the country are still suffering from the challenges that COVID created—supply chain issues making it harder to provide students free meals they need to stay healthy over the summer.

It would have been just awful—awful—for the Senate to leave without taking action to make sure we provided the waivers necessary to make sure kids can get the free meals they need over the summer.

Kids deserve to be healthy. They deserve to be well fed. And by extending these nutrition waivers before they expire, we can make sure that no student will have to worry about where they are going to get their lunch during the summer.

There is no justification in the world for letting these waivers come to an end, and the good, persistent, steady hard work of Senators Stabenow and Boozman made sure that didn't happen.

JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in order to expedite matters and move on to the vote, I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

S. 2938

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tomorrow will mark 1 month since the tragic shooting in Uvalde, TX.

A high school dropout with a history of violence and mental health struggles purchased 2 AR–15s within days of turning 18, and he passed a background check.

He then shot his own grandmother because she wanted him to go back into the classroom rather than drop out of school, and then went to the Robb Elementary School through an unlocked door.

He then opened fire on two fourth-grade classrooms, killing 19 students and 2 teachers.

The American people were shocked, outraged, and devastated by this attack and collectively asked: How can we prevent this from happening again?

Well, the discussion surrounding this topic causes emotions to run high, and I understand why.

For too long, some politicians have tried to pit the right to live in a safe community against the constitutional right to keep and bear arms. They make it seem like our country can only have one or the other—either the Second Amendment or safe schools and churches and grocery stores. And, of course, this is a false choice.

Law-abiding gun owners are not the problem. Men and women who buy guns to protect themselves and their family to hunt or engage in sports—they are not a public safety problem.

Following the shooting, I promised to do everything in my power to try to answer that call to do something. I don't believe in doing nothing in the face of what we saw in Uvalde and we have seen in far too many communities. Doing nothing is an abdication of our responsibility as representatives of the American people here in the U.S. Senate.

At the same time, I reiterated my bottom line, which is: I would not support any provisions that infringed on the rights of law-abiding gun owners. Again, they are not the problem.

But I knew that this effort was about the art of the possible; looking at areas where we could agree and setting aside those areas where we could not.

I was fortunate to find partners who were thoughtful and realistic about how we could pass this bill.

I want to thank Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, Senator TILLIS, as well as a larger group of Senators without whom this legislation would not be on the cusp of passage. Thank you. Thank you for not listening to the naysayers and the critics and those who would spew disinformation and outright lies about what we are doing here and for standing up to the responsibility that we all have as U.S. Senators to do our very best to make progress, to try to answer the call in the face of these tragedies, and try, in the end, to save lives, which is what this is all about.

Now, less than 1 month after the shooting in Uvalde, the Senate will vote soon on the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. This legislation will protect our schools, protect our communities, and safeguard the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: No parent should ever fear for the safety of their child at school, and no child should be afraid to go to school in fear of their safety.

This legislation responds to that in a positive and affirmative way. This bill includes targeted, commonsense measures to prevent violence and to save lives while respecting our Constitution.

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

Madam President, the dirty little secret is America is experiencing a mental health crisis. Our mental health delivery system is a scandal. Too many people are not getting the sort of attention and care they need in order to manage their mental health challenges. And many of them can be saved from the fate of Salvador Ramos or Adam Lanza if they can get access to timely care and the medication that will help them manage their mental illness. So this bill will represent the single largest investment in community-based mental health care in American history.

That is huge. That is enormously important. And to me it may be the most important aspect of what we do here.

So police officers answering a 9–1-1 call from somebody in a mental health crisis, they don't have to take that person to jail where they won't get help. They can take them to a community-based mental health delivery system—to a clinic. And a person experiencing a mental health crisis, they don't have to go to the emergency room. They can go to a clinic and get the sort of care and help they need in order to manage their condition, whatever it may be.

This bill will also provide support and services for our schools. Our schools should be sanctuary—a sanctuary—for our children, not a place where they plan on what will happen during the next shooting and how they can hide under their desks or try to make their escape. Schools should be a sanctuary. And this bill will provide the kind of services that will help identify students in crisis and help intervene to provide them the assistance they need.

This bill also provides major investments in school safety and security. It includes physical safety measures. We probably can't eliminate human error like we saw in Uvalde, TX, but we can promulgate the best practices, which we have done in this bill, from the best minds based on evidence—what works and what does not—to make sure we keep unauthorized visitors out of the hallways and the classrooms as well as evaluate current protocols and, like I said, develop best practices.

Again, those who say we need to infringe on the rights of law-abiding citizens under the Constitution in order to make good policy are offering a false choice. Passing good public policy and supporting the Constitution are not mutually exclusive.

One of the ways we are providing assistance to the States is through crisis intervention grants which will provide the States with funding to implement programs to help those in crisis and prevent them from committing self-harm or harm to others.

We have rejected the idea of a national red flag law, even though 19 States and the District of Columbia have chosen to do that themselves, and one of the ways we can help is to make sure that these funds assist State officials in training them on how to make sure that the due process rights of an individual are protected, as they should be.

This legislation also closes a gaping hole in the background check system which is the lack of juvenile records. This is a real challenge because most juvenile records are sealed or expunged. But we know that Salvador Ramos, who went in at 18-years-old and passed a background check—he was a ticking timebomb. Everybody knew he was struggling with his mental health challenges, and he was slowly circling the drain because he didn't get the help that might have prevented his self-harm, not to mention the harm to others.

But if a person's record includes a criminal conviction or mental health adjudication that prohibits them from purchasing a firearm as an adult, it shouldn't matter whether they were 17 or 18 at the time. That information should be available on the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and that is what this bill will encourage. Our bill incentivizes the States to upload this information to ensure that disqualifying criminal convictions or mental health adjudications are available.

Unless a person is convicted of a crime or adjudicated as mentally ill, their Second Amendment rights will not be impacted by this legislation, period.

Let me close by saying, I am grateful to Senator MURPHY, who has been a good-faith partner. He would like to do a lot of things in addition to what we have done here, but he was pragmatic and realistic enough to know that if we were actually going to be successful, we weren't going to be able to do everything that he wanted. Conversely, there were things that we did on our side that were outside of our comfort zone that, frankly, we are having to explain to people, but that is what a good-faith negotiation looks like. And again, I think, on balance, the good we are doing here and the potential we have to save lives is worth any sort of concession we might have had to make during the negotiation.

Let me also express my gratitude to Senator SINEMA, the Senator from Arizona, who has been a key partner in the negotiation as well as Senator TILLIS, the Senator from North Carolina. But the truth is, a lot of people were involved in this. And I want to thank all of our colleagues who helped us round out this legislation and make sure it delivers the benefits that we sought. We also worked with a variety of stakeholders from education to mental health groups, to law enforcement, as

well as gun rights groups. And I appreciate everybody who has helped us make this product better. And obviously we don't agree on a lot of things, but I am encouraged about how much common ground we were able to find.

Our bill has earned the endorsement of more than 100 mental health and education groups, including the National Alliance on Mental Illness and the National Association of School Psychologists. It has received the support of law enforcement organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National District Attorneys Association, and the Major Cities Chiefs Association. It has been backed by domestic violence groups such as the National Network to End Domestic Violence and the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

I believe we have in the Gallery tonight people who have suffered unthinkable losses of loved ones in some of these mass shooting incidents. But I want to tell them that their advocacy has turned their pain into something positive. I believe the best antidote for the sort of unthinkable loss that they have suffered is the knowledge that something good will come out of their tragedies, something that will save lives.

This broad support for this legislation shows that it is a meaningful comprehensive response to the tragedies we have experienced. And I am proud of what we have been able to do together. And I am very optimistic about the impact it will have on our schools and communities across the country. So, thank you, colleagues, for working together in good faith in a bipartisan way.

I think in one way we have demonstrated to people that our institutions can work. Many have come to doubt whether we are capable of making our institutions work, including the world's greatest deliberative body, the U.S. Senate. And we have proved that we can, when sufficiently inspired by the people in the Gallery and others, when they say do something to come together and find common ground that will help keep our communities safer, protect our children, and save lives.

I look forward to voting yes and moving this bill one step closer to the President's desk for signature.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague and friend from Texas as well as the team that worked with him—Senators MURPHY, TILLIS, SINEMA, and all of us who worked with them. Where he is surely right is that we have shown that democracy works, at least that it can work, when people come together seeking common ground and responding to the overwhelming sense of urgency from the American people about solving a problem. And that democracy working stands in stark juxtaposition to the tableau on the other side of Congress, the House Commission that is investigating the near-overthrow of that democracy. So for all who are doubting and all who may have doubts in the future, we are providing some reassurance that we can get things done and solve problems.

My mind goes back to watching that Gallery almost 10 years ago in the wake of the Newtown tragedy—the unthinkable murder of 20 beautiful children and 6 brave educators at Sandy Hook Elementary School. And when we failed to take action then on a very modest improving the background check system—we had 55 votes but not enough to reach 60—I will never forget the cry of ''Shame, shame'' that came from that Gallery.

I remember the Sandy Hook families were in that Gallery, and at least two of them are here today, Mark Barden and Nicole Hockley. And it is not only those families that are in the Gallery, it is the movement that those families, through their immeasurable grief and unthinkable trauma, created in the wake of that unimaginable murder. That movement is here, comprised of survivors and first responders, medical professionals, educators, advocates, and so many others. And today when the U.S. Senate passes the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, we won't hear cries of ''Shame,'' there will be cries of relief, finally.

I am proud to have been part of the team that negotiated this measure and to have worked with colleagues on the other side of the aisle like Senator CORNYN. This is not the measure I fought for. It is not the measure I would have written if I had been doing it alone, but it marks meaningful progress.

If you wait to get everything in the U.S. Senate, chances are you will get nothing. Progress is better than nothing. This measure will save lives—not all the lives that we want to save, but it will save lives, and I will be proud to vote for it today.

After 30 years, hundreds of thousands of gun deaths after Sandy Hook and dozens of failed legislative proposals, we are finally taking this step forward. The Sandy Hook victims, the Parkland victims, the Uvalde victims, and so many more deserve so much better, and they deserve more, but the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is that significant step forward that responds to the Nation's sense of urgency to get something done.

One way the legislation will do so that I am particularly proud of is investing in crisis intervention programs. This bill will increase funding for these programs, including red flag laws and programs already in place in 21 jurisdictions like Connecticut, which was the first. These laws will keep firearms out of the hands of individuals who are dangerous to themselves or others. It is separating those guns from people who say they are going to kill someone or themselves. More than half of all gun deaths are suicides. Red flag laws are practical and proven and they prevent not only suicides but school mass shootings and other violent crimes. Just last week, Connecticut probably saved tens of lives by separating an individual who told his parents that he was having those thoughts again about killing people, and he was separated from a firearm.

I have worked on the red flag issue for years with Senator GRAHAM and with Senator FEINSTEIN in the bipartisan negotiations that led to this bill. We worked collaboratively and closely to develop the funding framework that can support States that already have these laws and States that choose to enact these laws going forward. Implementation is so important, and the resources necessary for implementation are key to making them work effectively. In fact, very arguably, the failure of the New York red flag law to prevent the Buffalo massacre was due to a lack of resources commitment.

To alleviate concerns among some of my Republican colleagues and some gun owners, we reached a bipartisan agreement to include provisions that specify that, for States to be eligible to use funding under red flag programs, those programs have to include minimum due process protections. These protections are consistent with due process safeguards provided in the 21 jurisdictions that already have these laws, and several have already been upheld in the face of constitutional challenges.

The Constitution already applies to these laws. The due process guarantees would apply in any event, but we had no problem spelling it out. That explicit protection in the legislative text is added for reassurance. In so doing, our bipartisan group agreed that all 21 jurisdictions that already have red flag laws will all qualify for funding under this bill. So, too, we agreed that any future jurisdiction that enacts such a law must at least meet the same constitutional due process minimum to be eligible.

I spell out this legislative history because it is important to understand not only the context but also the intention of these provisions. Let no one doubt that States like Connecticut, which already have these laws, will receive funding.

I am also pleased that, among other measures, we have substantially shrunk, even if not eliminated, the boyfriend loophole. We made straw purchasing and trafficking illegal at the Federal level—a measure that I know, as a former U.S. attorney and chief Federal prosecutor in Connecticut, is enormously important. We are investing hundreds of millions of dollars in community violence intervention and in the STOP School Violence Program.

We have been meeting just this week and throughout these past years with community groups and educators and others who want to stop mental health

issues upstream before they create violence downstream. I know how enormously important these measures can be for Connecticut and other States.

Finally, let me say that I have come to the Senate floor too many times—too many times to count—to call on us to honor with action those incredibly strong, brave families from Sandy Hook and from all around the country who have created this movement that we have now. It is a movement that will go on. They are not stopping. Neither should we. We need to continue with the same sense of urgency and purpose—that movement—toward making America even safer.

This bill is a breakthrough that builds a foundation for the future. It opens the door. Hopefully, it will show colleagues who have, perhaps, been reluctant to stand up to the gun lobby in the past and have helped to maintain the vice-like grip of that gun lobby on the Congress that their power is done. They have not only waned in their impact, but their intimidation and threats will no longer hold sway here.

So we are saving lives. It is a proud moment for the U.S. Senate, and I thank all of my colleagues for supporting this breakthrough measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, let me begin by saying that I am proudly pro-Second Amendment. I believe in the God-given right for law-abiding Americans to keep and bear arms. The Second Amendment has given millions of Americans the right to defend their spouses, their families, their children, and their homes.

But if you consider yourself a supporter of the Second Amendment, you absolutely want to do something about Uvalde, to do something about the murders related to domestic violence, to do something about straw purchases, and to do something about teen suicide by gun. You cannot be pro-Second Amendment unless you care deeply about these issues.

That is why we have targeted legislation, the Safer Communities Act, that addresses the specific problems that have led to mass shootings. We do it by restricting the access of someone who should not have a weapon, by providing additional mental health resources, and by hardening schools. This legislation accomplishes these goals without infringing upon a law-abiding citizen's Second Amendment right.

Let me repeat that because there has been confusion in speeches from this floor. There has been the internet exploding. There are rumors afloat that somehow this infringes upon a law-abiding citizen's right to keep and bear arms. That is absolutely false, and if anyone says so, they are misleading the American people. This doesn't do any of that.

What this legislation says is that unless you are adjudicated—now, ''adjudicated'' is a $5 word that means you go before a judge, and the judge looks at the evidence. Under this bill, if a State puts this into law, then they have got to follow due process, which says that the person who may lose his Second Amendment right has the right to an attorney, a higher standard for the evidence that must be presented, and that the person has his day in court.

This was the gold standard that the National Rifle Association always advocated for, as if we were going to take Second Amendment rights from someone who should not have them, and this bill has that gold standard.

I had a couple of townhalls just to find out what folks back in Louisiana were thinking about as to all of this. Frankly, they are talking about inflation and the price at the pump as much as they are talking about this, but I got a message: They think that we can protect Second Amendment rights and do something about a tragedy such as Uvalde. Let me give you some of the comments because it shows you the confusion and it shows you the concerns and it shows you where the American people are.

Chris asked if, when he dies, he can pass his gun to his child if his child is law-abiding.

Absolutely. That is preserved. We don't touch that, and, by golly, Chris should be able to do so.

We were asked by Tyler if this raises the age of the ability to purchase a weapon from 18 to 21.

It does not. It doesn't touch that—although, apparently, Tyler had been told that that was the case.

I was asked by R.J. about keeping guns out of the hands of criminals.

I said: Man, we have got something in there, R.J., that actually addresses that.

I heard from two people who said we should forbid the purchase of so-called assault weapons. Then I heard from one guy who said: Man, I live in a tough section of town, and if somebody invades my house, I don't want it to be a fair fight.

So I have heard all sides of these arguments as to what, but the message I got was that we can address—we can protect—Second Amendment rights but still do something about Uvalde.

Now, it is not just Uvalde. There are other types of gun violence in our society. This bill addresses at least four. There is the domestic violence. There is the suicide by the child. There is the gangster buying a gun and shooting people up. Then there is the rampage shooting. Let's talk about each of those.

When it comes to the domestic violence—when a guy beats up his girlfriend and he comes back with a weapon and shoots her a month later—that happens too much. I have talked to my police chief, Murphy Paul, in Baton Rouge, and he tells me that domestic violence and domestic murder spiked under the pandemic. This bill does something about it.

I asked people who oppose this bill: What about domestic violence, man? What about that woman who is threatened? Shouldn't we do something for her safety?

This bill does something for her safety and, quite likely, for her children's safety, and it quite likely prevents a suicide by the troubled man who goes there in the first place.

Let's talk about crime, gangsters, straw purchases.

A boyfriend has got a felony and can't buy a weapon. So the girlfriend buys one and slips it to him. It is against the law now, but it happens all the time.

R.J., if you are watching on C–SPAN, man, I am channeling you.

We took the provision R.J. said we should do, and we increased the penalties for that person who buys a weapon merely to pass it to another. They will, hopefully, throw her in prison for as much as 10 years if she contributes to a murder by buying a gun for someone who goes out and commits that murder.

We talk about rampage shootings. Do you know what is much more common? It is the teenager shooting himself. We stop that. Oh, they can still steal a weapon if they want to, but there is $12 billion in some form or another for mental health services. We do our best to reach that child.

By the way, the rampage shooting is the worst. Then comes suicide. Then comes the addiction. I am a doctor. I have seen this stuff. After the addiction, it just becomes the person who is emotionally troubled.

We are putting in mental health services that can address it all with money for a 9–8–8 line so that if somebody is just like, ''Oh, my gosh, I am desperate,'' they have somebody to call.

Personally, I would like to have an app. I would like to have an ''I am a troubled teenager'' app, and ''I need somebody to talk to.'' They are doing this in Utah, and they tell me that the investment has been tremendous. I think they told me they prevent a suicide a week. That is off the top of my head. Call it a suicide every 2 weeks. That is a powerful intervention. This bill has that capability.

Lastly, there is the information regarding the rampage shooting—Uvalde.

Somebody told me: You know, I searched on the internet, and I didn't see that this guy was troubled.

That is precisely the point. This man is troubled, but he is less than 18. Those records are sealed. You can't get to them. So, even though every indication was that this young, troubled man would have had a reason not to be able to purchase a weapon, it is sealed. When he turns 18, he is a clean guy, and he goes out and buys two assault weapons and starts planning his assault.

If you are pro-Second Amendment, by golly, you want to stop that. What this bill does is it allows the court to look into that and say: ''Oh, he is clean; that is OK,'' or ''No, he is troubled, and we need a little extra time to look at this.''

By the way, that is a provision that has been distorted and twisted to imply that law-abiding 18-to-21-year-olds would not be able to purchase a weapon. If you are law-abiding, you can still purchase that weapon if you are 18, but if not or if there is another indication, then the background check has a chance to look at it. If you are pro-Second Amendment, by golly—I will say it one more time—you should applaud that provision.

Now, let's do a couple of other things.

Do you know that, right now, a Mexican cartel can smuggle weapons to Mexico to shoot people up? We make that illegal. You would think it already would be, but it is not. How can somebody be against that, criminalizing cartels for smuggling weapons to Mexico? But, somehow, we are infringing upon the Second Amendment rights of cartels. My gosh, I wish we would do worse to them.

We increase penalties for illegal gun traffickers and criminal-to-criminal gun transfers. We are doing something about criminals, but—have I said it yet?—we preserve the Second Amendment rights for the law-abiding.

Now, I am a gastroenterologist. So I don't know anything about due process except as a term, but in speaking to JOHN CORNYN, who has done a fantastic job, and the other attorneys, I have learned a little bit about due process.

By the way, whenever somebody calls me up and they say they have heard something on the internet, I say: Why don't you read the bill? It is 80 pages. Read the bill. On page 33, you are going to read about due process.

It says that any State red flag law—and we don't encourage those red flag laws, but if the State decides to do one and they want Federal dollars, they now have got to obey these rules. The rules say that it must include, at a minimum, due process rights that prevent any violation or infringement of the Constitution of the United States.

If you are pro-Second Amendment, you should like that. A State can actually have a red flag law right now and not have that in there, but under this bill, by golly, they had better. How can anyone object to that?

The bill also ensures that no State can sidestep due process. It strengthens the citizen's right to due process. It increases the evidentiary bar. It can't be hearsay. It can't be a social worker: Oh, I am a little nervous. It has to be before a judge, and it has to have evidence, and the person losing their right or may be losing their right has to have the ability to have an attorney with them.

Now, no offense to my people on the other side of the aisle, but if a liberal State puts forth a law that has poor due process, they won't get Federal dollars. That should be something we are proud of.

My State doesn't have a red flag law. This bill does not require, mandate, or incentivize that Louisiana develop a red flag law. But, you know, my State does get money for drug courts, for enforcing restraint orders so the fellow who is not supposed to go near his wife because they are afraid he will beat her up again—the police have more resources in order to prevent that. Who can be against that? That is in this bill.

By the way, our legislation also hardens schools. There is money for the STOP School Violence school safety program, including school resource officers and school hardening. There is additional funding for mental health resources, drug and violence prevention, mentoring, crisis intervention, high-quality training for school personnel on suicide prevention, and human trafficking. How can someone be against that? This is a solution.

By the way, we have a serious problem in mental health. In my career, I have been privileged to work with Senator MURPHY and others on solutions for mental health. There are increased dollars for Medicaid, including telehealth services for schools that might be in a rural area otherwise without a mental professional around. It expands mental health services under Medicaid, school-based mental health services—all expanded. It reauthorizes the Pediatric Mental Health Care Access Program. It gives pediatric providers extra training in mental health. I could go on.

Now, there is still a lot of misinformation out there, but I would say, if you don't know what is in the bill, it is online. Pick it up, and read it. But if you are pro-Second Amendment, you should be for this bill.

We can protect Second Amendment rights. We can make an impact on teen suicide, upon domestic abuse, upon straw purchases landing guns in the hands of criminals, and upon rampage shootings, and we could do that while protecting the Second Amendment. That is what I am hearing from the American people. That is what this bill does.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate is considering bipartisan legislation to help protect our kids and our communities from the scourge of gun violence.

This is a critical issue. And it is one we have spent a lot of time on in the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair.

We have held nine hearings in our committee in the 117th Congress to discuss ways to address our Nation's gun violence epidemic.

Four of those hearings were held in the Constitution Subcommittee, which is chaired by Senator BLUMENTHAL, and I want to commend him for the subcommittee's focus on important issues like red flag laws, ghost guns, safe storage, and gun violence by domestic abusers.

And we have held five hearings in the full Judiciary Committee, where we have heard testimony from witnesses on how to reduce violence.

I am pleased that the bipartisan bill before us includes a number of measures that witnesses before the Judiciary Committee urged the Senate to adopt.

Last December, the Judiciary Committee held a field hearing in Chicago to discuss the firearms trafficking that floods the city with illicit guns.

We heard testimony from David Brown, superintendent of the Chicago Police Department, who pointed out that 93 percent of murders in Chicago last year were committed by guns.

Superintendent Brown testified that we need strong Federal laws to crack down on gun trafficking and straw purchases, which fuel Chicago's gun violence. And the bill before us today provides those laws.

Straw purchases are not minor offenses. They have devastating consequences. Superintendent Brown talked about Chicago Police Officer Ella French, who was murdered last year with a straw purchased gun. I will never forget the outpouring of grief I saw in the city after we lost Officer French.

The bill before us would crack down on straw purchases that put guns in the hands of criminals and prohibited people. The Senate first voted on this issue in 2013 and fell short, so this step is long overdue.

We also held a hearing in March of last year where we heard testimony from Dr. Selwyn Rogers. He is a trauma surgeon and public health expert from the University of Chicago Medicine.

His emergency room is on the frontlines of the gun violence epidemic, stitching up bullet wounds to save lives. He called upon Congress to do more to help prevent gunshot victims from showing up in his hospital in the first place.

He described the way that trauma and witnessing violence harms the brain and development of a child, making it difficult to regulate emotions, form healthy relationships, and resolve conflicts.

Dr. Rogers implored us to address these emotional scars of trauma that fuel the cycle of violence. And so did Dr. Moira Szilagyi, the president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, who testified before our committee last week.

The bill we are considering today does just that. It provides billions of dollars in grants for school- and community-based mental health programs.

It includes more than $28 million for a bipartisan program that I passed into law in 2018 with Senator CAPITO, Republican of West Virginia. This program would expand trauma-informed care for students by training more school personnel and bringing in more mental health professionals from the community.

The bill also provides $40 million to a program I have supported for years, the National Child Traumatic Stress Network, which is providing specialized

care to thousands of children in Chicago.

And it will help expand mental health treatment for students by enhancing the ability for schools to use Medicaid coverage for this care.

Helping children cope with traumatic experiences is a vital strategy to prevent and break the cycle of violence. The investments provided in this bill will make a dramatic difference in this effort.

At another of our hearings, which focused on the problem of armed carjackings, we heard testimony from Vaughn Bryant of the organization Metropolitan Family Services in Chicago.

He testified about the importance of community violence intervention, or CVI, programs to help steer those who are at risk of committing gun violence onto a better path.

These CVI programs have shown real promise in Chicago, as another of our hearing witnesses, Roseanna Ander of the University of Chicago, testified. But the programs do not have adequate funding to meet the need.

The bill before us would provide $250 million over 5 years in Department of Justice grants for CVI programs. That is double the current annual funding for these programs, and it will make a big difference.

We also heard compelling testimony last week at our hearing about the impact of gun violence on children. It is a grim reality that gunfire is now the leading cause of death of American children and teens, according to the Centers for Disease Control.

Every day, on average, we lose 12 kids in America to gun homicides, suicides, and accidents. In the year 2020 alone, we lost 4,368 American babies, children, and teens in firearm deaths—an increase of nearly 30 percent over the previous year.

At our hearing, we heard testimony from law enforcement and pediatrician witnesses about how the Senate needs to act to protect our kids. And we also heard moving testimony from 19-year-old Ernest Willingham, who grew up on the West Side of Chicago as the youngest of 11 kids in his family.

He has an incredible story. He is the first in his family to attend college and the first male in his family to graduate high school. He is currently in college in Boston and is well on his way to a career in the healthcare field. Ernest has been surrounded by gun violence his whole life. His father has been shot. His brother has been shot twice. His cousin has been shot. And a few years ago, his best friend was killed by a stray bullet. Ernest talked about the anguish of seeing loved ones around him get shot. And he described his constant fear that he, himself, would be shot too.

At the hearing Ernest called for gun law reforms, but he also talked about the importance of mental health. He urged us to make sure that communities that are hard hit by gun violence have the counselors and mental health professionals they need to help kids who are traumatized by gun violence.

Ernest, help is on the way. This bill makes dramatic investments—billions of dollars—in mental health treatment and care in schools and in communities.

I was so impressed by this young man's testimony at our hearing and the way he has benefited from ''a village'' of supporters—family, friends, teachers, and mentors—to build the resilience to rise above trauma in his life to pursue his dreams in the medical field.

For the sake of the kids we have lost to the gun violence, and for the sake of kids like Ernest who shouldn't have to grow up surrounded by this violence, we need to act. The bill before us, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, is a compromise. It doesn't accomplish everything I want when it comes to gun violence, and it has provisions I would like to change or could do without.

It won't end gun violence in America. But it takes important steps toward making our Nation safer. It is a meaningful bipartisan package, negotiated in good faith by Senators from across the political spectrum.

I want to commend those Senators for their hard work, especially Senators MURPHY, CORNYN, SINEMA, and TILLIS.

We have heard so much in the Senate Judiciary Committee about the need to do something to reduce gun violence and about commonsense reforms and investments that would help. It heartens me that a number of those reforms and investments are included in this package, particularly when it comes to cracking down on straw purchases, treating trauma, supporting community violence intervention programs, and investing in mental health and counseling in schools and communities.

This bill doesn't have everything I want. But it is a good, meaningful bipartisan compromise, and I will support it. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I rise today to thank the National Sheriffs' Association for its tireless work on the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. I ask unanimous consent that their letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, June 22, 2022.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader,
US. Senate.

DEAR LEADERS: On behalf of the National Sheriffs' Association, representing over 3,000 Sheriffs across this great nation, we write to lend our support to ''The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.'' The Sheriffs do request that the Medicaid Inmate Exclusion Policy (MIEP) be addressed in a colloquy as the bill is debated. As you know, the federal law does not differentiate between a convicted inmate and a person incarcerated prior to conviction. This anomaly needs to be corrected.

Sheriffs see, up close, the daily carnage of gun violence carried out by criminals and individuals suffering from mental illness. We appreciate the authors coming together on a bill that can actually save lives, which is written in such a way that allows the States to craft their own unique answers to the questions raised by gun violence.

Important to Sheriffs and their communities:

Supporting better access to mental health services in schools is an important part of early screening for 40 million Medicaid students nationwide. Furthermore, in our discussions we have determined that school property hardening is a critical and necessary step in preventing mass school shootings.

Reviewing juvenile records improves current law and may help detect persons not eligible for firearm purchases while protecting their Constitutional rights.

Allowing flexibility in the administration of the new purpose Byrne JAG grant program will help States, and therefore counties, implement crisis intervention courts which may take many forms such as Veteran courts, drug courts and outpatient treatment.

We also find that the due process provisions for extreme risk protection, ''red flag'' orders, maintain the 5th and 14th amendments and provide the rights and tools necessary to defend oneself.

There are many other provisions of the legislation that are also important but too numerous to mention here. The Sheriffs are available to discuss this bill with any member of your Caucus/Conference who might have questions. Thank you for your work on this legislation.

Very respectfully,
JONATHAN THOMPSON,
Executive Director and CEO,
National Sheriffs' Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, 4 weeks ago, I was sitting where you are sitting, presiding over the Senate on a quiet Tuesday afternoon, when news broke that 19 children—all the same age as my youngest son—had been gunned down in their Texas elementary school.

As I scrolled through the early reports of the carnage, all I could think of were these two simple questions: What are we doing? Why are we here?

I sat up there obsessing over our willful decision as a body to ignore the slaughter that has become so regular that the news only seems to pay attention now when over a dozen die. Our collective decision year after year is to do nothing. What is the point of this job that we fought so hard to get if we just decide that saving children's lives is too hard or involves too inconvenient an amount of political risk?

Shooting after shooting, murder after murder, suicide after suicide—for 30 years, Congress stood in its political corners and did nothing. But not this time. Within 2 days of the Uvalde massacre, Senator CORNYN, Senator TILLIS, Senator SINEMA, and I, joined by other Members of this body, had started talking, not about our disagreements—we

have plenty of those—but instead about what could be possible if we sat together and refused to give up until we figured out the set of things that we could agree on—the things that could get 60 votes—to save lives.

I am so grateful in the bottom of my soul to JOHN, to THOM, to KYRSTEN, and the other Senators here who took part in these talks for what they did over these last 4 weeks.

I am grateful to Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL for empowering these discussions and allowing us to have this debate this week.

I am equally proud of my team—Allison and Samir, Emily and Rebecca, Pete and Elizabeth—who worked 24/7 for the last 30 days straight to get this bill done.

