



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2022

No. 128

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 2, 2022, at 3 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2022

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Lord God of Heaven and Earth, thank You for the joy that comes to those who delight in Your presence. Your mercies are new each day, for You sustain us with Your wisdom as we follow Your leading.

Today, continue to sustain our lawmakers as they embrace Your precepts and walk in Your path. Remind them that Your way enables them to become instruments for goodness in our Nation and world. Help them also to see that it is the difficult road that leads to life, and few find it.

As our Senators receive guidance from You, give them attentive hearts and open minds. Enable them to find in the diversity of ideas what is best for our Nation and world.

We pray in your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HIRONO 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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth Wilson Hanes, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

FLOODING IN KENTUCKY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, Eastern Kentucky is reeling, reeling from some of the worst flooding in our State's history. The area is still experiencing rainfall today. This horrible, tragic crisis is far from over.

In Jackson, waters reached 43-1/2 feet high, breaking an 83-year-old record. Drone footage shows whole towns completely submerged. Roadways have turned into rivers. Rising waters have reached rooftops. Across more than a dozen counties, severe rainstorms have created crisis conditions. Water rose too quickly for many to react, with tragic consequences.

The Governor has confirmed that, so far, 35 people have lost their lives amid flash floods, including children, and I think that number is likely to rise in the coming days. Even the families who were lucky enough to get out unscathed have lost homes, businesses, and heirlooms. In many communities, the waterlogged destruction is absolute.

Eastern Kentucky is well known for its steep hilltops, rolling forests, and deep hollers. Those features, which make the region one of the most unique in the country, also create complications for emergency personnel.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3793

Our heroic first responders, including the National Guard from Kentucky and surrounding States, are working overtime to find and recover stranded residents. They have rescued more than 1,400 individuals since floodwaters hit. Nearly half of the rescues were by air.

Late last week, I joined with every member of Kentucky's congressional delegation to support the Governor's request to the President for a major disaster declaration to give our first responders Federal help. President Biden issued that declaration promptly, and resources are already flowing into the Commonwealth to assist local emergency personnel. The President called me the other day, as well as Secretary Mayorkas and FEMA Director Criswell. We are deeply grateful to them all for their speedy action.

Director Criswell traveled to Kentucky last week and has been on the ground assisting with recovery efforts directly. My staff in Southeastern Kentucky are in close touch with local officials in the area, providing all the help we can. I will visit the affected communities myself in the coming days to meet with constituents and offer support.

Unthinkably painful stories continue to come to us out of Eastern Kentucky. However, we have also heard moving reminders of Kentuckians' selflessness. Last December, the city of Mayfield, in the western part of Kentucky, was devastated by tornadoes. The town lost its fire station in that storm. But despite their own challenges, last week, the Mayfield Fire Department filled an ambulance with equipment and rushed to Eastern Kentucky to aid relief efforts. They didn't have to think twice before helping fellow Kentuckians.

We saw generosity all across the affected region. Residents with boats, jet skis, and kayaks put their own lives at risk to rescue their neighbors. Schools, churches, parks, and businesses opened their doors to displaced families. As one resident put it over the weekend, no matter what, Eastern Kentuckians "help each other."

So I am monitoring the situation closely and doing all I can to assist. Kentucky leaders on both sides of the political aisle are working together to coordinate further Federal aid. I am thankful to everyone who sprang into action to help with the rescue efforts, whether they were professional first responders or just Good Samaritans.

And I am thankful for the help our State has already received from FEMA. Their continued assistance will be vital for rebuilding in the months ahead. Eastern Kentucky has been devastated by these floods. Our recovery process will take months and, in some places, literally years. But I know we will bounce back. Kentucky has faced challenges before, and we always, always overcome.

THE ECONOMY

Madam President, now on a completely different matter, when it comes to our economy, American families do

not trust this Democratic Party government one bit. Nearly 90 percent of Americans are feeling anxious about inflation. Twenty-eight percent approve of how President Biden is handling it—just a 28 percent approval rating. Only 22 percent think things will get any better after another year on his watch.

Americans' distrust of Democrats stands to reason. A year and a half ago, every single Senate Democrat provided the deciding vote for a \$1.9 trillion reckless spending spree that has caused the worst inflation in 40 years.

The Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, said back then "I do not think the dangers of inflation, at least in the near term, are very real." He went on to lead every single Democrat to cast the deciding vote for the party-line spending spree that has destroyed families' purchasing power through inflation. Now, the very same people want to deal our economy another body blow on a party-line vote. The same Democrats who said that a \$1.9 trillion spending spree would not cause inflation are now saying—listen to this—it is a good idea to raise taxes, kill jobs, attack American energy, and hammer American manufacturing, all—all—in the middle of the apparent recession, which they have already created.

Everyone knows that raising taxes in a recession kills jobs, but that is precisely what Democrats are desperate to do. So here is what they are proposing: a huge new tax hike on American jobs, more than \$300 billion in new taxes. The Joint Committee on Taxation says a whopping 50 percent of that burden would fall directly on our Nation's manufacturing sector.

So in the middle of a supply chain crisis, Democrats want huge, job-killing tax hikes that will disproportionately crush American manufacturing and manufacturing jobs. Oh, and Democrats also want a huge new tax hike on American natural gas.

Natural gas is the single largest source of electricity generation in our entire country. A plurality of all the power in America comes from—you guessed it—natural gas. It is also how countless families heat their homes. And it is a linchpin of our domestic energy independence and our ability to export to our allies in Europe.

But the Green New Deal Democrats are coming straight after American natural gas with huge new tax hikes. The result will be higher electricity bills, higher heating costs, less exporting to our European allies just as Putin is trying to cut them off, and 90,000 workers in the oil and gas industry—listen to this—out of work, eliminating 90,000 workers in the oil and gas industry in the process.

Democrats' tax hikes on American energy don't stop there. With gas prices still sky-high, our colleagues are also proposing to resurrect a defunct tax that would take direct aim at American oil refining, and they want it

pegged to inflation so the tax hike will automatically climb up and up exactly when the country can least afford it.

So on top of all this, the Democrats also want to pour new funding into the IRS so they can more easily come after small business. IRS agents get new cars and new computers; small businesses get more audits. Add it all up, these tax hikes and others, and Democrats want to drop an anvil—an anvil—on our economy at the worst possible time.

The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation has demonstrated the Democrats' plan would shatter—shatter—President Biden's promise not to raise taxes on households earning less than \$400,000. Households making less than half that amount—less than \$200,000—would see a \$16.7 billion tax hike in year 2023 alone. This is people making under \$200,000 would see a \$16.7 billion tax hike next year alone. Amazingly, the very lowest earning Americans who make less than \$10,000 per year would see the largest percentage tax hike of any group in the entire bill. So it hits people who make below \$10,000, on a percentage basis, harder than any other group in the entire bill.

So Democrats are labeling all these tax hikes the "Inflation Reduction Act," but nonpartisan experts have already proven that is flat-out false. The budget experts at Penn Wharton show this bill would slightly—slightly—increase inflation in the near term and do nothing to meaningfully reduce it in the long term. So it is not about inflation.

When you raise taxes on something, you get less of it. That is the way it works. In the middle of a recession, Democrats want to raise taxes on American jobs. In the middle of an energy crisis, Democrats want to raise taxes on American energy. In the middle of a middle-class inflation crisis, Democrats want to raise taxes on households way, way below the President's \$400,000 threshold.

All of this economic genius—all of this economic genius—is brought to you by the same people who called a \$1.9 trillion inflation time bomb the "American Rescue Plan" and promised it wouldn't cause inflation right before it did.

We know what it looks like when Democrats say they will help the economy, and American families can't take much more of it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate gavels in for what will be a

very consequential week for this Chamber and for our country.

Later today, we will vote on the nomination of Elizabeth Hanes to serve as district judge for the Eastern District of Virginia. If confirmed, she will be the 75th judge this Senate majority has confirmed since the start of President Biden's term.

In the coming days, the Senate will also finish its work passing the PACT Act, the largest expansion of veteran healthcare benefits in decades and a piece of legislation that should sail through this Chamber with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Over the past few days, the Capitol steps have been the site of something we should never see in this country: dozens of veterans braving heat and heavy rain, protesting through the night, demanding that the Senate take action on their healthcare benefits. They are there right now as we speak. No veteran who has sacrificed for our country should ever have to resort to spending the night on the Capitol steps to secure their benefits, but sadly, in this case, they have.

It is unfortunate that our Republican colleagues chose to block quick passage of this bill last week even though this is the exact same piece of legislation many of them supported in June, with one small technical fix. In the coming days, we are going to give Senate Republicans another chance to do the right thing, to work with us so we can send this bill to the President's desk ASAP.

Since 9/11, nearly 3½ million veterans have been exposed to toxic burn pits in the line of duty, leading to complications like cancer, lung disease, and other illnesses, but instead of getting the care they need without delay, many veterans have had to hire lawyers and jump through hoops. They have to sue the Veterans' Administration to get the help they deserve and need, incurred as they served our country in dangerous places like Iraq and Vietnam. Is that incredible? They have wasted years fighting the VA just to get the care they need when they should have spent that time treating their illnesses. It is equally parts tragic and infuriating.

Our veterans have already given their all to defend our Nation from threats abroad. They shouldn't have to fight a second war here at home just to get the healthcare benefits they rightfully deserve. These brave Americans sacrificed everything. They risked life and limb. The very least we can do as a country is ensure they receive top care.

I urge both sides to work together to quickly pass the PACT act so we can send it to the President's desk ASAP.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2022

Now on the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022, this week, the Senate will take action on a groundbreaking piece of legislation, one that we haven't seen in decades: the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

Over the coming days, both sides will continue conversations with the Parliamentarian in order to move forward the bipartisan Byrd bath process. Our timeline has not changed, and I expect to bring this legislation to the Senate floor and to begin voting this week.

Already, leading experts have confirmed the Inflation Reduction Act lives up to its name.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget—by no means a liberal group—affirmed that “almost every one of [this bill's] policies, in and of itself, will fight inflation. And on net, the entire package most certainly will.” That is the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, whom our Republican friends often quote.

Former Treasury Secretary Larry Summers—recently the Republican leader's favored economist—said, “This bill is fighting inflation” and that “this is disinflationary policy that's also going to make the economy more efficient.”

Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's—again, hardly a liberal authority, someone who actually served as an economic adviser to Senator McCain—writes that our bill will have a “material economic impact” and said that the Inflation Reduction Act will “push inflation lower.” That is Mark Zandi.

In short, the Inflation Reduction Act is going to be just what the doctor ordered for bringing down costs for American families. We are excited and eager to pass this bill through the Senate as soon as we can.

Of course, of huge significance—this is one of the things that make this bill so historic—by a significant margin, our bill will also be the largest package on climate change ever—ever—passed by this Congress.

By our analysis, this bill will cut greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 40 percent by 2030—that is a lot—and independent studies corroborate this.

According to a new study by the non-partisan Energy Innovation group, the Inflation Reduction Act would not only create at least 1.5 million new jobs by 2030, it also affirms that our bill will achieve approximately 40 percent greenhouse gas reduction by the end of the decade.

Let me repeat that last part. This independent analysis says that our bill, if enacted, could cut greenhouse gasses by approximately 40 percent. That is the number we believe it does. That is a very, very, very big deal.

But with this bill, we are going to put the country on track to meet the climate goals we need to preserve for our planet, for our children, and for our grandchildren.

Now, cutting emissions is not just about protecting our planet's health; it is also about protecting our kids' health, too.

If we slash emissions, that means cleaner air for everyone, which in turn means fewer people suffer health com-

plications that arise from pollution. It means less strain on our healthcare system. It means that communities—poorer communities, minority communities—long exposed to harmful emissions can, quite literally, breathe easy at last.

In fact, the same study from Energy Innovation found that our bill could avoid as many as 3,900 premature deaths and 100,000 asthma attacks annually by 2030—3,900 fewer premature deaths, 100,000 fewer asthma attacks. These are benchmarks every single one of us should aspire to, regardless of party. Put simply, this legislation will save lives, create jobs, reduce costs, reduce inflation.

Now, over the past few days, we have heard Republicans go back to their timeworn attacks that they use virtually against any Democratic policy. They are sounding alarms that this bill will raise taxes on American families, but it does not. Here is the plain truth: The bill will not raise any taxes—any taxes—on families making under \$400,000 a year. Instead, it will close loopholes long exploited by the largest corporations that essentially give them lower tax rates than many nurses, firefighters, teachers. You won't hear Republicans admit that. Why? Because they know that their tax policies are utterly toxic in the minds of American people.

When you increase taxes on the wealthiest and corporations who pay nothing, they say: You are raising taxes on everybody. Bull. They tried it in 2017. They went out there and said they had a massive tax reduction for the middle class. They called it a “middle class miracle,” even though they were just cutting taxes predominantly on the rich. I think it was like 70, 80 percent. It was a boondoggle in favor of the rich.

They promised their tax bill would unleash a tsunami of economic activity. Instead, it led to record corporate stock buybacks, benefiting the wealthy and nobody else.

So when Republicans talk about cutting taxes, what they really mean is cutting taxes for the richest of the rich. That is how their whole philosophy is. That is the people who seem to control lots of the Republican party.

Our bill, meanwhile, will close tax loopholes in our Tax Code and not touch anyone—anyone—making under \$400,000 a year. That is common sense.

At the end of the day, the American people want us to do a few straightforward things. They want us to lower the cost of daily expenses like healthcare and drugs. They want us to lower energy costs and protect our planet for future generations. And they want to make sure that everyone plays by the same rules and that we close loopholes long exploited by powerful corporations.

That is what the Inflation Reduction Act will do, and soon, Democrats will take action to pass this bill and deliver on our promise to make better the lives of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Iowa.

FBI INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we all know that Congress has a constitutional responsibility to ensure that the executive branch executes the laws and uses taxpayers' money appropriately in accordance with congressional intent. It doesn't matter whether we have a Republican President, a Democratic President, a Republican Senate, or a Democratic Senate. We all have the constitutional responsibility of checking the executive branch.

In furtherance of that constitutional responsibility, Congress has an obligation to investigate the executive branch for fraud, for waste, for abuse, and even gross mismanagement.

And if Congress finds potential wrongdoing, we have an obligation to the American people to make sure that it is public because transparency of the public's business brings accountability to those who conduct that public business.

Last week, I made public two oversight letters that I have sent to the Justice Department and to the FBI. These two letters are part of my investigation into a political bias that is infecting the Department of Justice and the FBI.

These letters are based on information provided to my office by whistleblowers, and I hope everybody knows that I consider whistleblowers as patriots. And whistleblowers have to have guts, and they do have guts.

And Director Wray has personally told me that these whistleblowers won't be subject to retaliation, as often, whistleblowers in the Federal Government are subject to retaliation, hurting themselves professionally and maybe even losing their jobs.

Now, these letters that I sent follow up on a May 31, 2022, letter to the Justice Department, the FBI, and the inspector general.

In those letters, I provided evidence of extreme leftwing bias shown by a special agent in charge by the name of Tim Thibault. He is special agent in charge of the FBI's Washington field office.

Now, he has since been referred to the Office of Special Counsel for potential Hatch Act violations. Thibault is at the center of my two letters sent last week. The first letter relates to an FBI investigation that Thibault opened on the Trump campaign and its advisers. He allegedly had help from Richard Pilger, an official in the Justice Department's Election Crime Branch within the Public Integrity Section. During Chairman DURBIN's investigation into the Justice Department misconduct, Pilger really stood out.

The committee interviewed Richard Donoghue, the former Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General during the Trump administration. He was also a key January 6 Committee witness. Donoghue testified to the Judiciary

Committee that Pilger's conduct frustrated the Department's ability to properly operate the Elections Crime Branch.

Thibault and Pilger played a major role in opening the criminal investigation into the Trump campaign. And this isn't a preliminary investigation; it is a full investigation, which requires heightened standards to go forward with that investigation.

According to the whistleblowers that contacted my office, the opening memo for that investigation is based, in substantial part, on liberal news reporting. Liberal news reports are not enough for a full investigation. The Washington Post reported on the investigation last Tuesday. However, the Post did not report that Thibault and Pilger were involved in opening that case against Trump and his advisers. Yet Attorney General Garland and Director Wray allegedly approved opening those investigations.

Now, as I have said in my letter to those two people, if you are going to open an investigation, you have to do it in the right way.

So let's contrast this investigation with what the FBI has done with the information received from sources relating to Hunter Biden. Whistleblowers have told my office that the FBI maintains many sources that have provided extensive information on Hunter Biden. That information allegedly involves potential criminal activity, such as money laundering. That is the same criminal concern that Senator JOHNSON and I raised in our 2020 Biden report. To clarify, that was way back in 2020. According to the whistleblowers' allegations, the underlying information was verified and was verifiable.

Now, here is where it is appropriate to raise questions about politics and political interference in investigations. However, instead of green-lighting the investigative activity, the FBI shut down the Hunter investigation.

So, now, how did they do that? According to allegations, in August 2020, FBI Supervisory Intelligence Analyst Brian Auten opened an assessment. That assessment was used by the FBI officials to improperly discredit Hunter Biden's information as you know what? Disinformation. Those officials allegedly included Thibault.

Then, in October 2020, an avenue of additional Hunter reporting was ordered closed at the direction of Special Agent Thibault. It has been alleged that Thibault and others suggested to FBI agents that the information was at risk of being you know what? Disinformation. However, according to allegations, the source reporting was either verified or verifiable via criminal search warrants.

Thibault allegedly ordered the matter closed without providing a valid reason as required by FBI guidelines. In other words, Thibault shut down an allegedly legitimate avenue of information. So in order to shut down Hunter

Biden sources and investigative leads, the FBI engaged in a disinformation campaign against itself and its own agents. If these allegations are true and accurate, the Justice Department and the FBI are and have been substantially corrupted.

Before I conclude, I want to know four things regarding the summer of 2020. Yes, the summer of 2020: The opening of Auten's assessment in August 2020; secondly, efforts by the FBI officials to shut down Hunter Biden's investigative activity; third, efforts by the FBI to provide a really unnecessary briefing to me and Senator JOHNSON in August of 2020—that reading was purportedly about our Biden investigation, but it had nothing to do with the Biden investigation—fourth, and lastly, leaks relating to the briefing and the liberal media and Democrats falsely accusing me and Senator JOHNSON of advancing Russian information.

All of those four data points happened as Senator JOHNSON and I prepared to finalize our September 2020 Biden report. These data points show a plan was in place at the FBI to undermine anything related to Hunter Biden.

Attorney General Garland and Director Wray, you both have an obligation to the country to immediately investigate these allegations and to clean house.

And my oversight work on this and related matters will certainly continue.

INSPECTORS GENERAL

Madam President, on another point and a much shorter point, just in case some of my colleagues are wondering how long I am going to have the floor—today, I come to speak on the importance of inspector generals, IGs, as they are called in this town.

IGs play an important role watchdogging executive branch Agencies. They help make sure that government bureaucrats are held accountable when they engage in waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayers' money.

IGs are force multipliers for Congress in overseeing our responsibility of checks and balances of the executive branch of government. They are charged with keeping Congress informed of wrongdoing and to provide objective, nonpartisan recommendations on even the most politically sensitive issues.

As of today, there are currently 13 IG vacancies throughout the Federal Government. Some have nominees; some don't have nominees; and some haven't had Senate-confirmed IGs in years.

Now, to hone in on one vacancy that I paid special attention to over the years is that of the Department of Defense inspector general. Believe it or not, that office has not had a Senate-confirmed IG in more than 6 years. The Department of Defense has an annual budget of well over \$700 billion, and to date it looks like they will have much more money the next fiscal year.

Now, I have spent many years calling out waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayers' money at the Department of Defense, and I know full well the importance of having a Senate-confirmed IG in place at that very important Department. Having an independent and effective watchdog at this point is critical to keep the Congress informed of all the tomfoolery that happens at the Pentagon. Whether that be paying exorbitant amounts of money for a hammer, constructing buildings in foreign countries that remain vacant to this day, or failing to hold contractors accountable, it all happens time and time again.

We in Congress need a watchdog with teeth, not afraid to fight off the corporate fat cats who seek to enrich themselves off the backs of the American taxpayers. Some of these contractors have made careers from ripping off the taxpayers through wasteful spending at the Department of Defense. A few thousand dollars here, a couple million there, it turns out to be waste many times.

We need a watchdog—an inspector general—at this post, and we need it now. I believe my colleagues here in the Senate share my belief in the importance of having Senate-confirmed IGs in these vital roles. The President must act to nominate, and the Senate should confirm qualified and effective watchdogs to the vacancies like this, particularly the one at the Department of Defense.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, Joe Biden and the Democrats have ushered us into what will be remembered as one of the most cynical and dangerous periods in our Nation's history. For 18 months, they have wreaked havoc on the economy, welcomed drugs and crime into their own backyards, and enabled the rise of the new axis of evil, which is my term for Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea.

Last week was really a particularly bad week for the Biden-Harris administration, but it was even worse for the people watching it play out, sitting at home in their communities. Inflation hit a 41-year high, consumer confidence hit a historic low, and we confirmed that the American economy is indeed in a recession.

But rather than taking responsibility, my Democratic friends decided they would go on an all-out campaign and redefine the word "recession," and they insisted that the economic ruin that they have rained down on us all is in our imaginations. The economy is in great shape, they say. It is better than ever, they say. But Tennesseans sitting at their kitchen table, trying to figure

out how to make ends meet, they know different.

If ever there were a time to listen to what the American people are telling each and every one of us, it is now. Yet here we are facing now what is possibly the Democratic Party's most cynical and dangerous move to date: a trillion-plus—a trillion-plus-dollar spending spree. It is full of tax increases and policies so unpopular that its negotiators had to hide its existence from our own colleagues.

CHUCK SCHUMER and JOE MANCHIN have dubbed this secret plan—I guess is what it was—they have dubbed it the Inflation Reduction Act, which immediately brings to mind one simple question: How out of step can you possibly be with where the American people are? You are so out of step. And do you truly think that the American people are so stupid that they think raising taxes is going to bring a reduction in inflation?

If the situation weren't so dire for people back in Tennessee, I would assume this was some sort of joke, but it is not. The American people are drowning, and CHUCK SCHUMER and JOE MANCHIN have thrown them a cinder block instead of a life preserver. People cannot believe this. They absolutely cannot believe this.

This bill represents the worst elements of a radical socialist agenda that Americans have already rejected: a multihundred-billion-dollar tax hike that will kill tens of thousands of jobs, sabotage energy producers, and make it even more expensive to heat homes and fill gas tanks; a multihundred-billion-dollar payday for climate activists and the environmental lobby; innovation-killing price controls on prescription drugs; and tax breaks, but only for the wealthiest Americans.

Nothing in this bill will make life easier. Nothing in this bill will lower gas prices or reduce inflation. But it is exactly what Tennesseans were afraid would happen if Joe Biden and the Democrats took control of the Federal Government.