But mostly I am proud of the regular people all across this country, many of whom were forced to become advocates after this epidemic took from them a son or a daughter, a mother or a father. Those citizens, many of whom are watching this debate right now, who protested or wrote letters or showed up at townhalls year after year, failure after failure, roadblock after roadblock, refusing to give up because the stakes—their children's safety—was so high that they couldn't afford to give up, that is who I am really proud of today, people who would not take no for an answer and knew that the righteousness of their cause had to eventually prevail.

This bill is a compromise. It doesn't do everything I want. But what we are doing will save thousands of lives without violating anyone's Second Amendment rights.

Through more effective red flag laws, by keeping guns away from domestic abusers, by being more careful about giving weapons to 18-year-olds, by getting more people access to treatment for their mental illness, this will become the most significant piece of anti-gun violence legislation Congress has passed in three decades.

As a result, this bill also has the chance to prove to a weary American public that democracy is not so broken that it is unable to rise to the moment when the need for action, like right now, in the wake of Uvalde and Buffalo, is most acute.

What are we doing? Why are we here? We are answering those questions today—not fully but with enough force that anxious moms and dads and kids all across this Nation will wake up tomorrow and be a little more confident that the adults who run this country actually care about their safety, because, you know what, people still believe in us. People still count on us.

Two months after his son was gunned down by a 19-year-old with an assault rifle in Sandy Hook, one of the dads came to Congress and gave this testimony: ''Before he died,'' Neil Heslin told Congress, my son ''Jesse and I used to talk about maybe coming to Washington someday. He wanted to go up to the Washington monument. When we talked about it last year Jesse asked if we could [go] meet the President. Now I could be a little cynical about politicians. But Jesse, he believed in you. He learned about you in school and he believed in you. I want to believe in you, too. I know you can't give me Jesse back. Believe me, if I thought you could, I'd be asking you for that. But I want to believe that you will think about what happened to my son and what I've seen. I want to believe that you'll think about it and then you'll do something about it.''

What are we doing? What are we here for if not to do something—something meaningful, something real, something together—to end this carnage.

Jesse believed in us. And, today, more so than at any time since I came to Congress 16 years ago, I believe in us too.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me thank Senator MURPHY for his amazing work and that powerful speech. He did a great, great job, as did many others.

Now, tonight, the U.S. Senate is doing something many believed was impossible even a few weeks ago: We are passing the first significant gun safety bill in nearly 30 years.

The gun safety bill we are passing tonight can be described with three adjectives: bipartisan, commonsense, lifesaving.

As the author of the Brady bill in 1994—the last legislative effort to fight gun violence in Congress—I am pleased that this moment has finally come and that we are finally taking meaningful action to keep our communities safe. I hope it paves the way for future action on guns in Congress and at all levels of government.

As I said, this is not a cure-all for all the ways gun violence affects our Nation, but it is a long-overdue step in the right direction. Passing this gun safety bill is truly significant, and it is going to save lives. It was so, so significant that we let the process work instead of just having one vote, which would divide us and not accomplish anything. And I hope that portends doing it again on guns and on other issues as well.

I want to thank my colleagues for their incredible work. This was a great moment here on a very, very difficult issue. I want to thank Senators MURPHY and SINEMA; Senators CORNYN and TILLIS, who showed amazing courage; and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together to break this logjam. The American people have waited long enough. Let's finally take action to pass this lifesaving gun safety bill.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Now, Madam President, I withdraw amendment No. 5100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The amendment is withdrawn.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the motion to concur with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 2938 with amendment No. 5099.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) would have voted ''nay.''

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Leg.]

YEAS—65

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

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Hoeven	Risch
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Boozman	Inhofe	Rubio
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lee	Shelby
Fischer	Lummis	Sullivan
Grassley	Marshall	Thune
Hagerty	Moran	Tuberville
Hawley	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Cotton	Cramer

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 5134

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 5134 to the title be considered and agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 5134) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: ''An act to make our communities safer.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3967

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, 1 week ago, this body passed Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our

PACT Act. We passed that bill with 84 votes in favor of it, something that rarely happens around here.

This bill was supported by the President; it was supported by the VA Secretary; and it was the No. 1 priority for nearly every major veterans advocacy group in the Nation. In fact, I cannot think of one that this wasn't the No. 1 priority for.

Upon passage, it was transmitted to the House, and they indicated that they would move it within days to the President's desk. Unfortunately, after Senate passage, the bill ran into a procedural hurdle, as bills often do around here, but tonight we have a chance to get back on track. We have a chance to get it to the House without further delay. And I might add, what this bill does is it takes care of a decades-long issue with toxic exposure.

The ranking member, Senator MORAN, and I talked about this bill a week or two ago at length. This bill will help save veterans' lives who have been exposed to toxins and will help support their families after they passed. I would hope my colleagues will keep that in mind as they decide whether this is an appropriate time to play political games, to delay this bill's ability to become law, and obstruct for the sake of obstruction.

Everyone in this body knows that our veterans deserve more than that. They have waited long enough for the care and the benefits that are provided by this bill, and they shouldn't have to wait any longer because it did receive 84 votes in this body a week or so ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to request the House of Representatives to return the papers on H.R. 3967; I further ask that notwithstanding the lack of receipt of the papers, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the Tester resolution that is at the desk to remove the blue-slip provision in the PACT Act; that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and let me be clear that the nature of my objection is not about the fact that this legislation authorizes about $280 billion, I think, for healthcare for veterans that resulted from toxic exposure and it creates new categories of eligibility and it contemplates this and authorizes this $280 billion of additional spending over 10 years.

What everybody should be aware of is that absent of this legislation, existing statute already obligates the Federal Government, through the VA, to spend about $400 billion over the next 10 years on veterans' healthcare that results from veterans being exposed to toxic circumstances during their service. So there is $400 billion that preexisted this bill and $280 billion of new spending.

Now, the $400 billion that we were already going to spend—and we will spend—is put under the discretionary spending caps in that category of discretionary spending because, as you know, discretionary spending is limited. There is a cap every year on how much can be spent in this discretionary spending category. There is one other category of spending around here, and that is mandatory spending that is not subject to caps. That is just unlimited whatever is required.

The legislation puts the $280 billion in new spending in the mandatory spending category, and we can argue about whether that is a good idea or not. I don't think it is a great idea, but that is not what really is outrageous about what is going on here. What is really outrageous is in this legislation, they take the $400 billion that was going to be spent anyway that is already preexisting under existing statute—they take that out of discretionary spending and move it over to mandatory spending.

Why would they do a thing like that? Why would that be necessary to move $400 billion that is already authorized to be spent under current law and move it out of discretionary and into the mandatory spending? The reason is because that way you create a big gaping hole in the discretionary spending category, which can be filled with another $400 billion of totally unrelated spending. Who knows on what? That is why it had to be moved out of discretionary and into mandatory spending.

My objection isn't about the substance of this bill. It is about this budgetary gimmick that is designed to allow hundreds of billions of dollars of additional spending on totally unrelated, who-knows-what categories. We have inflation hitting a 40-year high. We have a government that has been spending trillions of dollars, too much money—printing the money to spend—and everybody sees it every day at the pump, at the grocery store, everywhere. And what this gimmick does is it makes it possible to spend yet another $400 billion.

This is terrible policy. I am going to suggest the modification to the unanimous consent request from my friend—and he is my friend—from Montana. And it is very simple. It says nothing about the $280 billion in new spending that is permitted under this legislation. It simply would keep the $400 billion that we were going to spend anyway, keep it right in the category that it has always been in—keep it in the discretionary spending category so that it doesn't create this hole that gets filled with another $400 billion on who knows what. That is what my amendment does.

My amendment wouldn't reduce spending on veterans' healthcare by a penny. It wouldn't, in any way, impede the ability of veterans to get the healthcare that they need as a result of toxic exposures. It has nothing to do with that. It is only about preventing huge, excessive spending in other categories—who knows what—that would be permitted under this bill.

Mr. President, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request to include my amendment to the Tester resolution; that the amendment be considered and agreed to; that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Reserving the right to object. I don't know where to start.

First of all, this amendment does nothing to fix the blue-slip issue that was the real problem here. That was a de minimis amount of money anyway. Nonetheless, it is a blue-slip issue, and we have to fix it.

I would wholeheartedly disagree with my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, in saying that what you are actually doing is stopping benefits from veterans with this amendment. We are a body here in the U.S. Senate. If you want to talk about the appropriations process, we can talk about the appropriations process. But in the process of those debates, you shouldn't be denying healthcare to veterans, which is exactly what the good Senator from Pennsylvania is doing today. For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original Tester request?

Mr. TOOMEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

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. 599.

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 Ashish S. Vazirani, of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

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. 599, Ashish S. Vazirani, of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Richard J. Durbin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jacky Rosen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen.

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. 1037.

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 Steven M. Dettelbach, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

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. 1037, Steven M. Dettelbach, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Ben Ray Luján, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Tina Smith, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tim Kaine.

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. 975.

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 Michael S. Barr, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

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. 975, Michael S. Barr, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Ben Ray Luján, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Tina Smith, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tim Kaine.

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. 976.

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 Michael S. Barr, of Michigan, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

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. 976, Michael S. Barr, of Michigan, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Ben Ray Luján, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Tina Smith, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tim Kaine.

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. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today be waived.

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

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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 998 through 1030 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, Navy, and Space Force; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; and no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to

the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Jacquelyn McClelland

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Eric C. Ruttenberg
Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas S. Wall
Rear Adm. (lh) Larry D. Watkins

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Michael J. Steffen

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Charles Kirol

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Mark R. Myers

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David M. Buzzetti

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David G. Malone

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Charles M. Brown
Capt. Ingrid M. Rader
Capt. Michael Tanner

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Robert J. Dodson
Capt. Michael S. Richman

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David J. Faehnle
Capt. Calvin M. Foster
Capt. Joaquin Martinezdepinillos
Capt. John D. Saccomando
Capt. Andrew J. Schreiner
Capt. Kimberly A. Walz

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David H. Duttlinger

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Eugene D. Black, III

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William M. Jurney

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Gen. Christopher G. Cavoli

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Richard R. Coffman

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Richard A. Correll

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael D. Tomatz

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Thomas E. Ishee

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Stacey T. Hawkins

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Kevin B. Kennedy

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Kemble

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John J. Bartrum

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Ronald P. Clark

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Patrick D. Frank

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. David W. Abba
Brig. Gen. Charles E. Brown, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Joel L. Carey
Brig. Gen. Julian C. Cheater
Brig. Gen. Darren R. Cole
Brig. Gen. Heath A. Collins
Brig. Gen. Douglas S. Coppinger
Brig. Gen. Daniel A. Devoe
Brig. Gen. Steven G. Edwards
Brig. Gen. Michael A. Greiner
Brig. Gen. Stephen F. Jost
Brig. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Daniel T. Lasica
Brig. Gen. Benjamin R. Maitre
Brig. Gen. Caroline M. Miller
Brig. Gen. John P. Newberry
Brig. Gen. Evan L. Pettus
Brig. Gen. Bradley L. Pyburn
Brig. Gen. Mark B. Pye
Brig. Gen. David J. Sanford
Brig. Gen. Jennifer M. Short
Brig. Gen. David W. Snoddy
Brig. Gen. Alice W. Trevino
Brig. Gen. Parker H. Wright

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Leah G. Lauderback

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Pamela C. Miller

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Gary M. Brito

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. James B. Hecker

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael J. Deegan

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Mark W. Siekman

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Stuart B. Munsch

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Darryl A. Williams

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN2105 AIR FORCE nominations (11) beginning DWAYNE A. BACA, and ending LIANA LUCAS VOGEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2233 AIR FORCE nomination of Marc A. Daigle, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

IN THE ARMY

PN1921 ARMY nominations (20) beginning PAUL E. BOQUET, and ending DIANA W. WEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 4, 2022.

PN1933 ARMY nominations (92) beginning IVAN J. ANTOSH, and ending D016623, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 4, 2022.

PN2029 ARMY nominations (15) beginning JOHN H. BARKEMEYER, and ending MYUNG Y. RYU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2022.

PN2147 ARMY nominations (9) beginning CHAD C. BLACK, and ending MATTHEW D. WEGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.PN2148 ARMY nominations (9) beginning GEORGE A. BARBEE, and ending CLEVE B. SYLVESTER, which nominations were received by the Senate appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2149 ARMY nominations (48 beginning JOSEPH H. AFANADOR, and ending D011573, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2150 ARMY nominations (25) beginning FRANCIS K. AGYAPONG, and ending LAKISHA S. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2151 ARMY nominations (32) beginning GEORGE M. BINGER, III, and ending TIMOTHY M. ZERBE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2181 ARMY nominations (13) B-inning LAURA M. ANDERSON, and ending TSELANE P. WARE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2182 ARMY nominations (21) beginning TYSON G. BAYNES, and ending JAMES P. WINSTEAD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2183 ARMY nominations (121) beginning MICHAEL L. AHRENS, and ending D016666, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2184 ARMY nominations (68) beginning CHAD W. BACKUS, and ending FRANCES R. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2185 ARMY nomination of Alan R. Boyes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2186 ARMY nomination of Thomas S. Furman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2187 ARMY nominations (149) beginning DUSTIN M. ALBERT, and ending D016614, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2188 ARMY nominations (35) beginning AARON H. AMANO, and ending NICHOLAS D. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2022.

PN2234 ARMY nomination of Philip J. Botwinik, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2235 ARMY nomination of Arthur R. Mosel, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2236 ARMY nomination of Binhminh T. Nguyen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2237 ARMY nomination of Michael R. Hanneken, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2238 ARMY nominations (30) beginning ROBERT J. BELTON, and ending RICKIE E. WAMBLES, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PNI417 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (47) beginning Roxana Aguirre, and ending Peter S. Zube, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 17, 2021.

PN1812–1 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (8) beginning Barrett David Bumpas, and ending Charles Y. Wang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2022.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1623 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning GEORGE H. FORBES, III, and ending ROSS A. HRYNEWYCH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 5, 2022.

PN2239 MARINE CORPS nomination of Johnathan D. Reed, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

IN THE NAVY

PN2110 NAVY nomination of Charles E. Knight, II, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2111 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JOSHUA C. LIPPS, and ending RYAN M. MUDD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2112 NAVY nominations (4) beginning RICHARD T. OVERKAMP, JR., and ending WELDON B. WILLHITE, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2113 NAVY nominations (2) beginning STEPHAN M. BUSSELL, and ending WILLIAM P. PHILLIPS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2114 NAVY nomination of Julio E. Patron, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2115 NAVY nomination of Michael J. Martin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2116 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MATTHEW E. BREEDLOVE, and ending CHARITY C. HARDISON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2117 NAVY nominations (6) beginning RALPH E. HULBERT, JR., and ending JOSEPH A. WILLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2118 NAVY nominations (70) beginning BRIAN C. ARENA, and ending PETER J. ZELLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2119 NAVY nominations (13) beginning DARREN N. BESS, and ending CHRISTOPHER E. WEAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2120 NAVY nominations (3) beginning HEATH J. BRIGHTMAN, and ending DANIEL W. KROWE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2121 NAVY nomination of Robert A. Powell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2122 NAVY nominations (5) beginning JAMES C. BOYT, and ending ANTHONY G. MATT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2123 NAVY nomination of Mitchell R. Jones, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2124 NAVY nominations (2) beginning Suzanna G. Brugler, and ending Shivan Sivalingam, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2125 NAVY nomination of Jodi C. Beattie, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2152 NAVY nominations (6) beginning RANDY J. BERTI, and ending MICHAEL WINDOM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2153 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JOSHUA E. CALLOWAY, and ending DANIEL C. SHORT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2154 NAVY nominations (19) beginning DARRIN E. BARBER, and ending MICHAEL A. WOEHRMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2155 NAVY nominations (6) beginning BENJAMIN F. ARMSTRONG, and ending MICHAEL H. SANDERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2156 NAVY nominations (8) beginning CHRISTOPHER J. CARMICHAEL, and ending MARCO D. SPIVEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2157 NAVY nominations (188) beginning BENJAMIN P. ABBOTT, and ending MICHAEL K. WITT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2158 NAVY nominations (2) beginning Brad A. Bauer, and ending John A. Courtial, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2159 NAVY nominations (2) beginning Stephen A. Folsom, and ending Ronnie C. Harper, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2160 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DAVID F. ETHERIDGE, and ending MICHAEL K. SIMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2161 NAVY nominations (4) beginning ZEVERICK L. BUTTS, and ending RODERICK V. LITTLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2162 NAVY nomination of Peter M. B. Harley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2163 NAVY nominations (14) beginning KEVIN D. BARNARD, and ending MICHAEL S. TIEFEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2164 NAVY nominations (18) beginning KATIE M. ABDALLAH, and ending RALPH J. STEPHENS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2165 NAVY nominations (10) beginning RON J. ARELLANO, and ending WILLIAM M. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2166 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ERIN M. CESCHINI, and ending HEATHER H. QUILENDERINO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2167 NAVY nominations (12) beginning CHRISTOPHER S. BERNOTAVICIUS, and ending GEDION T. TEKLEGIORGIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2168 NAVY nominations (4) beginning NATHAN J. CHRISTENSEN, and ending CANDICE C. TRESCH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 19, 2022.

PN2240 NAVY nomination of Cynthia L. Kane, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

PN2242 SPACE FORCE nomination of Andrew S. Menschner, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2243 SPACE FORCE nominations (2) beginning Paul A. Karsten, III, and ending Eric J. Perez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2244 SPACE FORCE nominations (10) beginning DAVID A. BEAUMONT, and ending NICOL R. STROUD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2245 SPACE FORCE nominations (8) beginning WENDY M. DELACRUZ, and ending ERIC S. SCHLIEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2246 SPACE FORCE nominations (5) beginning CRAIG E. FRANK, and ending DAVID A. PHEASANT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 1036, Phillip A. Talbert, to be the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Phillip A. Talbert, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Talbert nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XXII, if applicable, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider: Calendar No. 920, Bernadette M. Meehan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile; that there be 10 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form on the nomination; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by the order of the Senate.

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

BRIDGING THE GAP FOR NEW AMERICANS ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3157, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3157) to require the Secretary of Labor to conduct a study of the factors affecting employment opportunities for immigrants and refugees with professional credentials obtained in foreign countries.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 3157) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3157

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 ''Bridging the Gap for New Americans Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPLICABLE IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES.—The term ''applicable immigrants and refugees''—

(A) means individuals who—

(i)(I) are not citizens or nationals of the United States; and

(II) are lawfully present in the United States and authorized to be employed in the United States; or

(ii) are naturalized citizens of the United States who were born outside of the United States and its outlying possessions; and

(B) includes individuals described in section 602(b)(2) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (title VI of division F of Public Law 111–8; 8 U.S.C. 1101 note).

(2) OTHER TERMS.—Except as otherwise defined in this section, terms used in this Act have the definitions given such terms under section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

SEC. 3. STUDY ON FACTORS AFFECTING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES WITH PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS OBTAINED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Administrator of the Internal Revenue Service, and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, shall conduct a study of the factors affecting employment opportunities in the United States for

applicable immigrants and refugees who have professional credentials that were obtained in a country other than the United States.

(2) WORK WITH OTHER ENTITIES.—The Secretary of Labor shall seek to work with relevant nonprofit organizations and State agencies to use the existing data and resources of such entities to conduct the study required under paragraph (1).

(3) LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURE.—Any information provided to the Secretary of Labor in connection with the study required under paragraph (1)—

(A) may only be used for the purposes of, and to the extent necessary to ensure the efficient operation of, such study; and

(B) may not be disclosed to any other person or entity except as provided under this subsection.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—The study required under subsection (a)(1) shall include—

(1) an analysis of the employment history of applicable immigrants and refugees admitted to the United States during the 5-year period immediately preceding the date of the enactment of this Act, which shall include, to the extent practicable—

(A) a comparison of the employment applicable immigrants and refugees held before immigrating to the United States with the employment they obtained in the United States, if any, since their arrival; and

(B) the occupational and professional credentials and academic degrees held by applicable immigrants and refugees before immigrating to the United States;

(2) an assessment of any barriers that prevent applicable immigrants and refugees from using occupational experience obtained outside the United States to obtain employment in the United States;

(3) an analysis of available public and private resources assisting applicable immigrants and refugees who have professional experience and qualifications obtained outside of the United States to obtain skill-appropriate employment in the United States; and

(4) policy recommendations for better enabling applicable immigrants and refugees who have professional experience and qualifications obtained outside of the United States to obtain skill-appropriate employment in the United States.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall—

(1) submit a report to Congress that describes the results of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a); and

(2) make such report publicly available on the website of the Department of Labor.

JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH COLLABORATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 369, S. 3846.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3846) to reauthorize the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 3846) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3846

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 ''Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH COLLABORATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2991(b)(5) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10651(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''teams and treatment accountability services for communities'' and inserting ''teams, treatment accountability services for communities, and training for State and local prosecutors relating to diversion programming and implementation'';

(B) in clause (v)—

(i) in subclause (III), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subclause (IV), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(V) coordinate, implement, and administer models to address mental health calls that include specially trained officers and mental health crisis workers responding to those calls together.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) SUICIDE PREVENTION SERVICES.—Funds may be used to develop, promote, and implement comprehensive suicide prevention programs and services for incarcerated individuals that include ongoing risk assessment.

''(vii) CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.—Funds may be used for case management services for preliminary qualified offenders and individuals who are released from any penal or correctional institution to—

''(I) reduce recidivism; and

''(II) assist those individuals with reentry into the community.

''(viii) ENHANCING COMMUNITY CAPACITY AND LINKS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE.—Funds may be used to support, administer, or develop treatment capacity and increase access to mental health care and substance use disorder services for preliminary qualified offenders and individuals who are released from any penal or correctional institution.

''(ix) IMPLEMENTING 988.—Funds may be used to support the efforts of State and local governments to implement and expand the integration of the 988 universal telephone number designated for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system under section 251(e)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(4)), including by hiring staff to support the implementation and expansion.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(K) TEAMS ADDRESSING MENTAL HEALTH CALLS.—With respect to a multidisciplinary team described in subparagraph (I)(v) that receives funds from a grant under this section, the multidisciplinary team—

''(i) shall, to the extent practicable, provide response capability 24 hours each day and 7 days each week to respond to crisis or mental health calls; and

''(ii) may place a part of the team in a 911 call center to facilitate the timely response to mental health crises.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2991(o)(1)(C) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10651(o)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''2017 through 2021'' and inserting ''2022 through 2026''.

SEC. 3. EXAMINATION AND REPORT ON PREVALENCE OF MENTALLY ILL OFFENDERS.

Section 5(d) of the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–416; 122 Stat. 4355) is amended by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026''.

WOMEN VETERANS APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 668.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 668) designating June 12, 2022, as ''Women Veterans Appreciation Day''.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 668) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 9, 2022 under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE 23, 2002, AS NATIONAL PELL GRANT DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 676.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 676) expressing support for the designation of June 23, 2022, as ''National Pell Grant Day''.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 676) was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 15, 2022, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE TERRAPINS MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK FOR WINNING THE 2022 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S LACROSSE NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 699, 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. 699) congratulating the Terrapins men's lacrosse team of the University of Maryland, College Park for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletics Association Division I men's lacrosse national championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the University of Maryland's Men's Lacrosse Team for winning the NCAA Division 1 championship. The Terrapins completed an historic undefeated season, winning 18 games—an NCAA record for the most victories in a season without a loss. The perfect season culminated with a 9–7 victory over Cornell University for the national championship.

Lacrosse is the oldest organized team sport in North America, dating back among Indigenous communities to 1100 AD. Jesuit missionaries in Canada documented the Mohawk people playing the game in 1757. Here in the United States, lacrosse is popular nationwide, but New York and Maryland remain the ''hotbeds'' of lacrosse. The game became popular in the Baltimore area in the 1890s. The NCAA began hosting a tournament to determine the national champion in 1971. In the 51 years since then—there was no tournament in 2020 because of the COVID–19 pandemic—the Terps have won four national championships, Johns Hopkins University—JHU—has won nine, and Loyola University Maryland has won one. Maryland universities have been national champion or runner-up in 37 of the 51 years the NCAA has hosted the tournament.

The Terps' championship season was particularly sweet, coming on the heels of a one-goal loss to the University of Virginia—UVA—in last year's championship match. That was the team's only loss last season; over the last 2 years, the Terps have gone 33–1. This year' team was the first Division 1 team to go undefeated since 2006 and just the fourth undefeated team over the past 30 years, joining UVA, JHU, and Princeton in that exalted club. The championship is the second for head coach John Tillman, who has guided the Terps to the NCAA tournament all 11 years he has been the head coach.

Lacrosse is truly a team sport. There are a few players, however, whose contributions deserve special recognition. Logan Wisnauskas—attack—became the first Terp to record 100 points in a single season and then went on to win the Tewaaraton Award as the Nation's top collegiate player after a 61 goal, 42 assist, 103 point season. Anthony DeMaio—midfield—scored the 100th goal of his career during the national championship game and scored 17 goals in the postseason. He scored three straight goals during a span of 2:09—and four overall for his fifth hat trick in his last six games—as Maryland ended the first quarter on a 4–0 run to take a lead the team would not relinquish. Goalie Logan McNaney was the 2022 NCAA Tournament's Most Outstanding Player, making 17 saves against Cornell and 61 saves in the tournament. Wisnauskas, DeMaio, McNaney, Luke Wierman—faceoff—and Ajax Zappitello—defense—were named to the NCAA All-Tournament Team.

I congratulate all the players, coaches, and staff for guiding the Terps through a season for the record books and making all Marylanders proud. The players are: Noah Beacham, Colin Burlace, Jack Brennan, B.J. Burlace, Chace Cope, Joshua Coffman, Jonathan Donville, Anthony DeMaio, Bubba Fairman, Gabe Goforth, John Geppert, Garrett Gibbons, Jake Higgins, Geordy Holmes, Matthew Kopp, Charlie Koras, Keegan Khan, Jack Koras, Shea Keethler, Daniel Kelly, Kyle Long, Eric Malever, Drew Morris, Logan McNaney, Jackson Marshall, Daniel Maltz, Brett Makar, Jack McDonald, Owen Murphy, Roman Puglise, Owen Prybylski, Matt Rahill, Michael Roche, Nick Redd, King Ripley, Eric Spanos, Ryan Siracusa, Alex Smith, Westin Schmidt, Justin Sherrer, Gavin Tygh, Kevin Tucker, Logan Wisnauskas, Zach Whittier, Alex Wicks, Dawson Wynne, Luke Wierman, and Ajax Zappitello.

The coaches are: John Tillman, head coach; Bobby Benson, assistant coach; Jesse Bernhardt, assistant coach; and Carroll Kennedy, volunteer assistant coach. The staff includes: Tim Ahner, equipment manager; Heather Arianna, academic adviser; Anthony Benyarko, MS, ATC, CES—athletic trainer; Colleen Carrion, MS, RD, CDN, CSSD—sports nutrition; Ben Hoffman, strength and conditioning; Clara Hollander, director of operations; Sharle Kekuewa, marketing strategy and fan experience; Eric Mantz, facilities, operations and events; Josh Schmidt, media relations; Sydnee Strong, student-athlete development; and Brian Thornburg, development.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 699) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA SOONERS SOFTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2022 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION WOMEN'S COLLEGE WORLD SERIES

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 700, 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. 700) congratulating the University of Oklahoma Sooners softball team for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's College World Series.

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 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. 700) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MORNING BUSINESS

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today marks the 50th anniversary of the Pell Grant Program, a program that has been the bedrock of our Nation's investment in higher education.

This bipartisan program has provided direct financial aid to low-income students since 1972, and there currently are 7 million students receiving a Pell grant. In my home State of Illinois, more than 208,000 Pell grants totaling nearly $860 million were awarded in the 2020–2021 academic year. These Federal dollars help provide students and families access to higher education, well-paying jobs, and economic mobility.

But Pell grants have failed to keep up with the times. When it was created, the Pell grant covered more than 75 percent of the average cost of attendance at a 4-year public college. Today, Pell grants cover less than 30 percent of these expenses. This means that students are forced to take on student loans, exacerbating the student loan debt crisis. Fourty-five million Americans owe $1.7 trillion in student loan debt, which is second only to mortgages as the largest category of consumer debt.

Doubling the Pell grant would be an investment in our Nation's future and would help ensure students can access higher education. At the same time, the for-profit college industry—an industry with a track record of preying on low-income students—must continue to be held accountable so students and taxpayers are not being ripped off. The for-profit college industry enrolls only 8 percent of all postsecondary students in America, but accounts for 30 percent of all Federal student loan defaults. Too often, students and taxpayers are left holding the bag.

As we celebrate the 50th anniversary of Pell grants, I urge my colleagues to support low-income students by increasing these grants to cover a greater amount of college expenses and ensuring the most vulnerable students are protected from fraudulent for-profit colleges.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, S. Con. Res. 14, the fiscal year 2022 congressional budget resolution, included a reserve fund in section 3003 to allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to revise budget aggregates and committee allocations for legislation that would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2022 to 2031.

The Senate will soon consider S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, as proposed to be amended by Senate Amendment No. 5099, which meets the condition of not increasing the deficit over the relevant 10-year period. As such, I am filing a revision to the aggregates and committee allocations under the budget resolution, which were last revised on April 7, as well as the Senate pay-as-you-go scorecard. Specifically, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that Division A of the bill would increase 2022 budget authority by $7.5 billion and increase 2022 outlays by $1 million but decrease spending over the 5- and 10-year windows. Over the 2022–2026 period, the bill would decrease spending by $5.7 billion and increase revenues by $4 million. Over the 2022–2031 period, the bill would decrease spending by $5.3 billion and increase revenue by $10 million. Division B of the bill appropriates additional discretionary spending, but that spending is designated as an emergency and not subject to budget enforcement.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVISIONS TO BUDGET AGGREGATES—BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

(Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)

($ in billions)

	2022
Current Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	4,169.593
Outlays	4,503.538
Adjustment:	
Budget Authority	7.097
Outlays	−0.340
Revised Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	4,176.690
Outlays	4,503.198

Note: Adjustments reflect the mandatory costs in Division A of S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, as proposed to be amended by Senate Amendment 5099. The discretionary spending in Division B is designated as an emergency and not subject to budget enforcement. Adjustment also revises a previous program integrity adjustment to exclude off-budget amounts appropriated for SSDI.