This week, every Member of this body has a choice to make: Will you stand with the American people, or will you make their life harder every day because of more spending, more tax increases, and more Green New Deal? Will you ease their pain, or will you make their pain worse by supporting this bloated, foolish spending spree?

I hope that my colleagues will come to their senses because this is a breaking point between Congress and the American people.

I cannot tell you how many times I heard that very statement this week-end from Tennesseans. They cannot even believe another trillion dollars in spending—another trillion. Money does not grow on trees.

If you, as an individual who has a vote on this bill, if you choose to support this bill and tax and spend this country into oblivion, that is a road that you are going to have to go down

alone because the American people cannot afford to go down this road with you.

PACT ACT OF 2022

Madam President, the Democratic press machine has done a great job framing the debate over much needed changes to the PACT Act as an attack on our most vulnerable veterans. This framing ignores reality.

I supported the PACT Act. I voted for final passage last time around. I have worked for years on the issue of toxic exposure. I intend to vote for the bill again, so do many of my colleagues who have joined me in still pushing for critical improvements to this bill.

Before we vote on final passage this week, I would ask my colleagues one question: Why wait to fix the problems we all know will hamper the effectiveness of this bill? Why not fix the PACT Act now and ensure that veterans actually have access to the care they deserve once this bill leaves the President's desk with his signature? That is the real choice here.

Now, I know my Democratic colleagues are on a tight timeline. They want this thing done. They want it done before the elections. They want this signed. They want to get out there and campaign on this. They want us just to move on and not have to fix it until later.

But it is not my job to make CHUCK SCHUMER's life easier or those running for election, to make their lives easier. It is my job to be certain that I represent these veterans in Tennessee who have given their commitment to defend this Nation. They have done it honorably. They have done it expecting care from the VA for harms that have come their way. And we should make certain that they have access to the care that they need.

The PACT Act in its current form is not the best that we can do, but we can get it there in a few more hours with a few amendments that would make sure this bill can help veterans suffering from the effects of toxic exposure and help them get the care that they deserve.

And I want to make it clear that Senator SCHUMER and Chairman TESTER know this. The majority of my colleagues who sit with me on the Veterans' Affairs Committee support a vote on these amendments, so much so that, at one point, we had all agreed to give these amendments a vote because we all know that the VA is not capable of implementing this bill as it is currently written.

The VA cannot deliver on the promise that is in this bill. In fact, it will do the exact opposite. Right now, the claims backlog at the VA sits at 168,000 cases. You heard me right on that—168,000 cases. That is the current backlog.

The PACT Act, as written, will increase that backlog by more than—get this—1 million cases—1 million. That is not according to me. That is according

to the Biden-nominated, Senate-confirmed VA Secretary Denis McDonough.

Here is what he told us in testimony delivered to the committee on March 29, 2022:

Estimates from VA's initial technical assistance . . . demonstrated a potential backlog increase to 1.5 . . . million claims by the end of fiscal year . . . 2023.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have Secretary McDonough's testimony printed in the RECORD.

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

TITLE II: TOXIC EXPOSURE PRESUMPTION
PROCESS
SUMMARY

Title II, called the Fairly Assessing Service-related Toxic Exposure Residuals Presumptions Act, or the FASTER Presumptions Act, would create new provisions in chapter 11 of title 38, U.S.C., regarding determinations relating to presumptions of service connection based on toxic exposure.

The new 38 U.S.C. §1171 would establish the process by which VA could establish or modify presumptions of service connection based on toxic exposures.

The new 38 U.S.C. §1172 would establish a Formal Advisory Committee on Toxic Exposure.

VA could consult with, and seek the advice of, the Committee with respect to cases in which Veterans are suspected of having experienced a toxic exposure during active service or dependents of such Veterans.

The Committee would have to assess cases of toxic exposures of Veterans and their dependents by conducting ongoing surveillance and reviewing scientific literature, media reports, information from Veterans and information from Congress. These assessments would cover suspected and known toxic exposures.

The Committee also would be responsible for periodically assessing the accuracy of the Individual Longitudinal Exposure Record (ILER) and the data collected.

The Committee could develop a recommendation for formal evaluation under the new 38 U.S.C. §1173 to conduct a review of the health effects related to an exposure if the Committee determines that the research may change the current understanding of the relationship between an exposure to an environmental hazard and adverse health outcomes in humans. Based upon evidence regarding the periods and locations of exposure covered by an existing presumption, the Committee could nominate for formal evaluation under new 38 U.S.C. §1173 modifications of the periods and locations for eligibility for benefits.

The new 38 U.S.C. §1173 would require VA to establish a process to conduct a formal evaluation for each recommendation of the Committee established under proposed §1172.

Under this process, VA would have to conduct research regarding the health effects related to a case of toxic exposure or to evaluate evidence regarding the periods and locations of exposure covered by an existing presumption of service connection.

Each formal evaluation would have to cover scientific evidence, claims data and other factors as VA determined appropriate.

The formal evaluations would have to evaluate the likelihood that a positive association existed between an illness and a toxic exposure while serving in active service and assess toxic exposures and illnesses to determine whether the evidence supported a find-

ing of a positive association between the toxic exposure and the illness.

Not later than 120 days after a formal evaluation is commenced, the element of VA that conducts the evaluation would have to submit to the Secretary a recommendation with respect to establishing a presumption of service connection for the toxic exposure and illness, or modifying an existing presumption of service connection, covered by the evaluation.

The new 38 U.S.C. §1174 would require VA to commence issuing regulations if the Secretary determines, based on a recommendation under §1173, that the presumption or modification is warranted or to notify the public that the presumption or modification is not warranted. If VA removed a presumption, Veterans and other beneficiaries who were receiving benefits based on that presumption would continue to receive such benefits.

The new 38 U.S.C. §1175 would allow VA to modify the process under which it conducts formal evaluations under §1173 and issues regulations under §1174.

VA would have to ensure the new evaluations cover the evidence, data and factors required by §1173(b).

VA would have to notify Congress and wait 180 days before implementing such changes.

VA also would have to seek to enter into an agreement with a nongovernmental entity or a Federally funded research and development center to conduct a review of the implementation of this subchapter.

The new 38 U.S.C. §1167 would require VA, whenever a law, regulation or Federal court decision established or modified a presumption of service connection, to identify all previously denied claims that were submitted to VA that might have been decided differently had the presumption been in effect at the time of the application.

VA would have to allow for the re-evaluation of such claims at the election of the Veteran.

Notwithstanding 38 U.S.C. §5110, VA would have to provide compensation with respect to claims approved pursuant to such reevaluation based on the date of the submission of the original claim.

VA also would have to conduct outreach to inform relevant Veterans they may elect to have a claim re-evaluated under this authority.

This section would apply to presumptions of service-connection established or modified on or after the date of enactment.

Title II also would amend 38 U.S.C. §1116 to require VA to ensure that any determination made on or after the date of enactment regarding a presumption of service connection based on exposure to an herbicide agent under this section would be made pursuant to the new authorities described previously.

In addition, title II would require VA to submit to Congress:

Not less frequently than annually, a publicly available report on recommendations for research and any recommendations for legislative or administrative action from the Committee established under §1172; VA would have to submit a publicly available report on the findings and opinions of VA with respect to the Committee's report.

Within 2 years of enactment, a report on the implementation of, and recommendations for, the new §§1171–1175. On a quarterly basis during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment, VA would have to provide to Congress a briefing on the implementation of these provisions.

Within 540 days of enactment, a report containing the review by the nongovernmental entity or Federally funded research and development center on the implementation of the new §§1171–1175.

IMPACT ON CARE AND BENEFITS

As the President said in the State of the Union earlier this month, VA already is pioneering new ways of linking toxic exposures to diseases, thus helping more Veterans receive their benefits. Based on a focused review of scientific and medical evidence related to exposure to fine particulate matter and the subsequent development of rare respiratory cancers, VA recently announced its intention to initiate rulemaking that would consider adding presumptions of service connection for several rare respiratory cancers for certain Veterans. This announcement follows VA's rulemaking action last year establishing a presumption of service connection for three chronic respiratory conditions, including asthma, rhinitis and sinusitis.

We appreciate that the bill, as passed, includes changes made in collaboration between VA and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. For example, removal of the Science Review Board and Working Group on presumptions of service connection would allow VA to implement an efficient, science-driven process. We are concerned, though, that the creation of a new Committee, particularly one subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, would likely slow existing mechanisms for proposing and conducting research.

Rather than using an advisory committee that would create significant administrative burdens and slow down the presumptive decision-making process, we recommend Congress consider requiring VA to publish in the Federal Register an annual list of conditions the Department plans to evaluate under VA's presumptive decision model, explain why the conditions were chosen for evaluation and seek input from the public on that list. This approach would enable transparency, intentionality and allow for public participation. It also would allow for a timelier decision-making process. We further recommend that Congress establish clear effective dates indicating when the proposed changes would take effect. VA recommends that sufficient time be given to allow it to implement this authority based on a variety of factors, including the regulatory development and public comment process, as well as the significant implementation requirements and dependencies (such as staffing and resources) associated with the bill as a whole.

We also are concerned that the current bill text is ambiguous, notwithstanding the four "strength of evidence" categories listed in proposed §1173, as to when a presumption is warranted. It remains unclear whether Congress intends for the Secretary to adopt the recommendations from the bill's proposed process as a matter of course. If Congress intends to allow VA to determine the applicable standards for creating a presumption, it would be helpful to make that clear and to provide specific guidelines for when VA must create or modify these presumptions. For example, if the strength of evidence for a particular condition falls in the category of "equipoise and above," it is unclear whether the Secretary would be required to establish a presumption or if the Secretary would have discretion in those instances. If Congress intends any specific, triggering standards governing these determinations, it would be helpful to clarify such standards in the bill. The court orders in the long-standing, complex class action litigation in *Nehmer v. U.S. Dep't of Veterans Affairs* (*Nehmer*) were based on a finding that, in creating presumptions based on herbicide agent exposure, VA applied standards inconsistent with Congressional intent. It would be helpful for the Committee to clarify Congressional intent on this point to avoid similar consequences with respect to this bill.

The new §1167 would impose a Nehmer-type effective date mechanism for new presumptions. We want to be clear to the Committee, though, that applying a Nehmer-like retroactive effective date provision in this instance would create a significant exception to the legal structure governing Veterans' benefits. Applying this standard makes it difficult to predict the consequences of this type of effective date provision. VA would be required to apply the provision in this new authority not only to the presumptions created in this bill but also to any future presumptions created by regulation, statute or court order. This requirement would present extraordinary workload challenges to the agency and unprecedented delays in the delivery of benefits to Veterans. For example, every previously denied claim for any of the presumptive conditions identified in or contemplated by this bill (out of the nearly 3.5 million Gulf War-deployed Veterans) would now be subject to a retroactive effective date as far back as 1991 for Gulf War I Veterans and 2001 for Global War on Terrorism Veterans.

We would welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to ensure that new authorities in this area support our ongoing work to help us make informed decisions as quickly as possible.

COSTS AND RESOURCES

VA is concerned that an extremely large and unprecedented disability claims backlog would be created if the Nehmer-like provisions in this bill are retained. Based on VA's previous experience in implementing similar retroactive effective date provisions, we understand this provision would result in complex and time-intensive claims processing procedures. In this case, claims processors would be required to review 20 to 30 years of evidence for a single issue. Considering that more than 1.9 million Gulf War-era deployed Veterans have filed disability claims in the past 30 years (over 900,000 of whom filed claims for respiratory issues), VA is very concerned about the impact of this provision. VA claims processors would be required to re-adjudicate hundreds of thousands of previously denied claims for earlier effective dates. Estimates from VA's initial technical assistance, without this provision, demonstrated a potential backlog increase to 1.5 and 1.8 million claims by the end of fiscal year (FY) 2023. Any further application of retroactive presumptions would drive further benefit delivery delays for all Veterans.

RESEARCH

Title II would establish a new Committee and institute new processes related to the identification of and support for research related to toxic exposures. As noted previously, we are concerned some of the specific provisions in this title would prove more onerous and less nimble than our current approach.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Now, the reason I have paid so much attention to this backlog is because every single week the team that works with me in Tennessee handling these issues with our VSOs—our veterans service officers—keeps track of what we hear from the veterans.

Right now in Tennessee, I have veterans telling me they are waiting almost 100 days for a primary care appointment at the VA. Now, for many vets, this is just step 1. So once they contact the VA, it is 100 days. Think about that: 100 days before they get that primary care appointment, and that is if the appointment doesn't get

canceled or it has to be rescheduled. So that is an average to get to step 1—first step.

Across Tennessee, veterans are waiting yet another 39 days to get mental healthcare. Now, if they are needing dental appointments, dental surgery, or dental care, that is 44 days. If they go for that primary care appointment and they need to go see a cardiologist, that is 33 days; 28 days to see a gynecologist; 30 days to go talk to someone about chronic pain.

Look at what is happening. The VA cannot meet the load in front of them. Our veterans—our veterans who have defended our Nation's freedom—cannot get the care they need in a timely manner.

Now, we have done a lot of work over the years to help the VA help itself. We have given them support for hiring. We have given them support for retention. But, Madam President, it takes 90 days for this Agency, the VA, to hire one person—90 days. And think of the number of caseworkers they would have to hire to implement this. Throwing money at the problem isn't going to make these wait times and backlogs disappear.

It is imperative that we fix the PACT Act so it is not a false promise, so it is not false hope. If the PACT Act is going to work for our veterans, then the VA needs to embrace community care.

I proposed an amendment to the bill that would have eliminated arbitrary bureaucratic hurdles for toxic-exposed veterans who will inevitably face these long wait times. It would allow them to seek care in the community right there where they live if they could get it faster than they could from the VA.

I offered this amendment based on my conversations with Tennessee veterans who are chronically ill but cannot get in to the VA to see a doctor and get that primary care appointment so they can move on to specialty care. Many of them are deteriorating at an alarming rate, and they deserve access to care as soon as they can get it. The only way that access to care for them is going to happen is if we allow them community care. They have fought for this country. They deserve to have access to that care, but right now, they cannot get it.

Madam President, I know you more than most understand how imperative it is for veterans to have access to the care they need, that this government make good on its promise to our veterans, that we stop these long wait times, that we stop the delays, and that we allow them that access that they have earned and that they deserve.

There is a way to fix this bill. I know there are some who say: Well, we are afraid this will privatize the VA. That is their fear, and I understand that. But at some point, veterans want us to take that action to put them first—not the bureaucracy first, put the veterans first—allow the veterans to make that

choice if they cannot get to the VA in a timely manner. If the VA can't get them in for an appointment, let's open this up and let the veterans out into community care so their needs can be met in a timely manner.

A promise in a piece of legislation ought not to end up as a false hope when it comes to our Nation's veterans. The best way we can fulfill our promise to toxic-exposed veterans is to give this bill the time it needs for an amendment that will allow our veterans to access the care they need without having to wait on the VA to figure out how to implement this bill.

Surely, surely, we can do this. Let's have a vote on these amendments and fix this bill before it is signed into law.

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. 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.

KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to talk briefly about a very sacred place on our Nation's Mall, The National Mall, that I had an opportunity to visit yesterday. It is the Korean War Veterans Memorial that millions and millions of Americans have visited. Something happened last Wednesday that I wanted to talk about a little bit, a really important rededication of this very moving war memorial.

Now, I like to get out on The Mall most days, go for a run in the morning when I am in DC, and I love our memorials, like everybody in America does, particularly the memorials that are dedications to the service of our military members, our veterans. The Presiding Officer is a veteran, a war hero. I have a ton of respect for her and her service. But whether it is the World War II or the Vietnam Memorial, one of the most moving memorials that I like to visit is the Korean War Veterans Memorial. Why? Well, I think there is so much we can all learn from the Korean war.

In the Marine Corps, they really drill into you what happened during the Korean war. Unfortunately, not enough Americans know about the Korean war. But one of the big lessons is, you need to be ready. You need to be ready.

In 1945, the U.S. military was the most fearsome military in the world, probably in the history of the world, and in 1950, just 5 years later, we had a very difficult time stopping a third world army in the opening months of the Korean war. Now, we rebounded, as Americans always do, but that is a lesson. That is a lesson for our country. In my view, the uniformed civilian leadership of our military did not serve their country well, letting the state of our forces become very unready. That is

one of the lessons of that very difficult, brutal war.

There is another lesson, and it is the nobility of service from our veterans that really is epitomized by service in the Korean war. The memorial has many beautifully engraved sayings, but one, when you think about it, is so moving and, in my view, depicts the nobility of American military service, particularly as it relates to that war.

It says:

Our nation honors her sons and daughters who answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met.

Think about that—young men and women in America sent to fight halfway around the world to defend freedom. That is exactly what they were doing. And they didn't even know whom they were defending. A lot of them didn't even know where they were.

To me, those words capture the essence of nobility, and so does the Korean War Memorial. You see part of it here. The centerpiece is nine large statues—soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines. They are grunts, infantry grunts on patrol. You can see there is a cold, wet wind whipping their ponchos. Their faces are full of fear, when you look at the statues, but also pride and determination. And all of this, in my view, captures the nobility of our service and our sacrifice as a nation in this war.

Now, historians have referred to the Korean war as the "forgotten war." I am kind of a Korean war history buff. I really, really dislike that term. I think we should just get rid of it. It is kind of a pejorative term in some ways. I have always thought it downplays the sacrifice and nobility and meaning of this very brutal conflict.

I have often thought and said that, instead of the forgotten war, we should call it the noble war because it was a noble undertaking. It was a noble undertaking. Anyone who knows the history of this war or visits the memorial or knows a Korean war veteran or their family members knows that this was a noble undertaking by our great Nation, saving a country—literally saving a country—and we sacrificed a lot for it.

That is the other thing that I think is very powerful on this memorial. Take a look at it—another depiction. You have heard it many times, but it is right there: "Freedom is not free." "Freedom is not free." Indeed, the freedoms that we enjoy in America, that so many countries around the world enjoy right now because of our military members over the course of history, decades—I always like to say, probably the greatest force in liberating mankind from oppression and tyranny in the world is the U.S. military. Think about it. Hundreds of millions of people. World War I; World War II; the Civil War, of course; but the Korean war, certainly. Over 37,000 Americans were killed in action, over 8,000 are still listed as missing in action, and over 103,000 Americans were wounded.

And, of course, the killed and wounded Korean veterans and military and civilians from that war are literally in the millions—in the millions. But what also resonates are the very, very tangible results of the war in terms of freedom.

Many of us have seen the famous satellite images at night taken over the Korean Peninsula—the whole peninsula. And if you look at the 38th parallel and what is north, it is literally dark and looks cold and looks lifeless. And if you look at everything south in that satellite picture, it is alive, bursting with life, and light.

In my view, there are very few better illustrations of the disparity between freedom and authoritarianism than the image of that Korean Peninsula at night with those two countries—one is bright and alive, and one is dark and literally dead. American citizens, American soldiers, American military kept an entire country free.

So what happened last week? I didn't think this war memorial, to be honest, could be improved—one of my favorites: powerful, as I have talked about; great words—but it was improved.

Last Wednesday, I had the opportunity to attend the dedication—really, the rededication—of the Wall of Remembrance that was added to the Korean War Memorial last week. The wall now has engraved on it the 36,573 Americans that were killed in action—every one of them—like the Vietnam wall.

This is an example of what you will see at the new memorial. I encourage everybody, every American, if you are in DC, go take a look; go pay your respects. It is so moving. It is dramatically improved, this memorial, which I didn't think could be improved upon.

Importantly, intermixed in the names of the Americans are also the 7,200 KATUSA soldiers. These were the Korean Army personnel who served with American forces, right alongside them. So they are just here. They are not divided by American and Korean. Those are just the ones who served with the Americans. Again, the Korean military—their killed-in-action numbers are way higher than even these.

And here is the other thing that is so moving about this memorial. The names are actually laid out by service—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines. And they are actually listed according to rank. So if you look at the Vietnam Memorial, it is mixed in. It doesn't matter what service. And it is the date in which somebody was actually killed, chronologically.

This is by military service and their rank. Why does that matter? What does it mean? Well, I will tell you what it means. It depicts the sacrifice of war, regardless of what the war is. Wars throughout history, up until now, always fall upon the young men and women of our great Nation—the 18-, 19-, 20-year-olds. They are the ones who do the fighting, and they are the ones who do the dying.

So, for example, this is actually a picture of the section after section

after section after section, which is just U.S. Army Private First Class—U.S. Army PFCs. And it is just thousands, one group. Huge sacrifice. Huge sacrifice.

So I encourage everybody to go out, take a look at this newly improved Korean War Memorial that was dedicated last week. It was such a moving ceremony. It was made all the more moving by the beautiful voice of Miss America, Emma Broyles, who sang "God Bless America" in front of the thousands of veterans who were there—thousands—Americans, Koreans.

By the way, Emma is a constituent of mine. She is the first Alaskan to win Miss America, first Korean American to ever win Miss America. So she did a great job.

And the final thing I just want to mention—and I think the whole Senate—I am working on a Senate resolution, and I would love to get some of my colleagues here on the floor right now to join this resolution with me. It is a simple resolution saying thank you to the Korean government and the Korean people, because guess who paid for this memorial. It wasn't the American taxpayer. It was the Korean Government and the people of Korea. Over 22 million. We had tremendous support from our Korean war American veterans associations. They did a great job. But the vast, vast bulk of the funding for this new, incredibly moving Korean War Memorial was from the people of Korea and the Government of Korea. And they sent their defense minister, they sent their veterans affairs minister, they sent a huge delegation of members of their legislature all for this ceremony. So I want to thank all of them.

And I want to thank our veterans, our Korean War veterans, who served in the noble war—not the forgotten war, the noble war, a proud moment of history between our two great nations—a history that has bonded us—the Republic of Korea and the United States of America—for decades.

And now our Gold Star families and Korean War veterans can visit the names of their friends and families and loved ones who did this, as the memorial says:

Answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met.

That is why this should be called the noble war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, my remarks are coming about 6 minutes after I was intending to start. I would ask for permission to complete my remarks before the vote begins.

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

(The remarks of Mr. KAINE pertaining to the submission of S. 4688 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. KAINE. I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 1068, Elizabeth Wilson Hanes, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, Jeanne Shaheen, Jeff Merkley, Alex Padilla, Richard J. Durbin, Jack Reed, Gary C. Peters, Edward J. Markey, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine, Ben Ray Lujan, Mazie 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 nomination of Elizabeth Wilson Hanes, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 275 Ex.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Boozman	Cassidy
Blackburn	Braun	Cotton

Cramer	Inhofe	Rubio
Crapo	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lee	Sullivan
Ernst	Lummis	Thune
Fischer	Marshall	Toomey
Hagerty	McConnell	Tuberville
Hoeven	Paul	Wicker
Hyde-Smith	Risch	Young

NOT VOTING—11

Blunt	Hawley	Moran
Burr	Kennedy	Sasse
Cornyn	Leahy	Shelby
Durbin	Merkley	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). On this vote, the yeas are 56 and the nays are 33.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 1078 through 1093 and all nominations on the Secretary's Desk in the Air Force, Army, 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; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed, en bloc, are as follows:

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

Maj. Gen. Robert A. Rasch, Jr.

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Sarah K. Albrycht
Col. Kevin J. Lambert

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

Lt. Gen. Tony D. Bauernfeind

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. Donna D. Shipton

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

Maj. Gen. Andrew M. Rohling

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas J. Anderson

IN THE SPACE FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Space 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. Philip A. Garrant

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers 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. Anne B. Gunter
Brig. Gen. Lynette J. Hebert
Brig. Gen. Constance L. Jenkins
Brig. Gen. Tanya R. Kubinec
Brig. Gen. John M. Olson
Brig. Gen. David W. Smith
Brig. Gen. Aaron G. Vangelisti

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael P. Cruff
Col. Heath D. Fowler
Col. Leslie S. Hadley
Col. Lori C. Jones
Col. William A. Matney
Col. Kelvin D. McElroy
Col. Andre A. McMillian
Col. Stephen J. Nester
Col. Shannon OHarren
Col. Kenneth J. Ostrat
Col. Sarah H. Russ
Col. Stephen E. Slade
Col. Dean D. Sniogowski

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Kevin D. Admiral
Brig. Gen. Robert L. Barrie, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Christopher G. Beck
Brig. Gen. Peter N. Benchoff
Brig. Gen. Trevor J. Bredekamp
Brig. Gen. Winston P. Brooks
Brig. Gen. Glenn A. Dean, III
Brig. Gen. David S. Doyle
Brig. Gen. Patrick L. Gaydon
Brig. Gen. Jared P. Helwig
Brig. Gen. James P. Isenhower, III
Brig. Gen. Ryan M. Janovic
Brig. Gen. John D. Kline
Brig. Gen. Gavin A. Lawrence
Brig. Gen. Kevin C. Leahy
Brig. Gen. Michael C. McCurry, II.
Brig. Gen. Scott M. Naumann
Brig. Gen. Christopher R. Norrie
Brig. Gen. Thomas W. OConnor, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Keith C. Phillips
Brig. Gen. Jeth B. Rey
Brig. Gen. Paul T. Stanton
Brig. Gen. David B. Womack

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Isaac Johnson, Jr.

To be brigadier general

Col. Noel F. Palmer

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. Bryan P. Fenton

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Air Force Reserve and appointment in the Reserve of the 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. Michael E. Langley

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Air Force Reserve and appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 9038:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Dagvin R.M. Anderson

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Air Force Reserve and appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 9038:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John P. Healy

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. David A. Ottignon

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

PN2107 AIR FORCE nominations (63) beginning VICTORIA D. ABLES, and ending ANN M. ZENOBIA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2022.

PN2319 AIR FORCE nomination of Judson C. Dressler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2320 AIR FORCE nominations (230) beginning JIMMY T. ADDISON, and ending JOANNA J. ZEMEK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2321 AIR FORCE nominations (113) beginning TIMOTHY JAY ABLAY, and ending JAMES E. YARNELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2322 AIR FORCE nominations (590) beginning DANIEL C. ABELL, and ending ROQUE ZARATE, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2323 AIR FORCE nominations (89) beginning DANIEL C. ADAMS, and ending JULIA M. ZIEGLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2324 AIR FORCE nominations (27) beginning MICHAEL ANTOINE BRADFORD, and ending JOSEPH R. ZITO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2325 AIR FORCE nominations (36) beginning JUSTIN D. ATWOOD, and ending DAVID J. YU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2326 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning Douglas D. Demaio, and ending Adria P. Zuccaro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2327 AIR FORCE nomination of Keith A. Deering, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

IN THE ARMY

PN2281 ARMY nominations (300) beginning BRYAN G. ADAMS, and ending D016618, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2282 ARMY nominations (64) beginning EMER B. BAJUELOS, and ending CONNOR W. WITTY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2283 ARMY nomination of Leah M. Triolo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2284 ARMY nomination of Joseph R. Yancey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2285 ARMY nomination of Tannis D. Mittelbach, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2286 ARMY nomination of David M. Haynes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2287 ARMY nomination of Daniel S. Rhoades, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2288 ARMY nomination of Stephen D. Ekblad, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2289 ARMY nomination of Scott F. Duncan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2290 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ANNA M. ARROYOSANTIAGO, and ending ZHIBIN JIANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2328 ARMY nomination of Raymond A. Degennaro, II, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2329 ARMY nomination of Kesler Weaver, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2330 ARMY nomination of William M. Harris, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2331 ARMY nomination of Lance M. Kunz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2332 ARMY nominations (60) beginning JOHN T. AASMAN, and ending D016440, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2333 ARMY nominations (26) beginning SARA R. A. ALMCRANTZ, and ending NICHOLE M. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2334 ARMY nominations (60) beginning SHANEE E. ALLEN, and ending DOUGLAS B. YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2335 ARMY nominations (170) beginning JERMAINE ADAMS, and ending D016771, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2336 ARMY nominations (118) beginning FRANCES K. ALFARO, and ending D016646, which nominations were received by the Sen-

ate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2391 ARMY nomination of Juan D. Magri, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

PN2393 ARMY nomination of Justin T. Wright, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

PN2394 ARMY nomination of Benjamin R. Stone, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

PN2395 ARMY nominations (2) beginning DENA R. GOBLE, and ending JASON P. NAGELI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

PN2396 ARMY nomination of Aaron L. Bert, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN2363 MARINE CORPS nomination of Dominique B. Neal, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

IN THE NAVY

PN2241 NAVY nomination of Steven D. Sideri, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2022.

PN2291 NAVY nominations (20) beginning RUBEN DELPILAR, and ending STEVEN C. WANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2292 NAVY nominations (5) beginning JASON S. ALLEN, and ending MICHAEL J. PATTERSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2293 NAVY nominations (3) beginning LOUISE M. ANDERSON, and ending WILLIAM E. PARTHUN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2294 NAVY nominations (7) beginning DILLON J. AMBROSE, and ending KATHRYN M. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2295 NAVY nominations (6) beginning OBIE A. AUSTIN, and ending SUSAN O. VALENTINE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2296 NAVY nominations (9) beginning ADAM D. GUTHRIE, and ending RENEE D. WHITSELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2297 NAVY nominations (2) beginning James D. Bach, and ending Donald R. Toso, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2298 NAVY nominations (3) beginning PHILLIP I. LIEBERMAN, and ending FRANK T. RUPNIK, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2299 NAVY nominations (4) beginning RANDELL T. BUCHANAN, and ending JASON P. WIESE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2337 NAVY nominations (8) beginning TIMOTHY M. FLINTOFT, and ending CHAD C. TEMPLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2338 NAVY nominations (21) beginning KRYSTAL M. BAUMAN, and ending BROOKES A. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2339 NAVY nominations (26) beginning ANDRE M. AGRAVIADOR, and ending MICHAEL VALLIANOS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2340 NAVY nominations (12) beginning CHARLOTTE A. BENBOW, and ending KAXIONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2341 NAVY nominations (26) beginning LINDSAY K. BARNES, and ending SHEIVON A. YUILLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2342 NAVY nominations (41) beginning DEREK J. ANASTASIADIS, and ending SCOTT C. TOLLEFSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2343 NAVY nominations (44) beginning MICHAEL A. AMMENDOLA, and ending LAURA C. YOON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2344 NAVY nomination of William R. Fleming, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2345 NAVY nominations (6) beginning ALDEN Y. ARGANTE, and ending JASON M. SETLIFF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2346 NAVY nominations (11) beginning BRANDON D. CARVER, and ending CLAIBORN B. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2347 NAVY nominations (13) beginning ERIC L. ALEXANDER, and ending JOHN A. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2348 NAVY nominations (9) beginning MARIO E. CANAS, and ending RAFAEL M. VILLARREAL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2349 NAVY nominations (469) beginning KRISTIN P. ACTON, and ending MICHAEL J. ZECCA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2350 NAVY nominations (14) beginning JODI M.D. BIERMANN, and ending WILLIAM C. SOUDER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2351 NAVY nominations (32) beginning ARTHUR D. ANDERSON, III, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. TOCKEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2352 NAVY nominations (15) beginning WILLIAM A. BOWEN, III, and ending COURTNEY R. STALTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2353 NAVY nominations (10) beginning TODD M. ANDERSON, and ending JESSE L. WHITFIELD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2354 NAVY nominations (9) beginning JESSICA B. ANDERSON, and ending AMELIA E. UYAMAYAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2355 NAVY nominations (25) beginning THOMAS E. ARNOLD, and ending JOSEPH K. SPEDE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2356 NAVY nominations (12) beginning ALAN CAMERON, and ending LEROY C. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2357 NAVY nominations (16) beginning JOHN H. BEATTIE, and ending BENJAMIN V. WAINWRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2358 NAVY nomination of Javier Lopezmartinez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2359 NAVY nominations (72) beginning WENDY A. ARNOLD, and ending JANET M. WEST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2360 NAVY nominations (24) beginning TERESITA ALSTON, and ending DONAVON A. YAPSHING, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2361 NAVY nominations (35) beginning CLEMIA ANDERSON, and ending CHARLES R. WILHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2362 NAVY nomination of Christopher J. Kane, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2022.

PN2367 NAVY nomination of Christopher E. Bowman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

PN2368 NAVY nomination of Christopher L. Caudill, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

PN2369 NAVY nomination of Rosa M. Allen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2022.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

PN2300 SPACE FORCE nomination of Christina N. Gillette, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

PN2301 SPACE FORCE nomination of Daniel R. Hammer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2022.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ETHYLE E. O'NEAL

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, Oregonians will soon gather to honor an American hero, Ethyle O'Neal. Ethyle will be posthumously awarded the Congressional Gold Medal next month in McMinnville, OR. When the Senate voted to award the medal to Ethyle and her fellow Civil Air Patrol volunteers from WWII, it was with the heroism and devotion to service she embodied in mind. Since I won't be able to

attend the ceremony, I want to spend a few minutes today to honor her outstanding legacy, her service, the communities she bettered, and the family she has left behind.

Born and raised in my hometown, Portland, 14-year-old Ethyle E. Kremers was the first from her high school to volunteer for the Civil Air Patrol, or CAP. With the U.S. military tied up in WWII, the CAP was tasked with patrolling America's borders to detect threats, deter submarine attacks, and protect vital shipping lanes. Ethyle trained as a radio-communicator and support person, as well as taking on the responsibilities of cadet training at dozens of CAP camps across the country. Six years after joining the CAP, Ethyle used her training to single-handedly save the life of a young child and assist in the rescue of four more during the Vanport Flood disaster. For the rescues, she became the first CAP cadet to receive the program's highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award. Soon after, Ethyle joined the U.S. Air Force and trained as a medical laboratory assistant at Edwards Air Force Base, where she met her future husband Theodore O'Neal. The two went on to have four wonderful children: Timothy, Ken, Kathy, and Susie.

After years traveling with her family to Air Force bases around the world, Ethyle returned to Portland. She shortly resumed work with the CAP as commander of the Milwaukie and then Beaverton Cadet Squadrons. Tasked with training new recruits, Ethyle's dedication to the role was matched only by the compassion she showed to her cadets. Her family still remembers Ethyle inviting cadets over to her house to study and practice maneuvers around the dining room. For her service, Ethyle was awarded the CAP's highest award for adult officers, the Gill Robb Wilson Award, and the grade of lieutenant colonel. In addition to training new cadets, Ethyle began flying search and rescue sorties as a mission observer, took the role of director of cadet programs, earning numerous commendations for her work.

Ethyle was also an active member of her community outside of the CAP. For 13 years, she worked as a bus driver for children with special needs, ensuring education remained accessible for the most vulnerable in society. She also loved teaching local children to fly model rockets.

A model of selflessness, Ethyle's accomplishments survive her, reminding us that the efforts of a determined few can raise, or even save, the lives of many. Ethyle's success as a woman in the Armed Forces and work with children with special needs inspire me to continue my own work for these underrepresented groups. It is an honor to remember her achievements, and I can think of nobody more deserving of the Congressional Gold Medal. It is my sincere hope that her story continues to inspire the best in all who hear it, in Oregon and across the Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DEBORAH CROSS

• Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I am honored to recognize Deborah Cross of Manchester as July's Granite Stater of the Month. After surviving stage 4 cancer, Deborah used her artistic talents to create photo journals to help other cancer patients process their emotions and find resilience.

After recovering from endometrial cancer in 2014 and living cancer-free for almost 4 years, Deborah received awful news from her doctor. Her cancer had come back. While Deborah was devastated by the news, she also found solace in a creative outlet that would also help others.

Deborah began creating booklets with strikingly edited photos of nature in New Hampshire, for example, images of seagulls and ocean sunsets around the New England coast. Below the photos are blank lines where cancer patients can journal. Deborah hopes that the photos can evoke deeper emotions that patients might be struggling with in a time of intense personal hardship. In addition, some of the proceeds from the sales go to the North of Boston Cancer Resource.

Deborah exemplifies the Granite State spirit of giving back to others and bringing people together even during challenging times. She took an immensely difficult experience—battling with stage 4 cancer—and found her way through it by creating art that would touch others. I commend her for her work and know that her story will inspire others to make a difference in their communities.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2021, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 29, 2022, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 4346. An act making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2021, the enrolled bill was signed on July 29, 2022, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 3451. An act to include certain computer-related projects in the Federal permitting program under title XLI of the FAST Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 263. An act to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1808. An act to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to make certain activities eligible for grants from the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 780, the Speaker appoints the following member to the National Council on Disability: Mr. Shawn Kennemer of Bakersfield, California.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1057. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1842. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth.

H.R. 3359. An act to provide for a system for reviewing the case files of cold case murders at the instance of certain persons, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1808. An act to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator STEVE DAINES, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th

Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Kimberly Ann McClain, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Leonard Wolfson.

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. KAINÉ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 4688. A bill to guarantee that Americans have the freedom to make certain reproductive decisions without undue government interference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 4689. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder threshold for registration under that Act for issuers that receive support through certain Federal universal service support mechanisms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 4690. A bill to provide grants for fire station construction through the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 4691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the charitable mileage rate with the business travel rate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 4692. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make publicly available information on infant formula procurement under the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 4693. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails and designate the American Discovery Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4694. A bill to support the preparation and retention of outstanding educators in all fields to ensure a bright future for children and youth in under-resourced and underserved communities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 4695. A bill to establish a Western Water Cooperative Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 4696. A bill to require the Secretary of the Air Force to include the Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System mission as part of the basing criteria of the Air Force for C-130J aircraft for the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 4697. A bill to require limitations on research on potential pandemic pathogens of concern; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4698. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify requirements relating to the regulation and examination of credit union organizations and service providers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. Res. 732. A resolution recognizing the United States Border Patrol for deploying to Del Rio, Texas, on September 19, 2021, to respond to the border crisis; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 733. A resolution designating September 2022 as "National Child Awareness Month" to promote awareness of charities that benefit children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing the efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting.

S. 1157

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee.

S. 1548

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1548, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diversity of participants in research on Alzheimer's disease, and for other purposes.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to address maternity care

storages and promote optimal maternity outcomes by expanding educational opportunities for midwives, and for other purposes.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1873, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 2130

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2130, a bill to modify the disposition of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues and to open Federal financial sharing to heighten opportunities for renewable energy, and for other purposes.

S. 2263

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2263, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for sustainable aviation fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 2287

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2287, a bill 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.

S. 2379

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2379, a bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to allow the release of education records to facilitate the award of a recognized postsecondary credential.

S. 2409

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2409, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 2808

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2808, a bill to provide compensation for United States victims of Libyan state-sponsored terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 2952

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2952, a bill to

amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow manufacturers and sponsors of a drug to use alternative testing methods to animal testing to investigate the safety and effectiveness of a drug, and for other purposes.

S. 2992

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2992, a bill to provide that certain discriminatory conduct by covered platforms shall be unlawful, and for other purposes.

S. 3295

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3295, a bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV.

S. 3546

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3546, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made to reporting of third party network transactions by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

S. 3860

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3860, a bill to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local governments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

S. 4069

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4069, a bill to amend the National Firearms Act to provide an exception for stabilizing braces, and for other purposes.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to make available additional frequencies in the 3.1–3.45 GHz band for non-Federal use, shared Federal and non-Federal use, or a combination thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 4181

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 4181, a bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to allow coronavirus State and local fiscal recovery funds to be used for low-income housing credit projects.

S. 4394

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4394, a bill to modify the minimum required weight of orange juice soluble solids.

S. 4416

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4416, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students.

S. 4485

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4485, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status.

S. 4576

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4576, a bill to provide competitive grants for the promotion of Japanese American confinement education as a means to understand the importance of democratic principles, use and abuse of power, and to raise awareness about the importance of cultural tolerance toward Japanese Americans, and for other purposes.

S. 4595

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4595, a bill to support local governments for jurisdictions that elect or appoint a person with a disability in providing the accommodations needed for the elected or appointed official to carry out their official work duties, and to build the capacity of local governments to have consistent and adequate funding for accommodations.

S. 4597

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4597, a bill to allow individuals with disabilities to campaign for elected office without losing access to Federally supported benefits.

S. 4601

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4601, a bill to improve the management and performance of the capital asset programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs so as to better serve veterans, their families, caregivers, and survivors, and for other purposes.

S. 4628

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4628, a bill to improve certain criminal provisions.

S. 4642

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4642, a bill to require a comprehensive southern border strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 4687

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4687, a bill to enhance the authority granted to the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice with respect to unmanned aircraft systems and unmanned aircraft, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 675

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 675, a resolution commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

S. RES. 713

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 713, a resolution recognizing Russian actions in Ukraine as a genocide.

S. RES. 730

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 730, a resolution remembering the 30th anniversary of the bombing of the Embassy of Israel in Buenos Aires on March 17, 1992, the 28th anniversary of the bombing of the Argentine-Israeli Mutual Association building in Buenos Aires on July 18, 1994, and committing to efforts to uphold justice for the victims of the attacks.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 4688. A bill to guarantee that Americans have the freedom to make certain reproductive decisions without undue government interference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, for nearly half a century, the Supreme Court held that the right to make reproductive decisions was protected by the 14th Amendment. Generations of women have relied on the freedom to make reproductive health decisions as a matter of fundamental personal rights. In particular, seminal cases such as *Roe v. Wade*, *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*, *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, *Griswold v. Connecticut*, *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, and *Carey v. Population Services International* established basic rights to obtain abortion services and access contraception.

The Supreme Court's recent decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* overruled *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylv-*

ania v. Casey, the landmark decisions holding that a woman's right to a pre-viability abortion is constitutionally protected. As the dissenters in *Dobbs* observed, this right is "embedded in core constitutional concepts of individual freedom, and of the equal rights of citizens to decide on the shape of their lives." The Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs* resulted in immediate abortion bans in several States and means that millions of women, particularly women who live in the South, parts of the Midwest, and the West, will live hundreds of miles from the nearest abortion clinic. In fact, approximately 17 million women could be forced to travel more than 200 miles in order to obtain abortion care.

Not only does the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs* upset decades of precedent protecting the right of Americans to make personal decisions about abortion, but it also places in jeopardy many other important 14th Amendment rights, including the right to access birth control. Because the Supreme Court has abandoned constitutional protection of reproductive rights, it is the responsibility of Congress to act.

That is why Senators MURKOWSKI, SINEMA, COLLINS, and I are introducing the Reproductive Freedom for All Act, bipartisan legislation to guarantee protections for reproductive and contraceptive care by enacting the essential holdings of the landmark cases *Roe v. Wade*, *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*, *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, *Griswold v. Connecticut*, *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, and *Carey v. Population Services International*. The Reproductive Freedom for All Act returns Federal law to its pre-*Dobbs* status by allowing pre-viability abortions, prohibiting States from banning post-viability abortions necessary to protect the life and health of the mother, and protecting access to contraception. The Reproductive Freedom for All Act creates a minimum Federal standard which states must follow. The bill also ensures that the U.S. Department of Justice or individuals adversely affected by a State abortion restriction can challenge any State restriction on reproductive freedom in court.

The Supreme Court's overturning of *Roe* and *Casey* goes directly against the will of the people. More than 60 percent of Americans believe abortion should be legal in all or most cases. Support for reproductive freedom transcends regional, political, ethnic, and religious differences. Since support for reproductive freedom is nonpartisan among the public, it is important to have a legislative vehicle protecting that freedom that can gain bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of the Reproductive Freedom for All Act. It is imperative that Congress come together to ensure that decisions as fundamental as reproductive choice are not determined by the State or ZIP Code where someone lives.

I thank my colleagues for standing together in support of a bipartisan solution to the crisis created by Dobbs. I also acknowledge the work of advocates supporting Michigan's Reproductive Freedom for All ballot initiative, which informed my work on this bill and which I hope will inspire similar efforts in other States. We must come together to pass the Reproductive Freedom for All Act now.

Mr. President, I rise to essentially do a part two of a talk that I gave on the Senate floor about 2 weeks ago. The first part of my talk was my analysis of the Dobbs decision of the Supreme Court, expressing my deep disillusionment with the Court's decision to cast aside a century of precedent under the 14th Amendment due process clause and, in particular, casting aside 50 years of using the 14th Amendment to protect women's rights to make reproductive decisions with regard to contraception and abortion.

I analyzed the Court's opinion and precedents at that time, but I sort of left it hanging what needs to be done because while we can critique the Court decision, and I do view it as completely ahistorical and not understanding the purpose of the 14th Amendment, nevertheless, the Court's majority ruling was the protection of reproductive freedom was now no longer a matter for constitutional protection but was, instead, for legislatures.

The majority seemed to assume that that would be State legislatures, but at least one of the concurring opinions acknowledged legislatures could include Congress.

And I take the floor today in the second part of this talk to discuss a bill that I have today introduced with three other Senate colleagues—Senator SINEMA, Senator COLLINS, and Senator MURKOWSKI—the Reproductive Freedom for All Act, taking the Supreme Court up on the challenge that what we need to do to protect reproductive freedom is to legislate to do so.

Let me describe the origin of the bill. Beginning in February, the Senate has had two votes on a bill that I have co-sponsored—the Women's Health Protection Act, which was designed—written before the Dobbs case but designed to protect reproductive freedom by disabling State legislatures from putting schemes and obstacles in the way of women making reproductive decisions.

The first time we had a vote on that bill, I voted yes. It was in February. It received 49 votes. We were scheduled to have a second vote on the Women's Health Protection Act in May. And it occurred to me that we would likely have the same result; we would get 49 votes.