REVISIONS TO BUDGET REVENUE AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)

($ in billions)

	2022	2022–2026	2026–2031
Current Revenue Aggregates	3,409.875	17,817.012	39,007.531
Adjusments	0.000	0.004	0.010
Revised Revenue Aggregates	3,409.875	17,817.16	39,007.541

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION TO SENATE COMMITTEES

(Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)

($ in billions)

	2022	2022–2026	2026–2031
Judiciary:			
Budget Authority	19.326	90.419	183.057
Outlays	18.598	92.358	183.989
Adjustments:			
Budget Authority	7.53	−5.702	−5.298
Outlays	0.001	−5.715	−5.308
Revised allocation:			
Budget Authority	26.829	84.717	177.759
Outlays	18.599	86.643	178.681

Note: Adjustments reflect the mandatory costs and savings in Division A of S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, as proposed to be amended by Senate Amendment 5099. The discretionary spending in Division B is designated as an emergency and not subject to budget enforcement.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE SENATE

(Revisions Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)

($ in billions)

	Balances
Current Balances:	
Fiscal Year 2022	−8.424
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	−75.460
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	−138.777
Revisions:	
Fiscal Year 2022	0.001
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	−5.719
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	−5.318
Revised Balances:	
Fiscal Year 2022	−8.423
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	−81.179
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	−144.095

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letter in the RECORD.

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

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN1691, the nomination of The Honorable Elizabeth Frawley Bagley, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil, having been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee, with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

1.) on the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed, 11 ayes to 11 noes; and

2.) in accordance with section 3, paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote, and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the resolution.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 0I–22. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 19–34 of May 3, 2019.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures

TRANSMITTAL NO. 0I–22

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(A), AECA)

(i) Purchaser: Government of the Czech Republic

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 19–34; Date: May 3, 2019; Implementing Agency: Navy.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On May 3, 2019, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 19–34 of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of four (4) AH–1Z attack helicopters, eight (8) T700–GE–701D engines (installed), eight (8) Honeywell Embedded Global Positioning Systems with Inertial Navigation (EGI) and Precise Positioning Service (PPS) (installed), and fourteen (14)

AGM–114 Hellfire missiles. Also included were communication equipment, electronic warfare systems, M197 20mm machine guns, Target Sight System, support equipment, spare engine containers, spare and repair parts, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost was $205 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted $180 million of this total.

On August 4, 2020, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 0I–20 of the addition of forty-four (44) AGM–114A Hellfire Missiles; four (4) M36E8 Inert Hellfire Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs); twelve (12) 7.62MM M240D Machine Guns; and one hundred fourteen (114) Advance Precision Kill Weapon System II (APKWS–II) WGU–59/B Guidance Sections. The estimated value of these MDE items was $9.7 million and resulted in an increase of the estimated MDE cost to $189.7 million. The total case value increased to $214.7 million.

This transmittal reports the replacement of fifty-eight (58) AGM–114A Hellfire Missiles (MDE) with fifty-eight (58) AGM–114R (NN) Hellfire Missiles (MDE); four (4) M36E8 Inert Hellfire Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs) (MDE) with four (4) M36E9 Inert Hellfire CATMs (MDE); and one hundred fourteen (114) Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS–II) WGU–59B Guidance Sections (MDE) with one hundred fourteen (114) Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS–II) WGU–59/B Guidance Sections (Single Variant) (MDE). No additional quantities will be provided. The estimated MDE value will remain $189.7 million. The total case value will remain $214.7 million.

(iv) Significance: These proposed weapons systems will augment the Czech Republic's multi-mission, multi-role helicopters, increasing the Czech Republic's ability to meet current and future threats.

(v) Justification: The proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to U.S. national interests to assist the Czech Republic in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology: The AGM–114R Hellfire Missile is an air-to-surface missile with a multi-mission, multi-target, precision strike capability. The M36E9 is an inert Hellfire Captive Air Training Missile.

The Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS) is an air-to ground weapon that consists of an APKWS Guidance Section (GS), legacy 2.75-inch MK66 Mod 4 rocket motor, and legacy MK152 and MK435/436 warhead/fuze. The APKWS is a tactical rocket system that can be launched from several platforms, offering multi-mission, multi-target capability and precision-strike lethality. These guided rockets are steered to the target by following reflected laser beam energy directed onto the target either by the launching aircraft, a second aircraft, or ground-based troops operating a laser designator.

The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 22, 2022.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 22–0H. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 14–54 of October 6, 2014.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–0H

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(C), AECA)

(i) Purchaser: Government of Estonia.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 14–54; Date: October 6, 2014; Implementing Agency: Army.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On October 6, 2014, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 14–54, of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of three hundred fifty (350) Javelin Guided Missiles, one hundred twenty (120) Command Launch Units (CLU) with Integrated Day/Thermal Sight, one hundred two (102) Battery Coolant Units, sixteen (16) Enhanced Performance Basic Skills Trainers (EPBST), one hundred two (102) Missile Simulation Rounds (MSR), spare and repair parts, rechargeable and non-rechargeable batteries, battery chargers and dischargers, support equipment, publications and technical data, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor representative engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related logistics support. The estimated total cost was $55 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted $42 million of this total.

On February 21, 2019, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 19–0D, of the inclusion of an additional one hundred thirty (130) Javelin Block 1 (FGM–148) missiles (MDE). The addition of these items resulted in a revised total MDE cost of $75.6 million. The total estimated case value increased to $91 million.

This transmittal reports the inclusion of an additional one hundred fifty-six (156) Javelin Block 1 (FGM–148F) missiles (MDE). This inclusion will result in a revised MDE value of $111.6 million. The total estimated case value will increase to $127 million.

(iv) Significance: Estonia plays an important role in strengthening deterrence capabilities on the northeastern flank of NATO. Sale of the requested items will significantly enhance this NATO partner's ability to counter threats posed by armored and hardened targets, greatly increasing NATO's overall security, and providing a demonstrable deterrent effect.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology: The Sensitivity of Technology statement contained in the original notification applies to items reported here.

The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is UNCLASSIFIED.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 22, 2022.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Sectin 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 22–17, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA) as Lead Nation for defense articles and services estimated to cost $22.7 million. After this letter is delivered to your offie, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–17

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA) as Lead

Nation for Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* $21.8 million.

Other $ 0.9 million.

Total $22.7 million.

Funding Source: National Funds

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case N4–D–YAB, was below congressional notification threshold at $1.87 million ($1.78 million in MDE) and included forty (40) GBU–39/B Small Diameter Bombs, Increment I. NATO Support and Procurement Agency as Lead Nation has requested the case be amended to include the below listed, additional MDE and non-MDE items and services. This amendment will push the current case above the MDE notification threshold and thus requires notification of the entire case.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Two hundred seventy-nine (279) GBU–39/B Small Diameter Bombs, Increment I.

Two hundred four

(204) FMU–152 Fuzes.

Two hundred four (204) MK–82 500LB General Purpose Bombs.

Fifty (50) BLU–109 2000LB Hard Target Penetrator Bombs.

Non-MDE:

Also included are smoke signal cartridges; engineering and technical support and assistance; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (N4–D–YAB).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 22, 2022.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA)—Precision Guided Munitions

NATO Support and Procurement Agency as Lead Nation has requested the possible sale of two hundred thirty-nine (239) GBU–39/B Small Diameter Bombs, Increment I; two hundred four (204) FMU–152 fuzes; two hundred four (204) MK–82 500LB General Purpose Bombs; and fifty (50) BLU–109 2000LB Hard Target Penetrator Bombs, that will be added to a previously implemented case. The original FMS case, valued at $1.87 million, included forty (40) GBU–39/B Small Diameter Bombs, Increment I. Therefore, this notification is for a total of two hundred seventy-nine (279) GBU–39/B Small Diameter Bombs, Increment I; two hundred four (204) FMU–152 fuzes; two hundred four (204) MK–82 500LB General Purpose Bombs; and fifty (50) BLU–109 2000LB Hard Target Penetrator Bombs. Also included are smoke signal cartridges; engineering and technical support and assistance; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated cost is $22.7 million.

This proposed sale supports the foreign policy and national security of the United States by increasing the flexibility of Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom, twelve NATO nations and one NATO enhanced opportunity partner nation, to contribute to overseas contingency operations. This sale increases the quantity of precision-guided munitions within NATO and allows for their pre-coordinated transfer in support of national and NATO requirements.

The proposed sale will improve NATO's capability to meet current and future ground threats with precision. NATO will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats, and to increase interoperability within contingency operations. Many of the purchasing nations already have precision-guided munitions in their inventories and will all have no difficulty absorbing these munitions into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors for production are the Boeing Corporation, St Louis, MO; and Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ. The principal contractor for integration is unknown and will be determined during contract negotiations. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to NATO.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–17

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology

1. The GBU–39 Small Diameter Bomb Increment 1 (SDB–1) is a 250 pound GPS-aided inertial navigation system, small autonomous, day or night, adverse weather, conventional, air-to-ground precision glide weapon able to strike fixed and stationary relocatable non-hardened targets from standoff ranges. It is intended to provide aircraft with an ability to carry a high number of bombs. Aircraft are able to carry four SDBs in place of one 2,000 pound bomb.

2. The Joint Programmable Fuze (JPF) FMU–152 is a multi-delay, multi-arm and proximity sensor compatible with general purpose blast, frag and hardened-target penetrator weapons. The JPF settings are cockpit selectable in flight when used with numerous precision-guided weapons.

3. MK–82 General Purpose (GP) bomb is a 500 pound, free-fall, unguided, low-drag weapon used for attacking soft and intermediately protected targets.

4. The BLU–109 is a 2,000 pound hard target penetrator warhead designed to penetrate hardened structures before detonating.

5. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

6. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

7. A determination has been made that NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA) and the participating countries can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

8. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to NSPA, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss and express my support for the Columbia River Federal Power System. The federal dams on the Columbia River System are a boon to the Pacific Northwest and stands as an example to other hydropower projects across the country and the world. Its capacity to generate always-on, baseload carbon-free power is vital not just to the Northwest, but relied upon by our friends in surrounding regions as well. The dams also bring substantial benefits for flood control, local recreation, irrigation, navigation, wildlife conservation, and industry. Even Idaho, my landlocked home State, is able to have a working seaport because of the navigation benefits provided by these dams, sending Idaho's products all around the world in an efficient, cost-effective, and low-carbon manner. As additional challenges have risen, scientists and managers at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have adapted to ensure the dams are still beneficial to humans and our natural environment.

In the Water Resources Development Act before the Senate today, there is a seemingly innocuous but rather consequential and far-reaching study directed at aquatic habitat restoration in the Columbia River Basin. Other studies in this section are small enough to be measured in acres or at largest, a portion of a state. The Columbia River Basin spans nearly 260,000 square miles and reaches into seven States. This is not a small, localized review but instead an authorization for a comprehensive study on anything relating to aquatic restoration in one of the largest basins in the country.

This may sound benign to my colleagues who are not from the Northwest, but this issue is not a new or small one. I have been discussing the Columbia River System and salmon recovery since my early days in the Idaho Legislature. Improving salmon and steelhead populations in the Northwest is an important goal and one I have long supported. What I cannot, however, support are the constant efforts to remove the benefits provided by our hydropower system under the guise of salmon recovery. The fact of the matter is we have studied this river and these dams ad nauseam. Most recently, we completed the Columbia River System Operations review, which specifically considered whether dam breaching was necessary for fish recovery and determined the opposite. It is pointless and irresponsible to spend further taxpayer dollars considering dam breaching.

This brings me back to the study in title II. I appreciate very much the chairman and ranking member working with me to place appropriate

sideboards to ensure this study will not consider any recommendations that would result in the removal or reduction of the federally authorized purposes of the system or any measures that would result in a reduction in services provided by those purposes. While I still believe that this study is far too large and untargeted to result in timely recommendations for anadromous fish recovery—and as such, wastes funding better used in the region than on yet another river study—with this important limitation, I am pleased to be able to support the overall WRDA bill and the many important priorities it encompasses for our water infrastructure. Should this study be signed into law, I expect and will pay careful mind that it meets the specific congressional intent of preserving our hydropower system and the many benefits it provides. I look forward to continue working with my colleagues to identify solutions to salmon recovery that do not inhibit the clean energy, flood control, navigation, agricultural, and recreation benefits of our Federal power system.

UNITED STATES INNOVATION AND COMPETITION ACT OF 2021

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 27, 2022.

Hon. RAPHAEL WARNOCK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNOCK: As a business organization focused on a vibrant economy, the Metro Atlanta Chamber encourages you to support the INFORM Consumers Act as part of the bipartisan U.S. Innovation and Competition Act of 2021. This will ensure legitimate businesses and consumers in Georgia and across the country are better protected.

The Metro Atlanta Chamber represents businesses, colleges and universities, and nonprofits across the 29–county region that makes up the nation's ninth largest market. As a more than 160-year-old organization, we strive to ensure that Georgia maintains its status as the number one state to do business.

In recent years, Georgia shoppers have been provided access to a vast network of affordable on line products and convenient, fast delivery. Georgia retailers are proud of the supply chain that has allowed for this, especially when our economy was upended due to the COVID–19 pandemic. Families could depend on Georgia retailers that were essential in keeping our state open for business and our communities safe. However, the rapid growth of online shopping has provided new opportunities for criminals and fraudsters—with many of the latter located in China—to peddle cheap counterfeits and stolen products designed to undercut American manufacturers and local retailers.

The INFORM Consumers Act will help stop unsafe counterfeit products such as N95 masks, toys, and automobile parts from being sold in significant quantities, which are putting Georgia consumers at risk. Today, illegitimate imports cost domestic retailers at least $54.1 billion in sales. We can only expect this number to grow as Russia scraps trademark protections amid the ongoing conflict in Eastern Europe and joins China as one of the most egregious intellectual property offenders.

Meanwhile, sophisticated rings of criminals are brazenly stealing merchandise off the shelves of retail store shelves and selling these items online using fake screennames and bogus business accounts. In addition to putting retail workers and customers in harm's way, these thieves pose a serious economic threat. Research suggests that retail theft has cost retailers across the nation $68.9 billion in losses. Congress must address these growing problems before additional consumers or legitimate American businesses pay the price. The common-sense measures of the INFORM Consumers Act, introduced by Senators Dick Durbin (D–IL) and Bill Cassidy (R–LA) in the Senate, and Representatives Jan Schakowsky (D–IL) and Gus Bilirakis (R–FL) in the House will make it harder for criminal networks and con artists from around the globe to use the anonymity of online marketplaces to dupe consumers with counterfeit and stolen products.

INFORM would require online marketplaces to verify high-volume sellers on their platforms and provides consumers with a method to contact sellers if they suspect they have been ripped off and sold a fake, broken, or dangerous item. This bill would not in any way inhibit the small businesses in Georgia that conduct legitimate commerce on marketplaces every day, and it protects the personal information of small sellers. That's why it has united consumer groups, manufacturers, retailers, and marketplaces who want to protect American consumers from stolen, fake, and dangerous products.

This simple, bipartisan measure will bring transparency and accountability to third-party sellers online and make it harder for criminals and counterfeiters to harm local businesses and consumers. On behalf of Georgia retailers—and especially for our employees and customers—we strongly urge you to support the INFORM Consumers Act and include it as part of the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act of 2021.

Sincerely,

KATIE KIRKPATRICK, P.E.,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

APRIL 27, 2022.

Hon. Senator RAPHAEL WARNOCK,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNOCK: In recent years, Georgia shoppers have been provided access to a vast network of affordable online products and convenient, fast delivery. Georgia retailers are proud of the supply chain that has allowed for this, especially when our economy was upended due to the COVID–19 pandemic. Families could depend on the many retailers that were essential in keeping our state open for business and our communities safe.

However, the rapid growth of online shopping has provided new opportunities for criminals and fraudsters—with many of the latter located in China—to peddle cheap counterfeits and stolen products designed to undercut American manufacturers and local retailers. Congress has the ability to act to ensure legitimate businesses and consumers in Georgia and across the country are better protected, we urge you to include the INFORM Consumers Act as part of the bipartisan U.S. Innovation and Competition Act of 2021.

The INFORM Consumers Act will help stop unsafe counterfeit products such as N95 masks, toys, and automobile parts from being sold in significant quantities, which are putting Georgia consumers at risk. Today, illegitimate imports cost domestic retailers at least $54.1 billion in sales. We can only expect this number to grow as Russia scraps trademark protections amid the ongoing conflict in Eastern Europe and joins China as one of the most egregious intellectual property offenders.

Meanwhile, sophisticated rings of criminals are brazenly stealing merchandise off the shelves of retail store shelves and selling these items online using fake screennames and bogus business accounts. In addition to putting retail workers and customers in harm's way, these thieves pose a serious economic threat. Research suggests that retail theft has cost retailers across the nation $68.9 billion in losses.

Congress must address these growing problems before additional consumers or legitimate American businesses pay the price. The common-sense measures of the INFORM Consumers Act, introduced by Senators Dick Durbin (D–IL) and Bill Cassidy (R–LA) in the Senate, and Representatives Jan Schakowsky (D–IL) and Gus Bilirakis (R–FL) in the House will make it harder for criminal networks and con artists from around the globe to use the anonymity of online marketplaces to dupe consumers with counterfeit and stolen products.

INFORM would require online marketplaces to verify high-volume sellers on their platforms and provides consumers with a method to contact sellers if they suspect they have been ripped off and sold a fake, broken, or dangerous item. This bill would not in any way inhibit the small businesses in Georgia that conduct legitimate commerce on marketplaces every day, and it protects the personal information of small sellers. That's why it has united consumer groups, manufacturers, retailers, and marketplaces who want to protect American consumers from stolen, fake, and dangerous products.

This simple, bipartisan measure will bring transparency and accountability to third-party sellers online and make it harder for criminals and counterfeiters to harm local businesses and consumers. On behalf of Georgia retailers—and especially for our employees and customers—we strongly urge you to support the INFORM Consumers Act and include it as part of the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act of 2021.

Sincerely,

CHRIS CLARK,
President and CEO,
Georgia Chamber of Commerce.

LAGRANGE TROUP COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LaGrange, GA, June 16, 2022.

Hon. RAPHAEL WARNOCK,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNOCK: On behalf of the LaGrange Troup County Chamber of Commerce, I am pleased to provide support for increased funding for domestic semiconductor production. Our membership includes several industrial partners in Troup County who have been negatively impacted and repeatedly shutdown due to chip shortages. Our Chamber appreciates your efforts to provide U.S. manufacturers access to these important components now and in the future.

The LaGrange Troup County Chamber of Commerce was established in 1911 to support and enhance the businesses and business climate of Troup County. Through our mission of championing our member businesses and serving as a catalyst for advancing the region's economic success, we work diligently on their behalf.

The LaGrange Troup County Chamber looks forward to continuing to support efforts to alleviate challenges in workforce development and strengthen supply chain resiliency.

Sincerely,

CONNIE HENSLER,
President and CEO.

MARCH 2, 2022.

Senator RAPHAEL WARNOCK.

DEAR SENATOR WARNOCK: On behalf of the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce, I am excited to offer this letter in support of the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act as well as the America COMPETES Act. As our economy and workforce continue to change, we believe that strengthening our ability to compete globally is key to our long-term success. The Chamber is actively engaged in supporting and enhancing our local community as a regional catalyst in economic growth, workforce development, community vibrancy, and inclusion.

We are hopeful that the passing of this bill means stronger funding and policy support for regional job growth; especially with support for semi-conductor manufacturing that further enables technology manufacturing and strengthens Georgia's automobile industry, the outcome of alleviating supply chain obstacles and the inclusion of historic investments in commercial development and science and technology. Further, strengthening the designated innovation hub between Columbus and Opelika remains an important focus and we'd look forward to the availability of funding to support research and development and commercialization in this arena.

Lastly, as we tackle the challenge of building a world class workforce in a tough environment, support via workforce development programs and funding is imperative.

Please accept our support for SB 1260, the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act. We look forward to this advancing and to continuing to build a strong Columbus, a strong Georgia and a strong nation. Thanks for your continued partnership.

Very respectfully,

JERALD MITCHELL,
President and CEO.

JUNE 16, 2022.

Hon. Rev. RAPHAEL WARNOCK,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REVEREND WARNOCK: As Director of the Georgia Manufacturing Extension Partnership (GaMEP), I want to thank you for your ongoing efforts to enhance Georgia's innovation and manufacturing sectors and work to strengthen U.S. competitiveness. Each year, GaMEP assists more than 1,000 small and medium-sized manufacturers across Georgia through onsite implementation, training and learning opportunities, connections to partners, and other resources. I hope you can further support the success of Georgia's manufacturing sector in your important role as Senate conferee to the bicameral conference for the United States Innovation and Competition Act (USICA, S. 1260) and the America COMPETES Act of 2022 (COMPETES Act, H.R. 4521).

These important bills under negotiation have the potential to transform the U.S. economy by spurring new innovations in emerging technologies, jumpstarting our domestic semiconductor production capabilities, and dramatically expanding and solidifying the resiliency of the U.S. manufacturing base. I strongly encourage the inclusion in the final conference agreement the proposed increase of authorized funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) program and the establishment ofa National Manufacturing Advisory Council as outlined in both the Senate USJCA and the House COMPETES Act. The bills also include important provisions to create new supply chain resiliency programs to identify, prepare for, and respond to threats to the U.S. supply chain. Looking toward development of future and emerging industries, manufacturers will also have an important role in furthering Georgia's economic development through the proposed Department of Commerce Regional Technology Hubs program. Without actual funding behind these tremendously important policy proposals, these activities may never advance. As such, I encourage Congress to include appropriated funding to begin these efforts.

GaMEP is proud to promote the success of the manufacturing industry within Georgia and support our manufacturers to be globally competitive. The competitiveness legislation under negotiation will propel our efforts even further. I urge Congress to come to a final agreement, which includes these important manufacturing and supply chain provisions, and swiftly enact this crucial legislation. I want to reiterate my appreciation for your work to support the manufacturing and innovation industries in Georgia and I would be happy to answer any questions you or your office may have.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY D. ISRAEL,
Director, Georgia Institute of Technology—Georgia Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

TRIBUTE TO KAREN FISHER

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize Karen Fisher for her decades of leadership toward innovation and systematic change to improve the health of Americans. Karen may be retiring from a momentous health policy career, but the Nation will long feel the positive impact of her work.

From 2011 to 2016, the Senate Finance Committee was fortunate to benefit from Karen's expertise on the Medicare program and other key health policy issues. Serving as senior health counsel, Karen led the committee's work in 2015 to permanently repeal the outdated and flawed sustainable growth rate—SGR—formula previously used to determine Medicare physician payments and to replace it with a new payment system that advances value-based care for the millions who rely on the Medicare program as a lifeline.

In addition to her historic role in permanently retiring the SGR, Karen oversaw legislative activities related to the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation—CMMI—and the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute—PCORI—as she uplifted the transformative effect alternative payment models could have in driving greater commitments to quality and value in healthcare. She also served—and continues to serve—as a mentor to early-career staff on the Committee and across Capitol Hill, offering professional guidance and networking opportunities for the next generation of female leaders.

At the Association of American Medical Colleges—AAMC—Karen has continued her commitment to improve healthcare through public policy. Throughout her nearly 6 years as chief public policy officer, the AAMC has been an important voice on the need to expand access to healthcare nationwide by strengthening coverage through both the Affordable Care Act and the Medicaid program and by addressing shortages of physicians and other health professionals.

Her more than 25 years of experience also have been an essential asset during the COVID pandemic, as she liaised between Federal policymakers and the academic medicine community to support the heroic efforts of the country's health professionals and scientists in treating patients, expanding access to telehealth, developing and administering COVID tests, advancing research on new countermeasures, developing and deploying vaccines, and enhancing health equity interventions.

I know that I speak for health policy professionals nationwide as I express my gratitude for Karen's dedication, talent, mentorship, leadership, and persistence in public service and in betterment of the Nation's health.

Thank you, Karen. I am wishing you and your family all the best for a very well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO ACKLEY PADILLA

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to proudly recognize the outstanding public service of Ackley Padilla, my brother, who is retiring after nearly two decades of helping to lead the city of Los Angeles.

Ackley is a proud son of Pacoima, CA—and I know that Pacoima takes incredible pride in him. Ackley, my sister Julie, and I all learned to value public service from our parents, Santos and Lupe Padilla. Ackley made his career serving the people of the San Fernando Valley while working for a number of local elected officials.

Ackley worked for the first Latino and the first Latina presidents of the Los Angeles City Council. And, yes, that means that I was once his boss. For the past 9 years, he has worked for council president Nury Martinez. As her chief of staff, he has been crucial to Los Angeles's response to the COVID–19 pandemic, including getting testing and vaccination sites up and running, as well as food distribution sites and other assistance for families in need.

In addition to his public service, Ackley is a passionate fan of the Angels and the Clippers—and known hater of the Lakers and the Dodgers. He clearly followed his father instead of his brother on those decisions. Ackley is a proud dad to three wonderful girls—Kaylyn, Kathryn and Khloey—and a proud handyman. He has come to love his minivan, ''Pony Boy,'' and will surely drive into many adventures in the years ahead.

The people of Pacoima, the San Fernando Valley, and all of Los Angeles have benefited from Ackley's public

service. I wish him the best in his next chapter. And I promise an extra cold refreshment on the next trip to Canelo's.

TRIBUTE TO CAMILLE PEASE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as most of us here in the Senate know, this Chamber functions with a dedicated and able staff to support us. Because we are a relatively small body that has to oversee the actions of the far larger executive branch, we rely on specialists detailed from other Agencies throughout the government. It is really a two-way deal. When they come here, they learn about the intricacies of the legislative process and get to participate in it. In return, we benefit from their years of experience in the Agency they come from.

In my case as chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we rely on the Government Accountability Office or GAO staff who specialize in nuclear and space systems to help us on the programmatic details of a multitude of programs in the Department of Energy and Defense, and every year, the committee sponsors one of them to spend a year with us.

For the past year, we were fortunate enough to have Ms. Camille Pease with us from the GAO as our detailee, and now, her year is up, and she is heading back.

Because of the way the Armed Services Committee works in preparing for a markup, members such as myself and Senator FISCHER, our ranking member on the subcommittee, spend a tremendous amount of time with staff, including Cami, on hearings and briefings in order to build a legislative record and develop legislation for our annual markup of the National Defense Authorization Act, or NDAA. In every aspect, Cami was there to enrich us with her expertise on the National Nuclear Security Administration. In return, I hope she is wiser on how we work in this Chamber, and in the Armed Services Committee in particular, on a bipartisan legislative process that has managed to produce a NDAA for the past 61 years.

So we thank you, Cami, for spending time with us, and we wish you the best on your return to the GAO. We hope your time with us will help you in the years to come. I hope you take back to the GAO that, when it comes to the national security of this nation, and the NDAA in particular, this Chamber does work in a bipartisan and productive fashion, and it is my hope it will continue to do so in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE NORTH GREENVILLE UNIVERSITY CRUSADERS

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the North Greenville University Crusaders baseball team for winning the 2022 NCAA Baseball Division II National Championship.

The Crusaders outscored their four World Series opponents by a combined 34–12. Their victory earned the program its first national championship and marked the second Conference Carolinas baseball team to win the title.

Throughout the season, Landon Powell, head coach of the Crusaders, was consistently a role model to the players. When he was hired in 2014, the Crusaders were 8–35 and had three and one-half scholarship players. Coach Powell turned the team around and guided them to a 29–25 winning record in his first year; since then, the Crusaders have consistently averaged more than 41 wins per season.

On the field, Jax Cash went three for four at the plate and drove in the final run of the game. Reece Fields pitched 5.0 innings, allowing one run on six hits, three walks, eight strikeouts, and was named the tournament MVP. Nate Roof pitched 3.0 innings, allowing no runs, two hits, and a walk. The entire team should be proud of their hard work and accomplishments. The North Greenville baseball team displayed outstanding dedication and teamwork throughout the season and brought pride to the State of South Carolina. The university, under the leadership of Dr. Gene C. Fant, Jr., and Coach Powell, has much to be proud of, and I look forward to another great season by the Crusaders.

I ask that our colleagues join me in congratulating the North Greenville University Crusaders baseball team for winning the 2022 NCAA Baseball Division II National Championship.•

TRIBUTE TO RON NUTZ

• Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and thank Mr. Ron Nutz of Haddam, KS.

Last September, I traveled to Washington County and met many outstanding Kansans, amongst them was Mr. Ron Nutz. Ron is responsible for spearheading the construction of the Mark Nutsch Horse Soldier Monument and the 9/11 Memorial in Washington County, KS. Mark Nutsch served as a Ranger in the Army and as a special forces officer, deploying on multiple combat tours. Shortly following the 9/11 attacks on our country, he led his team into northern Afghanistan and fought against the Taliban and al-Qaeda, much of the time on horseback.

I would like to thank Ron for the work he has done towards the completion of this project. The monument will depict a soldier on horseback and will also incorporate the stone, lapis lazuli, which is found throughout Afghanistan. The groundbreaking ceremony will be held on June 27.

I now ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Ron Nutz for all of his hard work, as well as in wishing him nothing but success in the future.•

TRIBUTE TO DALE W. MOORE

• Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Dale W. Moore for dedicating more than 40 years of his professional life to being a champion for agriculture in the public and private sector.

For the past 10 years, Dale has served farmers and ranchers as a leader at the American Farm Bureau Federation, first as executive director, public policy, then vice president, public affairs, and finally spending the past 4 years of his career serving as the executive vice president.

Dale served as chief of staff at the U.S. Department of Agriculture under four Secretaries of Agriculture, served as legislative director for the House Agriculture Committee, and as a legislative assistant for then-Representative Pat Roberts, who represented the ''Big First'' district of Kansas.

Dale's Kansas roots run deep. He is a native of Copeland, KS, with a population of approximately 250 people. Dale grew up on a livestock, hay, and grain farm, where he learned firsthand the intricacies of agriculture, the value of hard work, and fostered an appreciation of rural America that he carried with him throughout his entire career.

Dale received a bachelor of science in animal science and biology from Fort Hays State University, located in Hays, KS, where he participated in activities such as Rodeo Club, Block and Bridle Club, and Delta Tau Alpha.

In all of his roles throughout his illustrious career, Dale earned a reputation that continues with him today as a mentor, problem solver, counselor, and storyteller whose commitment sets a shining example for policymakers across the political spectrum. Dale has not only been an advocate for farmers and ranchers, but has contributed to the strength of American farm and ranch families, serving as a trusted friend and advisor to many.

On behalf of this body, the U.S. Senate, it my honor to recognize and thank Dale W. Moore for his dedication to agriculture and service to the American Farm Bureau Federation, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Congress and to congratulate him on his retirement.•

CENTENNIAL OF DAVIESS COUNTY FARM BUREAU

• Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, today I want to honor the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Daviess County Farm Bureau. Established in 1922 by a handful of people, the Daviess County Farm Bureau quickly grew to include approximately 100 farmers. With membership dues of only $2, the organization was forced to meet wherever it could: the courthouse, the rural electric office, and even members' homes. It was in these early meetings that the Daviess County Farm Bureau first dedicated itself to advocacy on behalf

of farmers, and soon after, the organization began lobbying in the Commonwealth's capital for the electrification of rural Daviess County.

In its early years, the Daviess County Farm Bureau supported the community through disaster and development. In response to the flood of 1937, the organization provided support to the local hospital, fire department, and Red Cross. The organization took on local issues; this included conducting a study to establish a tobacco warehouse and assessing warehouse charges related to the sale of tobacco. Daviess County Farm Bureau also established a food locker refrigerating and processing plant, formed a committee to head a funding drive—which ultimately raised a total of $23,669—for Kentucky Wesleyan College, and started a successful newsletter in the ''Messenger Inquirer''. In response to the outbreak of the COVID–19 pandemic, the Daviess County Farm Bureau partnered with River Valley Behavioral Health to create the ''You're Not Alone'' campaign, which sought to bring mental health awareness to rural communities.

Today, after a century of service to Daviess County, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and farmers everywhere, the Daviess County Farm Bureau continues to serve as ''The Voice for Agriculture.'' By lobbying the county, State, and Federal governments, the Daviess County Farm Bureau ensures that the needs of its membership are communicated to and considered by elected officials. Daviess County Farm Bureau is also active in the Kentucky Farm Bureau and American Farm Bureau.

In addition to its advocacy efforts, the Daviess County Farm Bureau still supports a number of local programs and organizations. These include 4–H clubs, Future Farmers of America chapters, and local schools and teachers that incorporate agriculture education in the classroom. The organization also sponsors the Annual Farm Expo, the Farm-City Breakfast, and the annual Rooster Booster Breakfast hosted by the Greater Owensboro Chamber of Commerce. Daviess County Farm Bureau is also responsible for administering several programs offered by the Kentucky Farm Bureau, including the Institute for Future Agricultural Leaders—IFAL—the Leadership Enhancement for Agricultural Development program, and college scholarship programs.

A dedication to advocating on behalf of farmers and a love of community have defined the first 100 years of the Daviess County Farm Bureau's history. In celebrating this momentous milestone, we also cast a hopeful eye toward the future. I have no doubt that the Daviess County Farm Bureau will play an integral role in shaping that future.●

RECOGNIZING SIMON'S SHOES

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

Operating a small business requires unparalleled commitment and perseverance, traits that have been inherited to each successive generation of the Simon Family. Jacob Simon immigrated to Henderson, KY, from Lithuania in 1910, following his two brothers who made Henderson their new home years prior. He began as a peddler selling merchandise across the county, but at times found it difficult to attract clients due to his lack of English. Insistent on improving his craft, Jacob developed a sense of trust with the locals as his career as a peddler led him to become a steadfast member of the community. As such, it did not take long for Jacob to embrace Henderson as his home. In the following years, Jacob mastered English, became an American citizen, and opened Simon's Shoes in January 1919.

In addition to footwear, Simon's Shoes offered a diverse array of clothing, and the store quickly became known for carrying any type of garment one could desire, from suits to base layers. His childhood in Lithuania and initial years in America had taught Jacob key principles of saving and being conservative with money, which were integral to the success of his business and the store's ability to survive the Great Depression. When Jacob's son, Larry, became involved in the family business, they decided to narrow the focus of the store to specialize in shoes.

As the store continued to flourish, Larry, who eventually took ownership of the business, was able to purchase the former J.C. Penny building next door and use this space for the store's inventory. The decades of success made Simon's Shoes a destination for people across the State and beyond. To this day, residents from Evansville, Owensboro, Louisville, St. Louis, as well as tourists traveling along the Ohio River make the journey to visit Simon's Shoes. Customers are continuously attracted by their wide range of shoes, inclusive of varying sizes and widths, and their benefits as a full-service store.

Three generations of the Simon family have been involved in the operations of Simon's Shoes, the latest Simon to take the reins being Larry's son Bruce Simon. Even as the store passes down through the successive generations, the Simons remain active members of the business for as long as possible. In 1975, then 85-year-old Jake Simon told local newspaper ''The Gleaner'', ''When I draw my last breath, that store will be in my consciousness.'' Likewise, Larry continues to visit Simon's Shoes often, stating that he would be in the store up to 6 days a week for several hours each day at 84 years of age. The Simons' passion for their business has grown into a now-century long catalyst for its success, as the store that once occupied a fraction of the building on First and Main Street now consists of three buildings on the same corner. Congratulations to the entire Simon family and to the whole team at Simon's Shoes. I look forward to seeing their continued growth and success in Kentucky.●

REMEMBERING REGINALD M. FELTON

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life of a dedicated public servant and a champion for education: Mr. Reginald ''Reggie'' M. Felton from my State of Maryland. Our community lost Reggie only a few days ago, at the age of 75. Today, I would like to take a moment to celebrate his extraordinary life and pay tribute to his lasting legacy of good works.

The story of Reggie's life can be defined by one word: service. He served our Nation in the military as a member of the U.S. Coast Guard and, later, as a Senior Executive within the Department of the Navy. He served his town and county as president of a local citizens association, as chair of the Silver Spring Center Citizens Advisory Board, and as chairman of the Freedom Fund Dinner organized by the Montgomery County Branch of the NAACP.

But most of all, Reggie served our students. With the trust of his community behind him, Reggie won a seat on the Montgomery County Board of Education in 1994. He would serve on the board for another 20 years, winning reelection in 1998 and 2002 and rising to become the first African-American president of the Montgomery County Board of Education, a position he held for three terms.

Reggie's commitment to the mission and spirit of the school board led to real results during his tenure. The Montgomery County School Board earned national recognition for excellence while Reggie served on the board, and it is no wonder why. Under his leadership, the Montgomery County Public Schools, which make up the largest school district in my State, saw major improvements in the quality of education and in the process for selecting and onboarding superintendents. Reggie also focused his efforts on establishing higher standards in curriculum, and those higher standards continue to inform a tradition of excellence at Montgomery County Public Schools that lives on to this day. In short: Reggie's time as president of the Montgomery County School Board helped make Montgomery County schools some of the best in the Nation.

Throughout his extraordinary life, Reggie Felton nurtured his talent for leadership, stepped up to serve his community and his country, and did all that he could to improve the lives of

his fellow citizens. He was beloved by all—respected across our communities for his kindness, his good humor, his brilliance, and his grace.

On a personal note, Reggie was a good friend whom I admired greatly. I will always remember his warm and generous spirit, his wonderful smile, and his determination to serve others. I know I speak for Marylanders everywhere when I say our State is eternally grateful for his service and sacrifice.

Today, Reggie's legacy lives on in every young student who benefits from his good deeds—whether they know it or not—and his story will continue to inspire us all. Thank you, Reggie. We love you.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:39 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5585. An act to establish the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Health, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7666. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to mental health and substance use disorders, and for other purposes.

At 2:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment and an amendment to the title, in which in requests the concurrence of the Senate.

S. 2089. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5585. An act to establish the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 7666. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to mental health and substance use disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHATZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3273. A bill to take certain land in the State of California into trust for the benefit of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–125).

H.R. 1975. An act to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–126).

H.R. 4881. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust for the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona certain land in Pima County, Arizona, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–127).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Reuben E. Brigety II, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Nominee: Reuben Earl Brigety, II.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee: Brigety, Reuben: $100.00, 03/31/2021, ACTBLUE; $250.00, 07/23/2020, Biden for President; $250.00, 07/23/2020, Biden Victory Fund; $50.00, 03/23/2020, ACTBLUE; $50.00, 03/23/2020, Evelyn for NY; $500.00, 02/21/2020, Evelyn for NY; $100.00, 02/05/2020 ACTBLUE; $250.00, 12/31/2019, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $250.00, 12/31/2019, Franken for Iowa; $100.00, 10/22/2019, ACTBLUE; $250.00, 09/30/2019, Franken for Iowa; $1,000.00, 08/14/2019, Biden for President; $500.00, 06/30/2019, Dan for Colorado; $250.00, 06/30/2019, Scott Cooper for Congress; $100.00, 05/23/2018, ACTBLUE; $100.00, 05/23/2018, ACTBLUE; $100.00, 05/23/2018, Helmer for Congress; $250.00, 02/12/2018, Amy McGrath for Congress; $250.00, 12/31/2017, Josh Butner for Congress; $250.00, 12/13/2017, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $250.00, 09/27/2017, Helmer for Congress; $50.00, 09/20/2017, ACTBLUE; $250.00, 09/04/2017, Josh Butner for Congress; $500.00, 08/09/2017, Dan for Colorado; Selassie, Leelie: $100.00, 07/31/2021, Emily's List; $35.00, 07/31/2021, Emily's List; $25.00, 05/20/2020, ACTBLUE; $25.00, 05/20/2020, ACTBLUE; $25.00, 04/24/2020, ACTBLUE; $7.00, 04/18/2020, ACTBLUE; $5.00, 01/30/2018, ACTBLUE; $10.00, 01/23/2018, ACTBLUE.

Timmy T. Davis, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Qatar.

Nominee: Timmy T. Davis.

Post: State of Qatar.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Timmy T. Davis: None.

Patti R. Davis: $100, 08/24/2018, ACT BLUE; $10, 08/24/2018, ACT BLUE.

Francisco O. Mora, of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Francisco Oscar Mora.

Post: Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Donna Shalala for Congress: $100, 5/4/2018, Ivette Mora (wife); $100, 5/4/2018, Francisco O. Mora; Act Blue—Andrew Gillum: $300, 9/9/2018, Francisco O. Mora; Debbie Wasserman for Cong: $250, 11/1/2018, Francisco O. Mora; Biden for President: $250, 4/27/2019, Francisco O. Mora; $500, 9/12/2019, Francisco O. Mora; $1,000, 4/8/2020, Francisco O. Mora; $250, 4/28/2020, Francisco O. Mora; Biden Victory Fund: $500, 8/17/2020, Francisco O. Mora; Biden for President: $500, 8/17/2020, Francisco O. Mora.

Michael Alan Ratney, of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Nominee: Michael Ratney.

Post: Saudi Arabia.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

From Self: None.

From Spouse: (Karen Sasahara): $16.66, 11/18/2020, Andy Kim for Congress; $16.67, 11/18/2020, Jon Ossoff for Congress; $16.67, 11/18/2020, Raphael Warnock for Congress; $100.00, 7/31/2021, Andy Kim for Congress.

Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Alyce Camille Richardson and ending with Diane Jones, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 7, 2022.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE—TREATY

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 116–2: Extradition Treaty with the Republic of Croatia with 2 declarations (Ex. Rept. 117–4).

The text of the committee-recommended resolution of advice and consent to ratification is as follows:

(A) THE U.S.-CROATIA EXTRADITION AGREEMENT

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Agreement between the

Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Croatia comprising the instrument as contemplated by Article 3(2) of the Agreement on Extradition between the United States of America and the European Union, signed June 25, 2003, as to the Application of the Treaty on Extradition signed on October 25, 1901 (the ''U.S.-Croatia Extradition Agreement''), signed at Washington on December 10, 2019, (Treaty Doc. 116–2), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The U.S.-Croatia Extradition Agreement is self-executing.

(B) THE U.S.-CROATIA MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration,-

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Croatia comprising the instrument as contemplated by Article 3(3) of the Agreement on Mutual Legal Assistance between the United States of America and the European Union signed at Washington on June 25, 2003 (the ''U.S.-Croatia Mutual Legal Assistance Agreement''), signed at Washington on December 10, 2019, (Treaty Doc. 116–2), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The U.S.-Croatia Mutual Legal Assistance Agreement is self-executing.

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. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 4458. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the process by which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines whether an educational institution meets requirements relating to the percentage of students who receive educational assistance furnished by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 4459. A bill to provide targeted relief for student borrowers, improve the affordability of higher education, provide reforms to the student loan system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4460. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to regularly review and update policies and manuals related to inspections at ports of entry; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4461. A bill to reauthorize the program for mental health awareness training grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 4462. A bill to establish a pilot program within the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice relating to advocacy for domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4463. A bill to terminate General License No. 8C of the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury and require the application of sanctions under Executive Order 14024 to the entities listed in General License No. 8C; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 4464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Kaena Point National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 4465. A bill to establish a Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office and an Office of Health Security in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 4466. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act by reauthorizing the Peace Corps, providing better support for current, returning, and former volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4467. A bill to preserve access to abortion medications; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 4468. A bill to improve the quality, appropriateness, and effectiveness of diagnosis in health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4469. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting disinformation in the advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 4470. A bill to release from wilderness study are designation certain land in the State of Montana, to improve the management of that land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 4471. A bill to provide relief for small businesses suffering extraordinary losses due to the COVID–19 pandemic; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4472. A bill to expand the availability of mental, emotional, behavioral, and substance use disorder health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. OSSOFF:

S. 4473. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to extend the authorization of use of depot working capital funds for unspecified minor military construction projects for the revitalization and recapitalization of defense industrial base facilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 4474. A bill to prohibit the declaration of a Federal emergency relating to abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 4475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for gain from the sale of real property for use as a manufactured home community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4476. A bill to amend the State Small Business Credit Initiative Act of 2010 to modify allocations under the State Small Business Credit Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 4477. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require agencies to include a list of outdated or duplicative reporting requirements in annual budget justifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 4478. A bill to provide for assistance to improve the resilience of historic light stations, to study the long-term protection needs of historic light stations, and to establish a national database of historic light stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 4479. A bill to ban certain small, high-powered magnets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 4480. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide increased labor law protections for agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions .

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 4481. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to collect and disseminate information about pharmaceutical affordability assistance programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4482. A bill to help persons in the United States experiencing homelessness and significant behavioral health issues, including substance use disorders, by authorizing a grant program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist State and local governments, Continuums of Care, community-based organizations that administer both health and homelessness services, and providers of services to people experiencing homelessness, better coordinate health care and homelessness services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 4483. A bill to prevent class-based loan forgiveness for Federal student loans under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 without the explicit appropriation of funds by Congress for such purpose; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 4484. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the fiduciary duty of plan administrators to select and maintain investments based solely on pecuniary factors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4485. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 4486. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 4487. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve procedures and requirements related to election mail; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 4488. A bill to establish an interagency committee on global catastrophic risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 4489. A bill to provide greater support for grandfamilies and older caretaker relatives; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4490. A bill to promote digital citizenship and media literacy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. 4491. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 4492. A bill to provide for the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to study and report on a Federal research agenda to advance the understanding of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 4493. A bill to improve cybersecurity practices and improve digital literacy among veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. PADILLA, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4494. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to modify the requirements for an eligible project under the competitive grant program for large-scale water recycling and reuse projects, to provide for an additional authorization of appropriations for that program, to repeal the termination of authority for that program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 4495. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to require export controls with respect to certain personal data of United States nationals and individuals in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4496. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development of 2000 to modify the authorization of appropriations for the Las Vegas Wash program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 4497. A bill to prohibit retail businesses from refusing cash payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 4498. A bill to expand the availability of mental, emotional, and behavioral health services under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Australia of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives relating to Definition of ''Frame or Receiver'' and Identification of Firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. Res. 691. A resolution affirming, commemorating, and celebrating the 50th anniversary of the enactment of title IX, applauding the increase in educational opportunities available to all individuals, regardless of sex or gender, and recognizing the tremendous amount of work left to be done to further increase those opportunities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. Res. 692. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the 50th anniversary of the enactment of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 into law; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. OSSOFF):

S. Res. 693. A resolution recognizing the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States and the need for greater access to music education for African-American students and designating June 2022 as African-American Music Appreciation Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. Res. 694. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 2022 as ''National Sarcoma Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Res. 695. A resolution designating June as ''National Annuity Awareness Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 696. A resolution recognizing the American people's commitment to rebuilding Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. Res. 697. A resolution designating July 2022 as ''Plastic Pollution Action Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. Res. 698. A resolution honoring the dedication of the Ball family to providing college educations and celebrating their 100-year legacy at Ball State University; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 699. A resolution congratulating the Terrapins men's lacrosse team of the University of Maryland, College Park for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletics Association Division I men's lacrosse national championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 700. A resolution congratulating the University of Oklahoma Sooners softball team for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's College World Series; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 56

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) 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. 129

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 129, a bill to permit disabled law enforcement officers, customs and border protection officers, firefighters, air traffic controllers, nuclear material couriers, members of the Capitol Police, members of the Supreme Court Police, employees of the Central Intelligence Agency performing intelligence activities abroad or having specialized security requirements, and diplomatic security special agents of the Department of State to receive retirement benefits in the same manner as if they had not been disabled.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes.

S. 467

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 467, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program to improve the identification, assessment, and treatment of patients in hospital emergency departments who are at risk of suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to enable the payment of certain officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized pursuant to a grant of deferred action, deferred enforced departure, or temporary protected status.

S. 690

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 690, a bill to expedite the provision of humanitarian assistance, including life-saving medical care, to the people of North Korea, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor 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. 2032

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2032, a bill to extend and modify the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, to postpone the medical exam for aliens who are otherwise eligible for such program, to provide special immigrant status for certain surviving spouses and children, and for other purposes.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2372, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2510

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2510, a bill to reduce the health risks of heat by establishing the National Integrated Heat Health Information System Program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Integrated Heat Health Information System Interagency Committee to improve extreme heat preparedness, planning, and response, requiring a study, and establishing financial assistance programs to address heat effects, and for other purposes.

S. 2607

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2607, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the former hostages of the Iran Hostage Crisis of 1979–1981, highlighting their resilience throughout the unprecedented ordeal that they lived through and the national unity it produced, marking 4 decades since their 444 days in captivity, and recognizing their sacrifice to the United States.

S. 2907

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2907, a bill to establish the Truth and Healing Commission on Indian Boarding School Policies in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2956

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2956, a bill to advance targeted, high-impact, and evidence-based inventions for the prevention and treatment of global malnutrition, to improve the coordination of such programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3084

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3084, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the termination of telephone, multichannel video programming, and internet access service contracts by servicemembers after the receipt of stop movement orders due to an emergency situation, and for other purposes.

S. 3295

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 3295, a bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV.

S. 3417

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3417, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 3421

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3421, a bill to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

S. 3529

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3529, a bill to amend the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 to provide grants to States for enhanced protection of senior investors and senior policyholders, and for other purposes.

S. 3603

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3603, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to improve the ability of veterans to access medical care in medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and in the community by providing veterans the ability to choose health care providers.

S. 3635

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3635, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize public safety officer death benefits to officers suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 3907

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3907, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to

require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to identify obstacles to identifying and responding to children missing from foster care and other vulnerable foster youth, to provide technical assistance relating to the removal of such obstacles, and for other purposes.

S. 3915

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3915, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide technology grants to strengthen domestic mining education, and for other purposes.

S. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4105, a bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 4202

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4202, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 4203

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4203, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 4260

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4260, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 4318

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4318, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow any deduction for punitive damages, and for other purposes.

S. 4321

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4321, a bill to amend the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act to improve the administration of the Marine Debris Foundation, to amend the Marine Debris Act to improve the administration of the Marine Debris Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 4359

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4359, a bill to designate the regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs in metropolitan Atlanta as the ''Senator Johnny Isakson Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office'', and for other purposes.

S. 4425

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4425, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a scholarship and loan repayment program to incentivize physicians to enter into the field of sickle cell disease research and treatment, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 623

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 623, a resolution calling on the Secretary of State to designate the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

S. RES. 668

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 668, a resolution designating June 12, 2022, as ''Women Veterans Appreciation Day'' .

S. RES. 669

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 669, a resolution condemning the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizing the effect of conflict on global food security and famine.

S. RES. 684

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 684, a resolution reaffirming the importance of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons.

S. RES. 688

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 688, a resolution expressing opposition to Congressional spending on earmarks.

AMENDMENT NO. 5121

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 5121 intended to be proposed to S. 2938, an act to make our communities safer.

At the request of Mr. SASSE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5121 intended to be proposed to S. 2938, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 4464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Kaena Point National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill, the Kaena Point National Heritage Area Act. This bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land in Hawaii as the Kaena Point National Heritage Area. Such a designation would bring Federal resources to bear on elevating public awareness of Kaena Point through increased interpretation and enhanced management activities to protect resources, both cultural and natural, for future generations.

The National Park Service currently oversees 55 National Heritage Areas across the country, none of which are in Hawaii. Kaena Point, located on the westernmost tip of Oahu, is home to some of the last remaining unimproved semiwilderness areas on Oahu and one of the last intact dune ecosystems in Hawaii. Native species such as critically endangered Hawaiian monk seals, humpback whales, spinner dolphins, and green sea turtles can be found in the waters at Kaena Point. Native shorebirds such as albatrosses and shearwaters also frequent Kaena Point to nest. In addition, the area is one of the last remaining examples of intact coastal strand vegetation on Oahu and is home to a number of endangered plant species and the endangered yellow-faced bee.

Kaena Point is significant to Native Hawaiian culture, being deemed one of the most sacred places on Oahu as it is home to numerous cultural and historic sites. The area currently includes a State park and a Natural Area Reserve, both operated by the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources. Kaena State Park is the second most visited park on Oahu, illustrating the significance of the area.

This bill directs the U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary to conduct a study in consultation with State and local historic preservation officers, State and local historical societies, State and local tourism offices, and other appropriate organizations and governmental agencies. This study would, among other things, assess the area's unique cultural, historic, and natural resources, cultural contributions to the story of the United States,

ability to provide recreation and educational opportunities, resources available for interpretation by visitors, inclusion of local stakeholders supportive of and involved with the planning of the Heritage Area, existence of a local management entity willing to work with these stakeholders to develop the Heritage Area, and include a map identifying the boundaries of the Heritage Area.

The Secretary of the Interior is given 3 years to conduct the study and report the results to Congress. Information from that report will then indicate if Kaena Point is a suitable location to be added as a National Heritage Area and if so, the boundaries for such a designation. This bill is supported by the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 4478. A bill to provide for assistance to improve the resilience of historic light stations, to study the long-term protection needs of historic light stations, and to establish a national database of historic light stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Historic Lighthouse Resiliency Act with Senator KING. This legislation would authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to partner with State, local, and nonprofit organizations, which own and operate historic light stations, to improve lighthouse resiliency and ensure continued public access to these valuable landmarks.

Our Nation's historic lighthouses are important parts of communities across the country and our maritime history. They serve as beacons of history, education, recreation, and often are associated with the unique character and identity of a community. Yet these historic structures are facing increased risk for catastrophic damage due to sea level rise, flooding, and aging infrastructure.

Indeed, in my State of Rhode Island, these historic lighthouses are interwoven in the fabric of our communities and our State's history. Rhode Island was home to perhaps the most famous lighthouse keeper in history, Ida Lewis. During her tenure as the Keeper of Lime Rock Lighthouse, Ida Lewis rescued at least 18 people and earned the title of ''Bravest Woman in America.'' Beavertail, Watch Hill, and Castle Hill Lighthouses, just to name a few of the 21 lighthouses remaining in my State, are iconic structures dotting the Rhode Island shoreline.

These historic landmarks must be protected and preserved for future generations. This bill would allow the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct projects that restore damaged lighthouses and increase their future resiliency to the adverse effects of climate change, including sea level rise and severe weather events. To conduct repairs and other improvements, the Army Corps would partner with public or nonprofit entities that have acquired light stations through conveyance under the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act. Additionally, it would require the Army Corps to conduct an assessment and maintain a database of all lighthouses nationwide.

Congress has already recognized the importance of preserving these structures and ensuring public access in the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000. However, these historic light stations must not only have the appropriate caretakers but must also have the appropriate funding to invest in infrastructure needs. Federal investment in lighthouse resiliency requirements will ensure they are maintained and accessible for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this commonsense legislation.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 4480. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide increased labor law protections for agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Fairness for Farmworkers Act, which I introduced today.

Throughout the ongoing COVID–19 pandemic, farmworkers continued to keep our country going. This was especially true in California—the agricultural heart of the Nation. California is the most successful State in agricultural production and has the largest population of farmworkers. In fact, more than one-third of our country's vegetables and two-thirds of fruits and nuts come from California.

During a time of incredible hardship, farmworkers put food on the tables of millions of Americans despite working in extreme conditions and facing deep-rooted inequities in the workforce. The time to address these inequities is now.

While the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act established Federal standards for minimum wage and overtime pay, the law excluded millions of domestic and agricultural workers, who were overwhelmingly people of color.

In 2016, California recognized the need to provide farmworkers with overtime protections. The California overtime law, which ensures farmworkers have an equal right to overtime pay, is a model for this Federal bill.

Farmworkers in California and across the Nation deserve an end to discrimination in labor laws. As we work to rebuild from the pandemic, we must also undo the discriminatory exclusion of farmworkers by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act.

That is why I am proud to introduce this bill, which will improve the lives of farmworkers and their families, create equity in our food system, and benefit farming communities as the increased wages are spent in local businesses.

This bill will gradually implement overtime pay over the course of 4 years and bring greater equity to the American agricultural industry and greater prosperity to historically marginalized workers.

This legislation will also boost farming community economies as increased wages are spent in local businesses.

I want to thank Representative GRIJALVA for joining me in introducing this bill, and I hope our colleagues will join us in support of this bill that would provide a measure of long overdue fairness for our Nation's farmworkers.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, the first thing you need to know about picking radishes is that it is hard work. You have to work literally on your knees, and you pick each radish out of the ground by hand—no machines, no tools.

I learned how to pick radishes and parsley about 3 weeks ago when I received an invitation from the United Farm Workers and the UFW Foundation to spend a day working alongside them in California.

Now, I have said countless times that, day in and day out, farmworkers show up to some of the hardest jobs in America. I have always believed that farmworkers are essential, but not until that day did I appreciate the physical demands of long hours on one's knees under the Sun.

Many of the workers picking radishes are older than I am and have worked in the fields for decades. They have labored through heat waves, through storms, wildfire smoke, and more. They have labored through a global health pandemic, and they are the backbone of our economy in helping to keep food on our tables. Yet the majority of farmworkers don't have legal status to live and work in the United States of America. That includes those I worked alongside who were picking radishes—people like Efren, who has worked on American farms for more than 40 years, and Patricia, who has raised her children here.

Several of them told me that one of the hardest parts of being undocumented was being cut off from their families in Mexico or in other countries, being denied the opportunity of seeing their mothers or their fathers one last time before passing away or being able to attend their funerals to pay their last respects.

Imagine that heartbreaking choice of never seeing your parents again because doing so means risking not being able to see your children ever again. That is the fate that we are forcing on countless undocumented farmworkers who fill our grocery stores with fruits and vegetables. This is the choice that

we exacerbate every time we push immigration reform off for another month, another year, another session of Congress. And this is why we must pass legislation that creates a pathway to citizenship for farmworkers.

Did you know that when you pick radishes, you get paid by the number of crates that you fill? On the day that I worked the fields, it comes as no surprise that I picked at a slower rate than the highly skilled and experienced farmworkers, who depend on speed for their livelihoods.

Yet laws across the country leave farmworkers in a position of uncertainty that few other workers have to face. If you are a farmworker and you miss a day of work, there is no paid sick leave. If you are a farmworker and you are injured on the job, you can't get disability insurance. And living and working while undocumented means worrying constantly about your status.

So when the Senate says that immigration reform can wait, we are not seeing the people whose lives are at stake: Isidro, Armando, Isabel, Epigemio. As they pick radishes, these workers are not taking jobs from American citizens. I repeat: They are not taking the jobs of American citizens. In fact, the opposite is true. We don't have enough farmworkers to meet the demand, not just for radishes but for countless other crops. As different produce comes into season, growers need skilled labor on tight timelines.

Corporate leaders, small business owners, and economists agree that we need more immigrants with more protections. The stakes for our economy are high. Right now, American families are paying higher prices not just at the gas pump but at the grocery store. Our labor shortage is contributing to higher inflation. Over $1 trillion of America's GDP is linked to agriculture.

All across the Nation, we rely on immigrant farmworkers. In North Carolina, agriculture is the top industry, aided by tens of thousands of undocumented workers in growing soybean, corn, and peanuts. In Idaho, agriculture accounts for 17 percent of the economic output, including a booming dairy industry. Around 90 percent of Idaho's dairy workers are foreign born, the vast majority undocumented. In Texas, agriculture is worth more than $20 billion each year. More than 100,000 immigrant workers, mostly undocumented, are employed on Texas's ranches, farms, and fields.

I can go on and on, but I think the point is clear: This is truly a national issue. The majority of all farmworkers lack legal status, and growers say that more help is needed.

Congress can make a difference. We can do so by passing the laws that farmworkers need and deserve. Our country cannot afford to wait. That is why it was the first bill I introduced—the Citizenship for Essential Workers Act—when I joined the Senate last year. I am talking about the workers who keep us healthy and safe and fed, the workers we as the Federal Government have deemed to be essential. They deserve dignity; they deserve respect; and they have earned a pathway to citizenship.

Today, I am also proud to introduce the Fairness for Farmworkers Act. This bill will support fair pay for agricultural workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In 1 day, I had just a small dose of the physically demanding life of a farmworker. Still, there is so much more that I could tell you about the kind, funny, generous individuals whom I worked alongside that day.

As we shared a lunch of homemade tortillas, beans, and carne con chiles, they told me about their hometowns that they miss, their favorite music, and their dreams for their children. They had one more message that they asked me to deliver, that they implored me to deliver to all of you, and that is that you should come too. I was the first U.S. Senator to accept an invitation to work in the fields. Last week, my friend and colleague Senator BOOKER became the second.

I urge you, each and every Member of the Senate, to take this opportunity, take a day to work alongside the heroes who feed America, and then come back here, as I have, humbled and inspired to do our job. Let's come together behind a solution so farmworkers can finally live and work with dignity and security.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4482. A bill to help persons in the United States experiencing homelessness and significant behavioral health issues, including substance use disorders, by authorizing a grant program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist State and local governments, Continuums of Care, community-based organizations that administer both health and homelessness services, and providers of services to people experiencing homelessness, better coordinate health care and homelessness services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Helping People Experiencing Substance Use Disorder and Homelessness Act, which I introduced today.

Housing is a fundamental social determinant of health, and unhoused individuals are often the victims of stark health disparities. Of the more than 580,000 people experiencing homelessness in the United States, an estimated 20 percent have a substance use and/or a mental health disorder. Mental health concerns, including substance use disorders, can cause and exacerbate homelessness.

A lack of affordable housing is the primary driver of homelessness, and we are working to address this issue. Another piece of the puzzle is to ensure housing and social service providers have the resources to work together to ensure access to supportive services.

That is why I am proud to introduce this bill to provide essential funding and tools for frontline organizations to coordinate health and homelessness services.

If enacted, it will create a Federal interagency working group to advise grantees on best practices. The grants will invest in programs to build the capacity necessary to combat the United States' dual homelessness and mental health crises.