And I had a strong feeling before that vote that if that was the case, we would be leaving votes on the table. By that, I understood from talking to my colleagues that there were more than 49 Members of this Chamber who wanted to codify Roe and related cases and

protect women's rights to access contraception and abortion services but that it wouldn't be ideal to send a message that less than a majority of the Senate was committed to reproductive freedom. And so I began efforts in May to find additional votes beyond the 49 that I knew would vote yes on the WHPA. And I began discussions with colleagues, including Republican colleagues, to look for a way to codify Roe that, yes, might be different in wording from the Women's Health Protection Act but would accomplish the same goal of providing a Federal guarantee that would operate in every ZIP Code in this country to protect women's rights to make decisions about contraception and abortion.

And today we have introduced that bill, the Reproductive Freedom for All Act. The name of it is a tribute to a ballot initiative that is currently under debate in Michigan and scheduled for a vote to be added to the Michigan Constitution in November, the Reproductive Freedom for All initiative. And the bill that we have put together fairly closely tracks—not identically but fairly closely tracks the language of the ballot referendum in Michigan.

What does the bill do? We worked on the bill between the leak of the Dobbs opinion and when Dobbs was decided by the Supreme Court right before our July Fourth recess. And we worked to make the bill as strong as we could. But then we set it aside because we knew the Dobbs decision might change from the leaked opinion, and we wanted to see what was actually in the opinion before we finalized the bill. And it is good that we waited because there were some aspects of the Dobbs opinion that were a bit different. They took some sandpaper to some controversial parts of the case, and they extended other arguments in the case that needed a response.

And so what we have done since Dobbs is analyzed the opinion but also, more importantly, looked at life in the United States since that decision was rendered. I could give many examples, even in the month since that decision has been rendered, of the tragedy of what I believe is now post-Dobbs America.

In particular, when a 10-year-old child has to be smuggled across State lines to receive care following her rape, that is gruesome. That is not what this country should expect, nor, indeed, what we should tolerate. And yet that is not an accidental byproduct of the Dobbs decision. That was a completely foreseeable and even foreseen consequence of the Dobbs decision that turning it over to 50 States would lead to a patchwork of horrible examples one after the next.

I have spoken about another example in Virginia. An individual who was living in Kentucky got a breast cancer diagnosis on the day the Dobbs opinion was leaked, went to her doctor and found out that her contraception could

potentially cause accelerated growth of cancer cells. And so she needed to come off contraception to get cancer treatment. She has two young children. She is worrying about her own cancer. She is trying to keep herself healthy for herself but also for her young children. If she were to come off contraception, there would be the chance of an unwanted pregnancy. The cancer treatments also would significantly degrade the possibility for a healthy pregnancy, but she was now living in a State that, post-Dobbs, would not allow her to have an abortion.

She wrote a piece about this in NBC News. She was fortunate enough to be able to move and get a new job in Virginia, where she would be able to make these choices, but these are the kinds of choices, post-Dobbs, people have to make every day: Do we smuggle a youngster across State lines or does someone move from one State to the next? Every person in this country, no matter what ZIP Code they live in, should have a basic Federal guarantee about contraception and availability of abortion services.

What the Reproductive Freedom for All Act would do would be, essentially—we tried to put ourselves in a time machine after Dobbs and travel back to the day before the Dobbs decision. It was a very narrow focus. You can look at this in other ways. Some folks didn't like what the law was the day before the Dobbs decision. But in order to find some bipartisanship—because, truly, the American public, on a bipartisan basis, wants to preserve reproductive rights—we looked at could we come up with a Federal statutory guarantee that would match the state of constitutional law that existed the day before the Dobbs decision and protect the rights of all to contraception access and also protect the rights of all to abortion access as it existed before Dobbs.

Simply put, that is this; that prior to fetal viability, no State can pass any statute regulating abortion that imposes an undue burden on a woman seeking to exercise that right. And post-viability, while a State can more significantly regulate abortion, no State can deprive any woman of the right to receive an abortion should she and her health providers determine that it is necessary to protect her life or health.

That is the bill that I have introduced today with Senators COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, and SINEMA. I thank them for working to try to show—because now we have shown that there is not a minority of the U.S. Senate, but there is actually a majority that wants to codify Roe and related cases; that we might have some differences of opinion about the right language to use to do that, but there is a difference between a Senate where that is only a minority sentiment and a Senate where, like in the rest of the American public, that is a majority sentiment.

The last thing I will say is this. I am very well aware, as are my cosponsors

in introducing that bill, that we do not have the votes today, should it be put up, to get 60 votes in the Senate for it. We don't. Yet I am given some inspiration by the fact that we recently passed a gun safety bill where 2 months before there were not 60 votes either. In fact, for the 10 years I have been in the Senate, we have been trying to pass legislation in this Chamber to deal with the scourge of gun violence and again and again and again have fallen short of 60 votes even to proceed to legislation. But in the aftermath of tragedies in Buffalo and Texas, a decision was made by the Members of this deliberative body that inaction was no longer an option and resolute action to protect people's rights and safety was a mandate.

I believe the Dobbs decision and what we have seen since is a catastrophe that, as it plays out over time in State after State, will also change the dynamic in the article I branch and demonstrate the need for a national protection for reproductive rights rather than a 50-State free-for-all in a race to the bottom.

It is in that spirit my colleagues and I have introduced this bipartisan bill today demonstrating that there is now bipartisan support and majority support in the U.S. Senate to protect reproductive freedom for all.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join in the introduction of the Reproductive Freedom for All Act, a bipartisan bill that would ensure the right of women to make certain reproductive choices without undue government interference.

I support a woman's right to have an abortion, and I believe that the threshold question of whether or not abortion is legal needs to be consistent at the national level. States can account for regional differences with regulations like parental notification requirements, but the basic right needs to be the same regardless of the State in which a woman happens to reside.

In its decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, the U.S. Supreme Court abandoned a nearly 50-year precedent that had been reaffirmed and on which women had relied for decades. The Dobbs ruling was, as the Chief Justice described it, a "jolt" to our legal system. This action has further divided the country at a moment when now, more than ever in modern times, we need the Court to demonstrate consistency, predictability, and restraint.

Prior to the Court's decision in *Dobbs*, I introduced, with Senator MURKOWSKI, the Reproductive Choice Act to enact in to Federal law the abortion rights established by *Roe v. Wade* and affirmed by *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

In the wake of the Dobbs decision, I have worked with my colleagues Senator Kaine, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator SINEMA in drafting a more comprehensive, bipartisan bill that would codify the abortion rights ar-

ticulated by the Supreme Court in *Roe*, *Casey* and *Whole Women's Health v. Hellerstedt*, as well as the contraception rights first articulated in *Griswold v. Connecticut* and later clarified in *Eisenstadt v. Baird* and *Carey v. Population Services International*.

Our legislation would enshrine important abortion and contraception rights into Federal law without undercutting basic conscience protections that have been in place for decade and that are relied upon by healthcare practitioners who have religious objections.

Our goal with this legislation is to do what the Court should have done—provide consistency in our laws that Americans have relied upon for five decades regarding the ability to make certain reproductive choices.

Mr. President, this bill maintains the pre-Dobbs status quo. In other words, it would ensure that the legal framework in place before Dobbs remains the law of the land. Our bill accomplishes this goal by tracking the Supreme Court's language in the seminal cases I mentioned.

Specifically consistent with decades of Supreme Court jurisprudence, the Reproductive Freedom for All Act provides that a State may not impose an undue burden on the ability of a woman to choose whether or not to terminate a pregnancy before fetal viability.

During this time Sates may enact reasonable regulations to further the health or safety of a woman seeking to terminate a pregnancy, unless such regulations impose an undue burden.

After fetal viability, a State may regulate or even proscribe the ability of a woman to terminate her pregnancy but not when such a termination is necessary to preserve the life or health of the woman.

Moreover, by codifying *Griswold*, *Eisenstadt*, and *Carey*, the bill makes clear that a State cannot prohibit an individual from obtaining or using contraceptives.

Finally the legislation specifically protects conscience protections that have been relied upon by healthcare providers who have religious objections.

Mr. President, the best path forward for our country is to maintain the same legal framework that was in place just weeks ago before the Supreme Court issued its ruling in *Dobbs*. Our bill would enshrine into law the important protections articulated in the Supreme Court cases that I mentioned without undercutting statutes that also have been in place for decades.

I urge all of my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 732—RECOGNIZING THE UNITED STATES BORDER PATROL FOR DEPLOYING TO DEL RIO, TEXAS, ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2021, TO RESPOND TO THE BORDER CRISIS

Mr. CRUZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 732

Whereas the Border Patrol operates within the Department of Homeland Security, and the mission of the Border Patrol is to protect the people of the United States, safeguard the borders of the United States, and enhance the economic prosperity of the United States;

Whereas the primary missions of Border Patrol agents are—

(1) to detect and prevent illegal entry and smuggling of aliens into the United States by land, sea, or air;

(2) to seek out and apprehend alien smugglers; and

(3) to enforce the criminal provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.);

Whereas, on his first day in office, President Biden reversed many policies put in place by the previous administration, including by halting construction of the border wall, which has—

(1) left the borders of the United States open and unsecured; and

(2) led to a self-inflicted border crisis that has left the Border Patrol unable to adequately respond to the surge of illegal immigrants crossing the southern border of the United States;

Whereas the crisis at the southern border of the United States has led to—

(1) since the date on which President Biden took office, a recordbreaking 3,271,585 encounters by Border Patrol agents of individuals attempting to cross such border illegally; and

(2) in May 2022, 239,416 encounters by Border Patrol agents of illegal immigrants attempting to cross such border, which is the highest number of recorded encounters in a single month;

Whereas, on September 19, 2021, an incident occurred in Del Rio, Texas, involving approximately 15,000 aliens from Haiti who were attempting to enter the United States illegally;

Whereas Border Patrol severely lacked resources and adequate personnel to handle the Haitian migrant crisis, and additional Border Patrol agents were deployed to the Del Rio Sector only 1 day before the Haitian migrant incident occurred;

Whereas, operating with almost no guidance, communication, or knowledge of operational goals, several Border Patrol agents were instructed by their superiors to assist the Texas Department of Public Safety to disperse a large crowd of Haitian aliens who were attempting to enter the United States without authorization or inspection;

Whereas photographs were taken of Border Patrol agents on horseback as they attempted to interdict individuals making illegal border crossings and engage numerous Haitian aliens;

Whereas President Biden, Vice President Harris, Secretary of Homeland Security Mayorkas, and other Democrat politicians rushed to judgment and, without any investigation or corroborating evidence—

(1) accused the Border Patrol agents of using their horse tack to whip Haitian aliens; and

(2) denounced the agents;

Whereas 4 Border Patrol agents were placed on administrative leave as a result of the politicization of the incident and the rush to judgment by Biden administration officials;

Whereas, despite the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General and the United States Attorney for the Western District of Texas declining to further pursue the matter, the Border Patrol has proposed disciplinary action against the 4 Border Patrol agents; and

Whereas the decision to discipline such Border Patrol agents appears to be politically motivated to provide cover for the rush to judgment and blatant mischaracterization by the Biden administration of the actions of the Border Patrol agents on September 19, 2021: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that there is an ongoing and growing crisis on the southern border of the United States;

(2) commends the Border Patrol agents who were deployed to the southern border to respond to the Haitian migrant crisis in Del Rio, Texas, on September 19, 2021, for their use of restraint in response to the crisis, despite a lack of clear rules of engagement; and

(3) concludes that the Department of Homeland Security should commend, rather than punish, the Border Patrol agents who answered the call of the United States to respond to such crisis.

Whereas private corporations and businesses have joined with hundreds of national and local charitable organizations throughout the United States in support of a month-long focus on children and youth; and

Whereas designating September 2022 as “National Child Awareness Month” would recognize that a long-term commitment to children and youth is in the public interest and will encourage widespread support for charities and organizations that seek to provide a better future for the children and youth of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2022 as “National Child Awareness Month”—

(1) to promote awareness of charities that benefit children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States;

(2) to recognize the efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States; and

(3) to recognize the importance of meeting the needs of at-risk children and youth, including children and youth who—

- (A) have experienced homelessness;
- (B) are in the foster care system;
- (C) have been victims, or are at risk of becoming victims, of child sex trafficking;
- (D) have been impacted by violence;
- (E) have experienced trauma; and
- (F) have serious physical and mental health needs.

“(B) any expenses incident to the delivery of veterans’ health care and benefits associated with exposure to environmental hazards in the active military, naval, air, or space service, including administrative expenses, such as information technology and claims processing and appeals, and excluding leases as authorized or approved under section 8104 of this title; and

“(C) medical and other research relating to exposure to environmental hazards.

“(2) The amounts specified in this paragraph are not more than the following:

- “(A) \$1,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.
- “(B) \$5,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2024.
- “(C) \$7,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2025.
- “(D) \$11,300,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.
- “(E) \$13,100,000,000 for fiscal year 2027.
- “(F) \$15,900,000,000 for fiscal year 2028.
- “(G) \$17,900,000,000 for fiscal year 2029.
- “(H) \$21,200,000,000 for fiscal year 2030.
- “(I) \$23,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2031.

“(J) For fiscal year 2032 and each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amount specified under this paragraph for the preceding fiscal year increased by the percentage (if any) by which—

“(i) the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Medical Care (CPI-M), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the fiscal year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which the increase is made, exceeds

“(ii) the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Medical Care, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year described in clause (i).

“(d) BUDGET SCOREKEEPING.—(1) Immediately upon enactment of the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022, expenses authorized to be appropriated to the Fund in subsection (c) shall be estimated for fiscal year 2023 and each subsequent fiscal year and treated as budget authority that is considered to be direct spending—

“(A) in the baseline for purposes of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907);

“(B) by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, as appropriate, for purposes of budget enforcement in the Senate and the House of Representatives;

“(C) under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), including in the reports required by section 308(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 639); and

“(D) for purposes of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 931 et seq.).

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), amounts appropriated to the Fund for fiscal year 2023 and subsequently, pursuant to subsection (c) shall be counted as direct spending under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and any other Act.

“(B) Any amounts appropriated to the Fund for a fiscal year in excess of the amount specified under subsection (c)(2) for that fiscal year shall be scored as discretionary budget authority and outlays for any estimate of an appropriations Act.

“(3) Notwithstanding the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines and the accompanying list of programs and accounts set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217, and for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), the Fund shall be treated, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Sergeant First Class

SENATE RESOLUTION 733—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2022 AS “NATIONAL CHILD AWARENESS MONTH” TO PROMOTE AWARENESS OF CHARITIES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN AND YOUTH-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS MADE BY THOSE CHARITIES AND ORGANIZATIONS ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH AS CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 733

Whereas millions of children and youth in the United States represent the hopes and the future of the United States;

Whereas numerous individuals, charities benefitting children, and youth-serving organizations that work with children and youth collaborate to provide invaluable services to enrich and better the lives of children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas raising awareness of and increasing support for organizations that provide access to health care, social services, education, the arts, sports, and other services will result in the development of character in, and the future success of, the children and youth of the United States;

Whereas the month of September, as the school year begins, is a time when parents, families, teachers, school administrators, and communities increase the focus on children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas the month of September is a time for the people of the United States to highlight and be mindful of the needs of children and youth;

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5186. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3373, to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5187. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. PETERS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3905, to prevent organizational conflicts of interest in Federal acquisition, and for other purposes.

SA 5188. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3860, to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local governments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

SA 5189. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 4003, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5186. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3373, to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 115, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 117, line 23, and insert the following:

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund amounts specified in paragraph (2) for investments in—

“(A) the delivery of veterans’ health care associated with exposure to environmental hazards in the active military, naval, air, or space service in programs administered by the Under Secretary for Health;

Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022 and ending on September 30, 2031, as if it were an account designated as ‘Appropriated Entitlements and Mandatories for Fiscal Year 1997’ in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217.

SA 5187. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. PETERS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3905, to prevent organizational conflicts of interest in Federal acquisition, 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 ‘‘Preventing Organizational Conflicts of Interest in Federal Acquisition Act’’.

SEC. 2. PREVENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN FEDERAL ACQUISITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation—

(1) to provide and update—
(A) definitions related to specific types of organizational conflicts of interest, including unequal access to information, impaired objectivity, and biased ground rules;

(B) definitions, guidance, and illustrative examples related to relationships of contractors with public, private, domestic, and foreign entities that may cause contract support to be subject to potential organizational conflicts of interest, including undue influence; and

(C) illustrative examples of situations related to the potential organizational conflicts of interest identified under this paragraph, including an example of the awarding by a Federal regulatory agency of a contract for consulting services to a contractor if employees of the contractor performing work under such contract are permitted by the contractor to simultaneously perform work under a contract for a private sector client under the regulatory purview of such agency;

(2) to provide executive agencies with solicitation provisions and contract clauses to avoid or mitigate organizational conflicts of interest, for agency use as needed, that require contractors to disclose information relevant to potential organizational conflicts of interest and limit future contracting with respect to potential conflicts of interest with the work to be performed under awarded contracts;

(3) to allow executive agencies to tailor such solicitation provisions and contract clauses as necessary to address risks associated with conflicts of interest and other considerations that may be unique to the executive agency;

(4) to require executive agencies—
(A) to establish or update as needed agency conflict of interest procedures to implement the revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation made under this section; and

(B) to periodically assess and update such procedures as needed to address agency-specific conflict of interest issues; and

(5) to update the procedures set forth in section 9.506 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation to permit contracting officers to take into consideration professional standards and procedures to prevent organizational conflicts of interest to which an offeror or contractor is subject.

(b) EXECUTIVE AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘‘executive agency’’ has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

SA 5188. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3860, to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local governments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, 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 ‘‘Invest to Protect Act of 2022’’.

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) DE-ESCALATION TRAINING.—The term ‘‘de-escalation training’’ means training relating to taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘‘Director’’ means the Director of the Office.

(3) ELIGIBLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘‘eligible local government’’ means—

(A) a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level that employs fewer than 200 law enforcement officers; and

(B) a Tribal government that employs fewer than 200 law enforcement officers.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ‘‘law enforcement officer’’ has the meaning given the term ‘‘career law enforcement officer’’ in section 1709 of title I the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389).

(5) OFFICE.—The term ‘‘Office’’ means the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Office a grant program to—

(1) provide training and access to mental health resources to local law enforcement officers; and

(2) improve the recruitment and retention of local law enforcement officers.

(c) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall award grants to eligible local governments as a part of the grant program established under subsection (b).

(d) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) BARRIERS.—The Attorney General shall determine what barriers exist to establishing a streamlined application process for grants under this section.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that includes a plan to execute a streamlined application process for grants under this section under which an eligible local government seeking a grant under this section can reasonably complete the application in not more than 2 hours.

(B) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required under subparagraph (A) may include a plan for—

(i) proactively providing eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section with information on the data such eligible local governments will need to prepare before beginning the grant application; and

(ii) ensuring technical assistance is available for eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section before and during the grant application process, including through dedicated liaisons within the Office.

(3) APPLICATIONS.—In selecting eligible local governments to receive grants under

this section, the Director shall use the streamlined application process described in paragraph (2)(A).

(e) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible local government that receives a grant under this section may use amounts from the grant only for—

(1) de-escalation training for law enforcement officers;

(2) victim-centered training for law enforcement officers in handling situations of domestic violence;

(3) evidence-based law enforcement safety training, including training for—

(A) active shooter situations;

(B) the safe handling of illicit drugs and precursor chemicals;

(C) rescue situations;

(D) high speed or pursuit driving;

(E) recognizing and countering ambush attacks;

(F) contact with individuals with mental health needs;

(G) contact with individuals with substance use disorders;

(H) contact with veterans;

(I) contact with individuals with disabilities;

(J) contact with vulnerable youth;

(K) contact with individuals who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or trafficking; or

(L) contact with individuals experiencing homelessness or living in poverty;

(4) the offsetting of overtime costs associated with scheduling issues relating to the participation of a law enforcement officer in the training described in paragraphs (1) through (3);

(5) a signing bonus for a law enforcement officer in an amount determined by the eligible local government;

(6) a retention bonus for a law enforcement officer—

(A) in an amount determined by the eligible local government that does not exceed 20 percent of the salary of the law enforcement officer; and

(B) who—

(i) has been employed at the law enforcement agency for not fewer than 5 years; and

(ii) has not been found by an internal investigation to have engaged in serious misconduct;

(7) a stipend for the graduate education of law enforcement officers in the area of mental health, public health, or social work, which shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) \$10,000; or

(B) the amount the law enforcement officer pays towards such graduate education; and

(8) providing access to patient-centered behavioral health services for law enforcement officers, which may include resources for risk assessments, evidence-based, trauma-informed care to treat post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder, peer support and counselor services and family supports, and the promotion of improved access to high quality mental health care through telehealth.

(f) DISCLOSURE OF OFFICER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION BONUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an eligible local government that receives a grant under this section awards a signing or retention bonus described in paragraph (5) or (6) of subsection (e), the eligible local government shall disclose to the Director and make publicly available on a website of the eligible local government the amount of such bonus.

(2) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that includes each signing or retention bonus disclosed under paragraph (1) during the preceding year.

(g) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Director under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall give priority to eligible local governments that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an eligible local government is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the eligible local government is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the fiscal year during which audits commence under paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an annual certification—

(A) indicating whether—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(h) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Director awards a grant to an eligible local government under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded by the Attorney General to determine if grant awards are or have been awarded for a similar purpose.

(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose, 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—

(A) a list of all such grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any such grants awarded; and

(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded multiple grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose.

(i) FUNDING.—In carrying out this section, the Director—

(1) shall use amounts otherwise made available to the Office; and

(2) may use not more than \$50,000,000 of such amounts for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027.

SA 5189. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 4003, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. TRAINING ON ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 901(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) the term ‘de-escalation’ means taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary;

“(30) the term ‘mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis’—

“(A) means a situation in which the behavior of a person—

“(i) puts the person at risk of hurting himself or herself or others; or

“(ii) impairs or prevents the person from being able to care for himself or herself or function effectively in the community; and

“(B) includes a situation in which a person—

“(i) is under the influence of a drug or alcohol, is suicidal, or experiences symptoms of a mental illness; or

“(ii) may exhibit symptoms, including emotional reactions (such as fear or anger), psychological impairments (such as inability to focus, confusion, or psychosis), and behavioral reactions (such as the trigger of a freeze, fight, or flight response);

“(31) the term ‘disability’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

“(32) the term ‘crisis intervention team’ means a collaborative, interdisciplinary team that brings together specially trained law enforcement officers, mental health providers, and other community stakeholders to respond to mental health-related calls, use appropriate de-escalation techniques, and assess if referral to services or transport for mental health evaluation is appropriate; and

“(33) the term ‘covered mental health professional’ means a mental health professional working on a crisis intervention team—

“(A) as an employee of a law enforcement agency; or

“(B) under a legal agreement with a law enforcement agency.”.