I want to thank Representative MADELEINE DEAN for introducing this bill with me, and I hope our colleagues will join us in taking this key step to addressing challenges that have been exacerbated by the COVID–19 pandemic.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 691—AFFIRMING, COMMEMORATING, AND CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF TITLE IX, APPLAUDING THE INCREASE IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO ALL INDIVIDUALS, REGARDLESS OF SEX OR GENDER, AND RECOGNIZING THE TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF WORK LEFT TO BE DONE TO FURTHER INCREASE THOSE OPPORTUNITIES

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 691

Whereas in 1972, President Richard M. Nixon signed into law title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as ''title IX'');

Whereas in 2002, Congress passed a joint resolution establishing that title IX may be cited as the ''Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act'';

Whereas title IX prohibits any institution that receives Federal education funding from discriminating against students or employees on the basis of sex;

Whereas sex discrimination includes discrimination based on—

(1) pregnancy, childbirth, termination of pregnancy, and medical conditions related to pregnancy, childbirth, and termination of pregnancy;

(2) actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex characteristics;

(3) sex stereotypes; and

(4) sex-based harassment, including sexual harassment and assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and sex-based stalking;

Whereas since 1972, the United States has made great progress in providing educational opportunities to women and girls and, in 2022, women earned the majority of doctoral, master's, and associate degrees;

Whereas in the 2020–2021 academic year, women earned approximately 60 percent of the bachelor's degrees awarded by institutions of higher education in the United States;

Whereas since 1972, the participation of women and girls in sports has increased by 1,057 percent in high school and greater than 600 percent in college, providing women and girls with the opportunity—

(1) to develop leadership and teamwork skills;

(2) to earn athletic scholarships to help finance a college degree; and

(3) to become successful professional athletes;

Whereas despite the progress that has been made in higher education and athletics, women, girls, pregnant or parenting students, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, and gender nonconforming (LGBTQI+) individuals in the United States are still frequently denied equal educational opportunities;

Whereas pregnant and parenting students are more likely to drop out of high school compared to other students, only 50 percent of teenage mothers earn a high school diploma by the age of 22, 38 percent of Black teen mothers and 36 percent of Latina teen mothers never obtain a diploma or GED, and fewer than 2 percent of all teen mothers graduate college by age 30, leading to decreased opportunities for continuing education and employment;

Whereas a 2018 report from the Government Accountability Office found that, compared to White girls, Black girls were 5 times more likely and American Indian and Alaskan Native girls and multiracial girls were nearly 2 and a half times more likely to receive an out-of-school-suspension;

Whereas the number of baccalaureate degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math earned by women has decreased over the past decade and, as of the 2019–2020 academic year, women earn only—

(1) 39.1 percent of physical science degrees;

(2) 18.7 percent of computing degrees;

(3) 20.9 percent of engineering degrees; and

(4) 42.4 percent of mathematics degrees;

Whereas despite representing 60 percent of all students enrolled in colleges and universities in the United States, women hold almost 2/3 of all outstanding student debt ($929,000,000,000 of the total $1,762,000,000,000), and the average amount of student debt owed by a woman following the completion of a baccalaureate degree is $2,700 more than the average amount of student debt owed by a man;

Whereas men still hold the vast majority of leadership positions, while women make up approximately—

(1) 6.4 percent of the chief executive officers of companies included in the S&P 500;

(2) 18 percent of Governors;

(3) 31 percent of executive officers elected in statewide elections; and

(4) 30 percent of college and university presidents;

Whereas when data is disaggregated, women of color have lower rates of—

(1) leadership positions; and

(2) science, technology, engineering, and math degrees;

Whereas despite constituting a majority in their field or industry, women remain underrepresented in leadership positions and, for example, constitute—

(1) 50 percent of law school graduates over the past 20 years, but only 31 percent of nonequity partners and 21 percent of equity partners at major law firms;

(2) 76 percent of the health care workforce, but only 27 percent of the chief executive officers of hospitals; and

(3) 44 percent of all National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I, Division II, and Division III student athletes, but only 14 percent of the athletic directors in Division I sports;

Whereas since the enactment of title IX in 1972, inequities in participation opportunities for women and men NCAA athletes have persisted, with women having 60,000 fewer opportunities than men for the 2020–2021 school year;

Whereas women continue to experience sexual harassment and assault—

(1) in elementary and secondary schools;

(2) at colleges and universities; and

(3) in the workplace;

Whereas among individuals in elementary or secondary school, 1 in 4 girls will experience some form of sexual abuse before turning 18 years old, with more than 50 percent of girls in grades 7 through 12 experiencing sexual harassment;

Whereas multiple studies have confirmed that—

(1) 1 in 5 women and 1 in 4 transgender or gender non-conforming students are sexually assaulted on college campuses; and

(2) approximately 20 percent of girls have been the victims of sexual assault or attempted sexual assault while in high school;

Whereas experiencing sexual harassment and discrimination can—

(1) lead to higher rates of depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation; and

(2) have severe educational and financial consequences and negatively impact academic achievement, including dropping out of school; and

Whereas students face pervasive discrimination and harassment on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in school, on college campuses, and in the workplace, which impedes the ability of the students to fully access the educational opportunities to which the students are entitled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) applauds the tremendous increase in educational opportunities for women and girls, including in sports, since the passage of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.);

(2) encourages the Department of Education and the Department of Justice to protect the rights of students to have safe learning environments by working to ensure schools prevent and respond to discrimination and harassment on the basis of sex, including based on—

(A) pregnancy, childbirth, termination of pregnancy, and medical conditions related to pregnancy, childbirth, and termination of pregnancy;

(B) actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex characteristics;

(C) sex stereotypes; and

(D) sex-based harassment, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and sex-based stalking; and

(3) recognizes the work that still remains to be done to secure the rights and opportunities guaranteed by title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) that no federally funded educational institution shall discriminate against any individual on the basis of sex.

SENATE RESOLUTION 692—RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972 INTO LAW

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 692

Whereas, on June 23, 1972, President Richard M. Nixon signed the Education Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92–318; 86 Stat. 235) into law;

Whereas title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is commonly referred to and referenced in common vernacular as ''title IX'';

Whereas title IX originally read, ''No person in the United States shall, based on sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance'';

Whereas Representatives Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii and Edith Green of Oregon and Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana are recognized as the early authors and sponsors of the legislative proposal that would eventually become title IX;

Whereas, on May 4, 1980, the Department of Education began enforcing title IX through the creation of the Office for Civil Rights;

Whereas, on February 26, 1992, in Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools, 503 U.S. 60 (1992), the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously ruled that students who are subjected to sexual harassment in public schools may sue for monetary damages under title IX;

Whereas only 1 in 27 girls participated in school sports before title IX was enacted, and 2 in 5 girls now participate in school sports;

Whereas, in 1972, 12 percent more men than women received college degrees, but today, women are more likely than men to receive college degrees; and

Whereas, since title IX became the law of the land, women and girls have enjoyed increased access to higher education, graduation, athletic participation, and overall advancement in every facet of education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and celebrates the 50th anniversary of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 on June 23, 2022;

(2) honors and commemorates the work of women's rights activists who led the fight for the equal treatment of men and women in education; and

(3) encourages all women and girls in the United States to continue pursuing academic and athletic accomplishments, if they so choose.

SENATE RESOLUTION 693—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THE MUSICAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEED FOR GREATER ACCESS TO MUSIC EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AND DESIGNATING JUNE 2022 AS AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSIC APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 693

Whereas spirituals, ragtime, blues, jazz, gospel, classical composition, and countless other categories of music have been created or enhanced by African Americans and are etched into the history and culture of the United States;

Whereas the first Africans transported to the United States came from a variety of ethnic groups with a long history of distinct and cultivated musical traditions, brought musical instruments with them, and built new musical instruments in the United States;

Whereas spirituals were a distinct response to the conditions of African slavery in the United States and expressed the longing of slaves for spiritual and bodily freedom, for safety from harm and evil, and for relief from the hardships of slavery;

Whereas jazz, arguably the most creative and complex music that the United States has produced, combines the musical traditions of African Americans in New Orleans with the creative flexibility of blues music;

Whereas masterful trumpeters Louis Armstrong and Miles Davis achieved national and international recognition with the success of ''West End Blues'' by Louis Armstrong in the 1920s and ''So What'' by Miles Davis in the late 1950s;

Whereas Thomas Dorsey, the father of gospel music, used his composing talents to merge sacred and secular styles that created a revolution in music;

Whereas talented jazz pianist and vocalist Nathaniel Adams Coles recorded more than 150 singles and sold more than 50,000,000 records;

Whereas the talent of Ella Fitzgerald, a winner of 13 Grammys, is epitomized by a rendition of ''Summertime'', a bluesy record accompanied by melodic vocals;

Whereas Natalie Cole, the daughter of Nathaniel Adams Coles, achieved musical success in the mid-1970s as a rhythm and blues artist with the hits ''This Will Be'' and ''Unforgettable'';

Whereas in the 1940s, bebop evolved through jam sessions, which included trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie and the alto saxophonist Charlie Parker, that were held at clubs in Harlem, New York, such as Minton's Playhouse;

Whereas earlier classical singers such as Elizabeth Taylor Greenfield, one of the first widely known African-American vocalists, and other early African-American singing pioneers, including Nellie Mitchell Brown, Marie Selika Williams, Rachel Walker Turner, Marian Anderson, and Flora Batson Bergen, paved the way for the female African-American concert singers who have achieved great popularity during the last 50 years;

Whereas the term ''rhythm and blues'' originated in the late 1940s as a way to describe recordings marketed to African Americans and replaced the term ''race music'';

Whereas lyrical themes in rhythm and blues often encapsulate the African-American experience of pain, the quest for freedom, joy, triumphs and failures, relationships, economics, and aspiration and were popularized by artists such as Ray Charles, Ruth Brown, Etta James, and Otis Redding;

Whereas soul music originated in the African-American community in the late 1950s and early 1960s, combines elements of African-American gospel music, rhythm and blues, and jazz, and was popularized by artists such as Aretha Franklin, James Brown, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, Bill Withers, and Jackie Wilson;

Whereas Motown, founded as a record label in 1959, evolved into a distinctive style known for the ''Motown Sound'', a blend of pop and soul musical stylings made popular by prominent Black artists such as Marvin Gaye, James Mason, and Mary Wells;

Whereas in the early 1970s, the musical style of disco emerged and was popularized by programs such as Soul Train and by artists such as Donna Summer;

Whereas reggae is a genre of music that originated in Jamaica in the late 1960s and incorporates some of the musical elements of rhythm and blues, jazz, mento, calypso, and African music, and was popularized by artists such as Bob Marley;

Whereas rock and roll was developed from African-American musical styles such as gospel and rhythm and blues and was popularized by artists such as Chuck Berry, Bo Diddley, Little Richard, and Jimi Hendrix;

Whereas rap, arguably the most complex and influential form of hip-hop culture, combines blues, jazz, and soul and elements of the African-American musical tradition with Caribbean calypso, dub, and dance hall reggae;

Whereas the development and popularity of old-style rap combined confident beats with wordplay and storytelling, highlighting the struggle of African-American youth growing up in underresourced neighborhoods;

Whereas Dayton, Ohio, known as the ''the Land of Funk'', helped give rise to the genre of funk as a mixture of soul, jazz, and rhythm and blues and popularized bands such as the Ohio Players, Heatwave, Roger and Zapp, and Lakeside;

Whereas contemporary rhythm and blues, which originated in the late 1970s and combines elements of pop, rhythm and blues, soul, funk, hip hop, gospel, and electronic dance music, was popularized by artists such as Whitney Houston and Aaliyah;

Whereas Prince Rogers Nelson, who was known for electric performances and a wide vocal range, pioneered music that integrated a wide variety of styles, including funk, rock, contemporary rhythm and blues, new wave, soul, psychedelia, and pop;

Whereas the incredible Billie Holiday created a cultural reset by recording ''Strange Fruit'', originally a poem that depicted lynching in the southern United States, that became the first protest song of the civil rights era;

Whereas the talented jazz artist Duke Ellington pushed boundaries with his hits ''It Don't Mean a Thing if It Ain't Got That Swing'' and ''Sophisticated Lady'' and received 13 Grammys as well as the Presidential Gold Medal;

Whereas Sister Rosetta Tharpe, known as the Godmother of Rock 'N Roll, combined her distinctive guitar style with melodic blues and traditional gospel music that influenced the likes of Aretha Franklin and Chuck Berry;

Whereas trailblazer Florence Price is the first noted African-American female composer to gain national status and the first African-American woman to have her composed work performed by a major national symphony orchestra;

Whereas the classical singer Marian Anderson broke down racial barriers by performing at the Lincoln Memorial in 1939 after being denied to sing in front of an integrated audience at the DAR Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas country music singer Charley Pride was inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame in 2000 and has over 40 number 1 country hits;

Whereas Nina Simone, one of the most prominent and extraordinary soul singers, has music spanning over 4 decades that has impacted generations with her detailed story telling;

Whereas musician Bobby McFerrin brought joy to audiences everywhere with his smash hit ''Don't Worry Be Happy'';

Whereas famous saxophone player John Coltrane made his impact on genres like bebop, jazz, and rhythm and blues through his work such as ''A Love Supreme'';

Whereas musical force Marvin Gaye used his versatility as an artist to produce hits like ''I Heard It Through the Grapevine'' and ''Ain't No Mountain High Enough'';

Whereas a recent study by the Department of Education found that only 28 percent of African-American students receive any kind of arts education;

Whereas African-American students scored the lowest of all ethnicities in the most recent National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment;

Whereas students who are eligible for the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) have significantly lower scores on the music portion of the National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment than students who are ineligible for that program, which suggests that students in low-income families are disadvantaged in the subject of music;

Whereas a recent study found that—

(1) nearly ⅔ of music ensemble students were White and middle class, and only 15 percent of those students were African American; and

(2) only 7 percent of music teacher licensure candidates were African American; and

Whereas students of color face many barriers to accessing music education and training, especially students in large urban public schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States;

(B) the wide array of talented and popular African-American musical artists, composers, songwriters, and musicians who are underrecognized for contributions to music;

(C) the achievements, talent, and hard work of African-American pioneer artists and the obstacles that those artists overcame to gain recognition;

(D) the need for African-American students to have greater access to, and participation in, music education in schools across the United States; and

(E) Black History Month and African-American Music Appreciation Month as an important time—

(i) to celebrate the impact of the African-American musical heritage on the musical heritage of the United States; and

(ii) to encourage greater access to music education so that the next generation may continue to greatly contribute to the musical heritage of the United States; and

(2) designates June 2022 as ''African-American Music Appreciation Month''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 694—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JULY 2022 AS ''NATIONAL SARCOMA AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. JOHNSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 694

Whereas sarcoma is a rare cancer of the bones or connective tissues, such as nerves, muscles, joints, fat, and blood vessels, that can arise nearly anywhere in the body;

Whereas, in the United States—

(1) about 16,000 individuals are diagnosed with sarcoma each year;

(2) approximately 7,000 individuals die from sarcoma each year; and

(3) about 50,000 individuals struggle with sarcoma at any 1 time;

Whereas, each year, about 1 percent of cancers diagnosed in adults and around 20 percent of cancers diagnosed in children are sarcoma;

Whereas more than 70 subtypes of sarcoma have been identified;

Whereas the potential causes of sarcoma are not well understood;

Whereas treatment for sarcoma can include surgery, radiation therapy, or chemotherapy;

Whereas sarcoma is often misdiagnosed and underreported; and

Whereas July 2022 would be an appropriate month to designate as National Sarcoma Awareness Month—

(1) to raise awareness about sarcoma; and

(2) to encourage more individuals in the United States to get properly diagnosed and treated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the designation of July 2022 as ''National Sarcoma Awareness Month''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 695—DESIGNATING JUNE AS ''NATIONAL ANNUITY AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 695

Whereas annuities provide a predictable way to meet immediate, ongoing, and future financial obligations and objectives in retirement;

Whereas surveys consistently indicate that the vast majority of individuals in the United States are looking for a financial solution that provides the benefits offered by annuities, specifically the ability to address the critical concern of running out of money during retirement;

Whereas outliving retirement savings can—

(1) create a financial hardship that reduces the standard of living in retirement;

(2) defeat the fulfillment of legacy goals; and

(3) require dependence on family and friends for monetary support;

Whereas millions of individuals in the United States currently lack an adequate level of guaranteed income in retirement to ensure a secure financial future for themselves and their loved ones;

Whereas research indicates that an owner of an annuity has a higher confidence in overall retirement readiness;

Whereas an annuity is the only product in the financial marketplace that can provide guaranteed lifetime income;

Whereas determining the type of annuity to buy and when to take income is one of the most important financial decisions a consumer will ever make, and individuals and families can benefit greatly from the expert guidance of a financial professional; and

Whereas numerous stakeholders who support annuities have designated June as ''National Annuity Awareness Month'', the goals of which are—

(1) to educate consumers on annuity benefits;

(2) to support access to annuities to meet the individual financial goals of consumers; and

(3) to encourage savers to seek professional guidance to implement annuities effectively in income and legacy planning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June as ''National Annuity Awareness Month''; and

(2) calls on the United States Government, the States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe National Annuity Awareness Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 696—RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S COMMITMENT TO REBUILDING UKRAINE

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 696

Whereas Vladimir Putin's invasion of Ukraine has generated massive levels of human and economic suffering in the sovereign nation of Ukraine;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Human Rights Council, Putin's war has caused more than 7,000,000 civilians to flee from Ukraine since February 24, 2022;

Whereas, according to the World Bank, Putin's war will cause Ukraine's economy to shrink by 45.1 percent during 2022;

Whereas, according to the World Bank, Putin's war in Ukraine has created almost $60,000,000,000 worth of damage to buildings and infrastructure; and

Whereas Ukrainian civilians are being killed every day and the true number of Ukrainian civilian casualties might never be known: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that the United States—

(A) has long sought to alleviate the suffering of civilians and nations hurt by war; and

(B) remains committed to ensuring the long-term peace, prosperity, and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(2) recognizes that aid packages, such as the Marshall Plan—

(A) helped Western Europe recover from the economic damage and human suffering generated by the World War II; and

(B) did much to promote the stability of global good order nations enjoy today;

(3) recognizes that an effective Ukrainian reconstruction effort can only be accomplished by working in concert with other nations and international bodies; and

(4) encourages the United States Government to lead an international group of allies that will equitably contribute to provide the Government of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people with a reconstruction assistance package for the purpose of increasing ties between nations that are seeking a stable international order to counter malign and rogue actors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 697—DESIGNATING JULY 2022 AS ''PLASTIC POLLUTION ACTION MONTH''

Mr. MERKLEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 697

Whereas plastic pollution represents a global threat that will require individual and collective action, both nationally and internationally, to address;

Whereas, since the 1950s, over 8,000,000,000 tons of plastic have been produced worldwide;

Whereas, in the United States—

(1) just 9 percent of plastic waste is sorted for recycling; and

(2) less than 3 percent of plastic waste is recycled into a similar quality product;

Whereas a recent study found that, despite the United States only accounting for 4 percent of the global population in 2016, in that same year the United States—

(1) generated 17 percent of all plastic waste; and

(2) ranked third among all countries contributing to coastal plastic pollution;

Whereas single-use plastics account for at least 40 percent of the plastic produced every year;

Whereas over 12,000,000 tons of plastic waste enter the ocean every year from land-based sources alone;

Whereas, if no action is taken, the flow of plastics into the ocean is expected to triple by 2040;

Whereas studies estimate that there are between 15,000,000,000,000 and 51,000,000,000,000 pieces of plastic in the oceans;

Whereas, globally, 100,000 marine mammals die every year as a result of plastic pollution;

Whereas plastics, and associated chemicals of plastics, directly impact human health;

Whereas studies suggest that, every week, humans swallow the amount of plastic that is in a credit card;

Whereas taking action to reduce plastic use, collect and clean up litter, and reuse and recycle more plastics will lead to less plastic pollution;

Whereas, every July, people challenge themselves to reduce their plastic footprint through ''Plastics Free July'';

Whereas, during the International Coastal Cleanup in 2020, nearly 950,000 people across the globe cleaned up over 10,000 tons of plastic from beaches;

Whereas switching to reusable items instead of single-use items can prevent waste, save water, and reduce litter; and

Whereas July 2022 is an appropriate month to designate as Plastic Pollution Action Month to recommit to taking action, individually and as a country, to reduce plastic pollution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 2022 as ''Plastic Pollution Action Month'';

(2) recognizes the dangers to human health and the environment posed by plastic pollution; and

(3) encourages all individuals in the United States to protect, conserve, maintain, and rebuild the environment by responsibly participating in activities to reduce plastic pollution in July 2022 and year-round.

SENATE RESOLUTION 698—HONORING THE DEDICATION OF THE BALL FAMILY TO PROVIDING COLLEGE EDUCATIONS AND CELEBRATING THEIR 100-YEAR LEGACY AT BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BRAUN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 698

Whereas, in 1880, the Ball brothers, Edmund, Frank, George, Lucius, and William, founded an American manufacturing company to produce wood-jacketed tin cans with a $200 loan from their uncle;

Whereas, in 1884, the Ball family began making glass home-canning jars, the product that made the Ball Corporation a household name;

Whereas the Ball brothers moved from Buffalo, New York, to Muncie, Indiana, in 1887;

Whereas the first glassware was produced in Muncie in 1888, and the Ball Corporation led the United States in production of fruit jars by 1900;

Whereas, by purchasing the land and buildings, the Ball brothers rescued Muncie National Institute, which was renamed ''Indiana State Normal Institute, Eastern Division'', and later donated the school to the State of Indiana;

Whereas, in June 1918, classes began at the new Muncie campus to prepare students in east central Indiana to become educators;

Whereas, in recognition of the generosity of the Ball family, the Indiana General Assembly renamed the school as ''Ball Teachers College'' in 1922 and ''Ball State Teachers College'' in 1929;

Whereas, in 1927, the Muncie Chamber of Commerce proposed a memorial to express gratitude for the generosity of the Ball family on behalf of Muncie and Ball Teachers College;

Whereas, by the 1960s, the school had begun to attract faculty from outside the Midwest and students sought majors in business, architecture, and other emerging disciplines;

Whereas, in 1965, the Indiana General Assembly renamed the school ''Ball State University'', acknowledging phenomenal growth in enrollment and facilities, the variety and quality of educational programs and services, and the anticipation of the broader role the school would play in the future of Indiana;

Whereas enrollment and funding at Ball State University surged with trends across the United States and new facilities and degree offerings were added, including the college of architecture, the human performance lab, and the center for radio and television, marked a new period of growth, and solidified the shift from a small regional teachers' college to a major State university emphasizing ''education, research, and service'';

Whereas Ball State University continues to produce alumni who, in various fields and endeavors, make great impacts in Indiana and throughout the United States; and

Whereas Ball State University and its namesake, the Ball family, have played a vital role in education of Hoosiers and other individuals throughout the United States: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that—

(A) the philanthropy and dedication to the Muncie and Delaware County, Indiana, community by the Ball brothers and their families has been and continues to be vital to the economic development, growth, cultural identity, and rich history of the community and Indiana; and

(B) the legacy of the Ball brothers, their families, and Ball State University, with its education program and service to the community, continues to enrich the community, Indiana, and the world;

(2) honors the dedication of the Ball brothers and their families to providing college educations; and

(3) celebrates the 100th anniversary of the renaming of Indiana State Normal Institute, Eastern District as ''Ball Teachers College'' and later as ''Ball State University''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 699—CONGRATULATING THE TERRAPINS MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK FOR WINNING THE 2022 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S LACROSSE NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 699

Whereas, on May 30, 2022, the Terrapins men's lacrosse team of the University of Maryland, College Park (referred to in this preamble as the ''Terps'') won the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division I national championship game at Rentschler Field, East Hartford, Connecticut, with a 9 to 7 victory over the seventh-seeded Cornell Big Red men's lacrosse team;

Whereas the Terps set a record in the NCAA for the most wins in a season with 18 wins, becoming the first undefeated NCAA men's lacrosse champion since 2006;

Whereas the Terps have now achieved 4 NCAA national championships and 9 United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association crowns;

Whereas Logan Wisnauskas became the first Terp to have a record of 100 points in a single season;

Whereas Anthony DeMaio scored the 100th goal of his career during the national championship game and 17 goals in the postseason;

Whereas goalie Logan McNaney was declared Most Outstanding Player of the 2022 NCAA tournament, making 17 saves during the national championship game and 61 saves in the tournament;

Whereas, under the leadership of Coach John Tillman, the Terps have made all 11 NCAA tournaments and earned 9 NCAA Men's Lacrosse Championship Weekend appearances;

Whereas Logan McNaney, Anthony DeMaio, Luke Wierman, Logan Wisnauskas, and Ajax Zappitello were named to the 2022 NCAA All-Tournament Team; and

Whereas the Terps became the fourth team in the last 30 years to complete a perfect season as NCAA national champions, joining Princeton University, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Terrapins men's lacrosse team of the University of Maryland, College Park (referred to in this resolution as the ''Terps''), Coach John Tillman, Athletic Director Damon Evans, President Darryll Pines, and fans of the Terps on the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's lacrosse national championship victory;

(2) commends the Terps for their achievements and dedication during the 2021–2022 season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) President of the University of Maryland, College Park, Dr. Darryll Pines; and

(B) Head Coach of the University of Maryland, College Park men's lacrosse team, John Tillman

SENATE RESOLUTION 700—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA SOONERS SOFTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2022 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION WOMEN'S COLLEGE WORLD SERIES

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 700

Whereas the University of Oklahoma Sooners (referred to in this preamble as the ''Sooners'') swept rival University of Texas on June 9, 2022, to win the 2022 Women's College World Series by a combined score of 26–6 in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma;

Whereas the Sooners softball team were ranked the best team in the Nation, finishing the season with 59 wins and 3 losses, including winning 38-straight games to start the season and setting a new Division I softball record;

Whereas over the 47-year history of the University of Oklahoma softball program, the Sooners—

(1) have won 6 Women's College World Series National Championships, including 4 championships in the past 6 years; and

(2) have competed in 14 Women's College World Series;

Whereas the 2022 national championship for the Sooners builds on the strong tradition of success for the University of Oklahoma athletics department, whose teams have delivered 40 national championships and 299 conference titles throughout the rich history of the department;

Whereas Jocelyn Alo was named the Honda Sport Award Winner for Softball, was named back-to-back USA Softball Collegiate Player of the Year and Big 12 Player of the Year for Softball, and was named Most Outstanding Player in the 2022 Women's College World Series, in which she went 12 for 18 with 5 home runs and 13 runs batted in;

Whereas Tiare Jennings set a new record during the Women's College World Series with 15 runs batted in;

Whereas true-freshmen pitcher Jordy Bahl finished with a 22–1 record, a 1.09 earned run average, and 205 strikeouts in 141 and ⅓ innings;

Whereas during the 2022 season, the Sooners softball team paced the Nation in team batting average, team slugging percentage, on-base percentage, home runs, and earned run average;

Whereas the Sooners players should be applauded for their outstanding contributions to the University of Oklahoma, to the achievement of winning a national championship, and to the sport of softball;

Whereas such Sooners players include Rylie Boone, Grace Lyons, Taylon Snow, Hope Trautwein, Kinzie Hansen, Macy McAdoo, Sophia Nugent, Nicole May, Jana Johns, Grace Green, Lynnsie Elam, Tiare Jennings, Jayda Coleman, Hannah Coor, Alyssa Brito, Turiya Coleman, Quincee Lilio, Jocelyn Alo, Emmy Guthrie, and Jordy Bahl;

Whereas the Sooners coaches, including Patty Gasso, Jennifer Rocha, JT Gasso, Kristen Zaleski, Fale Aviu, Sydney Romero, and Shannon Saile, should be applauded for their outstanding leadership of the University of Oklahoma softball program and their role in guiding and mentoring young women at the University of Oklahoma;

Whereas Head Coach Patty Gasso has become a distinguished coach and leader in the softball community, which is evidenced by her—

(1) leadership of the Sooners to each of the 6 national championships in the history of the University of Oklahoma softball program; and

(2) achievement of nearly 1,400 wins in her coaching career at the University of Oklahoma; and

Whereas the Sooners bring pride to the State of Oklahoma and the entire softball community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the University of Oklahoma for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's College World Series;

(2) recognizes the excellence and dedication of all coaches, support staff, and players whose contributions led to victory in the Women's College World Series;

(3) celebrates alongside the students and faculty at the University of Oklahoma and all fans of the University of Oklahoma Sooners softball team; and

(4) requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Joseph Harroz Jr., President of the University of Oklahoma;

(B) Joseph Castiglione, Director of Athletics and Vice President for Intercollegiate Athletic Programs of the University of Oklahoma; and

(C) Patty Gasso, Head Coach of the University of Oklahoma softball team.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5122. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5123. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5124. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5125. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5126. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5127. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5128. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5129. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5130. Mr. LEE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 4261, to suspend duties and other restrictions on the importation of infant formula to address the shortage of infant formula in the United States, and for other purposes.

SA 5131. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5132. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5133. Ms. STABENOW proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2089, to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes.

SA 5134. Mr. TESTER (for Mr. MURPHY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5122. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, strike lines 15 through 17, and insert the following:

(A) a school-based health center, as that term is defined in section 399Z–1(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280h–5(a)(3)); and

---

SA 5123. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subtitle A of title III of division A.

SA 5124. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE IV—HOME DEFENSE AND COMPETITIVE SHOOTING

SEC. 14001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Home Defense and Competitive Shooting Act of 2022''.

SEC. 14002. SHORT-BARRELED RIFLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''(3) a rifle'' and all that follows through ''(5) any other weapon'' and inserting ''(3) any other weapon'', and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to calendar quarters beginning more than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 14003. ELIMINATION OF DISPARATE TREATMENT OF SHORT-BARRELED RIFLES USED FOR LAWFUL PURPOSES.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in each of subsections (a)(4) and (b)(4) by striking ''short-barreled shotgun, or short-barreled rifle'' and inserting ''or short-barreled shotgun''.

SEC. 14004. TREATMENT OF SHORT-BARRELED RIFLES DETERMINED BY REFERENCE TO NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT.

Section 5841 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) SHORT-BARRELED RIFLE REQUIREMENTS DETERMINED BY REFERENCE.—In the case of any short-barreled rifle registration or licensing requirement under State or local law which is determined by reference to the National Firearms Act, any person who acquires or possesses such a rifle in accordance with chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, shall be treated as meeting any such registration or licensing requirement with respect to such rifle.''.

SEC. 14005. PREEMPTION OF CERTAIN STATE LAWS IN RELATION TO SHORT-BARRELED RIFLES.

Section 927 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a law of a State or a political subdivision of a State that imposes a tax, other than a generally applicable sales or use tax, on making, transferring, using, possessing, or transporting a short-barreled rifle in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or imposes a marking, recordkeeping or registration requirement with respect to such a rifle, shall have no force or effect.''.

SEC. 14006. DESTRUCTION OF RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall destroy any registration of an applicable rifle maintained in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record pursuant to section 5841 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, any application to transfer filed under section 5812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that identifies the transferee of an applicable rifle, and any application to make filed under section 5822 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that identifies the maker of an applicable rifle.

(b) APPLICABLE RIFLE.—For purposes of this section, the term ''applicable rifle'' means a rifle, or weapon made from a rifle, described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 5845(a) of such Code (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Home Defense and Competitive Shooting Act of 2022).

SA 5125. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NONREFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT FOR GUN SAFES AND GUN SAFETY COURSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new section:

''SEC. 25E. FIREARM SAFETY CREDIT.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the sum of—

''(1) the amount paid by the taxpayer for any gun safe that is placed into service by the taxpayer during the taxable year, and

''(2) the amount paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year for a concealed carry firearms course or a firearm safety course which—

''(A) is taught by a firearms instructor certified by the State to teach such course, or

''(B) satisfies the training requirement, if any, for any license or permit related to a firearm (including a hunting license) which is issued under the authority of State law.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the credit allowable to a taxpayer under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed—

''(A) for purposes of the credit allowable under paragraph (1) of such subsection, $100, and

''(B) for purposes of the credit allowable under paragraph (2) of such subsection, $100.

''(2) GUN SAFES.—No credit under subsection (a)(1) shall be allowed to any taxpayer if a credit has been allowed under such subsection to the taxpayer for any of the 10 preceding taxable years.

''(c) PROHIBITION ON COLLECTION OF INFORMATION REGARDING FIREARMS.—No taxpayer shall be required, as a condition of the credit allowed under this section, to provide any information with respect to any firearms owned by the taxpayer.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25D the following new item:

''Sec. 25E. Firearm safety credit.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 5126. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SCHOOL SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of an ESSERF program or any other law, a State or local educational agency that has received funds under an ESSERF program may, in lieu of the original requested or authorized use for such funds, use a portion of, or all, of the unexpended funds to carry out 1 or more school security measures.

(b) NO FEDERAL INTERFERENCE.—The Secretary of Education shall not—

(1) prevent or discourage any State or local educational agency from using any ESSERF program funds for school security measures;

(2) require the use of funds under subsection (a) to be in response to, or in any way connected with, the coronavirus; or

(3) enforce any requirement of an ESSERF program if such requirement would prevent a State or local educational agency from carrying out a school security measure authorized under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ESSERF PROGRAM.—The term ''ESSERF program'' means a program carried out under—

(A) section 18003 of the CARES Act (20 U.S.C. 3401 note; Public Law 116–136);

(B) section 313 of division M of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 1929); or

(C) section 2001 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 19).

(2) SCHOOL SECURITY MEASURE.—The term ''school security measure'' means any of the following:

(A) An evidence-based strategy or program to prevent violence, which may include the use of appropriate technologies, including the placement and use of metal detectors and other deterrent measures and emergency notification and response technologies.

(B) Training to prevent student violence against others and self, including training for local law enforcement officers, school personnel, and students.

(C) The development and operation of an anonymous reporting system for threats of school violence, including a mobile telephone application, hotline, or internet website.

(D) The development and operation of—

(i) a school threat assessment and intervention team that may include coordination with law enforcement agencies and school personnel; and

(ii) specialized training for school officials in responding to mental health crises.

(E) Coordination with local law enforcement agencies.

(F) A security assessment.

(G) Security training of personnel and students.

(H) Acquisition and installation of technology for expedited notification of local law enforcement during an emergency.

(I) Reinforcing or replacing classroom doors, locks, or window panels.

(J) Constructing fencing, bollards, planters, curbs, walls, or any other entry control measure to create a single point of entry to the campus.

(K) Clearing exterior spaces of foliage or structures to eliminate spaces that could conceal illicit activity, provide access to the building above the first floor, or otherwise aid an intruder.

(L) Installing a system to monitor entryways, hallways, stairwells, and utility rooms, such as physical inspection, a buzz-in system, or surveillance cameras.

(M) Hiring and paying the salaries of qualified individuals, such as retired law enforcement officers or military veterans, to serve as armed school resource officers.

SA 5127. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TRANSMITTAL OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR USE BY THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5501A the following new section:

''§ 5501B. Prohibition on transmittal of certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system

''The Secretary may not transmit to any entity in the Department of Justice, for use by the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901), personally identifiable information of an individual, solely on the basis of a determination by the Secretary under chapter 11 of this title that the individual has a service-connected disability.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5501A the following new item:

''5501B. Prohibition on transmittal of certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system.''.

SA 5128. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NICS REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes, with respect to the preceding year—

(1) the demographic data of persons who were determined to be ineligible to purchase a firearm based on a background check performed by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, including race, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender, age, disability, average annual income, and English language proficiency, if available; and

(2) the reasons for the ineligibility determinations described in paragraph (1).

SA 5129. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CONDITIONS FOR TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS ADJUDICATED MENTALLY INCOMPETENT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes

''In any case arising out of the administration by the Secretary of laws and benefits under this title, a person who is mentally incapacitated, deemed mentally incompetent, or experiencing an extended loss of consciousness shall not be considered adjudicated as a mental defective under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 without the order or finding of a judge, magistrate, or other judicial authority of competent jurisdiction that such person is a danger to himself or herself or others.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.''.

SA 5130. Mr. LEE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 4261, to suspend duties and other restrictions on the importation of infant formula to address the shortage of infant formula in the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fixing Our Regulatory Mayhem Upsetting Little Americans Act'' or the ''FORMULA Act''.

SEC. 2. DUTY-FREE TREATMENT OF IMPORTS OF INFANT FORMULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, infant formula shall enter the United States free of duty and free of quantitative limitation.

(b) INFANT FORMULA DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''infant formula'' has the meaning given that term in section 201(z) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(z)).

SA 5131. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. TRAINING AND HIRING VETERANS AND FORMER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AS SCHOOL SECURITY OFFICERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ESSER FUNDS.—The term ''ESSER funds'' means funds provided under—

(A) section 18003 of the CARES Act (20 U.S.C. 3401 note; Public Law 116–136);

(B) section 313 of division M of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 1929); or

(C) section 2001 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 19).

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) TRAINING AND HIRING VETERANS AND FORMER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AS SCHOOL SECURITY OFFICERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of a law relating to ESSER funds or any other law, a State or local educational agency that has received ESSER funds may, in lieu of the original requested, required, or authorized use for such funds, use a portion of, or all, of the unexpended funds to carry out any of the following activities:

(1) Establish, if necessary, and implement a State certification or licensure program, or other training program required by the State, that—

(A) is designed to train individuals who are veterans or former law enforcement officers to serve as school security officers; and

(B) may include firearm or de-escalation training.

(2) Hire veterans or former law enforcement officers who have completed the State's program described in paragraph (1) to serve as school security officers in elementary schools and secondary schools in the State.

(c) NO FEDERAL INTERFERENCE.—The Secretary of Education shall not—

(1) prevent or discourage any State or local educational agency from using any ESSER funds for a school security activity described in subsection (b);

(2) impose any requirements as to the content or structure of the State certification, licensure, or other training program described in subsection (b)(1);

(3) require that ESSER funds used to carry out subsection (b) be used to prevent, prepare for, or respond to the coronavirus; or

(4) enforce any requirement related to ESSER funds if such requirement would prevent a State or local educational agency from carrying out a school security activity described in subsection (b).

SA 5132. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5099 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TILLIS)) to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE _____—EAGLES ACT OF 2022

SEC. _____01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''EAGLES Act of 2022''.

SEC. _____02. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On February 14, 2018, 17 individuals lost their lives in a senseless and violent attack on Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland Florida, a school whose mascot is the eagle.

(2) These individuals lived lives of warmth, joy, determination, service, and love, and their loss is mourned by the Nation.

(3) The shooter in that attack exhibited patterns of behavior that were alarming and that should have alerted law enforcement and other Federal, State, and local officials.

(4) The attack on Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School was preventable.

(5) Lives were saved because of the brave and exemplary conduct of many students, teachers, and staff at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, including several of the victims of the attack.

(6) The National Threat Assessment Center (referred to in this title as the ''Center'') was established in 1998 to conduct research on various types of targeted violence.

(7) Studies conducted by the Center on targeted school violence, in particular, have shown that—

(A) most incidents were planned in advance;

(B) the attackers' behavior gave some indication that the individual was planning, or at least contemplating, an attack;

(C) most attackers had already exhibited a pattern of behavior that was of concern to other people in their lives; and

(D) prior to the attack, someone associated with the attacker, such as a family member or peer, knew the attack was to likely to occur.

(8) Through their research, the Center developed the threat assessment model for responding to indicators of targeted violence, which includes a 3-step process—

(A) identifying individuals who are exhibiting behaviors that indicate they are planning an attack on a school;

(B) assessing whether the individual poses a threat to the school, based on articulable facts; and

(C) managing the threat the individual may pose to the school.

(9) The threat assessment model works most effectively when all the relevant parties, including school officials, local law enforcement, and members of the community, are part of a comprehensive protocol to identify, assess, and manage a potential threat to the school.

(10) The primary goal of threat assessment programs in schools should be to prevent violent conduct, with an emphasis on early intervention, treatment, and care of individuals exhibiting behaviors associated with targeted violence.

(11) Early intervention, treatment, and prevention of violent behavior is an effective way to prevent violent conduct that would harm others and necessitate disciplinary action, including criminal penalties.

(12) The parties involved need the appropriate training and tools to establish the appropriate mechanisms for implementing this type of approach.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that a fact-based threat assessment approach, involving school officials, local law enforcement, and members of the community, is one of the most effective ways to prevent targeted violence in schools, and is a fitting memorial to those who lost their lives in the February 14, 2018, attack on Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School and those who heroically acted to preserve the lives of their friends, students, and colleagues.

SEC. _____03. REAUTHORIZATION AND EXPANSION OF THE NATIONAL THREAT ASSESSMENT CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3056A the following:

''§ 3056B. Functions of the National Threat Assessment Center of the United States Secret Service

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a National Threat Assessment Center (in this section referred to as the 'Center'), to be operated by the United States Secret Service, at the direction of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(b) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the Center shall include the following:

''(1) Training in the area of best practices on threat assessment.

''(2) Consultation on complex threat assessment cases or programs.

''(3) Research on threat assessment and the prevention of targeted violence, consistent with evidence-based standards and existing laws and regulations.

''(4) Facilitation of information sharing on threat assessment and the prevention of targeted violence among agencies with protective or public safety responsibilities, as well as other public or private entities.

''(5) Development of evidence-based programs to promote the standardization of Federal, State, and local threat assessments, best practices in investigations involving threats, and the prevention of targeted violence.

''(c) SAFE SCHOOL INITIATIVE.—In carrying out the functions described in subsection (b), the Center shall establish a national program on targeted school violence prevention, focusing on the following activities:

''(1) RESEARCH.—The Center shall—

''(A) conduct research into targeted school violence and evidence-based practices in targeted school violence prevention, including school threat assessment; and

''(B) publish the findings of the Center on the public website of the United States Secret Service.

''(2) TRAINING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall develop and offer training courses on targeted school violence prevention to agencies with protective or public safety responsibilities and other public or private entities, including local educational agencies.

''(B) PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Center shall establish a plan to offer its training and other educational resources to public or private entities within each State.

''(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Center shall develop research and training programs under this section in coordination with the Department of Justice, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services.

''(4) CONSULTATION WITH ENTITIES OUTSIDE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The Center is authorized to consult with State and local

educational, law enforcement, and mental health officials and private entities in the development of research and training programs under this section.

''(5) INTERACTIVE WEBSITE.—The Center may create an interactive website to disseminate information and data on evidence-based practices in targeted school violence prevention.

''(d) HIRING OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—The Director of the United States Secret Service may hire additional personnel to comply with the requirements of this section, which, if the Director exercises that authority, shall include—

''(1) at least 1 employee with expertise in child psychological development; and

''(2) at least 1 employee with expertise in school threat assessment.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the functions of the Center $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025.

''(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the Secret Service shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report on actions taken by the United States Secret Service to implement provisions of this section, which shall include—

''(1) the number of employees hired (on a full-time equivalent basis);

''(2) the number of individuals in each State trained in threat assessment;

''(3) the number of school districts in each State trained in school threat assessment or targeted school violence prevention;

''(4) information on Federal, State, and local agencies trained or otherwise assisted by the Center;

''(5) a formal evaluation indicating whether the training and other assistance provided by the Center is effective;

''(6) a formal evaluation indicating whether the training and other assistance provided by the Center was implemented by the school;

''(7) a summary of the Center's research activities and findings; and

''(8) a strategic plan for disseminating the Center's educational and training resources to each State.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'evidence-based' means—

''(A) strong evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study;

''(B) moderate evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study; or

''(C) promising evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias;

''(2) the term 'local educational agency' has the meaning given that term under section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801); and

''(3) the term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(h) NO FUNDS TO PROVIDE FIREARMS TRAINING.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section may be used to train any person in the use of a firearm.

''(i) NO EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preclude or contradict any other provision of law authorizing training in the use of firearms.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 4 of the Presidential Threat Protection Act of 2000 (18 U.S.C. 3056 note) is repealed.

(2) The table of sections for chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3056A the following:

''3056B. Functions of the National Threat Assessment Center of the United States Secret Service.''.

SEC. _____04. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to create, satisfy, or waive any requirement under—

(1) title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.);

(2) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.);

(3) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.);

(4) title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.); or

(5) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(b) PROHIBITION ON FEDERALLY DEVELOPED, MANDATED, OR ENDORSED CURRICULUM.—Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to authorize any officer or employee of the Federal Government to engage in an activity otherwise prohibited under section 103(b) of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3403(b)).

SA 5133. Ms. STABENOW proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2089, to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TEMPORARY LUNCH REIMBURSEMENT.—Each lunch served under the school lunch program authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) shall receive additional reimbursement in the amount of 40 cents.

(2) TEMPORARY BREAKFAST REIMBURSEMENT.—Each breakfast served under the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) shall receive additional reimbursement in the amount of 15 cents.

(3) LIMITATION.—The additional reimbursement amounts authorized under this subsection shall only be available for the school year beginning July 2022.

(4) APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

(B) DISBURSEMENT.—A State agency shall disburse funds made available under subparagraph (A) to school food authorities participating in the school meal programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) EXTENSION OF WAIVERS.—Section 2202 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''due to the COVID–19 pandemic'' after ''(42 U.S.C. 1760(l))'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon and inserting ''or''; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) ensuring continuity of program operation under a qualified program.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking ''the following:'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through ''A summary'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''a summary''; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) SUNSET.—

''(1) NATIONWIDE WAIVERS.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2022.

''(2) WAIVER RESTRICTION.—After June 30, 2022, a waiver established or granted under subsection (a) shall only apply to schools or summer food service program food service sites—

''(A) operating—

''(i) the qualified program described in subsection (f)(1)(D); or

''(ii) the option described in section 13(a)(8) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(8)); and

''(B) not operating the qualified program described in subsection (f)(1)(A).

''(3) OTHER WAIVERS.—

''(A) CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM WAIVER.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (b) shall expire on June 30, 2022.

''(B) MEAL PATTERN WAIVER.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (c) shall expire on June 30, 2023.

''(4) LIMITATIONS.—A waiver authorized by the Secretary under this section shall not be in effect after the date on which the authority of the Secretary to establish or grant that waiver under this subsection expires.''.

(c) APPROPRIATION.—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to provide waivers under section 2202(a) of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127) that apply—

(1) only during the months of May through September in 2022; and

(2) to—

(A) the summer food service program for children under section 13 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761); or

(B) the option described in section 13(a)(8) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(8)).

(d) NATIONWIDE WAIVER FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2022-2023.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of school year 2022-2023, the Secretary of Agriculture may establish waivers under section 12(l) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(l))—

(A) on a nationwide basis; and

(B) without regard to the requirements under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of such section that a State or eligible service provider shall submit an application for a waiver request.

(2) SUNSET.—A nationwide waiver established by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 12(l) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(l)) pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not be in effect after June 30, 2023.

SEC. 3. CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR 2022-2023 SCHOOL YEAR.—Each meal and supplement served under the program authorized by section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C.

1766) shall receive additional reimbursement in the amount of 10 cents.

(2) LIMITATION.—The additional reimbursement amount authorized under paragraph (1) shall only be available for the school year beginning July 2022.

(b) TIER DETERMINATIONS FOR 2022-2023 SCHOOL YEAR.—For the school year beginning July 2022, a tier II family or group day care home described in subsection (f)(3)(A)(iii) of section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766) shall be considered a tier I family or group day care home for purposes of the program authorized under that section.

(c) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 4. RESCISSIONS AND SUNSET.

(a) RESCISSIONS.—

(1) USDA.—

(A) Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture in section 1001(a) of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (7 U.S.C. 7501 note; Public Law 117–2), $1,000,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(B) Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture in section 751 of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2105), $400,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Education in section 2003 of title II of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 23) and allocated to institutions of higher education as defined in section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(b)), $400,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(3) SBA.—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Small Business Administration in section 5005 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 91) and in section 323(d)(1)(H) of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2021) to carry out section 324 of such division of such Act (15 U.S.C. 9009a), $1,200,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(b) ADDITIONAL RESCISSION.—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture under the heading ''Agricultural Programs—Office of the Secretary'' in title I of division B of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116–136; 134 Stat. 505), $600,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(c) SUNSET.—Section 756 of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (7 U.S.C. 2254c), is amended by striking ''for fiscal year'' and all that follows through ''thereafter'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022''.

SEC. 5. OPERATIONALLY READY.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that technical assistance is made available to States and school food authorities for purposes of assisting parents and school leaders with respect to the transition of operating school meal programs not pursuant to a waiver under section 2(d) or section 2202 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127).

SA 5134. Mr. TESTER (for Mr. MURPHY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2938, to make our communities safer; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''An act to make our communities safer.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I have five 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 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, June 23, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 23, 2022, at 9:15 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, June 23, 2022, at 11 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 23, 2022, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 23, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until June 27, 2022: Ana Worthington, Christian Gentile, John Couch, and Jonavin Smith.

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

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 24 THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 11, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, June 24 at 10:30 a.m.; Tuesday, June 28 at 3:30 p.m.; Friday, July 1 at 8:30 a.m.; Tuesday, July 5 at 6:25 a.m.; and Thursday, July 7 at 10 a.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, July 7, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, July 11; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Vazirani nomination; further, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 11.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:46 p.m., adjourned until Friday, June 24, 2022, at 10:30 a.m.

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:

JESSICA G. L. CLARKE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23, 2022:

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JACQUELYN MCCLELLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ERIC C. RUTTENBERG
REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS S. WALL
REAR ADM. (LH) LARRY D. WATKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL J. STEFFEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHARLES KIROL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK R. MYERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID M. BUZZETTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID G. MALONE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHARLES M. BROWN

CAPT. INGRID M. RADER
CAPT. MICHAEL TANNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBERT J. DODSON
CAPT. MICHAEL S. RICHMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID J. FAEHNLE
CAPT. CALVIN M. FOSTER
CAPT. JOAQUIN MARTINEZDEPINILLOS
CAPT. JOHN D. SACCOMANDO
CAPT. ANDREW J. SCHREINER
CAPT. KIMBERLY A. WALZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID H. DUTTLINGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. EUGENE D. BLACK III

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM M. JURNEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. CHRISTOPHER G. CAVOLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD R. COFFMAN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RICHARD A. CORRELL

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL D. TOMATZ

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. THOMAS E. ISHEE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STACEY T. HAWKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KEVIN B. KENNEDY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. RICHARD L. KEMBLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN J. BARTRUM

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RONALD P. CLARK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PATRICK D. FRANK

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DAVID W. ABBA
BRIG. GEN. CHARLES E. BROWN, JR.
BRIG. GEN. JOEL L. CAREY
BRIG. GEN. JULIAN C. CHEATER
BRIG. GEN. DARREN R. COLE
BRIG. GEN. HEATH A. COLLINS
BRIG. GEN. DOUGLAS S. COPPINGER
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL A. DEVOE
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN G. EDWARDS
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. GREINER
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN F. JOST
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. KLEIN, JR.
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL T. LASICA
BRIG. GEN. BENJAMIN R. MAITRE
BRIG. GEN. CAROLINE M. MILLER
BRIG. GEN. JOHN P. NEWBERRY
BRIG. GEN. EVAN L. PETTUS
BRIG. GEN. BRADLEY L. PYBURN
BRIG. GEN. MARK B. PYE
BRIG. GEN. DAVID J. SANFORD
BRIG. GEN. JENNIFER M. SHORT
BRIG. GEN. DAVID W. SNODDY
BRIG. GEN. ALICE W. TREVINO
BRIG. GEN. PARKER H. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LEAH G. LAUDERBACK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAMELA C. MILLER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. GARY M. BRITO

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. JAMES B. HECKER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL J. DEEGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARK W. SIEKMAN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. STUART B. MUNSCH

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. DARRYL A. WILLIAMS

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PHILLIP A. TALBERT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DWAYNE A. BACA AND ENDING WITH LIANA LUCAS VOGEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MARC A. DAIGLE, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL E. BOQUET AND ENDING WITH DIANA W. WEBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 4, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH IVAN J. ANTOSH AND ENDING WITH D016623, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 4, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN H. BARKEMEYER AND ENDING WITH MYUNG Y. RYU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHAD C. BLACK AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW D. WEGNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE A. BARBEE AND ENDING WITH CLEVE B. SYLVESTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH H. AFANADOR AND ENDING WITH D011573, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANCIS K. AGYAPONG AND ENDING WITH LAKISHA S. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE M. BINGER III AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY M. ZERBE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAURA M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH TSELANE P. WARE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TYSON G. BAYNES AND ENDING WITH JAMES P. WINSTEAD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL L. AHRENS AND ENDING WITH D016666, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHAD W. BACKUS AND ENDING WITH FRANCES R. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ALAN R. BOYES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF THOMAS S. FURMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DUSTIN M. ALBERT AND ENDING WITH D016614, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON H. AMANO AND ENDING WITH NICHOLAS D. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PHILIP J. BOTWINIK, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ARTHUR R. MOSEL, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BINHMINH T. NGUYEN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL R. HANNEKEN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT J. BELTON AND ENDING WITH RICKIE E. WAMBLES, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2022.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE H. FORBES III AND ENDING WITH ROSS A. HRYNEWYCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 5, 2022.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JOHNATHAN D. REED, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. KNIGHT II, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA C. LIPPS AND ENDING WITH RYAN M. MUDD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD T. OVERKAMP, JR. AND ENDING WITH WELDON B. WILLHITE, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHAN M. BUSSELL AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM P. PHILLIPS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JULIO E. PATRON, JR., TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. MARTIN, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW E. BREEDLOVE AND ENDING WITH CHARITY C. HARDISON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RALPH E. HULBERT, JR. AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH A. WILLIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN C. ARENA AND ENDING WITH PETER J. ZELLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARREN N. BESS AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER E. WEAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEATH J. BRIGHTMAN AND ENDING WITH DANIEL W. KROWE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROBERT A. POWELL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES C. BOYT AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY G. MATT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MITCHELL R. JONES, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SUZANNA G. BRUGLER AND ENDING WITH SHIVAN SIVALINGAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JODI C. BEATTIE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RANDY J. BERTI AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL WINDOM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA E. CALLOWAY AND ENDING WITH DANIEL C. SHORT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARRIN E. BARBER AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. WOEHRMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BENJAMIN F. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL H. SANDERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER J. CARMICHAEL AND ENDING WITH MARCO D. SPIVEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BENJAMIN P. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL K. WITT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRAD A. BAUER AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. COURTIAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN A. FOLSOM AND ENDING WITH RONNIE C. HARPER, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID F. ETHERIDGE AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL K. SIMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ZEVERICK L. BUTTS AND ENDING WITH RODERICK V. LITTLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PETER M.B. HARLEY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN D. BARNARD AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL S. TIEFEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KATIE M. ABDALLAH AND ENDING WITH RALPH J. STEPHENS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RON J. ARELLANO AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM M. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIN M. CESCHINI AND ENDING WITH HEATHER H. QUILENDERINO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER S. BERNOTAVICIUS AND ENDING WITH GEDION T. TEKLEGIORGIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATHAN J. CHRISTENSEN AND ENDING WITH CANDICE C. TRESCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CYNTHIA L. KANE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

SPACE FORCE NOMINATION OF ANDREW S. MENSCHNER, TO BE COLONEL.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL A. KARSTEN III AND ENDING WITH ERIC J. PEREZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2022.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. BEAUMONT AND ENDING WITH NICOL R. STROUD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2022.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WENDY M. DELACRUZ AND ENDING WITH ERIC S. SCHLIEBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2022.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG E. FRANK AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. PHEASANT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2022.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROXANA AGUIRRE AND ENDING WITH PETER S. ZUBE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 17, 2021.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BARRETT DAVID BUMPAS AND ENDING WITH CHARLES Y. WANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2022.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4176, LGBTQI+ DATA INCLUSION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5585, ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY–HEALTH ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7666, RESTORING HOPE FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING ACT OF 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 2022

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, in his State of the Union Address this year, President Biden laid out his powerful ''Unity Agenda.''

This inspiring vision encompassed areas of broad bipartisan agreement on four of the biggest challenges we face.

And today, I proudly rise in support of legislation that forges important progress on three of the President's ambitious and unifying goals:

improving mental health and addressing the opioid epidemic, with the Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act;

and intensifying the fight against cancer, with the Advanced Research Projects Agency–Health Act.

Today, the House will pass a package of critical resources to address our Nation's twin crises of mental health and the substance use disorders.

The CDC estimates that more than half of American adults will be diagnosed with a mental illness or disorder at some point in their lifetime.

At the same time, more than two million Americans suffer from an opioid use disorder—and our Nation has seen a 30 percent spike in overdose deaths from 2019 to 2020.

Families and communities are being torn apart—and we must act now.

Our Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act strengthens and expands more than 30 essential, life-saving initiatives: from crisis response, including the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline; to treatments helping combat the opioid epidemic; and to behavioral health services for our children, to name just a few.

Let us salute the unyielding leaders of the Bipartisan Addiction and Mental Health Task Force: who have moved us all with their powerful personal stories of these issues have touched their lives.

And thank you to Energy & Commerce Chairman FRANK PALLONE for helping steer this crucial package to the Floor.

At the same time, the House will today pass legislation to supercharge our Nation's Cancer Moonshot.

Our hearts break for the hundreds of thousands of American families each year who lose a loved one to the scourge of cancer.

Six years ago, then-Vice President Biden inspired our Nation with his bold and personal leadership in the fight to defeat cancer.

And this year, as President, he has proudly reignited this ambitious initiative: redoubling our Nation's efforts to slash the cancer death rate in half over the next 25 years.

Thanks to the determined leadership of Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, the ARPA–H Act will accelerate innovation in medicine and technology: harnessing the power of American ingenuity; and fueling new breakthroughs in the search for a cure.

In doing so, we will take an important step to save lives—not only from cancer, but from additional devastating diseases such as ALS, Alzheimer's and diabetes.

In his inspiring State of the Union Address last March, President Biden called on the Congress to ''show the Nation that we can come together and do big things.''

And today, the House proudly answers that call—with strong, popular legislation that the American people want and deserve.

So I urge all Members to join together in a strong ''aye'' vote for these bipartisan bills, so we can prove that Congress still works For The People.

RECOGNIZING NAVAL AIR STATION LEMOORE

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Naval Air Station (NAS) Lemoore on its 60th anniversary.

Construction of the Naval Air Base in 1960 brought an important military presence to the Central Valley. On July 8, 1961, thousands came to witness the commissioning of the base, as it became the largest air station on the West Coast. For the next sixty years, NAS Lemoore has been a fixture in the community.

Throughout its history, NAS Lemoore has been critical to the United States Military. The base has trained thousands of Navy pilots since its opening and has been a consistent source of innovation and testing of the newest military equipment. In 1998, NAS Lemoore was chosen to host the latest in Navy aircraft technology, the F/A 18 E/F Super Hornet, and in 2017, the F–35 Lightning II onsite. Today, NAS Lemoore is the Navy's largest master jet base.

NAS Lemoore has not only been vital to the U.S. Military, but it has also been a source of public service for Valley residents. Over the past sixty years, the base has hosted job fairs, partnered with the non-profit group Habitat for Humanity to build homes for veterans, and has hosted air shows featuring the Blue Angels among many other community-centered events.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 60th anniversary of Naval Air Station Lemoore.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF U.S. CONGRESSWOMAN PATSY MINK OF HAWAII ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join so many others in honoring the life and legacy of U.S. Congresswoman Patsy Takemoto Mink and the 50th Anniversary of her signature stamp on our nation, Title IX.

Born in Paia, Hawaii, Congresswoman Mink was a true pioneer in so many areas: the first female elected class president at Maui High School, the first Japanese-American woman admitted to the Hawaii bar in 1953, and the first woman of color ever elected to this body.

She experienced many firsts throughout her life but spent her career ensuring that she would not be the last. She is best remembered as the principal author of Title IX, where she fought successfully to end the gender discrimination in academics and athletics in federally funded education that she and so many others had endured.

A half century later, we see the results of her labor with nearly three million young women participating in high school sports across the country and 1.1 million female college graduates every year. For this, we owe her an immense amount of gratitude.

But it would be a true mistake to remember her only for this one singular accomplishment, for over her long and productive career she fought endlessly on so many fronts to end poverty, discrimination and injustice, advance the inherent right of all peoples and realize a more perfect union. And, as a true keiki o ka aina, child of the land, she always stayed true to her roots and her Hawaii home.

Mahalo nui loa, or thank you very much, on behalf of a grateful Nation and home.

CELEBRATING 165 YEARS OF BETHEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the one hundred and sixty-five years of the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church located in Ann Arbor, Michigan as they host the Michigan Annual Conference of the Fourth Episcopal District of AME Churches. Their over one hundred and fifty years of service and dedication to our community is worthy of commendation.

The AME Church is the oldest historically Black church denomination, founded by faith leaders who faced racial discrimination that would prevent African American worshippers from attending the same sermons as their white peers. Beginning with the first Church in Philadelphia, Mother Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church, the AME churches expanded rapidly following the end of the Civil War and the emancipation of enslaved African Americans who sought a spiritual home. The Mission of the AME Church is to minister the social, spiritual, and physical development of all people.

Founded by John Wesley Brooks in 1857, Bethel AME is the oldest historically Black church in Washtenaw County. Since their humble beginnings in a shared worship space, they have been a welcoming a vibrant member of our diverse faith collaborative in Southeast Michigan. Currently led by Reverend Mashod A. Evans, Sr. Bethel AME is a beacon of the Ann Arbor community. Their work goes far beyond worship with their charitable work done throughout the county by the congregation. They arrange donation drives for agencies that assist our neighbors at all walks of life, run a literacy program for children, and host events that support the health of our entire community. The church and its members are dedicated to uplifting and bettering our community, and for that we are thankful for their nearly two centuries of service.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in celebrating one hundred and sixty-five years of Bethel AME Church. As the Fourth Episcopal District celebrates their one hundred and thirty sixth Michigan Annual Conference here in Ann Arbor, we welcome leaders and delegates representing over fifty churches from across this great state. I join with Bishop John F. White, Reverend Mashod A. Evans, and the entire congregation of Bethel AME and the Fourth Episcopal District in extending my best wishes and gratitude to all on this special day. We are grateful for Bethel AME's impactful work and wish them continued success in the coming years.

RECOGNIZING MATT McLOGAN AND HIS YEARS OF SERVICE AT GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. PETER MEIJER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. MEIJER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize West Michigan's own Grand Valley State University Vice President Matthew E. McLogan, who for nearly 35 years has delivered unparalleled leadership and expertise to our region's academic communities.