(b) COPS PROGRAM.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) TRAINING IN ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION TECHNIQUES, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.—

“(1) TRAINING CURRICULA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall develop training curricula or identify effective existing training curricula for law enforcement officers and for covered mental health professionals regarding—

“(i) de-escalation tactics and alternatives to use of force;

“(ii) safely responding to an individual experiencing a mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis or an individual with a disability, including techniques and strategies that are designed to protect the safety of that individual, law enforcement officers, mental health professionals, and the public;

“(iii) successfully participating on a crisis intervention team; and

“(iv) making referrals to community-based mental and behavioral health services and support, housing assistance programs, public benefits programs, the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and other services.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The training curricula developed or identified under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) scenario-based exercises;

“(ii) pre-training and post-training tests to assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula; and

“(iii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training.

“(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and identify training curricula under this paragraph in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups.

“(2) CERTIFIED PROGRAMS AND COURSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall establish a process to—

“(i) certify training programs and courses offered by public and private entities to law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which may include certifying a training program or course that an entity began offering on or before the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process; and

“(ii) terminate the certification of a training program or course if the program or course fails to continue to meet the standards under the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1).

“(B) PARTNERSHIPS WITH MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall develop criteria to ensure

that public and private entities that offer training programs or courses that are certified under subparagraph (A) collaborate with local mental health organizations to—

“(i) enhance the training experience of law enforcement officers through consultation with and the participation of individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or disabilities, particularly such individuals who have interacted with law enforcement officers; and

“(ii) strengthen relationships between health care services and law enforcement agencies.

“(3) TRANSITIONAL REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY PERSONNEL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process required under paragraph (2)(A) and ending on the date that is 18 months after that date, the Attorney General shall, and thereafter the Attorney General may, provide, in collaboration with law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government as appropriate, regional training to equip personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government in a State to offer training programs or courses certified under paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and implement continuing education requirements for personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government who receive training to offer training programs or courses under subparagraph (A).

“(4) LIST.—Not later than 1 year after the Attorney General completes the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall publish a list of law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government employing law enforcement officers or using covered mental health professionals who have successfully completed a course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which shall include—

“(A) the total number of law enforcement officers that are employed by the agency;

“(B) the number of such law enforcement officers who have completed such a course;

“(C) whether personnel from the law enforcement agency have been trained to offer training programs or courses under paragraph (3);

“(D) the total number of covered mental health professionals who work with the agency; and

“(E) the number of such covered mental health professionals who have completed such a course.

“(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

“(A) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023;

“(B) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2024;

“(C) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

“(D) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.”

(c) BYRNE JAG PROGRAM.—Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 508 as section 509; and

(2) by inserting after section 507 the following:

“SEC. 508. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘certified training program or course’ means a program or course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1), or equivalents to such training curricula—

“(1) that is provided by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(3); or

“(2) that is—

“(A) provided by a public or private entity, including the personnel of a law enforcement agency or law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government who have been trained to offer training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(3); and

“(B) certified by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(2).

“(b) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the Attorney General completes the activities required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1701(n), the Attorney General shall, from amounts made available to fund training programs pursuant to subsection (h), make grants to States for use by the State or a unit of government located in the State to—

“(A) pay for—

“(i) costs associated with conducting a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education; and

“(ii) attendance by law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals at a certified training program or course, including a course provided by a law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government;

“(B) procure a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education on 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

“(C) in the case of a law enforcement agency of a unit of local government that employs fewer than 50 employees (determined on a full-time equivalent basis), pay for the costs of overtime accrued as a result of the attendance of a law enforcement officer or covered mental health professional at a certified training program or course for which the costs associated with conducting the certified training program or course are paid using amounts provided under this section;

“(D) pay for the costs of developing mechanisms to comply with the reporting requirements established under subsection (d), in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award; and

“(E) pay for the costs associated with participation in the voluntary National Use-of-Force Data Collection of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award, if a law enforcement agency of the State or unit of local government is not already reporting to the National Use-of-Force Data Collection.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR USE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered topic’ means a topic covered under the curricula developed or identified under clause (i), (ii), or (iv) of section 1701(n)(1)(A).

“(B) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE INITIAL TRAINING.—A State or unit of local government shall ensure that all officers who have been employed with the State or unit of local government for at least 2 years have received training as part of a certified training program or course on all covered topics before the State or unit of local government uses amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to any covered topic.

“(C) START DATE OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a State or unit of local government may not use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic until the date that

is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—A State or unit of local government may use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022 if the State or unit of local government has complied with subparagraph (B) using amounts available to the State or unit of local government other than amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1).

“(3) MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIPS WITH LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS.—A State or unit of local government that receives funds under this section shall establish and maintain relationships between law enforcement officers and local mental health organizations and health care services.

“(C) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Attorney General shall allocate funds to each State in proportion to the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State, as compared to the total number of law enforcement officers in the United States.

“(2) RETENTION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROPORTIONAL TO NUMBER OF STATE OFFICERS.—Each fiscal year, each State may retain, for use for the purposes described in this section, from the total amount of funds provided to the State under paragraph (1) an amount that is not more than the amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount as the ratio of—

“(A) the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State; to

“(B) the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State.

“(3) PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State shall make available to units of local government in the State for the purposes described in this section the amounts remaining after a State retains funds under paragraph (2).

“(B) ADDITIONAL USES.—A State may, with the approval of a unit of local government, use the funds allocated to the unit of local government under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) to facilitate offering a certified training program or course or, subject to subsection (b)(2), a certified training program or course that provide continuing education in 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) to law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government; or

“(ii) for the costs of training local law enforcement officers, including through law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government, to conduct a certified training program or course.

“(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall develop criteria governing the allocation of funds to units of local government under this paragraph, which shall ensure that the funds are distributed as widely as practicable in

terms of geographical location and to both large and small law enforcement agencies of units of local government.

“(D) ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a State receives an award under paragraph (1), the State shall announce the allocations of funds to units of local government under subparagraph (A). A State shall submit to the Attorney General a report explaining any delays in the announcement of allocations under this subparagraph.

“(d) REPORTING.—

“(1) UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Any unit of local government that receives funds from a State under subsection (c)(3) for a certified training program or course shall submit to the State or the Attorney General an annual report with respect to the first fiscal year during which the unit of local government receives such funds and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter that—

“(A) shall include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

“(B) may, at the election of the unit of local government, include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

“(C) shall include the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government;

“(D) shall include a description of any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

“(E) shall include information gathered through—

“(i) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

“(ii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training; and

“(F) shall include the amount of funds received by the unit of local government under subsection (c)(3) and a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government using available and anticipated funds.

“(2) STATES.—A State receiving funds under this section shall submit to the Attorney General—

“(A) any report the State receives from a unit of local government under paragraph (1); and

“(B) if the State retains funds under subsection (c)(2) for a fiscal year, a report by the State for that fiscal year, and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter—

“(i) indicating the number of law enforcement officers employed by the State that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic, including, at the election of the State, a certified training program or course using funds pro-

vided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b);

“(ii) indicating the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State;

“(iii) providing information gathered through—

“(I) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

“(II) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training;

“(iv) discussing any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A); and

“(v) indicating the amount of funding retained by the State under subsection (c)(2) and providing a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the State using available and anticipated funds.

“(3) REPORTING TOOLS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall develop a portal through which the data required under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be collected and submitted.

“(4) REPORTS ON THE USE OF DE-ESCALATION TACTICS AND OTHER TECHNIQUES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall establish—

“(i) reporting requirements on interactions in which de-escalation tactics and other techniques in curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1) are used by each law enforcement agency that receives funding under this section; and

“(ii) mechanisms for each law enforcement agency to submit such reports to the Department of Justice.

“(B) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) specify—

“(I) the circumstances under which an interaction shall be reported, considering—

“(aa) the cost of collecting and reporting the information; and

“(bb) the value of that information for determining whether—

“(AA) the objectives of the training have been met; and

“(BB) the training reduced or eliminated the risk of serious physical injury to officers, subjects, and third parties; and

“(II) the demographic and other relevant information about the officer and subjects involved in the interaction that shall be included in such a report; and

“(ii) require such reporting be done in a manner that—

“(I) is in compliance with all applicable Federal and State confidentiality laws; and

“(II) does not disclose the identities of law enforcement officers, subjects, or third parties.

“(C) REVIEW OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 2 years thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the entities specified under subparagraph (A), shall review and consider updates to the reporting requirements.

“(5) FAILURE TO REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity receiving funds under this section that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable and as determined by the Attorney General, shall not be eligible to receive funds under this section for a period of 2 fiscal years.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit a State that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (2), and is not eligible to receive funds under this section, from making funding available to a unit of local government of the State under subsection (c)(3), if the unit of local government has complied with the reporting requirements.

“(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORTS.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and each year thereafter in which grants are made under this section, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the implementation of activities carried out under this section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, information on—

“(A) the number, amounts, and recipients of awards the Attorney General has made or intends to make using funds authorized under this section;

“(B) the selection criteria the Attorney General has used or intends to use to select recipients of awards using funds authorized under this section;

“(C) the number of law enforcement officers of a State or unit of local government who were not able to receive training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) due to unavailability of funds and the amount of funds that would be required to complete the training; and

“(D) the nature, frequency, and amount of information that the Attorney General has collected or intends to collect under subsection (d).

“(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—A report under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

“(f) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE STUDY.—

“(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the National Institute of Justice shall conduct a study of the implementation of training under a certified training program or course in at least 6 jurisdictions representing an array of agency sizes and geographic locations, which shall include—

“(A) a process evaluation of training implementation, which shall include an analysis of the share of officers who participated in the training, the degree to which the training was administered in accordance with the curriculum, and the fidelity with which the training was applied in the field; and

“(B) an impact evaluation of the training, which shall include an analysis of the impact of the training on interactions between law enforcement officers and the public, any factors that prevent or preclude law enforcement officers from successfully de-escalating law enforcement interactions, and any recommendations on modifications to the training curricula and methods that could improve outcomes.

“(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the National Institute of Justice shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

“(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

“(4) FUNDING.—Not more than 1 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out this section during any fiscal year shall be made available to conduct the study under paragraph (1).

“(g) GAO REPORT.—

“(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the grant program under this section and submit to Congress a report assessing the grant program, including—

“(A) the process for developing and identifying curricula under section 1701(n)(1), including the effectiveness of the consultation by the Attorney General with the agencies, associations, and organizations identified under section 1701(n)(1)(C);

“(B) the certification of training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), includ-

ing the development of the process for certification and its implementation;

“(C) the training of law enforcement personnel under section 1701(n)(3), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that employ the personnel receiving the training and the sizes of those agencies;

“(D) the allocation of funds under subsection (c), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that receive funds and the degree to which both large and small agencies receive funds; and

“(E) the amount of funding distributed to agencies compared with the amount appropriated under this section, the amount spent for training, and whether plans have been put in place by the recipient agencies to use unspent available funds.

“(2) GAO ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

“(1) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

“(2) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I have one request 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 FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, August 1, 2022, at 6 p.m., to conduct a classified briefing.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the secretary of the senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Roger Marshall:					
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Israel	New Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Egypt	Pound	686.00			686.00
Delegation Expenses: *					
Turkey	Lira			1,154.76	1,154.76
Jordan	Dinar			174.74	174.74
Israel	New Shekel			1,298.97	1,298.97
Egypt	Pound			397.45	397.45
Total		3,884.87		3,025.92	6,910.59

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, July 20, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul Grove:					
Israel	Shekel	550.00			550.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	954.53			954.53
Thailand	Baht	672.12			672.12
Cambodia	Riel	770.00			770.00
United States	Dollar		13,623.73		13,623.73
Senator Roy Blunt:					
Denmark	Krone	152.00			152.00
Poland	Zloty	289.07			289.07
United States	Dollar		7,897.80		7,897.80
Daniel Burgess:					
Denmark	Krone	152.00			152.00
Poland	Zloty	289.07			289.07
United States	Dollar		7,897.80		7,897.80
Kali Farahmand:					
Tanzania	Shilling	1,676.15			1,676.15
South Africa	Rand	1,205.73			1,205.73
United States	Dollar		17,407.54		17,407.54
Time Rieser:					
United States	Dollar		63.00		63.00
Adam Yezerski:					
Poland	Zloty	422.32			422.32
Ethiopia	Birr	783.29			783.29
Sudan	Pound	1,191.42			1,191.42
United States	Dollar		9,600.00		9,600.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Katherine Bowles:					
Poland	Zloty	422.32			422.32
Ethiopia	Birr	785.72			785.72
Sudan	Pound	1,191.42			1,191.42
United States	Dollar		10,865.00		10,865.00
Paul Grove:					
Poland	Zloty	422.32			422.32
United States	Dollar		7,446.87		7,446.87
Senator Richard Shelby:					
Israel	Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Egypt	Pound	646.00			646.00
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
David Adkins:					
Israel	Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Egypt	Pound	646.00			646.00
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
Anne Caldwell:					
Israel	Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Egypt	Pound	646.00			646.00
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
Brennan Johnson:					
Israel	Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Egypt	Pound	646.00			646.00
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
Blair Taylor:					
Israel	Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Egypt	Pound	646.00			646.00
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
Watson Donald:					
Israel	Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Egypt	Pound	644.00			644.00
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
Chelsea Moser:					
Italy	Euro	546.00			546.00
France	Euro	1,552.00			1,552.00
Georgia	Lari	271.00			271.00
Ireland	Euro	259.78			259.78
Laura Friedel:					
Israel	Shekel	7,215.00			7,215.00
United States	Dollar		12,090.33		12,090.33
Senator Patrick Leahy:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Franc	4,351.23			4,351.23
Chanda Betourney:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
United States	Dollar		5,877.47		5,877.47
Kevin McDonald:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Franc	4,351.23			4,351.23
Senator Christopher Coons:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Franc	4,351.23			4,351.23
Jonathan Stahler:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Franc	4,351.23			4,351.23
Michael Bednarczyk:					
Switzerland	Franc	882.66			882.66
Italy	Euro	1,832.39			1,832.39
United States	Dollar		8,603.77		8,603.77
Allen Cutler:					
Switzerland	Franc	882.66			882.66
Italy	Euro	1,832.39			1,832.39
United States	Dollar		8,603.77		8,603.77
Brian Daner:					
Switzerland	Franc	882.66			882.66
Italy	Euro	1,832.29			1,832.29
United States	Dollar		8,603.77		8,603.77
Blaise Sheridan:					
Switzerland	Franc	882.66			882.66
Italy	Euro	1,832.29			1,832.29
United States	Dollar		8,603.77		8,603.77
Robert Leonard:					
Qatar	Riyal	991.18			991.18
Poland	Zloty	238.10			238.10
Germany	Euro	181.14			181.14
United States	Dollar		15,702.32		15,702.32
John Forbes:					
Qatar	Riyal	991.18			991.18
Poland	Zloty	238.10			238.10
Germany	Euro	181.14			181.14
United States	Dollar		15,702.32		15,702.32
Todd Phillips:					
Poland	Zloty	238.10			238.10
Germany	Euro	181.14			181.14
United States	Dollar		7,312.07		7,312.07
Delegation Expenses*:					
Israel	Shekel			1,927.11	1,927.11
Indonesia	Rupiah			446.23	446.23
Thailand	Baht			5,149.60	5,149.60
Cambodia	Riel			2,332.02	2,332.02
Turkey	Lira			669.34	669.34
Delegation Expenses*:					
Tanzania	Shilling			3,707.59	3,707.59
South Africa	Rand			1,653.11	1,653.11
Delegation Expenses*:					
Poland	Zloty	1,447.42			1,447.42
Ethiopia	Birr			2,254.16	2,254.16
Sudan	Pound			10,058.67	10,058.67

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Delegation Expenses:*					
Israel	Shekel			11,336.45	11,336.45
Egypt	Pound			2,384.67	2,384.67
Jordan	Dinar			1,143.72	1,143.72
Turkey	Lira			7,223.11	7,223.11
Delegation Expenses:*					
Israel	Shekel			527.75	527.75
Delegation Expenses:*					
Italy	Euro			3,706.00	3,706.00
France	Euro			625.29	625.29
Georgia	Lari			215.45	215.45
Ireland	Euro			74.02	74.02
Delegation Expenses:*					
Belgium	Euro			925.35	925.35
Switzerland	Franc			29,199.00	29,199.00
Delegation Expenses:*					
Switzerland	Franc			1,716.92	1,716.92
Italy	Euro			2,106.76	2,106.76
Delegation Expenses:*					
Qatar	Riyal			104.48	104.48
Poland	Zloty			318.48	318.48
Germany	Euro			394.92	394.92
Total		79,056.48	165,901.33	91,647.62	336,605.43

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Halie Craig:					
Switzerland	Franc	2,597.72			2,597.72
United States	Dollar		4,195.88		4,195.88
Senator Patrick Toomey:					
Switzerland	Franc	2,597.72			2,597.72
United States	Dollar		2,368.30		2,368.30
Michael Brownlie:					
Italy	Euro	2,367.45			2,367.45
United States	Dollar		12,300.14		12,300.14
Michael Brownlie:					
Italy	Euro	2,367.45			2,367.45
United States	Dollar		14,950.14		14,950.14
Senator Kyrsten Sinema:					
Italy	Euro	2,202.32			2,202.32
United States	Dollar		11,500.16		11,500.16
Delegation Expenses:*					
Switzerland	Franc			11,679.72	11,679.72
Italy	Euro			162.16	162.16
Total		12,132.66	45,314.62	11,841.88	69,289.16

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR SHERROD BROWN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
July 27, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON CODEL McCONNELL, REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM MAY 13, TO MAY 16, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mitch McConnell:					
Poland	Zloty	9.76			9.76
Sweden	Krona	1,325.76			1,325.76
Senator Susan Collins:					
Poland	Zloty	51.50			51.50
Sweden	Krona	1,367.50			1,367.50
Senator John Cornyn:					
Poland	Zloty	47.12			47.12
Sweden	Krona	1,363.12			1,363.12
Senator John Barrasso:					
Poland	Zloty	35.43			35.43
Sweden	Krona	1,351.43			1,351.43
Sharon Soderstrom:					
Poland	Zloty	187.55			187.55
Sweden	Krona	737.55			737.55
Robert Karem:					
Poland	Zloty	9.76			9.76
Sweden	Krona	719.76			719.76
Stefanie Muchow:					
Poland	Zloty	193.03			193.03
Sweden	Krona	743.03			743.03
Dr. Brian Monahan:					
Poland	Zloty	185.34			185.34

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON CODEL MCCONNELL, REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM MAY 13, TO MAY 16, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Sweden	Krona	735.34			735.34
Delegation Expenses:*					
Poland	Zloty			12,076.55	12,076.55
Sweden	Krona			5,253.00	5,253.00
Finland	Euro			791.58	791.58
Total		9,062.98		18,121.13	27,184.11

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Chairman, Committee on CodeL McConnell, Republican Leader,
June 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Megan Bailey:					
United States	Dollar		11,259.37		11,259.37
Germany	Euro	1,268.11			1,268.11
Poland	Zloty	290.56			290.56
Lithuania	Euro	353.69			353.69
Delegation Expenses:*					
Lithuania	Euro			345.94	345.94
Senator John Hickenlooper:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Franc	6,850.88			6,850.88
Camilla Vogt:					
United States	Dollar		1,086.67		1,086.67
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Delegation Expenses:*					
Belgium	Euro			370.14	370.14
Switzerland	Franc			5,839.86	5,839.86
Total		9,847.88	12,346.04	6,555.94	28,749.86

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MARIA CANTWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
July 19, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joe Manchin III:					
United States	Dollar		1,473.14		1,473.14
Canada	Dollar	1,295.00			1,295.00
Christopher "C.J." Osman:					
United States	Dollar		1,458.65		1,458.65
Canada	Dollar	895.00			895.00
Renee Black:					
United States	Dollar		380.76		380.76
Canada	Dollar	1,221.00			1,221.00
Senator Steve Daines:					
United States	Dollar		13,245.37		13,245.37
Romania	Leu	460.17			460.17
Darin C. Thacker:					
United States	Dollar		2,024.27		2,024.27
Romania	Leu	430.12			430.12
Senator Steve Daines:					
United States	Dollar		13,734.01		13,734.01
Moldova	Leu	150.95			150.95
Jason Thielman:					
United States	Dollar		8,348.91		8,348.91
Moldova	Leu	264.28			264.28
Senator Joe Manchin III:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Franc	4,006.86			4,006.86
Delegation Expenses:*					
Canada	Dollar			1,397.69	1,397.69
Romania	Leu			515.94	515.94
Moldova	Leu			11.00	11.00
Switzerland	Franc			5,839.86	5,839.86
Belgium	Euro			185.07	185.07
Total		9,265.70	40,665.11	7,949.56	57,880.37

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOE MANCHIN, III,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, July 24, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse					
United States	Dollar		10,028.50		10,028.50
Palau	Dollar	1,985.17			1,985.17
Mariah Pflieger:					
United States	Dollar		5,928.97		5,928.97
Palau	Dollar	2,413.93			2,413.93
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:					
India	Rupee	253.23			253.23
Nepal	Rupee	658.00			658.00
Germany	Euro	356.00			356.00
Delegation Expenses:*					
India	Rupee			2,101.60	2,101.60
Nepal	Rupee			856.89	856.89
Germany	Euro			220.60	220.60
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Franc	2,597.72			2,597.72
Delegation Expenses:*					
Belgium	Euro			185.07	185.07
Switzerland	Franc			6,000.45	6,000.45
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:					
United States	Dollar		5,325.47		5,325.47
Portugal	Euro	1,136.00			1,136.00
Mariah Pflieger:					
United States	Dollar		3,108.77		3,108.77
Portugal	Euro	987.00			987.00
Delegation Expenses:*					
Portugal	Euro			1,262.28	1,262.28
Total		10,929.37	24,391.71	10,626.89	45,947.97

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chairman, Committee on Environment & Public Works, July 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Cornyn:					
Japan	Yen	1,599.17			1,599.17
United States	Dollar		20,759.17		20,759.17
Isaac Jalakanen:					
Japan	Yen	392.03			392.03
United States	Dollar		20,759.17		20,759.17
Delegation Expenses:*					
Japan	Yen			6,254.60	6,254.60
Senator Steve Daines:					
Hungary	Forint	762.04			762.04
Slovakia	Euro	213.72			213.72
Poland	Zloty	15.00			15.00
United States	Dollar		9,004.67		9,004.67
Jason Thielman:					
Hungary	Forint	762.04			762.04
Slovakia	Euro	286.59			286.59
Poland	Zloty	15.00			15.00
United States	Dollar		9,434.67		9,434.67
Delegation Expenses:*					
Hungary	Forint			230.00	230.00
Slovakia	Euro			747.28	747.28
Senator Bill Cassidy:					
Israel	Shekel	875.68			875.68
France	Euro	849.04			849.04
United States	Dollar		4,738.14		4,738.14
Delegation Expenses:*					
Israel	Shekel			6,612.95	6,612.95
France	Euro			1,751.37	1,751.37
Stuart Portman:					
France	Euro	1,437.74			1,437.74
Belgium	Euro	287.98			287.98
United States	Dollar		8,891.73		8,891.73
Delegation Expenses:*					
France	Euro			769.33	769.33
Stuart Portman:					
Israel	Shekel	2,543.00			2,543.00
United States	Dollar		12,718.53		12,718.53
Delegation Expenses:*					
Israel	Shekel			473.75	473.75
Jonathan Goldman:					
United Kingdom	Pound	1,458.80			1,458.80
Belgium	Euro	12.31			12.31
France	Euro	1,051.41			1,051.41
United States	Dollar		8,003.72		8,003.72
Courtney Connell:					
United Kingdom	Pound	1,559.09			1,559.09
Belgium	Euro	12.25			12.25
France	Euro	1,097.25			1,097.25
United States	Dollar		7,840.42		7,840.42
Robert Andres:					
United Kingdom	Pound	1,384.05			1,384.05
Belgium	Euro	11.24			11.24
France	Euro	1,508.42			1,508.42
United States	Dollar		8,025.72		8,025.72
Virginia Lenahan:					
United Kingdom	Pound	1,474.96			1,474.96

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Belgium	Euro	6.70			6.70
France	Euro	1,584.60			1,584.60
United States	Dollar		8,940.42		8,940.42
Mayur Patel:					
United Kingdom	Pound	1,509.87			1,509.87
Belgium	Euro	7.50			7.50
France	Euro	1,524.43			1,524.43
United States	Dollar		8,396.67		8,396.67
Delegation Expenses:*					
United Kingdom	Pound			1,224.27	1,224.27
Belgium	Euro			643.67	643.67
France	Euro			963.77	963.77
Sally Laing:					
Switzerland	Franc	1,841.99			1,841.99
United States	Dollar		6,168.87		6,168.87
Virginia Lenahan:					
Switzerland	Franc	1,891.84			1,891.84
United States	Dollar		6,168.87		6,168.87
Mayur Patel:					
Switzerland	Franc	1,850.38			1,850.38
United States	Dollar		6,168.87		6,168.87
Francis Guiliano:					
Switzerland	Franc	2,026.01			2,026.01
United States	Dollar		6,168.87		6,168.87
Colin St. Maxens:					
Switzerland	Franc	1,624.89			1,624.89
United States	Dollar		6,168.87		6,168.87
Delegation Expenses:*					
Switzerland	Franc			7,054.00	7,054.00
Totals:		33,477.02	158,357.38	26,724.99	218,559.39

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Cory Booker:					
Poland	Zloty	334.88			334.88
United Arab Emirates	Dirham	340.80			340.80
India	Rupee	791.38			791.38
Nepal	Rupee	544.78			544.78
Germany	Euro	434.81			434.81
Veronica Duron:					
Poland	Zloty	334.88			334.88
United Arab Emirates	Dirham	340.80			340.80
India	Rupee	791.38			791.38
Nepal	Rupee	544.78			544.78
Germany	Euro	434.81			434.81
Delegation Expenses:*					
Poland	Zloty			1,424.38	1,424.38
United Arab Emirates	Dirham			187.57	187.57
India	Rupee			4,203.19	4,203.19
Nepal	Rupee			1,713.76	1,713.76
Germany	Euro			441.20	441.20
Senator Ben Cardin:					
Japan	Yen	1,639.00			1,639.00
United States	Dollar		11,023.00		11,023.00
Debbie Yamada:					
Japan	Yen	1,736.00			1,736.00
United States	Dollar		11,023.00		11,023.00
Senator Bill Hagerty:					
Japan	Yen	2,143.85			2,143.85
United States	Dollar		11,457.19		11,457.19
Robert Zarate:					
Japan	Yen	1,904.73			1,904.73
United States	Dollar		11,457.19		11,457.19
Delegation Expenses:*					
Japan	Yen			13,049.32	13,049.32
Senator Christopher Coons:					
France	Euro	2,018.01			2,018.01
Georgia	Lari	319.78			319.78
Italy	Euro	1,307.86			1,307.86
Ireland	Euro	259.78			259.78
Alexandra Davis:					
France	Euro	1,680.56			1,680.56
Georgia	Lari	261.28			261.28
Italy	Euro	1,501.22			1,501.22
Ireland	Euro	259.78			259.78
United States	Dollar		708.27		708.27
Delegation Expenses:*					
France	Euro			1,300.76	1,300.76
Georgia	Lari			430.89	430.89
Italy	Euro			5,479.38	5,479.38
Ireland	Euro			211.48	211.48
Senator Edward Markey:					
Poland	Zloty	318.24			318.24
Belgium	Euro	541.00			541.00
United States	Dollar		3,900.87		3,900.87
Sarah Trister:					
Poland	Zloty	363.95			363.95
Belgium	Euro	525.00			525.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar		3,900.87		3,900.87
Delegation Expenses:*					
Poland	Zloty			510.84	510.84
Belgium	Euro			1,995.48	1,995.48
Senator Robert Menendez:					
Australia	Australian Dollar	1,710.00			1,710.00
Japan	Yen	906.33			906.33
Taiwan	New Taiwan Dollar	342.61			342.61
Delegation Expenses:*					
Australia	Australian Dollar			2,651.71	2,651.71
Japan	Yen			1,198.55	1,198.55
Taiwan	New Taiwan Dollar			924.55	924.55
Senator Robert Menendez:					
Belgium	Euro	542.32			542.32
Switzerland	Euro	3,662.45			3,662.45
Delegation Expenses:*					
Belgium	Euro			185.06	185.06
Switzerland	Euro			5,839.86	5,839.86
Senator Christopher Murphy:					
Kosovo	Euro	180.77			180.77
Serbia	Euro	281.23			281.23
Bosnia and Herzegov	Euro	143.00			143.00
Belgium	Euro	343.00			343.00
United States	Dollar		11,331.27		11,331.27
Jessica Elledge:					
Kosovo	Euro	230.77			230.77
Serbia	Euro	281.23			281.23
Bosnia and Herzegov	Euro	143.00			143.00
Belgium	Euro	395.00			395.00
United States	Dollar		11,331.27		11,331.27
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:					
Serbia	Dinar	182.33			182.33
Bosnia and Herzegov	Bosnian Mark	198.00			198.00
Kosovo	Euro	134.00			134.00
Belgium	Euro	262.00			262.00
United States	Dollar		9,784.17		9,784.17
Amy English:					
Serbia	Dinar	192.23			192.23
Bosnia and Herzegov	Bosnian Mark	208.30			208.30
Kosovo	Euro	110.00			110.00
Belgium	Euro	353.00			353.00
United States	Dollar		6,146.56		6,146.56
Delegation Expenses:*					
Serbia	Dinar			316.66	316.66
Bosnia and Herzegov	Bosnian Mark			1,289.80	1,289.80
Kosovo	Euro			1,808.94	1,808.94
Belgium	Euro			2,271.69	2,271.69
United Kingdom	British Pound			437.30	437.30
Germany	Euro			2,427.12	2,427.12
Senator Robert Portman:					
Australia	Australian Dollar	1,710.00			1,710.00
Japan	Yen	906.33			906.33
Taiwan	New Taiwan Dollar	342.61			342.61
Delegation Costs:*					
Australia	Australian Dollar			2,651.71	2,651.71
Japan	Yen			1,198.55	1,198.55
Taiwan	New Taiwan Dollar			924.55	924.55
Senator Rob Portman:					
Romania	Leu	248.94			248.94
Moldova	Euro	362.13			362.13
United Kingdom	British pound	405.60			405.60
United States	Dollar		15,440.58		15,440.58
Michael Callesen:					
Romania	Leu	176.78			176.78
Moldova	Euro	362.13			362.13
United Kingdom	British Pound	326.00			326.00
United States	Dollar		11,391.17		11,391.17
Delegation Expenses:*					
Romania	Leu			2,324.89	2,324.89
Moldova	Leu			105.37	105.37
United Kingdom	British Pound			5,300.90	5,300.90
Turkey	Lira			387.50	387.50
Katherine Abrames:					
Turkey	Lira	370.00			370.00
Israel	Shekel	930.00			930.00
United States	Dollar		3,356.63		3,356.63
Delegation Expenses:*					
Turkey	Lira			100.83	100.83
Israel	Shekel			580.36	580.36
Sarah Arkin:					
Kosovo	Euro	461.61			461.61
Serbia	Dinar	731.57			731.57
United States	Dollar		4,669.57		4,669.57
Delegation Expenses:*					
Kosovo	Euro			167.80	167.80
Serbia	Dinar			156.00	156.00
Victor Cervino:					
Mexico	Mexican Peso	1,289.12			1,289.12
United States	Dollar		683.25		683.25
Delegation Expenses:*					
Mexico	Mexican Peso			1,114.00	1,114.00
Margaret Dougherty:					
Peru	Soles	2,221.63			2,221.63
United States	Dollar		1,669.18		1,669.18
Joan Condon:					
Peru	Soles	2,222.63			2,222.63
United States	Dollar		1,669.18		1,669.18
Delegation Expenses:*					
Peru	Soles			4,655.63	4,655.63
Heather Flynn:					
Sudan	Pound	1,266.00			1,266.00
Ethiopia	Birr	1,531.45			1,531.45
South Sudan	Pound	344.00			344.00
United States	Dollar		4,802.32		4,802.32

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Delegation Expenses:*					
Sudan	Pound			1,179.99	1,179.99
Ethiopia	Birr			9,308.89	9,308.89
South Sudan	Pound			70.51	70.51
Andrew Keller:					
Belgium	Euro	310.60			310.60
Finland	Euro	644.60			644.60
United States	Dollar		4,201.87		4,201.87
David Andrew Olson:					
Belgium	Euro	309.00			309.00
Finland	Euro	961.91			961.91
United States	Dollar		5,688.07		5,688.07
Delegation Expenses:*					
Finland	Euro			1,754.13	1,754.13
Ann Kowalewski:					
Malaysia	Malaysia Ringgitt	966.50			966.50
Singapore	Singapore Dollar	1,248.30			1,248.30
United States	Dollar		7,790.37		7,790.37
Delegation Expenses:*					
Malaysia	Malaysia Ringgitt			2.27	2.27
Singapore	Singapore Dollar			1,173.00	1,173.00
Damian Murphy:					
Moldova	Leu	479.72			479.72
Poland	Zloty	769.72			769.72
United States	Dollar		6,704.37		6,704.37
Sarah Arkin:					
Moldova	Leu	536.00			536.00
Poland	Zloty	921.82			921.82
United States	Dollar		4,047.37		4,047.37
Charlotte Oldham Moore:					
Poland	Zloty	1,223.03			1,223.03
United States	Dollar		4,382.38		4,382.38
Delegation Expenses:*					
Poland	Zloty			2,674.74	2,674.74
Turkey	Dirham			512.85	512.85
Damian Murphy:					
Mexico	Mexican Peso	750.00			750.00
United States	Dollar		1,924.91		1,924.91
Juan Pachon:					
Mexico	Mexican Peso	750.00			750.00
United States	Dollar		1,839.15		1,839.15
Brandon Yoder:					
Mexico	Mexican Peso	715.00			715.00
United States	Dollar		1,227.14		1,227.14
Delegation Expenses:*					
Mexico	Mexican Peso			1,167.00	1,167.00
Lowell Schwartz:					
Australia	Dollar	1,852.00			1,852.00
United States	Dollar		5,910.77		5,910.77
Michael Schiffer:					
Australia	Dollar	1,471.20			1,471.20
United States	Dollar		7,337.37		7,337.37
Lara Crouch:					
Australia	Dollar	1,768.25			1,768.25
United States	Dollar		4,026.17		4,026.17
Delegation Expenses:*					
Australia	Dollar			5,150.00	5,150.00
Michael Schiffer:					
Palau	Dollar	1,425.00			1,425.00
Philippines	Peso	1,283.89			1,283.89
India	Rupee	888.30			888.30
United States	Dollar		5,395.79		5,395.79
Delegation Expenses:*					
Philippines	Peso			1,053.93	1,053.93
Christopher Socha:					
Romania	Euro	641.05			641.05
Slovakia	Euro	546.71			546.71
United States	Dollar		6,953.07		6,953.07
Delegation Expenses:*					
Romania	Euro			1,521.75	1,521.75
Slovakia	Euro			817.53	817.53
Christopher Socha:					
Germany	Euro	684.90			684.90
Finland	Euro	684.61			684.61
United States	Dollar		5,704.37		5,704.37
Delegation Expenses:*					
Germany	Euro			1,385.18	1,385.18
Finland	Euro			836.96	836.96
Hannah Thoburn:					
Belgium	Euro	588.42			588.42
Poland	Euro	816.72			816.72
United States	Dollar		6,024.07		6,024.07
Rob Hunter:					
Belgium	Euro	588.00			588.00
Poland	Euro	816.72			816.72
United States	Dollar		6,024.07		6,024.07
Delegation Expenses:*					
Belgium	Euro			642.57	642.57
Poland	Euro			374.52	374.52
Matthew Sullivan:					
United Kingdom	British Pound	1,002.00			1,002.00
Belgium	Euro	1,252.34			1,252.34
United States	Dollar		2,645.97		2,645.97
Kate Chaudoin:					
United Kingdom	British Pound	1,002.00			1,002.00
Belgium	Euro	1,252.34			1,252.34
United States	Dollar		2,645.97		2,645.97
John G. Tomaszewski:					
Kenya	Shilling	1,593.50			1,593.50
United States	Dollar		4,442.57		4,442.57
Delegation Expenses:*					
Kenya	Shilling			211.25	211.25
Brandon Yoder:					
Colombia	Peso	1,385.00			1,385.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mexico	Peso	1,043.00			1,043.00
United States	Dollar		2,130.90		2,130.90
Delegation Expenses:*					
Colombia	Peso			128.00	128.00
Mexico	Peso			742.00	742.00
Total		81,855.59	232,792.26	100,674.56	415,322.41

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on: Foreign Relations, July 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Rachel Portman:					
France	Euro	1,776.48			1,776.48
Belgium	Euro	214.60			214.60
United States	Dollar		8,874.81		8,874.81
Angela Wiles:					
France	Euro	1,776.48			1,776.48
Belgium	Euro	214.60			214.60
United States	Dollar		6,015.43		6,015.43
Delegation Expenses:*					
France	Euro			1,696.26	1,696.26
Rachel Portman:					
Israel	Shekel	2,543.00			2,543.00
United States	Dollar		12,653.53		12,653.53
Lindsey Seidman:					
Israel	Shekel	3,828.00			3,828.00
United States	Dollar		12,653.53		12,653.53
David Cleary:					
Israel	Shekel	3,828.00			3,828.00
United States	Dollar		12,653.53		12,653.53
Delegation Expenses:*					
Israel	Shekel			1,583.25	1,583.25
Total		14,181.16	52,850.83	3,279.51	70,311.50

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATTY MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
July 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Heather Melancon:					
		346.27			346.27
		431.13			431.13
		832.23			832.23
		644.86			644.86
		356.00			356.00
Arjun Ravindra:					
		1,758.00			1,758.00
Delegation Expenses:*			12,943.37		12,943.37
Adam Martina:				1,022.00	1,022.00
		1,704.82			1,704.82
			12,943.37		12,943.37
Bethany Poulos:					
		1,373.00			1,373.00
			10,503.47		10,503.47
Michael Tanner:					
		1,758.00			1,758.00
			12,943.37		12,943.37
Kathleen Reilly:					
			35.00		35.00
Emily Clise:					
		1,286.92			1,286.92
Delegation Expenses:*			8,494.87		8,494.87
Maria Mahler-Haug:				395.00	395.00
		1,286.92			1,286.92
			8,494.87		8,494.87
Ryan Kaldahl:					
		1,286.92			1,286.92
			8,494.87		8,494.87
Peter Metzger:					
		601.50			601.50
		283.93			283.93

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
		844.44	10,122.97		844.44 10,122.97
Delegation Expenses: *					
Elnigar Iltebir:				289.15	289.15
		571.50			571.50
		253.93			253.93
		851.89			851.89
Stephen Smith:			10,122.97		10,122.97
		560.94			560.94
		243.37			243.37
		841.33			841.33
Nicolas Adams:			10,122.97		10,122.97
		584.83			584.83
		267.26			267.26
		865.23			865.23
James Sauls:			10,122.97		10,122.97
		800.00			800.00
Delegation Expenses: *			2,521.80		2,521.80
Samantha Roberts:				20.00	20.00
		556.00			556.00
Valli Sanmugalingam:		2,282.60		2,282.60	
		800.00			800.00
Kathleen Reilly:			2,712.60		2,712.60
Senator Bob Casey:			70.00		70.00
		194.91			194.91
		1,553.13			1,553.13
		206.13			206.13
Zachary Shaw:		481.13			481.13
		1,488.01			1,488.01
		207.01			207.01
		482.00			482.00
		195.78			195.78
Ryan Kaldahl:			743.27		743.27
		1,032.80			1,032.80
		550.17			550.17
Delegation Expenses: *			10,152.47		10,152.47
Jon Estridge:				4,370.72	4,370.72
		1,105.00			1,105.00
		622.38			622.38
Valli Sanmugalingam:			10,147.47		10,147.47
		1,105.00			1,105.00
Jon Rosenwasser:			5,616.37		5,616.37
		1,063.00			1,063.00
Senator Richard Burr:			5,616.37		5,616.37
		1,710.00			1,710.00
		364.00			364.00
Tommy Nguyen:		342.61			342.61
		689.63			689.63
		453.17			453.17
Delegation Expenses: *			5,232.07		5,232.07
Emily Clise:				1,544.61	1,544.61
		1,050.75			1,050.75
Delegation Expenses: *			12,180.57		12,180.57
James Sauls:				3,695.59	3,695.59
		1,050.75			1,050.75
		295.05			295.05
Russell Willig:			12,291.57		12,291.57
		1,050.75			1,050.75
		295.04			295.04
Brian Walsh:			12,291.57		12,291.57
		685.38			685.38
		295.05			295.05
Maria Mahler-Haug:			8,336.57		8,336.57
		1,028.51			1,028.51
		272.80			272.80
Jon Estridge:			12,291.57		12,291.57
		1,909.60			1,909.60
Delegation Expenses: *			13,499.41		13,499.41
Caroline Wadhams:				2,871.36	2,871.36
		1,642.56			1,642.56
Elnigar Iltebir:			10,868.19		10,868.19
		1,499.87			1,499.87
Arjun Ravindra:			9,383.41		9,383.41
		446.60			446.60

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Brendan Ruppert:			8,436.27		8,436.27
		377.60			377.60
James Sauls:			8,436.27		8,436.27
		446.60			446.60
Brian Walsh:			8,436.27		8,436.27
		519.46			519.46
		867.29			867.29
Delegation Expenses:*			13,891.47		13,891.47
Andrew Polesovky:				955.42	955.42
		519.46			519.46
		554.21			554.21
Emily Clise:			13,141.67		13,141.67
		867.29			867.29
Maria Mahler-Haug:			13,640.47		13,640.47
		803.22			803.22
Michael Casey:			13,640.47		13,460.47
		1,430.95			1,430.95
Sarah Istel:			13,165.87		13,165.87
		1,530.24			1,530.24
Robert Karem:			4,640.87		4,640.87
		1,433.78			1,433.78
			13,165.87		13,165.87
Total		56,709.89	362,178.45	15,163.85	434,052.19

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MARK R. WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, July 25, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lindsey Graham:					
Australia	Dollar	1,710.00			1,710.00
Taiwan	Dollar	342.62			342.62
Japan	Yen	906.33			906.33
Senator Ben Sasse:					
Australia	Dollar	1,710.00			1,710.00
Taiwan	Dollar	342.62			342.62
Japan	Yen	906.33			906.33
Craig Abele:					
Australia	Dollar	1,710.00			1,710.00
Taiwan	Dollar	342.62			342.62
Japan	Yen	906.33			906.33
Alice James-Burns:					
Australia	Dollar	1,710.00			1,710.00
Taiwan	Dollar	342.61			342.61
Japan	Yen	906.32			906.32
Delegation Expense:*					
Australia	Dollar			12,114.28	12,114.28
Taiwan	Dollar			3,698.22	3,698.22
Japan	Yen			4,794.20	4,794.20
Total		11,835.78	0.00	20,606.70	32,442.48

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, July 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Kuiken:					
United States	Dollar		4,826.09		4,826.09
India	Rupee	1,223.63			1,223.63
Delegation Expenses:*					
India	Rupee			583.75	583.75
Gary Myrick:					
Israel	New Shekel	1,410.00			1,410.00
Jordan	Dinar	779.40			779.40
Egypt	Pound	646.00			646.00
Turkey	Lira	1,009.27			1,009.27
Delegation Expenses:*					
Israel	New Shekel			1,889.41	1,889.41

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jordan	Dinar			174.73	174.73
Egypt	Pound			397.44	397.44
Turkey	Lira			1,203.85	1,203.85
Dr. Brian Monahan:					
Belgium	Euro	514.32			514.32
Switzerland	Franc	4,151.23			4,151.23
Total		9,733.85	4,826.09	4,249.18	18,809.12

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CHARLES F. SCHUMER,
Chairman, Committee on Majority Leader, July 22, 2022.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert Karem:					
United States	Dollar		8,704.57		8,704.57
France	Euro	1,345.40	2,528.07	700.00	4,573.47
Germany	Euro	446.60			446.60
Total		1,792.00	11,232.64	700.00	13,724.64

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Chairman, Committee on Republican Leader, July 25, 2022.

NATIONAL CHILD AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 733, 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. 733) designating September 2022 as "National Child Awareness Month" to promote awareness of charities that benefit children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing the efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States.

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. 733) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.
(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

PREVENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN FEDERAL ACQUISITION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3905 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3905) to prevent organizational conflicts of interest in Federal acquisition, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the Peters 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. 5187) 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 "Preventing Organizational Conflicts of Interest in Federal Acquisition Act".

SEC. 2. PREVENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN FEDERAL ACQUISITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation—

- (1) to provide and update—

(A) definitions related to specific types of organizational conflicts of interest, including unequal access to information, impaired objectivity, and biased ground rules;

(B) definitions, guidance, and illustrative examples related to relationships of contractors with public, private, domestic, and foreign entities that may cause contract support to be subject to potential organizational conflicts of interest, including undue influence; and

(C) illustrative examples of situations related to the potential organizational conflicts of interest identified under this paragraph, including an example of the awarding by a Federal regulatory agency of a contract for consulting services to a contractor if employees of the contractor performing work under such contract are permitted by the contractor to simultaneously perform work under a contract for a private sector client under the regulatory purview of such agency;

(2) to provide executive agencies with solicitation provisions and contract clauses to avoid or mitigate organizational conflicts of interest, for agency use as needed, that require contractors to disclose information relevant to potential organizational conflicts of interest and limit future contracting with respect to potential conflicts of interest with the work to be performed under awarded contracts;

(3) to allow executive agencies to tailor such solicitation provisions and contract clauses as necessary to address risks associated with conflicts of interest and other considerations that may be unique to the executive agency;

(4) to require executive agencies—
(A) to establish or update as needed agency conflict of interest procedures to implement the revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation made under this section; and

(B) to periodically assess and update such procedures as needed to address agency-specific conflict of interest issues; and

(5) to update the procedures set forth in section 9.506 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation to permit contracting officers to take into consideration professional standards and procedures to prevent organizational conflicts of interest to which an offeror or contractor is subject.