Originally hired in 1987, he is the longest serving executive officer in university history. Prior to his time at GVSU, Matt was a fixture in broadcast news and served honorably as Michigan's former Public Service Commissioner. He took the exceptional skillset he built in these professions and brought it to GVSU.

When Matt joined Grand Valley and became a Laker, the school's lone campus was home to just 8,000 students. Now, as of 2022, the Laker community has grown nearly threefold, boasting over 23,000 students across five locations. The university's technological centers, libraries, and resources are now the envy of competing institutions at home in West Michigan and across the Nation.

Having served through the previous four of five university presidents, Matt facilitated and witnessed firsthand Grand Valley State University's historic expansion. For years, he has been essential to the success of Grand Valley's executive leadership, playing a crucial role in government and alumni relations, the school's marketing programs, and as secretary to the Board of Trustees.

Matt maintains responsibility for some of the institution's most memorable accomplishments: the university's presence on Grand Rapids' famous Medical Mile, the school's unprecedented expansion, and game-changing additions requiring public support. Matt is known widely throughout our community as one of West Michigan's best promoters and academic professionals.

Largely due to the leadership and expertise of Vice President McLogan, Grand Valley State University is poised to continue unprecedented growth for many years to come. Matt has brought great fortune to the Lakers, and there is no doubt that the successes of his leadership have made a lasting impact on our community.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to take this time to recognize the accomplishments of this distinguished leader. I applaud Matt for his decades of selfless leadership and service to the Grand Valley community and can say with great certainty that his accomplishments will not soon be forgotten.

CELEBRATING THE MILITARY SERVICE AND RETIREMENT OF LTC JASON MALONE

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the outstanding military service and retirement of Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) Jason Malone. He has demonstrated a devotion to America throughout hit long and distinguished military career in the U.S. Army and as a member of the Mississippi Army National Guard.

In 1995, LTC Malone completed Basic Training and Advanced Individual Training. Additional professional development training included the Non-Commissioned Officer Professional Development Course (2000), Reserve Officer Training Corps (Commissioned as a 2nd Lieutenant in 2003), Armor Officer Basic Course (2003–2004), Advanced Military Transition Trainer Course, Combat Lifesavers Course (2008), Logistics Captain's Career Course (2008), Logistics Captain's Career Course (2009), Command General Staff College (20I3–2014), Division Transportation Officer (2014), Joint Planners Course, and Airborne Course.

LTC Malone is proud of his military service. He served in the Mississippi Army National Guard (155th Armored Brigade) from January 1998 until May 2003. LTC Malone is a third generation 82nd Airborne Paratrooper. He led troops in combat as a Tank Platoon Leader with 3rd Infantry Division and Company Commander in the 82nd ABN Division. LTC Malone was selected as an Infantry (enlisted active duty), an Armor Officer (Tanks) and a Logistics Officer. He was also selected for Battalion Command (declined due to family reasons). Additionally, LTC Malone was selected as one of twelve Division Transportation Officers in the U.S. Army. LTC Malone served on four combat tours, six months in Europe for Operation Atlantic Resolve (Russian Deterrence Operations) and is most proud to have always served in critical and the most sought-after positions in his field for the Army. Prior to retirement, LTC Malone served at the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) from June 2018 until July 2022.

LTC Malone's combat tours were as follows: Iraq (Samarra) 2005–2006 as a Tank Platoon Leader (3rd Infantry Division), Iraq 2008–2009 (Mosul) as a Military Transition Trainer to the Iraqi Army, Afghanistan (Bagram) 2014–2015 as the Mobility Chief for all U.S. Forces-Afghanistan with the 3rd Infantry Division, and Iraq (Al Asad Airbase or AAAB) May–December 2011 as a Company Commander with the 82nd Airborne Division.

LTC Malone's proud and accomplished military service has earned him prestigious awards. His awards are the Bronze Star Medal (BSM) x three, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal (DMSM) x two, the Meritorious Service Medal (MSM) x three, the Army Commendation Medal (ARCOM) x two, and the Army Achievement Medal (AAM) x three.

LTC Malone is a graduate of Saltillo High School. In addition to his distinguished military accomplishments, LTC Malone earned a Bachelor of Science in Business Management and a Master of Science in Criminal Justice. He is the proud husband of his wife, Cheryl, and father to their three children, Hanna, Breanna, and Isaac. LTC Malone's parents are Steve Malone and Teri Kirkpatrick, both of whom have loved and supported him throughout his career.

COMMEMORATING THE NATIONAL FEDERAL PELL GRANT DAY

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Pell Grant Program.

All Americans, regardless of their income, should have the right to access quality education, which is invaluable for accessing good jobs, financial stability, and economic mobility. Throughout my career, I have strongly supported the Pell Grant Program, which provides direct financial assistance to low-income students to ensure they have the same access to higher education and opportunities for success as their higher-income peers.

Since its creation, more than 80 million students have received a Pell Grant. Today, nearly 7 million students are going to college with Pell Grants, including over 17,000 students in my district who are receiving $71 million to pursue their higher education goals.

As a recipient of financial aid who couldn't have attended college without help, I understand the need for the federal government to ensure students have access to higher education. I believe that a college education—

whether from a vocational school, a community college, or a four-year college—should open doors for students, not weigh them down with insurmountable debt.

When the program was created 50 years ago with bipartisan support, it could cover more than 75 percent of the cost of earning a four-year degree at a public university. But today, it doesn't even cover 30 percent of the cost. That's why I've fought throughout my career to increase Pell Grant funding in order to help current and future students with the rising costs of higher education.

Our investment in the Pell Grant is an investment in our children's and our nation's future. As we mark 50 years of the Pell Grant program and recognize the success of graduates who have benefitted from it, I look forward to continuing my support for the program to ensure future students have access to invaluable opportunities without being saddled with burdensome loan debt.

I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan resolution declaring June 23, 2022, as National Pell Grant Day, as well as to work towards protecting the right for all Americans to pursue a higher education should they choose, regardless of their financial status.

RECOGNIZING DR. CHRIS MARKWOOD

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to a gifted educator and devoted community leader, Dr. Chris Markwood, on his retirement as the President of Columbus State University (CSU). Dr. Markwood's retirement from three decades of work in higher education will be celebrated at a reception on June 23, 2022, at the Cunningham Conference Center in Columbus, Georgia.

Dr. Markwood earned a bachelor's degree in Political Science and History from Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, Missouri. He then returned to his native state of Texas to earn his doctorate and a master's degree in Political Science from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Before beginning his tenure as President of Columbus State University, Dr. Markwood ascended to several distinguished higher education positions across the United States, including the inaugural Dean of the University of Central Oklahoma's College of Arts, Media & Design; interim chancellor at the University of Wisconsin-Superior; and provost and vice president for Academic Affairs at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

In June of 2015, Dr. Markwood joined Columbus State University as the institution's fifth president, where he implemented an ambitious plan to reconnect the university with the greater Columbus community of fostering ''communiversity.'' During seven years of dedicated service, Dr. Markwood not only led CSU to achieve outstanding academic success but also oversaw the growth of community events such as Winter Fest, a holiday festival that brings thousands from the surrounding Columbus area to CSU's Main Campus every year for a celebration of the many religions, cultures, and traditions that live in the hearts of the people of the Chattahoochee Valley. Dr. Markwood's philosophy of ''communiversity'' has certainly paid off, expanding the reach of the University into the greater Columbus area and forging bonds that have created new opportunities for students, graduates, and the businesses that serve as the economic backbone of the community. This includes CSU being among the inaugural group of University System of Georgia institutions offering the system's new nexus degree programs—designed to aid more Georgians in accessing careers in high-demand areas and to help employers identify highly qualified talent.

Under Dr. Markwood's leadership, Columbus State University has remained a mainstay in the U.S. News and World Report's ranking of regional public universities and the publication's mobility index. Other publications and websites have lauded the university's academic strengths in business, communication, nursing, and online degrees, as well as its military-friendly environment. Additionally, CSU has introduced nearly thirty new undergraduate and graduate degree offerings, a nearly equal number of new certificate programs, and modernized more than a dozen academic programs to better serve its students. This transformation was exemplified through several corporate-community-academic partnerships, such as the creation of new cybersecurity and robotics engineering programs in collaboration with TSYS, Fort Benning, and Pratt & Whitney. Moreover, under Dr. Markwood's tenure, CSU demonstrated its preeminence in the arts by launching a new film production degree in partnership with the Georgia Film Academy, and created Flat Rock Studio, a state-of-the-art film and television production campus, with support of Columbus' own W.C. Bradley. These robust community partnerships have positioned Columbus State University and its students extremely well for successful future careers in an expanding field of job opportunities.

Dr. Markwood has been honored both locally and statewide; in 2021, he received the Meritorious Public Service Medal from the Department of the Army—presented by Major Gen. Patrick Donahoe, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Maneuver Center of Excellence and Fort Benning. He has also been included on Georgia Trend's 2022 list ''100 Most Influential Georgians'' which marked his sixth consecutive appearance among the handful of university presidents across the state to be included each year. Dr. Markwood currently serves as an executive committee member of the Peach Belt Conference, a member of the Georgia Council on Economic Education's Board of Trustees and the University System of Georgia's Comprehensive Administrative Review Steering Committee. He is also a longtime Rotarian and current member of the Columbus Rotary Club.

Dr. Markwood's official service at CSU will soon be coming to an end, but his dedication to helping others will continue. As a servant leader and man of faith, Dr. Markwood has shown a strong commitment to both serving students and improving the quality of life in the Chattahoochee Valley. Dr. Chris Markwood has accomplished much in his life, but none of it would have been possible without the grace of God; the love and support of his wife, Bridget, and their daughter, Reagan.

Nelson Mandela once said that ''education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world.'' Dr. Chris Markwood has dedicated his life's work to educating scholars who will turn their passions into thriving careers that will improve our communities and change the world.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join my wife, Vivian, and me along with the more than 730,000 residents of the Second Congressional District of Georgia in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Dr. Chris Markwood, and his family, upon the occasion of his retirement. Throughout his career, Dr. Markwood has done so much for so many for so long and we wish him the very best as he embarks upon the next chapter of his life.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark the 50th Anniversary of the Pell Grant program.

When Congress created the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant in 1972, they did so to provide direct financial aid to working families, like my own, who faced numerous challenges in paying for college.

My parents arrived in the U.S. in pursuit of the promise of the American dream for themselves and their seven children.

When I was accepted into UC Berkeley, the question of how to pay for it loomed large over my parents and me. It took me 20 years to pay off my school loans, which I always considered an investment in myself.

However, at 17 years old, taking out student loans was terrifying. And these days, paying for college has only gotten harder. Most of the families receiving Pell Grants earn incomes of $40,000 or less. That is why the federal Pell Grant program eases families' student loan burden and is critical to ensuring folks can pursue higher education.

My district is made of families like my own-working families trying to ensure their children have access to the economic mobility that college can provide. In the 38th district of California, a little over 15,000 students are receiving almost $59,000,000 in Pell Grant awards. That's only a portion of the 7 million students that can attend college because of Pell Grants.

As we approach the 50–year mark on the Pell Grant program, I encourage the United States to celebrate ''National Pell Grant Day'' on June 23. Let us recognize the current students and successful graduates who have benefited from the program.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can count on another 50 years of bipartisan support for low-income students through the Pell Grant program. I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan resolution declaring June 23, 2022, National Pell Grant Day this year, and in the future.

SUPPORTING THE PASSAGE OF THE ENHANCING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE PREVENTION THROUGH CAMPUS PLANNING ACT AND THE CAMPUS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY FOR STUDENTS ACT OF 2022

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of legislation to address the mental health and substance use needs of our college students. Our Nation continues to struggle with adequately meeting these needs, resulting in devastating consequences for too many of our constituents.

Milwaukee has long been a magnet for higher education. Students from across the globe enter our city to attend any of our twelve colleges and universities. When students enroll, we must offer them the support they need to attend and successfully complete their education. This includes those who need additional physical health, mental health, and substance misuse services during this exciting yet trying time of life.

We know the need for mental health and substance misuse services is increasing in our communities. It is critical that we take steps to protect the mental health of all Americans, especially our college students. Across the country, young adults struggling with mental health and addiction lack access to the quality, on-campus treatment they desperately need. With an average of 1,100 suicides on campuses each year, suicide is currently the number two leading cause of death among college students.

Today, I am proud to join my colleagues in supporting the passage of H.R. 5407, the Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act, and H.R. 6493, the Campus Prevention and Recovery for Students Act. These bills will fund programs that better support students on our college campuses.

The Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning Act would authorize federal support to encourage campuses to establish comprehensive, evidence-based mental health and suicide prevention programs that meet their student populations' diverse and urgent needs.

Such plans would consider existing Federal and State efforts to address mental health and suicide prevention at higher education institutions. They must also align with existing federal and state programs, including those authorized under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

The Campus Prevention and Recovery for Students Act would mandate all college campuses receiving federal funding or participating in the federal student loan program to have in place evidence-based programs and policies that prevent alcohol and substance misuse by students and school employees.

The legislation would also increase authorized funding (to $15 million annually) for federal grants, allowing institutions of higher education to implement and support evidence-based programs (including programs to improve access to treatment, referral for treatment services, or crisis intervention services) that eliminate illegal substance use, decrease substance misuse, and improve public health and safety for students. Universities may utilize these funds for a range of new activities, including recovery support services, peer-to-peer counseling, and integration of campus-based health services that coordinate screening, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of mental, behavioral, and substance use disorders.

Our students are struggling. In my home state of Wisconsin, opioid misuse outnumbered national trends by half a percent. According to data from the Wisconsin Department of Health Services, 3.5 percent of Wisconsin youth admit to misusing opioids. Implementing the measures outlined in these bills will help our schools and educators provide much-needed support to millions of college students throughout the country, including an estimated 68,000 in the Milwaukee area.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize and celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Pell Grant Program.

This program is aimed at ensuring that the door of educational opportunity is open to all students seeking higher education—regardless of economic background or income. The federal investment in Pell Grants is targeted to students with demonstrated financial need, with most families at incomes of $40,000 or less. The investment pays off by increasing college completion and economic mobility. It's a legacy that I'm committed to protecting and expanding so that future generations can continue to reach their educational goals free from financial barriers or undue cost burdens.

For me, personally, this is also an important program. My folks were schoolteachers, and I could not have gone to college if it hadn't been for the help of my community and the assistance of financial aid. I look at education as the door to opportunity for a lot of families—including mine—and it's clear that financial aid is the key to that door.

Since the creation of the Pell Grant, more than 80 million students have felt the impact of this program firsthand. Last year, Pell Grants benefited 5,419 students attending our local colleges in the district that I have the honor of representing. At the University of Washington, more than 10,000 students across the university system are Pell recipients. Furthermore, at Washington State University, 26.9 percent of enrolled undergraduate students across the university system were eligible to receive a Pell Grant this past Fall.

As we recognize today as the 50-year mark of the Pell Grant program, I encourage all of us to not only celebrate this milestone, but to recognize the current students and successful graduates who have benefited from the program by telling their stories, encouraging the same access for future students, and resolving to continue support for this vital program for the next 50 years and beyond.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bipartisan resolution declaring June 23, 2022, National Pell Grant Day this year.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. HOLDER C. ESTES

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the life and outstanding service of World War II veteran Holder C. Estes. Mr. Estes was born on July 5, 1919, to Eli Hugh "E.H." and Lillian Jones Estes. His siblings were Fred Estes and Hoyle Estes. After the death of his first wife, E.H. married Verble Dozier on June 3, 1935. She had one son, Harold Sullins. Together, they had Joe Howard Estes, Margie Estes Cook, Maynor Estes Blackburn, Martha Estes Draper, Willie Gene Estes, Tommy Estes, Geneva Estes Melko, Hugh Allen Estes, Mary Estes Hallman, Robert Estes, and Janice Estes.

On August 29, 1936, Mr. Holder Estes married Mary Ruth Brooks. They had four children, Cecil Estes, Charlie Estes, Jimmy Estes, and Brenda Estes Spearman.

In life, Mr. Estes was a retired contractor and a brick mason for 35 years. He served as the treasurer for the Brick Masons-Plaster Union and was a former member of the Lee County School Board. Mr. Estes was also a member of the Eggville Church of Christ. Prior to this death, he was a member of the East Main Church of Christ.

Mr. Estes served his country in the U.S. Army from June 28, 1944, until February 9, 1946. He fought in World War II with honor and pride. His commitment to serving our great nation earned him the American Campaign Medal, the European-Africa-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, the World War II Victor Medal, the Honorable Service Lapel Button WWII, and the Marksman Badge with Rifle Bar.

Mr. Estes' medals and ribbons could not be found after his death. At the request of his sister, Mary Hallman, the office of U.S. Representative Trent Kelly submitted a request for replacement medals to the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC). We were honored to present the medals to members of Mr. Estes' family during a ceremony held at the Eggville Church of Christ.

Mr. Estes was a true hero who served our great Nation. He will always be remembered as a man who loved God, country, and family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I rise today to explain how I would have voted on Roll Call Number 289, which was up for consideration on June 22, 2022. During the time I was on and off the floor last night, I discussed many bills and letters with my colleagues. In the midst of these discussions, I missed the opportunity to vote on H.R. 6538, a bill under the suspension of the rules. Had I been present,

I would have voted YEA on Roll Call Number 289.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHER M.C. DEIBERT

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christopher M.C. Deibert for his 23 years with St. Mary Church in South Amboy and to wish him the best of luck in his new roles as Director of Sacred Music for the Cathedral of St. Francis of Assisi, Metuchen and Diocese of Metuchen Director of Diocesan Liturgical Music.

Following his undergraduate education, Mr. Deibert focused his graduate studies in church music and organ performance at Westminster Choir College in Princeton, NJ as well as organ and harpsichord improvisation at The Eastman School of Music in Rochester, NY. Additionally, Mr. Deibert has studied under Brenda A. Day, Ronald W. Thayer, Bruce Neswick, Gerre Hancock, and William Porter.

A well-renowned and respected performer and music expert, Christopher Deibert has served on many organizations, including the Middlesex Chapter of the American Guild of Organists, the Diocese of Metuchen Chapter of the National Association of Pastoral Musicians, and the Royal School of Church Music, among others. He also offers university lectures and teaches at a private studio, and previously served as music department chair at Our Lady of Victories School in Sayreville, NJ. He continues to share his talent and love of music with the community and has received well-deserved accolades for his work.

Mr. Deibert brought his experience and talents to St. Mary Church in South Amboy, NJ, founding the Music at St. Mary's concert series in 2001, which many in the public enjoy frequenting. Throughout his tenure at St. Mary's, he has served as Director of Music and Liturgy, Executive Director of the Music at St. Mary's series and Conductor of the St. Mary Chamber Orchestra. Mr. Deibert has also performed as an organist and has conducted the St. Mary Choral Society. His musical gift has been a joy to experience and will truly be missed by St. Mary's parish and visitors like myself.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to join with the parish community of St. Mary's in thanking Christopher M.C. Deibert for his years of exceptional leadership and congratulating him on his next endeavor. I am confident that the Diocese of Metuchen and the Cathedral of St. Francis of Assisi, Metuchen will appreciate his talents and I look forward to hearing of his continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 287, YEA on Roll Call No. 288, and YEA on Roll Call No. 289.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF COLONEL MICHAEL F. BRESLIN

HON. BARRY MOORE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, today, I recognize the service of Colonel Michael Breslin.

Over 30 years ago, Michael began a long and storied career in the U.S. Army. Michael began his career in 1992, attending flight school at Fort Rucker, Alabama, where he learned to fly the U.S. Military's premier medium lift tactical transport aircraft, the UH–60 Black Hawk. Michael then went on to serve in a myriad of commands starting at Fort Campbell and Fort Bragg, then moving to several locations in Asia and Europe—ultimately becoming the Commander of the 1–214th Aviation Regiment in May 2005, where he served until May 2007.

At the conclusion of his service with the 214th Aviation regiment, Michael went on to earn his Master of Business Administration degree from Webster University. Upon completion of his degree, he assumed the position of Directorate of Evaluation and Standardization Operations Officer, where he established Army aviation policy and ensured compliance across all mission sets and components. He also went on to plan and execute four separate team deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan to assist deployed commanders and bring back evolving tactics to follow on units. Immediately following this assignment, he served as the Commander of the 1–228th Aviation Regiment in Central America.

In 2012, Michael was assigned to the Pentagon, where he served as the Chief, Current Operations, U.S. Army Aviation G3, and was responsible for the movement of over 1,000 aircraft in and out of numerous combat zones, sequencing all redeployed aircraft to the Reset program while ensuring Commanders were adequately resourced for their mission. While serving in this capacity, Michael simultaneously managed over 300 taskings over the course of his two-year assignment.

Michael was subsequently returned home to Alabama, where he served as Director, Army Medical Evacuation Proponency, defining and articulating Aeromedical Evacuation requirements for the entire U.S. Army. He also managed all programmatic efforts to sustain and improve the aeromedical evacuation fleet of over 600 aircraft, and he successfully collaborated with over twenty different entities—centered on the training, organizing and funding of the Army medical evacuation program.

Colonel Breslin's final assignment came in 2018 as he took on the title of Assistant Dean of the U.S. Army School of Aviation Medicine. In this position, he oversees fourteen programs of instruction, including 37 staff members and over 2,000 students.

After 30 years of military service, Michael began his hard-earned and well-deserved retirement on June 1, 2022. Colonel Breslin represents the best of what this country has to offer. Michael and his family have given so much over the years, and I could not be prouder to pay tribute and honor his decades of selfless, dedicated service to our country.

PAYING RESPECTS TO DAVID FINGER THE CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS AT THE NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIRE COUNCIL

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Dave Finger of the National Volunteer Fire Council who passed away on June 3rd following a courageous battle with pancreatic cancer.

Prior to joining the National Volunteer Fire Council (NVFC) as its Chief of Legislative and Regulatory Affairs in 2005, Dave served as the lead staffer on first responder issues for the Research and Technology Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. Dave worked closely with my staff and the staff of my three fellow co-chairs of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus sharing input on legislation pending before the House Science Committee that benefited our nation's fire and emergency services.

As NVFC's Chief of Legislative and Regulatory Affairs, Dave represented the interests of our nation's volunteer firefighters on Capitol Hill. His efforts played a critical role in the passage of federal legislation that not only advanced the health and safety of our nation's volunteer firefighters, but all firefighters and emergency services personnel.

Dave was the embodiment of collaboration. While his primary focus was always on advocating for the volunteer fire service, he understood the importance of working together with the other national fire organizations to advance a common agenda. Tributes from his colleagues expressed appreciation for his passion, integrity, and character. Cerebral in nature, he possessed a depth of knowledge and insight on the issues he championed. There was never a time when he walked into a meeting with Members of Congress or their staff unprepared; he was the consummate professional.

Dave was only forty-four when his life was cut short by cancer. He leaves behind his wife, Allison, and their two children: Vivienne, 7, and Sullivan, 2. He also leaves behind many friends and thousands of firefighters across the nation who owe him their deep gratitude for the work he performed on their behalf throughout his career.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of my fellow Co-Chairs of the Congressional Fire Service Caucus, I extend my sympathies to Dave's family and to his colleagues at the National Volunteer Fire Council and throughout the fire and emergency services community for the loss of their loved one and friend.

RECOGNIZING THE TULARE-KINGS POLICE ACADEMY

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tulare-Kings Police Academy at the College of the Sequoias on its 60th anniversary.

Since its inception in 1962, the Tulare-Kings Police Academy has been a vital part of training our future law enforcement officers in the Central Valley. The program initially began its operations out of the Tulare County Sheriff's Office and trained future recruits there for over a decade.

In 1973, the program moved to the College of the Sequoias campus in Visalia, providing even more access to young students looking to enter a career of public service. The program spent nearly forty years at the Visalia campus, with dozens of students graduating each year eager to begin protecting and serving the Central Valley. In 2010, the program made its most recent move into a state-of-the-art facility on the Hanford College of the Sequoias campus.

After sixty years of operation, the Tulare-Kings Police Academy has produced over 150 graduating classes from its programs across three different campuses. These men and women have gone on to protect our communities throughout the Valley. Their service has been a consistent display of duty, honor, and commitment to their communities—all traits instilled into them by the Tulare-Kings Police Academy.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Tulare-Kings Police Academy at the College of the Sequoias.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VETERANS EQUAL ACCESS ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I introduced the Veterans Equal Access Act. This legislation would provide equal access to state-legal medical marijuana for veterans participating in Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care by ending the harmful VA prohibition on doctors and healthcare providers giving opinions or recommendations on or completing forms for state-legal medical marijuana programs.

The cannabis laws in this country are broken, including our laws that govern veterans' access to medical cannabis. Many veterans report using cannabis for medical purposes as a substitute for prescription drugs. The VA National Center for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) has acknowledged that veterans use cannabis to relieve symptoms of PTSD, and that in many states, PTSD is a qualifying condition for enrollment in medical cannabis programs.

Most states with state-legal medical cannabis programs require some sort of recommendation or approval from a medical provider for patients to enroll in the program. However, VA policy prevents VA physicians and care providers from any participation, including helping with the required paperwork or forms.

This forces veterans to seek care outside of the VA system to receive medical cannabis recommendations, which can interrupt continuity of care, lead to mistakes or gaps in care, and require veterans to pay out of pocket for addition physician visits. VA physicians should not be denied the ability to offer a recommendation that they think may meet the needs of their patients.

Veterans should not be forced outside the VA system to seek treatment that is legal in their state.

The Veterans Equal Access Act would allow VA doctors and healthcare providers to give their opinions or recommendations on medical cannabis and to complete forms in compliance with state-legal medical marijuana programs.

I look forward to working with my co-lead, Representative BRIAN MAST, and my colleagues in the House and Senate to enact this legislation and provide equal access to state-legal medical cannabis for our veterans participating in VA health care.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SCLERODERMA AWARENESS DAY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the estimated 300,000 Americans living with Scleroderma, an autoimmune disease for which there is currently no cure, and we are unsure of its cause. The actions of individuals like Amy Gietzen and organizations such as the National Scleroderma Foundation have helped—and will continue to help—the community of individuals affected by Scleroderma spread awareness about this disease and work to advance research on a cure.

Scleroderma is an autoimmune disease that affects connective tissue and the vascular system through the excess production of collagen. A localized version of the disease can cause thickening and scarring of connective tissue, or fibrosis, in small areas of the skin. Scleroderma can also be systemic and result in fibrosis in the internal organs. Scleroderma can affect almost anyone and results in issues with the skin, muscles, joints, blood vessels, and in some cases, the heart, lungs, and esophagus. The disease is progressive, presents differently in every individual, and, in many cases, can be terminal.

Amy Gietzen, born and raised in Buffalo, NY, was diagnosed with Scleroderma when she was just 19 years old and has been living with the diagnosis ever since. Today, Ms. Gietzen is on the Board of Directors for the Buffalo chapter of the National Scleroderma Foundation, and she serves as the Chair of the Patient Education and Support Committee.

In addition to her involvement with the National Scleroderma Foundation, Ms. Gietzen is a columnist for the online publication Scleroderma News. She also travels across the country to speak publicly about her experiences with Scleroderma and her personal medical journey. In her quest to raise awareness for the disease, Ms. Gietzen has made it a priority to share her personal story and support others who receive a Scleroderma diagnosis.

Organizations like the National Scleroderma Foundation are similarly working to support those living with the disease. The National Scleroderma Foundation was founded in 1998 to ''advance medical research, promote disease awareness, and provide support and education to people with scleroderma, their families, and support networks.'' The Foundation provides resources including research updates and support groups. The National Scleroderma Foundation is focused on building a sense of community and solidarity for those living with Scleroderma.

I am proud to join the National Scleroderma Foundation in recognizing June 2022 as National Scleroderma Awareness Month and celebrating National Scleroderma Awareness Day on June 29, 2022. Throughout this month, the National Scleroderma Foundation is promoting the ''#tealforscleroderma'' campaign. To show support for those living with Scleroderma and raise awareness about the disease, on June 29th, lights on the Peace Bridge, Niagara Falls, and The Electric Building in Buffalo will turn teal.

It is due to the efforts of individuals like Ms. Amy Gietzen that I speak on this matter today. I thank Ms. Gietzen for her perseverance in the face of this disease and her tireless work advocating for scientific advancements, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the courageous work of Ms. Amy Gietzen and the National Scleroderma Foundation and go #tealforscleroderma.

RECOGNIZING DR. SHETAL SHAH, MD, FAAP

HON. THOMAS R. SUOZZI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, as I near the end of my Congressional public service, I rise today to recognize my constituent Dr. Shetal Shah, MD, FAAP of Syosset, New York for his sustained and expert advocacy in support of children's health. During my tenure representing New York's third Congressional District, Dr. Shah has been an indispensable resource to my office—and the entire Long Island Congressional Delegation, on issues related to children.

As former Legislative Chairman of the Long Island Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics and an expert in the intricacies of children's health insurance, Dr. Shah worked with my office to staunchly defend the gains in children's health insurance coverage made as a result of passage of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. His vigorous advocacy, in partnership with several national medical organizations, assisted our office and other members of New York State's Congressional Delegation in preserving core provisions of this landmark legislation, including the expansion of Medicaid and pediatric-specific tenets of the essential health care benefits package.

He has also worked to ensure reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, which in New York insures almost 750,000 of our state's children. Dr. Shah has been a vocal supporter of the need to reauthorize this program since its inception and worked with myself and fellow members of Congress to reauthorize this incredibly successful program again in 2018, safeguarding health coverage and access for all children covered by Child Health Plus.

A national pediatric leader in advocacy and child health policy. He has articulated the importance of providing robust federal funding

for major programs which impact children across Long Island and the nation. These include the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program, the PREEMIE Act, and the Emergency Medical Services for Children Act. His worked has been a supporter of legislation to increase access to pediatric subspecialty care and provide loan repayment to pediatric subspecialty physicians who care for patients from medically underserved areas in those branches of medicine.

Through lectures and scholarly articles in the medical literature, Dr. Shah also outlined the need to modernize the Vaccines for Children Program, advocating for legislation that would create incentives for more physicians to participate and provide routine childhood immunizations. This work closely aligned with his work to increase Medicaid payments to those of Medicare, creating more equity for children throughout our federal healthcare system.

Throughout the COVID pandemic, Dr. Shah had served as a leader in the state on the pediatric implications of the pandemic. At the pandemic's onset, Dr. Shah—now serving as President of New York Chapter 2 of the American Academy of Pediatrics, helped support pediatric immunization efforts by allaying fears about COVID vaccines, combatted the omnipresent vaccine misinformation that appeared across social media, reinforced the importance of wearing a facemask to prevent virus transmission, provided timely updates on changes to COVID protocols to over 1500 pediatricians across Long Island. Though fighting the pandemic as frontline physician, Dr. Shah hand-delivered over 10,000 pieces of personal protective equipment to pediatricians across Brooklyn, Queens, Nassau and Suffolk counties. At a time when these resources were extremely scarce, these deliveries helped over 200 physicians across New York City and Long Island. In several cases, these deliveries allowed pediatric offices to stay open, so they could continue to care for children with chronic medical issues throughout the early months of the pandemic. Upon creation of the Paycheck Protection Program, he assisted practices representing over 100 physicians in applying, often working in their backyards so they could navigate the process of securing financial assistance and forestall layoffs or furloughs of office staff.