(b) EXECUTIVE AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “executive agency” has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

The bill (S. 3905), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2992 and H.R. 6943 en bloc and the Senate proceed to their immediate consideration en bloc.

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

The clerk will report the bills by title.

TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY AND POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING ACT

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2992) to direct the Attorney General to develop crisis intervention training tools for use by first responders related to interacting with persons who have a traumatic brain injury, another form of acquired brain injury, or post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER SUPPORT ACT OF 2022

A bill (H.R. 6943) 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.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The bill (H.R. 2992) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill (H.R. 6943) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc, Calendar No. 419, S. 2151 and Calendar No. 423, S. 4007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title en bloc.

AMENDING THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2151) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that COPS grant funds may be used for local law enforcement recruits to attend schools or academies if the recruits agree to serve in precincts of law enforcement agencies in their communities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. STRONG COMMUNITIES PROGRAM.

Section 1701 of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (n); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (l) the following:

“(m) COPS STRONG COMMUNITIES PROGRAM.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(i) an institution of higher education, as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001), that, in coordination or through an agreement with a local law enforcement agency, offers a law enforcement training program; or

“(ii) a local law enforcement agency that offers a law enforcement training program.

“(B) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ‘local law enforcement agency’ means an agency of a State, unit of local government, or Indian Tribe that is authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

“(2) GRANTS.—The Attorney General may use amounts otherwise appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2020) to make competitive grants to local law enforcement agencies to be used for officers and recruits to attend law enforcement training programs at eligible entities if the officers and recruits agree to serve in law enforcement agencies in their communities.

“(3) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this subsection, each officer or recruit described in paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) serve as a full-time law enforcement officer for a total of not fewer than 4 years during the 8-year period beginning on the date on which the officer or recruit completes a law enforcement training program for which the officer or recruit received benefits;

“(B) complete the service described in subparagraph (A) in a local law enforcement agency located within—

“(i) 7 miles of the residence of the officer or recruit where the officer or recruit has resided for not fewer than 5 years; or

“(ii) if the officer or recruit resides in a county with fewer than 150,000 residents, within 20 miles of the residence of the officer or recruit where the officer or recruit has resided for not fewer than 5 years; and

“(C) submit to the eligible entity evidence of employment of the officer or recruit in the form of a certification by the chief administrative officer of the local law enforcement agency where the officer or recruit is employed.

“(4) REPAYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If an officer or recruit does not complete the service described in paragraph (3), the officer or recruit shall submit to the local law enforcement agency an amount equal to any benefits the officer or recruit received under this subsection.

“(B) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall promulgate regulations that establish categories of extenuating circumstances under which an officer or recruit may be excused from repayment under subparagraph (A).”.

FIGHTING POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER ACT OF 2022

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4007) to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fighting Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Public safety officers serve their communities with bravery and distinction in order to keep their communities safe.

(2) Public safety officers, including police officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians, and 911 dispatchers, are on the front lines of dealing with situations that are stressful, graphic, harrowing, and life-threatening.

(3) The work of public safety officers puts them at risk for developing post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder.

(4) It is estimated that 30 percent of public safety officers develop behavioral health conditions at some point in their lifetimes, including depression and post-traumatic stress disorder, in comparison to 20 percent of the general population that develops such conditions.

(5) Victims of post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder are at a higher risk of dying by suicide.

(6) Firefighters have been reported to have higher suicide attempt and ideation rates than the general population.

(7) It is estimated that between 125 and 300 police officers die by suicide every year.

(8) In 2019, pursuant to section 2(b) of the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-113; 131 Stat. 2276), the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice developed a report (referred to in this section as the “LEMHWA report”) that expressed that many law enforcement agencies do not have the capacity or local access to the mental health professionals necessary for treating their law enforcement officers.

(9) The LEMHWA report recommended methods for establishing remote access or regional mental health check programs at the State or Federal level.

(10) Individual police and fire departments generally do not have the resources to employ full-time mental health experts who are able to treat public safety officers with state-of-the-art techniques for the purpose of treating job-related post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder.

SEC. 3. PROGRAMMING FOR POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.—The term “public safety officer”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10284); and

(B) includes Tribal public safety officers.

(2) **PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATOR.**—The term “public safety telecommunicator” means an individual who—

(A) operates telephone, radio, or other communication systems to receive and communicate requests for emergency assistance at 911 public safety answering points and emergency operations centers;

(B) takes information from the public and other sources relating to crimes, threats, disturbances, acts of terrorism, fires, medical emergencies, and other public safety matters; and

(C) coordinates and provides information to law enforcement and emergency response personnel.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) not fewer than 1 proposed program, if the Attorney General determines it appropriate and feasible to do so, to be administered by the Department of Justice for making state-of-the-art treatments or preventative care available to public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators with regard to job-related post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder by providing public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators access to evidence-based trauma-informed care, peer support, counselor services, and family supports for the purpose of treating or preventing post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder;

(2) a draft of any necessary grant conditions required to ensure that confidentiality is afforded to public safety officers on account of seeking the care or services described in paragraph (1) under the proposed program;

(3) how each proposed program described in paragraph (1) could be most efficiently administered throughout the United States at the State, Tribal, territorial, and local levels, taking into account in-person and telehealth capabilities;

(4) a draft of legislative language necessary to authorize each proposed program described in paragraph (1); and

(5) an estimate of the amount of annual appropriations necessary for administering each proposed program described in paragraph (1).

(c) **DEVELOPMENT.**—In developing the report required under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, territorial, and local agencies employing public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators; and

(2) non-governmental organizations, international organizations, academies, or other entities, including organizations that support the interests of public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators and the interests of family members of public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that the committee-reported substitute amendments be agreed to; that the bills, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, all en bloc.

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

The committee-reported amendments, in the nature of a substitute, were agreed to, en bloc.

The bill (S. 2151), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading,

was read the third time and passed.

The bill (S. 4007), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 421, S. 3860.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3860) to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local governments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Invest to Protect Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this Act:

(1) **DE-ESCALATION TRAINING.**—The term “de-escalation training” means training relating to taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office.

(3) **ELIGIBLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “eligible local government” means—

(A) a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level that employs fewer than 200 law enforcement officers; and

(B) a Tribal government that employs fewer than 200 law enforcement officers.

(4) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term “career law enforcement officer” in section 1709 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389).

(5) **OFFICE.**—The term “Office” means the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established within the Office a grant program to—

(1) provide training, body cameras, and access to mental health resources to local law enforcement officers; and

(2) improve the recruitment and retention of local law enforcement officers.

(c) **AUTHORITY.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall award grants to eligible local governments as a part of the grant program established under subsection (b).

(d) **APPLICATIONS.**—

(1) **BARRIERS.**—The Attorney General shall determine what barriers exist to establishing a streamlined application process for grants under this section.

(2) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that includes a plan to execute a streamlined appli-

cation process for grants under this section under which an eligible local government seeking a grant under this section can reasonably complete the application in not more than 2 hours.

(B) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—The plan required under subparagraph (A) may include a plan for—

(i) proactively providing eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section with information on the data such eligible local governments will need to prepare before beginning the grant application; and

(ii) ensuring technical assistance is available for eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section before and during the grant application process, including through dedicated liaisons within the Office.

(3) **APPLICATIONS.**—In selecting eligible local governments to receive grants under this section, the Director shall use the streamlined application process described in paragraph (2)(A).

(e) **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—An eligible local government that receives a grant under this section may use amounts from the grant only for—

(1) de-escalation training for law enforcement officers;

(2) victim-centered training for law enforcement officers in handling situations of domestic violence;

(3) law enforcement officer safety training;

(4) the offsetting of overtime costs associated with scheduling issues when a law enforcement officer participates in the training described in paragraphs (1) through (3);

(5) the purchasing, storage, operation, data collection, and securing of body cameras in accordance with guidelines described in subsection (f)(1)(A) or, if such guidelines do not exist, established by the Attorney General under subsection (f)(2);

(6) a signing bonus for a law enforcement officer in an amount determined by the eligible local government;

(7) a retention bonus for a law enforcement officer—

(A) in an amount determined by the eligible local government that does not exceed 20 percent of the salary of the law enforcement officer; and

(B) who—

(i) has been employed at a law enforcement agency for not fewer than 5 years; and

(ii) has not been found by an internal investigation to have engaged in serious misconduct;

(8) a stipend for the graduate education of law enforcement officers in the area of mental health, public health, or social work, which shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) \$10,000; or

(B) the amount the law enforcement officer pays towards such graduate education; and

(9) providing access to patient-centered behavioral health services for law enforcement officers, which may include resources for risk assessments, evidence-based, trauma-informed care to treat post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder, peer support and counselor services and family supports, and the promotion of improved access to high quality mental health care through telehealth.

(f) **BODY CAMERA GUIDELINES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible local government that uses funds from a grant under this section for the purpose described in subsection (e)(5) shall—

(A) follow guidelines established by the eligible local government or the State in which the eligible local government is located relating to the purchasing, storage, operation, data collection, and securing of body cameras based on existing industry best practices; or

(B) if the guidelines described in subparagraph (A) do not yet exist or are not based on existing industry best practices, follow the guidelines established under paragraph (2).

(2) **FEDERAL GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish guidelines for

small law enforcement agencies relating to the purchasing, storage, operation, data collection, and securing of body cameras that are based on existing industry best practices.

(g) **DISCLOSURE OF OFFICER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION BONUSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an eligible local government that receives a grant under this section awards a signing or retention bonus described in paragraph (6) or (7) of subsection (e), the eligible local government shall disclose to the Director and make publicly available on a website of the eligible local government the amount of such bonus.

(2) **REPORT.**—The Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that includes each signing or retention bonus disclosed under paragraph (1) during the preceding year.

(h) **GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All grants awarded by the Director under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(B) **AUDITS.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall give priority to eligible local governments that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an eligible local government is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the eligible local government is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the fiscal year during which audits commence under paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an annual certification—

(A) indicating whether—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(i) **PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the Director awards a grant to an eligible local government under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded by the Attorney General to determine if grant awards are or have been awarded for a similar purpose.

(2) **REPORT.**—If the Attorney General awards grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose, 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—

(A) a list of all such grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any such grants awarded; and

(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded multiple grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose.

(j) **FUNDING.**—In carrying out this section, the Director—

(1) shall use amounts otherwise made available to the Office; and

(2) may use not more than \$50,000,000 of such amounts for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn, the Cortez Masto substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 5188), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill (S. 3860), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3860

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 “Invest to Protect Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this Act:

(1) **DE-ESCALATION TRAINING.**—The term “de-escalation training” means training relating to taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office.

(3) **ELIGIBLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “eligible local government” means—

(A) a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level that employs fewer than 200 law enforcement officers; and

(B) a Tribal government that employs fewer than 200 law enforcement officers.

(4) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “law enforcement officer” has the meaning

given the term “career law enforcement officer” in section 1709 of title I the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389).

(5) **OFFICE.**—The term “Office” means the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established within the Office a grant program to—

(1) provide training and access to mental health resources to local law enforcement officers; and

(2) improve the recruitment and retention of local law enforcement officers.

(c) **AUTHORITY.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall award grants to eligible local governments as a part of the grant program established under subsection (b).

(d) **APPLICATIONS.**—

(1) **BARRIERS.**—The Attorney General shall determine what barriers exist to establishing a streamlined application process for grants under this section.

(2) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that includes a plan to execute a streamlined application process for grants under this section under which an eligible local government seeking a grant under this section can reasonably complete the application in not more than 2 hours.

(B) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—The plan required under subparagraph (A) may include a plan for—

(i) proactively providing eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section with information on the data such eligible local governments will need to prepare before beginning the grant application; and

(ii) ensuring technical assistance is available for eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section before and during the grant application process, including through dedicated liaisons within the Office.

(3) **APPLICATIONS.**—In selecting eligible local governments to receive grants under this section, the Director shall use the streamlined application process described in paragraph (2)(A).

(e) **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—An eligible local government that receives a grant under this section may use amounts from the grant only for—

(1) de-escalation training for law enforcement officers;

(2) victim-centered training for law enforcement officers in handling situations of domestic violence;

(3) evidence-based law enforcement safety training, including training for—

(A) active shooter situations;

(B) the safe handling of illicit drugs and precursor chemicals;

(C) rescue situations;

(D) high speed or pursuit driving;

(E) recognizing and countering ambush attacks;

(F) contact with individuals with mental health needs;

(G) contact with individuals with substance use disorders;

(H) contact with veterans;

(I) contact with individuals with disabilities;

(J) contact with vulnerable youth;

(K) contact with individuals who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or trafficking; or

(L) contact with individuals experiencing homelessness or living in poverty;

(4) the offsetting of overtime costs associated with scheduling issues relating to the participation of a law enforcement officer in the training described in paragraphs (1) through (3);

(5) a signing bonus for a law enforcement officer in an amount determined by the eligible local government;

(6) a retention bonus for a law enforcement officer—

(A) in an amount determined by the eligible local government that does not exceed 20 percent of the salary of the law enforcement officer; and

(B) who—

(i) has been employed at the law enforcement agency for not fewer than 5 years; and

(ii) has not been found by an internal investigation to have engaged in serious misconduct;

(7) a stipend for the graduate education of law enforcement officers in the area of mental health, public health, or social work, which shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) \$10,000; or

(B) the amount the law enforcement officer pays towards such graduate education; and

(8) providing access to patient-centered behavioral health services for law enforcement officers, which may include resources for risk assessments, evidence-based, trauma-informed care to treat post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder, peer support and counselor services and family supports, and the promotion of improved access to high quality mental health care through telehealth.

(f) DISCLOSURE OF OFFICER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION BONUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an eligible local government that receives a grant under this section awards a signing or retention bonus described in paragraph (5) or (6) of subsection (e), the eligible local government shall disclose to the Director and make publicly available on a website of the eligible local government the amount of such bonus.

(2) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that includes each signing or retention bonus disclosed under paragraph (1) during the preceding year.

(g) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Director under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall give priority to eligible local governments that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an eligible local government is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the eligible local government is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the fiscal year during which audits commence under paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an annual certification—

(A) indicating whether—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(h) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Director awards a grant to an eligible local government under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded by the Attorney General to determine if grant awards are or have been awarded for a similar purpose.

(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose, 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—

(A) a list of all such grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any such grants awarded; and

(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded multiple grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose.

(i) FUNDING.—In carrying out this section, the Director—

(1) shall use amounts otherwise made available to the Office; and

(2) may use not more than \$50,000,000 of such amounts for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027.

LAW ENFORCEMENT DE-ESCALATION TRAINING ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 422, S. 4003.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4003) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. TRAINING ON ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 901(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) the term ‘de-escalation’ means taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary;

“(30) the term ‘mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis’—

“(A) means a situation in which the behavior of a person—

“(i) puts the person at risk of hurting himself or herself or others; or

“(ii) impairs or prevents the person from being able to care for himself or herself or function effectively in the community; and

“(B) includes a situation in which a person—

“(i) is under the influence of a drug or alcohol, is suicidal, or experiences symptoms of a mental illness; or

“(ii) may exhibit symptoms, including emotional reactions (such as fear or anger), psychological impairments (such as inability to focus, confusion, or psychosis), and behavioral reactions (such as the trigger of a freeze, fight, or flight response);

“(31) the term ‘disability’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

“(32) the term ‘crisis intervention team’ means a collaborative, interdisciplinary team that brings together specially trained law enforcement officers, mental health providers, and other community stakeholders to respond to mental health-related calls, use appropriate de-escalation techniques, and assess if referral to services or transport for mental health evaluation is appropriate; and

“(33) the term ‘covered mental health professional’ means a mental health professional working on a crisis intervention team—

“(A) as an employee of a law enforcement agency; or

“(B) under a legal agreement with a law enforcement agency.”.

(b) COPS PROGRAM.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) TRAINING IN ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION TECHNIQUES, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.—

“(1) TRAINING CURRICULA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall develop training curricula or identify effective existing training curricula for law enforcement officers and for covered mental health professionals regarding—

“(i) de-escalation tactics and alternatives to use of force;

“(ii) safely responding to an individual experiencing a mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis or an individual with a disability, including techniques and strategies that are designed to protect the safety of that individual, law enforcement officers, mental health professionals, and the public;

“(iii) successfully participating on a crisis intervention team; and

“(iv) making referrals to community-based mental and behavioral health services and support, housing assistance programs, public benefits programs, the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and other services.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The training curricula developed or identified under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) scenario-based exercises;

“(ii) pre-training and post-training tests to assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula; and

“(iii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training.

“(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and identify training curricula under this paragraph in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups.

“(2) CERTIFIED PROGRAMS AND COURSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall establish a process to—

“(i) certify training programs and courses offered by public and private entities to law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which may include certifying a training program or course that an entity began offering on or before the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process; and

“(ii) terminate the certification of a training program or course if the program or course fails to continue to meet the standards under the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1).

“(B) PARTNERSHIPS WITH MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall develop criteria to ensure that public and private entities that offer training programs or courses that are certified under subparagraph (A) collaborate with local mental health organizations to—

“(i) enhance the training experience of law enforcement officers through consultation with and the participation of individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or disabilities, particularly such individuals who have interacted with law enforcement officers; and

“(ii) strengthen relationships between health care services and law enforcement agencies.

“(3) TRANSITIONAL REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY PERSONNEL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process required under paragraph (2)(A) and ending on the date that is 18 months after that date, the Attorney General shall, and thereafter the Attorney General may, provide, in collaboration with law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government as appropriate, regional training to equip personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government in a State to offer training programs or courses certified under paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and implement continuing education requirements for personnel from law

enforcement agencies of States and units of local government who receive training to offer training programs or courses under subparagraph (A).

“(4) LIST.—Not later than 1 year after the Attorney General completes the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall publish a list of law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government employing law enforcement officers or using covered mental health professionals who have successfully completed a course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which shall include—

“(A) the total number of law enforcement officers that are employed by the agency;

“(B) the number of such law enforcement officers who have completed such a course;

“(C) whether personnel from the law enforcement agency have been trained to offer training programs or courses under paragraph (3);

“(D) the total number of covered mental health professionals who work with the agency; and

“(E) the number of such covered mental health professionals who have completed such a course.

“(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

“(A) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023;

“(B) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2024;

“(C) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

“(D) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.”.

(c) BYRNE JAG PROGRAM.—Subpart 1 of part E of title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 508 as section 509; and

(2) by inserting after section 507 the following:

“SEC. 508. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘certified training program or course’ means a program or course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1), or equivalents to such training curricula—

“(1) that is provided by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(3); or

“(2) that is—

“(A) provided by a public or private entity, including the personnel of a law enforcement agency or law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government who have been trained to offer training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(3); and

“(B) certified by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(2).

“(b) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the Attorney General completes the activities required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1701(n), the Attorney General shall, from amounts made available to fund training programs pursuant to subsection (h), make grants to States for use by the State or a unit of government located in the State to—

“(A) pay for—

“(i) costs associated with conducting a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education; and

“(ii) attendance by law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals at a certified training program or course, including a course provided by a law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government;

“(B) procure a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education on 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

“(C) in the case of a law enforcement agency of a unit of local government that employs fewer than 50 employees (determined on a full-time

equivalent basis), pay for the costs of overtime accrued as a result of the attendance of a law enforcement officer or covered mental health professional at a certified training program or course for which the costs associated with conducting the certified training program or course are paid using amounts provided under this section; and

“(D) pay for the costs of developing mechanisms to comply with the reporting requirements established under subsection (d), in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR USE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered topic’ means a topic covered under the curricula developed or identified under clause (i), (ii), or (iv) of section 1701(n)(1)(A).

“(B) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE INITIAL TRAINING.—A State or unit of local government shall ensure that all officers who have been employed with the State or unit of local government for at least 2 years have received training as part of a certified training program or course on all covered topics before the State or unit of local government uses amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to any covered topic.

“(C) START DATE OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a State or unit of local government may not use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—A State or unit of local government may use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022 if the State or unit of local government has complied with subparagraph (B) using amounts available to the State or unit of local government other than amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1).

“(3) MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIPS WITH LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS.—A State or unit of local government that receives funds under this section shall establish and maintain relationships between law enforcement officers and local mental health organizations and health care services.

“(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Attorney General shall allocate funds to each State in proportion to the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State, as compared to the total number of law enforcement officers in the United States.

“(2) RETENTION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROPORTIONAL TO NUMBER OF STATE OFFICERS.—Each fiscal year, each State may retain, for use for the purposes described in this section, from the total amount of funds provided to the State under paragraph (1) an amount that is not more than the amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount as the ratio of—

“(A) the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State; to

“(B) the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State.

“(3) PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State shall make available to units of local government in the State for the purposes described in this section the amounts remaining after a State retains funds under paragraph (2).

“(B) ADDITIONAL USES.—A State may, with the approval of a unit of local government, use

the funds allocated to the unit of local government under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) to facilitate offering a certified training program or course or, subject to subsection (b)(2), a certified training program or course that provide continuing education in 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) to law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government; or

“(ii) for the costs of training local law enforcement officers, including through law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government, to conduct a certified training program or course.

“(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall develop criteria governing the allocation of funds to units of local government under this paragraph, which shall ensure that the funds are distributed as widely as practicable in terms of geographical location and to both large and small law enforcement agencies of units of local government.

“(D) ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a State receives an award under paragraph (1), the State shall announce the allocations of funds to units of local government under subparagraph (A). A State shall submit to the Attorney General a report explaining any delays in the announcement of allocations under this subparagraph.

“(d) REPORTING.—

“(1) UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Any unit of local government that receives funds from a State under subsection (c)(3) for a certified training program or course shall submit to the State or the Attorney General an annual report with respect to the first fiscal year during which the unit of local government receives such funds and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter that—

“(A) shall include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

“(B) may, at the election of the unit of local government, include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

“(C) shall include the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government;

“(D) shall include a description of any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

“(E) shall include information gathered through—

“(i) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

“(ii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training; and

“(F) shall include the amount of funds received by the unit of local government under

subsection (c)(3) and a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government using available and anticipated funds.

“(2) STATES.—A State receiving funds under this section shall submit to the Attorney General—

“(A) any report the State receives from a unit of local government under paragraph (1); and

“(B) if the State retains funds under subsection (c)(2) for a fiscal year, a report by the State for that fiscal year, and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter—

“(i) indicating the number of law enforcement officers employed by the State that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic, including, at the election of the State, a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b);

“(ii) indicating the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State;

“(iii) providing information gathered through—

“(I) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

“(II) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training;

“(iv) discussing any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A); and

“(v) indicating the amount of funding retained by the State under subsection (c)(2) and providing a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the State using available and anticipated funds.