I was extremely proud to partner with Dr. Shah, who noticed that an initial draft of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, did not provide for payment of telehealth services for certain Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) and high deductible health plans. As these plans cover a large proportion of my constituents across New York State, my office served as an agent for New Yorkers, working to certify they could use telehealth to access healthcare during the stay-at-home period of 2020.

We should take special note that all of this work is done as a volunteer, and independent of Dr. Shah's work as a specialist in neonatal-perinatal medicine, providing care for the most critically-ill and premature infants in our state at a Regional Perinatal Center, New York's highest designation for a neonatal intensive care unit. This work, made harder by the challenges of the pandemic, is among the most emotionally and physically demanding specialties in medicine, and we are fortunate that we have dedicated newborn specialists like Dr. Shah caring for our most fragile New Yorkers.

For this work with my office, his leadership, dedication and service to the members and children of the Long Island Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, the chapter received the coveted 2020 Outstanding Chapter Award during his presidency, their first such award in over 57 years.

Madam Speaker, as I prepare to leave Congress, I wish to thank constituents like Dr. Shah for volunteering his time, passion and energy to provide advice on children's health issues. He serves as an example of how strong partnerships between engaged representatives and local experts in their districts can achieve better health for children. He has been among my most trusted advisors over the past 6 years on Medicaid, vaccinations and all aspects of child health policy. I take this opportunity to congratulate him, and the Long Island Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics for their dutiful work on behalf of our children.

RECOGNIZING DR. PETER PETTINATO, VMD, ON BEING NAMED THE UNICO NATIONAL PRESIDENT

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, today I honor Dr. Peter Pettinato, VMD, who will be named the UNICO National President at the group's annual convention in New Orleans, Louisiana. Founded in 1922, UNICO is the largest Italian American service organization in the United States.

Peter was born in Carbondale Pennsylvania in 1962. He graduated from Carbondale Area Junior-Senior High School in 1980 as the valedictorian of his class. He continued his academic career at the Pennsylvania State University, University Park where he studied animal bioscience and chemistry. In May 1984, he graduated from Penn State with his Bachelor of Science degree and went on to attend graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania. He graduated with his Veterinariae Medicinae Doctoris in 1989.

After receiving his VMD, he returned to Northeastern Pennsylvania and began working at the Carbondale Veterinary Hospital as a staff veterinarian. In July 1996, he joined Johnson Technical Institute as an instructor of veterinary technology and the staff veterinarian. Seeking to return to private practice, Peter opened his own clinic, French Hill Veterinary Clinic, in Greenfield Township in 1999, and he continues to own and operate the practice.

In 1989, Peter joined the Carbondale Chapter of UNICO, and over the past three decades, he has dedicated himself to the organization and truly embodied the motto of service above self. He was elected the president of Carbondale UNICO in 1996, and he has served as the secretary since July 2000. He has served as the governor of Pennsylvania District II twice. Additionally, he spent eight years as the secretary for the eastern region. He was elected 2nd vice president in 2018, 1st vice president in 2019, and executive vice president in 2021. He has also been both a trustee and secretary of the UNICO foundation.

Peter has dedicated his life to the service of others and is actively involved in his community in addition to his work with UNICO. He is a past president of the Northeastern PA Veterinary Medical Association and past president of the Board of Trustees of the Carbondale Public Library. He also participates in bringing theatrical productions to life in the region. He has served as president of both the Area Community Theater and the Coal Company Theater. He is the founder and president of the Royal Mutineers: A Fairly Talented Theater Company, and he is a member of the Ritz Company Players.

I am honored to congratulate Peter as he takes on this leadership role with UNICO National. May he have a successful and fulfilling tenure as president during which I know he will lead with intention and integrity.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the "Defense Access Roads Improvement Act," which would make commonsense reforms to reduce congestion outside military installations. The Defense Access Roads program is a unique partnership between the U.S. Departments of Defense and Transportation. Under the program, the Secretary of Defense designates civilian roadways that provide critical access for domestic military installations as Defense Access Roads, making them eligible for military construction funding transferred to the Department of Transportation for road improvements off base.

Military installations anchor communities across the nation, including California's Travis and Beale Air Force Bases in my Congressional district. The Defense Access Road Program ensures that the Department of Defense pays its fair share for maintenance, upkeep, or upgrades of roads impacted by military traffic and the constant movement of heavy equipment and vehicles.

My "Defense Access Roads Improvement Act" would create a new, public process for state, county, or municipal governments to petition the Department of Defense to designate new Defense Access Roads, unlocking military construction funding for needed roadway improvements off base. My bill would establish a new online database for designated Defense Access Roads and any federal funding requests outstanding, which improves public transparency and holds the Pentagon accountable. Lastly, my bill would also allow roads leading to commercial shipyards used by the U.S. Navy or Coast Guard to be designated as Defense Access Roads under the program, instead of just seaports as under current law.

As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, which oversees all U.S. military installations and the Defense Access Road Program, I am committed to securing additional federal investment in off-base infrastructure. As a senior member of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I plan to make

this legislation a top priority in future National Defense Authorization Acts and Highway Bills.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all Members to join me in cosponsoring the ''Defense Access Roads Improvement Act.''

HONORING DR. SANDRA HARRIS' 70TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Sandra Harris of Ann Arbor, Michigan on the occasion of her 70th birthday. Her excellent service to our community is worthy of commendation.

Born and raised in Ann Arbor, Dr. Harris is a graduate of Mack Elementary, Forsythe Middle School, and Pioneer High School. She attended Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti where she earned four degrees: a bachelors, masters, specialists, and doctorate, all in the education field. She began her career at Ann Arbor Public Schools, serving in various roles, including as teacher, Vice Principal, Personnel Director, and Vocational Coordinator. Dr. Harris then went on to serve as Superintendent at Lincoln Consolidated Schools and the Oak Park School District before retiring. Coming out of retirement, Dr. Harris now serves as Dean Emerita and Director of Graduate Education at the School of Education at Concordia University in Ann Arbor.

Dr. Harris' lifelong dedication to education exemplifies her passion for helping the youth in our community succeed and thrive. Her work has touched the lives of so many and her warmth and enthusiasm for helping others is made known wherever she goes. Even if she is busy, she always has time to mentor the next generation. Her commitment to our students has not gone unnoticed, and Dr. Harris is the recipient of multiple awards including the Women of Distinction Award from the Girl Scouts of the Huron Valley Council, the Outstanding Professional Educator Award from the Ann Arbor Club of the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the Most Influential Women Award from Business Direct Weekly, and the Women of Courage-Women of Change Award from the Minerva Educational Development Foundation.

Dr. Sandra Harris has paved the way for young African American women in our community and is a trailblazer in educational leadership. She is the first African American to earn a Doctor of Education from Eastern Michigan University, the first African American to hold the position of Superintendent for Lincoln Consolidated Schools and the first African American to become a Dean at Concordia University. Additionally, she was the first female Superintendent at Oak Park School District. Dr. Harris is a member of the Ann Arbor Chapter of the Links, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and the Second Baptist Church of Ann Arbor. Her continued involvement and outstanding contributions to our community are commendable, and I am proud to honor all her accomplishments here today.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Dr. Sandra Harris on her 70th birthday. She is someone that I am proud to call my friend. I join with Sandra's family and friends in extending my best and warmest wishes to her on this special day.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE LYNN WRIGHT

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mississippi State Representative Lynn Wright. Mr. Wright passed away on June 17, 2022, in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. He was 69.

He was preceded in death by his parents, Willie Loyd Wright, Sr. and Jo Etta Lipsey Wright. Survivors include his wife of 47 years, Ginger Howell Wright; sons, Josh Wright (Caroline), Jody Wright (Meredith) and Jonathan Wright (Pearl); brothers, Loyd Wright (Susan), Larry Wright (Kathy), Luther Wright (Penney) and Lane Wright (Carol); sister, Beth Wright Ludwig (Michael), and six grandchildren, Roper Penny, Thomas Wright, Levee Wright, Lydia Wright, Wellesley Wright and Landon Wright.

Lynn Wright graduated valedictorian from Carrollton High School (AL) in 1970, where he played football for Hall of Fame Coach Billy McGee. He went on to play football at the University of West Alabama where he helped lead the Tigers to a 22–7–3 overall record during his three years in Livingston, including an overall record of 8–1–2, and a trip to the NAIA Semifinals in 1972. After graduating from UWA in 1975, Mr. Wright began his coaching career in 1983 at McIntosh Academy, where he would serve as head coach through the 1987 season.

Mr. Wright has also coached five undefeated football teams and has put together winning streaks of 47 and 32 games. In addition to coaching, he also served as the Headmaster at Pickens Academy and won the AISA 2A Presidents Award for the Highest Academic School in its class. Mr. Wright is a 2003 inductee into the AISA Hall of Fame. He served in Education for 44 years. He also served as Headmaster and Head Coach at Jackson Academy and New Hope High School Principal. Mr. Wright was elected and served as Lowndes County (MS) Superintendent of Education from 2011–19 during which time the school district under his leadership received an 'A' rating from the state, and a state-of-the-art career technical center. Caledonia Elementary School and New Hope High School were also built under his leadership. In 2020, Mr. Wright was elected to the Mississippi House of Representatives District 37 and served as a Republican until his passing.

Pallbearers will be Steve Davis, Darrell Gregory, Tony Holmes, Sam McCorkle, Leo Wright and Steve Younger. Honorary Pallbearers are the Mississippi House of Representatives, former teammates, coaches and players and the Juanice Hayes Sunday School Class.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Pell Grant Program. Congress first enacted this program in 1972 to ensure all students would have the same access to higher education and opportunities for success, regardless of their income.

Since then, the Pell Grant Program has evolved into the foundation of federal college assistance for students nationwide. It has become an essential tool for students in financial need to utilize in their pursuit of the American Dream, and it's working.

Over the last 50 years, more than 80 million students—including 7 million currently—have received a Pell Grant to pursue opportunities in higher education nationwide. In Washington's 5th Congressional District alone, Pell Grants have helped more than 19,000 students pursue degrees at one of Eastern Washington's prestigious college institutions by providing an incredible $83 million in financial support during the 2020–21 academic year. The program has been especially impactful across the Washington State University system, where approximately 10,000 students received a Pell Grant to help pay for tuition.

This program has changed the lives of so many in Washington and across the country. Many of these bright minds will go on to earn their degree and become the next generation of entrepreneurs, innovators, and world leaders. All because this program gave them a chance that they may not have had 50 years ago.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating ''National Pell Grant Day'' today, June 23, and recognize both the students and successful graduates who have proved how special of an investment this program has become. Together, let us continue to teach our children that their circumstances do not define them, encourage them to chase their dreams, and celebrate this program that has provided support to so many.

RECOGNIZING BRUCE PLATZMAN

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bruce Platzman, a passionate entrepreneur and community leader who, as CEO and President of the furniture manufacturing company Affordable Interior Systems (AIS), has improved lives both locally and nationally over the last three decades.

Beginning his career as a salesperson, Bruce has been a worker in the furniture industry for over 35 years. In 1989 Bruce cofounded AIS and has been the driving engine for its rapid growth, ushering the company into the 21st century as a strong leader in the industry. Under his leadership, AIS has prioritized working with local groups, such as

Veterans agencies, on a regular basis. From customer service to product development, Bruce has never wavered in his commitment to making AIS a company that serves and centers people.

Bruce's passion for giving back isn't limited to his work with AIS. He serves on the board of directors at Make-A-Wish Massachusetts and Rhode Island, Mass Econ, and the Worcester Chamber of Commerce and is also a board member of the North Central MA Chamber of Commerce and the United Way of North Central Massachusetts.

Madam Speaker, Bruce's commitment and love for our community doesn't stop there. At the onset of the Covid–19 pandemic, Bruce led the AIS launch of Sew the Masks, a nationwide initiative to make and distribute high-quality facemasks. The program amassed almost 1,000 volunteers from 45 states and resulted in the donation of over 600,000 facemasks to first responders, frontline workers, and people in need.

The impact of Bruce's leadership cannot be understated. He has shown, time and time again, remarkable initiative and commitment to both Central Massachusetts and this country. Although Bruce is stepping back from his duties as CEO and President, I know he will continue to put forth his unwavering commitment to supporting and nurturing the communities he loves for years to come.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress and all the people in whose lives Bruce has made a difference, it is my great honor to thank Bruce Platzman for his service to the people of Massachusetts and to congratulate him on his retirement.

COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 5274, THE PREVENT ACT OF 2021

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office for H.R. 5274, the Prevent Exposure to Narcotics and Toxics Act of 2021. The cost-estimate was not available at the time of the Committee report filing.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2022.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5274, the PREVENT ACT of 2021.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Sofia Guo.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Enclosure.

H.R. 5274, PREVENT ACT OF 2021, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY ON MAY 19, 2022

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—		
	2022	2022–2027	2022–2032
Direct Spending (Outlays)	0	0	0
Revenues	0	0	0
Increase or Decrease (−) in the Deficit	0	0	0
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	*	*	**

* = between zero and $500,000.
** = not estimated.

Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? No.

Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2033? No.

Mandate Effects:

Contains intergovernmental mandate? No.

Contains private-sector mandate? No.

H.R. 5274 would require Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to provide officer training on how to use containment devices to prevent secondary exposure to fentanyl and other potentially lethal substances. The bill also would require CBP to provide containment devices for officers, agents, and other personnel who are at risk of accidental exposure to synthetic opioids.

CBP is currently carrying out activities similar to those required by H.R. 5274. Thus, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would not have a significant cost; any spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Sofia Guo. The estimate was reviewed by Leo Lex, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 7174, THE NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office for H.R. 7174, the National Computer Forensics Institute Reauthorization Act of 2022. The cost estimate was not available at the time of the Committee report filing.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2022.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 7174, the National Computer Forensics Institute Reauthorization Act of 2022.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Madeleine Fox.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Enclosure.

H.R. 7174, NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022, AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY ON JUNE 17, 2022

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—		
	2022	2022–2027	2022–2032
Direct Spending (Outlays)	0	0	0
Revenues	0	0	0
Increase or Decrease (−) in the Deficit	0	0	0
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	0	227	502

Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? No.

Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2033? No.

Mandate Effects:

Contains intergovernmental mandate? No.

Contains private-sector mandate? No.

H.R. 7174 would reauthorize the National Computer Forensics Institute at the Department of Homeland Security through fiscal year 2032. The current authorization for this program expires at the end of fiscal year 2022. The bill would require the institute to update its curriculum to include investigating cybersecurity incidents, conducting forensic examinations, and using digital evidence in court. Also, the bill would require the institute to analyze how it could expand its capacity and to report to the Congress on its activities.

The Congress appropriated $43 million for the institute in 2022. Using historical spending patterns and adjusting for inflation, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 7174 would cost $227 million over the 2022–2027 period and an additional $275 million after 2027; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

The costs of the legislation, detailed in Table 1, fall within budget function 750 (administration of justice).

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED INCREASES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION UNDER H.R. 7174

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—						
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2022–2027
National Computer Forensics Institute:							
Estimated Authorization	0	44	45	47	48	50	235
Estimated Outlays	0	38	45	47	48	50	227

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Madeleine Fox. The estimate was reviewed by Leo Lex, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 2938, Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3103–S3175

Measures Introduced: Forty-one bills and twelve resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4458–4498, S.J. Res. 53–54, and S. Res. 691–700. **Pages S3159–60**

Measures Reported:

S. 3273, to take certain land in the State of California into trust for the benefit of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. (S. Rept. No. 117–125)

H.R. 1975, to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians. (S. Rept. No. 117–126)

H.R. 4881, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust for the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona certain land in Pima County, Arizona. (S. Rept. No. 117–127) **Page S3158**

Measures Passed:

Fixing Our Regulatory Mayhem Upsetting Little Americans Act: Senate passed S. 4261, to suspend duties and other restrictions on the importation of infant formula to address the shortage of infant formula in the United States, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S3108–10**

Lee Amendment No. 5130, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3109**

Bridging the Gap for New Americans Act: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. 3157, to require the Secretary of Labor to conduct a study of the factors affecting employment opportunities for immigrants and refugees with professional credentials obtained in foreign countries, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S3148–49**

Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act: Senate passed S. 3846, to reauthorize the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program. **Page S3149**

Women Veterans Appreciation Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 668, designating June 12, 2022, as ''Women Veterans Appreciation Day'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S3149**

National Pell Grant Day: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 676, expressing support for the designation of June 23, 2022, as ''National Pell Grant Day'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S3149–50**

Congratulating the University of Maryland Terrapins Men's Lacrosse Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 699, congratulating the Terrapins men's lacrosse team of the University of Maryland, College Park for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletics Association Division I men's lacrosse national championship. **Page S3150**

Congratulating the University of Oklahoma Sooners Softball Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 700, congratulating the University of Oklahoma Sooners softball team for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's College World Series. **Page S3150**

House Messages:

Bipartisan Safer Communities Act: By 65 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 242), Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to S. 2938, to make our communities safer, with Schumer (for Murphy) Amendment No. 5099 (to the House amendment), relating to the Bipartisan Safer

Communities Act, and after taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S3104–08, 3110–37, S3137–44

Adopted:

Tester (for Murphy) Amendment No. 5134, to amend the title. **Page S3143**

Withdrawn:

Schumer Amendment No. 5100 (to Amendment No. 5099), to add an effective date. (By 39 yeas to 58 nays (Vote No. 241), Senate earlier failed to table the amendment.) **Page S3143**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 65 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 240), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Schumer (for Murphy) Amendment No. 5099 (to the House amendment), relating to the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. **Pages S3104–05**

Schumer motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with instructions, Schumer Amendment No. 5101, to add an effective date, fell when cloture was invoked on Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Schumer (for Murphy) Amendment No. 5099 (to the House amendment) (listed above). **Page S3105**

Schumer Amendment No. 5102 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 5101) of the motion to refer), to modify the effective date, fell when Schumer motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with instructions, Schumer Amendment No. 5101 (listed above) fell. **Page S3105**

Schumer Amendment No. 5103 (to Amendment No. 5102), to modify the effective date, fell when Schumer Amendment No. 5102 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 5101) of the motion to refer) (listed above) fell. **Page S3105**

Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022: Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 2089, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, with Stabenow Amendment No. 5133, in the nature of a substitute, and agreed to the title amendment from the House. **Page S3137**

Authorizing Leadership to Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **Page S3148**

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, June 24, 2022, at 10:30 a.m.; Tuesday, June 28, 2022, at 3:30 p.m.; Friday, July 1, 2022, at 8:30 a.m.; Tuesday, July 5, 2022, at 6:25 a.m.; Thursday, July 7, 2022, at 10 a.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, July 7, 2022, it next convene on Monday, July 11, 2022, at 3 p.m. **Page S3173**

Executive Reports of Committees: Senate received the following executive report of a committee:

Report to accompany Extradition Treaty with the Republic of Croatia (Treaty Doc. 116–2) (Ex. Rept. 117–4). **Pages S3158–59**

Motion to Discharge Clarke Nomination: By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. EX. 239), Senate agreed to the motion to discharge the nomination of Jessica G. L. Clarke, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, 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 S3101–04**

Vazirani Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Ashish S. Vazirani, of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. **Pages S3144–45**

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, June 23, 2022, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 11, 2022. **Page S3145**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S3144**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3:00 p.m., on Monday, July 11, 2022, Senate resume consideration of the nomination. **Page S3173**

Dettelbach Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Steven M. Dettelbach, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. **Page S3145**

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 Ashish S. Vazirani, of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. **Page S3145**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S3145**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S3145**

Barr Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Michael S. Barr, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018. **Page S3145**

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 Steven M. Dettelbach, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. **Page S3145**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S3145**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S3145**

Barr Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Michael S. Barr, of Michigan, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years. **Page S3145**

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 Michael S. Barr, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018. **Page S3145**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S3145**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S3145**

Meehan Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, if applicable, at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Bernadette M. Meehan, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile; that there be 10 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S3148**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Phillip A. Talbert, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California for the term of four years. **Page S3148**

31 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

8 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

26 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, Navy, and Space Force. **Pages S3145–48**

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination were discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Jessica G. L. Clarke, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, which was sent to the Senate on December 15, 2021, from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. **Page S3173**

Messages from the House: **Page S3158**

Measures Referred: **Page S3158**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3158**

Notice of a Tie Vote Under S. Res. 27: **Page S3151**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3160–62**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3162–69**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3156–58**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3169–73**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3173**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3173**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—242) **Pages S3104–05, S3137, S3143**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:46 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, June 24, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3173.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NFIP REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program, focusing on Administration perspectives, including S. 3128, to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, after receiving testimony from David Maurstad, Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of David Pressman, of New York, to be Ambassador to Hungary, Geoffrey R. Pyatt, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary (Energy Resources), and Robert A. Wood, of New York, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, all of the Department of State, and Elizabeth Shortino, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 674, celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Marshall Plan and recognizing the role of the Marshall Plan as the foundation of a transatlantic community committed to the preservation of peace, prosperity, and democracy;

S. Res. 623, calling on the Secretary of State to designate the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism, with amendments;

S. Res. 669, condemning the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizing the effect of conflict on global food security and famine, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Francisco O. Mora, of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, Reuben E. Brigety II, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, Timmy T. Davis, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar, and Michael Alan Ratney, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, all of the Department of State, Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

BUILDING TRUST IN GOVERNMENT

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine building trust in government through customer experience, focusing on putting people first, after receiving testimony from Martha A. Dorris, Dorris Consulting International, Ashburn, Virginia; William D. Eggers, Deloitte Center for Government Insights, Rosslyn, Virginia; and Mathew L. Lira, Hangar Capital, Alexandria, Virginia.

GRANDFAMILIES DURING THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine strengthening support for grandfamilies during the COVID–19 pandemic and beyond, after receiving testimony from Donna M. Butts, Generations United, Washington, D.C.; Kim Clifton, Helping and Lending Outreach Support, North Charleston, South Carolina; Gail Engel, Grand Family Coalition, Loveland, Colorado; and Ruth Stevens, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 8195–8220; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 89; and H. Res. 1200–1203 were introduced. **Pages H5877–78**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H5879**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5407, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans, and for other

purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–383); and

H.R. 6493, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–384).

Pages H5876–77

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Correa to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5825**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:20 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5834**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Support The Resiliency of Our Nation's Great Veterans: H.R. 6411, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; **Pages H5845–53**

Burial Equity for Guards and Reserves: S. 2089, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 376 yeas to 42 nays, Roll No. 290; **Pages H5837–40, H5853–54**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes". **Page H5854**

Enhancing Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Through Campus Planning: H.R. 5407, amended, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 405 yeas to 16 nays, Roll No. 291; and **Pages H5840–42, H5854–55**

Campus Prevention and Recovery Services for Students: H.R. 6493, amended, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 371 yeas to 49 nays, Roll No. 292.

Pages H5842–45, H5855–56

Recess: The House recessed at 3:54 p.m. and reconvened at 8 p.m. **Page H5867**

LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion: The House passed H.R. 4176, to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation and gender identity in certain surveys, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 201 nays, Roll No. 296. **Pages H5856–71**

Agreed to amend the title of H.R. 4176 as follows: "To improve Federal populations surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics in certain surveys, and for other purposes.". **Page H5871**

Rejected the Biggs motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Oversight and Reform by a yea-and-nay vote of 202 yeas to 218 nays, Roll No. 295. **Pages H5869–70**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–52, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–381, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform now printed in the bill. **Page H5856**

Agreed to:

Carolyn B. Maloney (NY) amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–381) that requires agencies collecting information through a covered survey to establish data standards and protocols for anonymizing data collected and destroying personally-identifiable information at the appropriate time, which cannot be later than 3 years after the date that the information was collected; **Page H5867**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–381) that requires a report to Congress from the Comptroller General about the impact of the implementation of this Act on the provision of services to persons according to their gender identity, sexual orientation, and variations in sex characteristics (by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 200 nays, Roll No. 293); and

Pages H5862–66, H5867–68

Carolyn B. Maloney (NY) amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–381) that clarifies that when applicable, Federal surveys should gather information from a knowledgeable proxy of a deceased LGBTQI+ individual (by a yea-and-nay vote of 213 yeas to 201 nays, Roll No. 294).

Pages H5866–67, H5868–69

H. Res. 1191, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 7666), (H.R. 5585), and (H.R. 4176) was agreed to yesterday, June 22nd.

Senate Referrals: S. 671 and S. 3510 were held at the desk. **Page H5834**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5834.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Seven yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5853–54, H5854–55, H5855, H5867–68, H5868–69, H5869–70, and H5870–71.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE FUTURE OF DIGITAL ASSET REGULATION

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Digital Asset Regulation''. Testimony was heard from Vincent McGonagle, Director, Division of Market Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the FY 2023 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill; and the FY 2023 Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. The FY 2023 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill and the FY 2023 Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a markup on the FY 2023 Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. The FY 2023 Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a markup on the FY 2023 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. The FY 2023 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 7900, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023''. H.R. 7900 was ordered reported, as amended.

EXAMINING THE POLICIES AND PRIORITIES OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Policies and Priorities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service''. Testimony was heard from Cindy Long, Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce held a markup on H.R. 8152, the ''American Data Privacy and Protection Act''; H.R. 3355, the ''SAFE Act''; H.R. 3962, the ''Securing and Enabling Commerce Using Remote and Electronic Notarization Act of 2021''; H.R. 4081 the ''Informing Consumers about Smart Devices Act''; H.R. 4551, the ''Reporting Attacks from Nations Selected for Oversight and Monitoring Web Attacks and Ransomware from Enemies Act''; H.R. 5313, the ''Reese's Law''; H.R. 5441, the ''PAST Act of 2021''; and H.R. 6290, the ''Manufacturing.gov Act''. H.R. 8152, H.R. 3355, H.R. 5313, and H.R. 5441 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended. H.R. 3962, H.R. 4081, H.R. 4551, and H.R. 6290 were forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy''. Testimony was heard from Jerome H. Powell, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 7195, to provide for certain whistleblower incentives and protections; H.R. 6528, the ''Housing Temperature Safety Act of 2022''; H.R. 7981, the ''Public and Federally Assisted Housing Fire Safety Act of 2022''; H.R. 3111, the ''Grandfamily Housing Act of 2021''; H.R. 68, the ''Housing Fairness Act of 2020''; H.R. 4495, the ''Downpayment Toward Equity Act of 2021''; H.R. 6814, the ''Small Business Fair Debt Collection Protection Act''; H.R. 4277, the ''Overdraft Protection Act''; H.R. 5912, the ''Close the ILC Loophole Act''; H.R. 7977, the ''Promoting Opportunities for Non-Traditional Capital Formation Act''; and H.R. 4586, the ''Risk-Based Credit Examination Act''. H.R. 68, H.R. 3111, H.R. 4277, H.R. 4495, H.R. 4586, H.R. 5912, H.R. 6528, H.R. 6814, H.R. 7195,

H.R. 7977, and H.R. 7981 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD AFTER 10 YEARS: IMPACT ON INNOVATION AND SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''The Patent Trial and Appeal Board After 10 Years: Impact on Innovation and Small Businesses''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 2522, the ''Cerro De Olla Wilderness Act''; H.R. 2882, the ''Great Basin National Heritage Area and Mormon Pioneer National Heritage Area Extension Act''; H.R. 5355, the ''Desert Community Lands Act''; H.R. 6240, to release the reversionary interest of the United States in certain non-Federal land in Salt Lake City, Utah, and for other purposes; and H.R. 7509, the ''Wild Rogue Conservation and Recreation Enhancement Act''. Testimony was heard from Chairman DeFazio, and Representatives Leger Fernandez, Horsford, and Stewart; Mark Lambrecht, Assistant Director, National Conservation Lands and Community Partnerships, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Darlene Vigil, Commissioner, District 3, Taos County, New Mexico; Karmolette O'Gilvie, Mayor, Twentynine Palms, California; Jake Garfield, Deputy Director, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, Utah; and a public witness.

A HEARING WITH TRUMP WHITE HOUSE CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE COORDINATOR DR. DEBORAH BIRX

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a hearing entitled ''A Hearing with Trump White House Coronavirus Response Coordinator Dr. Deborah Birx''. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

ASSESSING FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR MEASURING GREEN HOUSE GAS SOURCES AND SINKS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Assessing Federal Programs for Measuring Greenhouse Gas Sources and Sinks''. Testimony was heard from Eric K. Lin, Director, Material Measurement Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; Ariel Stein, Acting Director, Global Monitoring Laboratory and Director, Air Resources Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Karen M. St. Germain, Earth Science Division Director, Science Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Bryan Hubbell, National Program Director for Air, Climate, and Energy, Office of Research and Development, Environmental Protection Agency.

SBA MANAGEMENT REVIEW: OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''SBA Management Review: Office of Government Contracting and Business Development''. Testimony was heard from Bibi Hidalgo, Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, U.S. Small Business Administration.

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Defense Intelligence and Warfighter Support held a hearing entitled ''Defense Intelligence Agency Budget Hearing''. This hearing was closed.

CONGRESS AND TECHNOLOGY: MODERNIZING THE INNOVATION CYCLE

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Congress and Technology: Modernizing the Innovation Cycle''. Testimony was heard from Stephen Dwyer, Senior Advisor, Office of Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, U.S. House of Representatives; and public witnesses.

JANUARY 6TH INVESTIGATION

Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''January 6th Investigation''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

DECOLONIZING RUSSIA

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission received a briefing on decolonizing Russia from Fatima Tlis, Circassian journalist; Botakoz Kassymbekova, University of Basel; Erica Marat, National Defense University College of International Security Affairs; Hanna Hopko, former Member of the Ukrainian Parliament, on behalf of the Democracy in Action Conference; and Casey Michel, *American Kleptocracy*.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on the FY 2023 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill; and the FY 2023 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Cutting Methane Pollution: Safeguarding Health, Creating Jobs, and Protecting our Climate'', 9 a.m., 210 Cannon and Zoom.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Friday, June 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, June 24

House Chamber

Program for Friday: To be announced.

Extension of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E661
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E664
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E665
Case, Ed, Hawaii, E659
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E660
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E659, E666
Garamendi, John, Calif., E665
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E664
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E663
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E660, E662, E666
Kilmer, Derek, Wash., E662
McGovern, James P., Mass., E666
Meijer, Peter, Mich., E660
Mfume, Kweisi, Md., E662
Moore, Barry, Ala., E663
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E662
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E663
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E659
Rodgers, Cathy McMorris, Wash., E666
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E661
Suozzi, Thomas R., N.Y., E664
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E667, E667
Torres, Norma J., Calif., E663
Valadao, David G., Calif., E659, E663

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.