“(3) REPORTING TOOLS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall develop a portal through which the data required under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be collected and submitted.

“(4) REPORTS ON THE USE OF DE-ESCALATION TACTICS AND OTHER TECHNIQUES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall establish—

“(i) reporting requirements on interactions in which de-escalation tactics and other techniques in curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1) are used by each law enforcement agency that receives funding under this section; and

“(ii) mechanisms for each law enforcement agency to submit such reports to the Department of Justice.

“(B) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) specify—

“(I) the circumstances under which an interaction shall be reported, considering—

“(aa) the cost of collecting and reporting the information; and

“(bb) the value of that information for determining whether—

“(AA) the objectives of the training have been met; and

“(BB) the training reduced or eliminated the risk of serious physical injury to officers, subjects, and third parties; and

“(II) the demographic and other relevant information about the officer and subjects involved in the interaction that shall be included in such a report; and

“(ii) require such reporting be done in a manner that—

“(I) is in compliance with all applicable Federal and State confidentiality laws; and

“(II) does not disclose the identities of law enforcement officers, subjects, or third parties.

“(C) REVIEW OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 2 years thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the entities specified under subparagraph (A), shall review and consider updates to the reporting requirements.

“(5) FAILURE TO REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity receiving funds under this section that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable and as determined by the Attorney General, shall not be eligible to receive funds under this section for a period of 2 fiscal years.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit a State that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (2), and is not eligible to receive funds under this section, from making funding available to a unit of local government of the State under subsection (c)(3), if the unit of local government has complied with the reporting requirements.

“(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORTS.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and each year thereafter in which grants are made under this section, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the implementation of activities carried out under this section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, information on—

“(A) the number, amounts, and recipients of awards the Attorney General has made or intends to make using funds authorized under this section;

“(B) the selection criteria the Attorney General has used or intends to use to select recipients of awards using funds authorized under this section;

“(C) the number of law enforcement officers of a State or unit of local government who were not able to receive training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) due to unavailability of funds and the amount of funds that would be required to complete the training; and

“(D) the nature, frequency, and amount of information that the Attorney General has collected or intends to collect under subsection (d).

“(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—A report under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

“(f) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE STUDY.—

“(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the National Institute of Justice shall conduct a study of the implementation of training under a certified training program or course in at least 6 jurisdictions representing an array of agency sizes and geographic locations, which shall include—

“(A) a process evaluation of training implementation, which shall include an analysis of the share of officers who participated in the training, the degree to which the training was administered in accordance with the curriculum, and the fidelity with which the training was applied in the field; and

“(B) an impact evaluation of the training, which shall include an analysis of the impact of the training on interactions between law enforcement officers and the public, any factors

that prevent or preclude law enforcement officers from successfully de-escalating law enforcement interactions, and any recommendations on modifications to the training curricula and methods that could improve outcomes.

“(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the National Institute of Justice shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

“(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

“(4) FUNDING.—Not more than 1 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out this section during any fiscal year shall be made available to conduct the study under paragraph (1).

“(g) GAO REPORT.—

“(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the grant program under this section and submit to Congress a report assessing the grant program, including—

“(A) the process for developing and identifying curricula under section 1701(n)(1), including the effectiveness of the consultation by the Attorney General with the agencies, associations, and organizations identified under section 1701(n)(1)(C);

“(B) the certification of training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), including the development of the process for certification and its implementation;

“(C) the training of law enforcement personnel under section 1701(n)(3), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that employ the personnel receiving the training and the sizes of those agencies;

“(D) the allocation of funds under subsection (c), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that receive funds and the degree to which both large and small agencies receive funds; and

“(E) the amount of funding distributed to agencies compared with the amount appropriated under this section, the amount spent for training, and whether plans have been put in place by the recipient agencies to use unspent available funds.

“(2) GAO ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

“(1) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

“(2) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.”

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; the Cornyn substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 5189), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 4003), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 4003

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 "Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. TRAINING ON ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 901(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) the term ‘de-escalation’ means taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary;

“(30) the term ‘mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis’—

“(A) means a situation in which the behavior of a person—

“(i) puts the person at risk of hurting himself or herself or others; or

“(ii) impairs or prevents the person from being able to care for himself or herself or function effectively in the community; and

“(B) includes a situation in which a person—

“(i) is under the influence of a drug or alcohol, is suicidal, or experiences symptoms of a mental illness; or

“(ii) may exhibit symptoms, including emotional reactions (such as fear or anger), psychological impairments (such as inability to focus, confusion, or psychosis), and behavioral reactions (such as the trigger of a freeze, fight, or flight response);

“(31) the term ‘disability’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

“(32) the term ‘crisis intervention team’ means a collaborative, interdisciplinary team that brings together specially trained law enforcement officers, mental health providers, and other community stakeholders to respond to mental health-related calls, use appropriate de-escalation techniques, and assess if referral to services or transport for mental health evaluation is appropriate; and

“(33) the term ‘covered mental health professional’ means a mental health professional working on a crisis intervention team—

“(A) as an employee of a law enforcement agency; or

“(B) under a legal agreement with a law enforcement agency.”

(b) COPS PROGRAM.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) TRAINING IN ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION TECHNIQUES, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.—

“(1) TRAINING CURRICULA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall develop training curricula or identify effective existing training curricula for law enforcement officers and for covered mental health professionals regarding—

“(i) de-escalation tactics and alternatives to use of force;

“(ii) safely responding to an individual experiencing a mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis or an individual with a disability, including techniques and strategies that are designed to protect the safety of that individual, law enforcement officers, mental health professionals, and the public;

“(iii) successfully participating on a crisis intervention team; and

“(iv) making referrals to community-based mental and behavioral health services and support, housing assistance programs, public benefits programs, the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and other services.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The training curricula developed or identified under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) scenario-based exercises;

“(ii) pre-training and post-training tests to assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula; and

“(iii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training.

“(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and identify training curricula under this paragraph in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups.

“(2) CERTIFIED PROGRAMS AND COURSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall establish a process to—

“(i) certify training programs and courses offered by public and private entities to law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which may include certifying a training program or course that an entity began offering on or before the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process; and

“(ii) terminate the certification of a training program or course if the program or course fails to continue to meet the standards under the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1).

“(B) PARTNERSHIPS WITH MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall develop criteria to ensure that public and private entities that offer training programs or courses that are certified under subparagraph (A) collaborate with local mental health organizations to—

“(i) enhance the training experience of law enforcement officers through consultation with and the participation of individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or disabilities, particularly such individuals who have interacted with law enforcement officers; and

“(ii) strengthen relationships between health care services and law enforcement agencies.

“(3) TRANSITIONAL REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY PERSONNEL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process required under paragraph (2)(A) and ending on the date that

is 18 months after that date, the Attorney General shall, and thereafter the Attorney General may, provide, in collaboration with law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government as appropriate, regional training to equip personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government in a State to offer training programs or courses certified under paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and implement continuing education requirements for personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government who receive training to offer training programs or courses under subparagraph (A).

“(4) LIST.—Not later than 1 year after the Attorney General completes the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall publish a list of law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government employing law enforcement officers or using covered mental health professionals who have successfully completed a course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which shall include—

“(A) the total number of law enforcement officers that are employed by the agency;

“(B) the number of such law enforcement officers who have completed such a course;

“(C) whether personnel from the law enforcement agency have been trained to offer training programs or courses under paragraph (3);

“(D) the total number of covered mental health professionals who work with the agency; and

“(E) the number of such covered mental health professionals who have completed such a course.

“(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

“(A) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023;

“(B) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2024;

“(C) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

“(D) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.”

(c) BYRNE JAG PROGRAM.—Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 508 as section 509; and

(2) by inserting after section 507 the following:

“SEC. 508. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘certified training program or course’ means a program or course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1), or equivalents to such training curricula—

“(1) that is provided by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(3); or

“(2) that is—

“(A) provided by a public or private entity, including the personnel of a law enforcement agency or law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government who have been trained to offer training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(3); and

“(B) certified by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(2).

“(b) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the Attorney General completes the activities required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1701(n), the Attorney General shall, from amounts made available to fund training programs pursuant to subsection (h), make grants to States for use by the State or a unit of government located in the State to—

“(A) pay for—

“(i) costs associated with conducting a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education; and

“(ii) attendance by law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals at a certified training program or course, including a course provided by a law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government;

“(B) procure a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education on 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

“(C) in the case of a law enforcement agency of a unit of local government that employs fewer than 50 employees (determined on a full-time equivalent basis), pay for the costs of overtime accrued as a result of the attendance of a law enforcement officer or covered mental health professional at a certified training program or course for which the costs associated with conducting the certified training program or course are paid using amounts provided under this section;

“(D) pay for the costs of developing mechanisms to comply with the reporting requirements established under subsection (d), in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award; and

“(E) pay for the costs associated with participation in the voluntary National Use-of-Force Data Collection of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award, if a law enforcement agency of the State or unit of local government is not already reporting to the National Use-of-Force Data Collection.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR USE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered topic’ means a topic covered under the curricula developed or identified under clause (i), (ii), or (iv) of section 1701(n)(1)(A).

“(B) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE INITIAL TRAINING.—A State or unit of local government shall ensure that all officers who have been employed with the State or unit of local government for at least 2 years have received training as part of a certified training program or course on all covered topics before the State or unit of local government uses amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to any covered topic.

“(C) START DATE OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a State or unit of local government may not use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—A State or unit of local government may use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022 if the State or unit of local government has complied with subparagraph (B) using amounts available to the State or unit of local government other than amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1).

“(3) MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIPS WITH LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS.—A State or unit of local government that receives funds under this section shall establish and maintain relationships between law enforcement officers and local mental health organizations and health care services.

“(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Attorney General shall allocate funds to each State in proportion to the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State, as compared to the total number of law enforcement officers in the United States.

“(2) RETENTION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROPORTIONAL TO NUMBER OF STATE OFFICERS.—Each fiscal year, each State may retain, for use for the purposes described in this section, from the total amount of funds provided to the State under paragraph (1) an amount that is not more than the amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount as the ratio of—

“(A) the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State; to

“(B) the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State.

“(3) PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State shall make available to units of local government in the State for the purposes described in this section the amounts remaining after a State retains funds under paragraph (2).

“(B) ADDITIONAL USES.—A State may, with the approval of a unit of local government, use the funds allocated to the unit of local government under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) to facilitate offering a certified training program or course or, subject to subsection (b)(2), a certified training program or course that provide continuing education in 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) to law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government; or

“(ii) for the costs of training local law enforcement officers, including through law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government, to conduct a certified training program or course.

“(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall develop criteria governing the allocation of funds to units of local government under this paragraph, which shall ensure that the funds are distributed as widely as practicable in terms of geographical location and to both large and small law enforcement agencies of units of local government.

“(D) ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a State receives an award under paragraph (1), the State shall announce the allocations of funds to units of local government under subparagraph (A). A State shall submit to the Attorney General a report explaining any delays in the announcement of allocations under this subparagraph.

“(d) REPORTING.—

“(1) UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Any unit of local government that receives funds from a State under subsection (c)(3) for a certified training program or course shall submit to the State or the Attorney General an annual report with respect to the first fiscal year during which the unit of local government receives such funds and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter that—

“(A) shall include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

“(B) may, at the election of the unit of local government, include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

“(C) shall include the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government;

“(D) shall include a description of any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

“(E) shall include information gathered through—

“(i) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

“(ii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training; and

“(F) shall include the amount of funds received by the unit of local government under subsection (c)(3) and a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government using available and anticipated funds.

“(2) STATES.—A State receiving funds under this section shall submit to the Attorney General—

“(A) any report the State receives from a unit of local government under paragraph (1); and

“(B) if the State retains funds under subsection (c)(2) for a fiscal year, a report by the State for that fiscal year, and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter—

“(i) indicating the number of law enforcement officers employed by the State that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic, including, at the election of the State, a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b);

“(ii) indicating the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State;

“(iii) providing information gathered through—

“(I) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

“(II) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training;

“(iv) discussing any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A); and

“(v) indicating the amount of funding retained by the State under subsection (c)(2) and providing a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the State using available and anticipated funds.

“(3) REPORTING TOOLS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall develop a portal through which the data required under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be collected and submitted.

“(4) REPORTS ON THE USE OF DE-ESCALATION TACTICS AND OTHER TECHNIQUES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall establish—

“(i) reporting requirements on interactions in which de-escalation tactics and other techniques in curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1) are used by each law enforcement agency that receives funding under this section; and

“(ii) mechanisms for each law enforcement agency to submit such reports to the Department of Justice.

“(B) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) specify—

“(I) the circumstances under which an interaction shall be reported, considering—

“(aa) the cost of collecting and reporting the information; and

“(bb) the value of that information for determining whether—

“(AA) the objectives of the training have been met; and

“(BB) the training reduced or eliminated the risk of serious physical injury to officers, subjects, and third parties; and

“(II) the demographic and other relevant information about the officer and subjects involved in the interaction that shall be included in such a report; and

“(ii) require such reporting be done in a manner that—

“(I) is in compliance with all applicable Federal and State confidentiality laws; and

“(II) does not disclose the identities of law enforcement officers, subjects, or third parties.

“(C) REVIEW OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 2 years thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the entities specified under subparagraph (A), shall review and consider updates to the reporting requirements.

“(5) FAILURE TO REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity receiving funds under this section that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable and as determined by the Attorney General, shall not be eligible to receive funds under this section for a period of 2 fiscal years.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit a State that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (2), and is not eligible to receive funds under this section, from making funding available to a unit of local government of the State under subsection (c)(3), if the unit of local government has complied with the reporting requirements.

“(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORTS.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and each year thereafter in which grants are made under this section,

the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the implementation of activities carried out under this section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, information on—

“(A) the number, amounts, and recipients of awards the Attorney General has made or intends to make using funds authorized under this section;

“(B) the selection criteria the Attorney General has used or intends to use to select recipients of awards using funds authorized under this section;

“(C) the number of law enforcement officers of a State or unit of local government who were not able to receive training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) due to unavailability of funds and the amount of funds that would be required to complete the training; and

“(D) the nature, frequency, and amount of information that the Attorney General has collected or intends to collect under subsection (d).

“(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—A report under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

“(f) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE STUDY.—

“(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the National Institute of Justice shall conduct a study of the implementation of training under a certified training program or course in at least 6 jurisdictions representing an array of agency sizes and geographic locations, which shall include—

“(A) a process evaluation of training implementation, which shall include an analysis of the share of officers who participated in the training, the degree to which the training was administered in accordance with the curriculum, and the fidelity with which the training was applied in the field; and

“(B) an impact evaluation of the training, which shall include an analysis of the impact of the training on interactions between law enforcement officers and the public, any factors that prevent or preclude law enforcement officers from successfully de-escalating law enforcement interactions, and any recommendations on modifications to the training curricula and methods that could improve outcomes.

“(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the National Institute of Justice shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

“(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

“(4) FUNDING.—Not more than 1 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out this section during any fiscal year shall be made available to conduct the study under paragraph (1).

“(g) GAO REPORT.—

“(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the grant program under this section and submit to Congress a report assessing the grant program, including—

“(A) the process for developing and identifying curricula under section 1701(n)(1), including the effectiveness of the consultation by the Attorney General with the agencies,

associations, and organizations identified under section 1701(n)(1)(C);

“(B) the certification of training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), including the development of the process for certification and its implementation;

“(C) the training of law enforcement personnel under section 1701(n)(3), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that employ the personnel receiving the training and the sizes of those agencies;

“(D) the allocation of funds under subsection (c), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that receive funds and the degree to which both large and small agencies receive funds; and

“(E) the amount of funding distributed to agencies compared with the amount appropriated under this section, the amount spent for training, and whether plans have been put in place by the recipient agencies to use unspent available funds.

“(2) GAO ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

- “(1) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and
- “(2) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.”.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. And, finally, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon on Tuesday, August 2; and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Hanes nomination postcloture; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings and that at 2:15 p.m., all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; finally, if any nominations are confirmed during Tuesday’s session, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be notified of the Senate’s action immediately.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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 7:21 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 2, 2022, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

MARIA ARAUJO KAHN, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT, VICE JOSE A. CABRANES, RETIRING.

JULIE RIKELMAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT, VICE SANDRA L. LYNCH, RETIRING.

MYONG J. JOUN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, VICE GEORGE A. O’TOOLE, JR., RETIRED.

JULIA E. KOBICK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, VICE WILLIAM G. YOUNG, RETIRED.

JEFFERY PAUL HOPKINS, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO, VICE TIMOTHY S. BLACK, RETIRED.

ARACELI MARTINEZ-OLGUIN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE JEFFREY S. WHITE, RETIRED.

RITA F. LIN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE EDWARD MILTON CHEN, RETIRED.

DANIEL J. CALABRETTA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE JOHN A. MENDEZ, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KEVIN G. RITZ, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE MICHAEL DUNAVANT, RESIGNED.

HENRY C. LEVENTIS, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DONALD Q. COCHRAN, JR., RESIGNED.

CASEY T. ARROWOOD, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE J. DOUGLAS OVERBEY, RESIGNED.

WILLIAM R. HART, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE NICK WIL-LARD, TERM EXPIRING.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 2022:

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

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT A. RASCH, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. SARAH K. ALBRYCHT
COL. KEVIN J. LAMBERT

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

LT. GEN. TONY D. BAUERNFEIND

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. DONNA D. SHIPTON

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

MAJ. GEN. ANDREW M. ROHLING

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS J. ANDERSON

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE 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. PHILIP A. GARRANT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS 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. ANNE B. GUNTER
BRIG. GEN. LYNETTE J. HEBERT
BRIG. GEN. CONSTANCE L. JENKINS
BRIG. GEN. TANYA R. KUBINEC
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. OLSON
BRIG. GEN. DAVID W. SMITH
BRIG. GEN. AARON G. VANGELISTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL P. CRUFF
COL. HEATH D. FOWLER
COL. LESLIE S. HADLEY
COL. LORI C. JONES
COL. WILLIAM A. MATNEY
COL. KELVIN D. MCELROY
COL. ANDRE A. MCILLIAN
COL. STEPHEN J. NESTER
COL. SHANNON OHARREN
COL. KENNETH J. OSTRAT
COL. SARAH H. RUSS
COL. STEPHEN E. SLADE
COL. DEAN D. SNIEGOWSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KEVIN D. ADMIRAL
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT L. BARRIE, JR.
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER G. BECK
BRIG. GEN. PETER N. BENCHOFF
BRIG. GEN. TREVOR J. BREDEKAMP
BRIG. GEN. WINSTON P. BROOKS
BRIG. GEN. GLENN A. DEAN III
BRIG. GEN. DAVID S. DOYLE
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK L. GAYDON
BRIG. GEN. JERED P. HELWIG
BRIG. GEN. JAMES P. ISENHOWER III
BRIG. GEN. RYAN M. JANOVIC
BRIG. GEN. JOHN D. KLINE
BRIG. GEN. GAVIN A. LAWRENCE
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN C. LEAHY
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL C. MCCURRY II
BRIG. GEN. SCOTT M. NAUMANN
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER R. NORRIE
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS W. OCONNOR, JR.
BRIG. GEN. KEITH C. PHILLIPS
BRIG. GEN. JETH B. REY
BRIG. GEN. PAUL T. STANTON
BRIG. GEN. DAVID B. WOMACK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ISAAC JOHNSON, JR.

To be brigadier general

COL. NOEL F. PALMER

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. BRYAN P. FENTON

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 general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL E. LANGLEY

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. DAGVIN R. M. ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE AND APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 9038:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN P. HEALY

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. DAVID A. OTTIGNON

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VICTORIA D. ABLES AND ENDING WITH ANN M. ZENOBIA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JUDSON C. DRESSLER, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JIMMY T. ADDISON AND ENDING WITH JOANNA J. ZEMEK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY JAY ABLAY AND ENDING WITH JAMES E. YARNELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL C. ABELL AND ENDING WITH ROQUE ZARATE III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JULIA M. ZIEGLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL ANTOINE BRADFORD AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH R. ZITO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JUSTIN D. ATWOOD AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. YU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOUGLAS D. DEMAIO AND ENDING WITH ADRIA P. ZUCCARO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF KEITH A. DEERING, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRYAN G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH D016618, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EMER B. BAJUELOS AND ENDING WITH CONNOR W. WITTY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LEAH M. TRIOLO, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH R. YANCEY, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TANNIS D. MITTELBAACH, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID M. HAYNES, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIEL S. RHOADES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEPHEN D. EKBLAD, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SCOTT F. DUNCAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANNA M. ARROYOSANTIAGO AND ENDING WITH ZHIBIN JIANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RAYMOND A. DEGENNARO II, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KESLER WEAVER, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM M. HARRIS, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LANCE M. KUNZ, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN T. AASMAN AND ENDING WITH D016640, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARA R. A. ALMGRANTZ AND ENDING WITH NICHOLE M. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHANEE E. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH DOUGLAS B. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERMAINE ADAMS AND ENDING WITH D016771, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANCES K. ALFARO AND ENDING WITH D016646, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JUAN D. MAGRI, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN T. WRIGHT, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN R. STONE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENA R. GOBLE AND ENDING WITH JASON P. NAGELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2022.

ARMY NOMINATION OF AARON L. BERT, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF DOMINIQUE B. NEAL, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF STEVEN D. SIDERI, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUBEN DELPILAR AND ENDING WITH STEVEN C. WANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON S. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. PATTERSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LOUISE M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM E. PARTHUN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DILLON J. AMBROSE AND ENDING WITH KATHRYN M. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH OBIE A. AUSTIN AND ENDING WITH SUSAN O. VALENTINE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADAM D. GUTHRIE AND ENDING WITH RENEE D. WHITSELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES D. BACH AND ENDING WITH DONALD R. TOSO, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PHILLIP I. LIEBERMAN AND ENDING WITH FRANK T. RUPNIK III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RANDELL T. BUCHANAN AND ENDING WITH JASON P. WIESE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY M. FLINTOFT AND ENDING WITH CHAD C. TEMPLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRYSTAL M. BAUMAN AND ENDING WITH BROOKES A. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDRE M. AGRAVIADOR AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL VALLANOS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLOTTE A. BENBOW AND ENDING WITH KA XIONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LINDSAY K. BARNES AND ENDING WITH SHEIVON A. YULLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEREK J. ANASTASIADIS AND ENDING WITH SCOTT C. TOLLEFSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. AMMENDOLA AND ENDING WITH LAURA C. YOON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM R. FLEMING, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALDEN Y. ARGANTE AND ENDING WITH JASON M. SETLIFF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRANDON D. CARVER AND ENDING WITH CLAIBORN B. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC L. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARIO E. CANAS AND ENDING WITH RAFAEL M. VILLARREAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRISTIN P. ACTON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. ZECCA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JODI M. D. BIERMANN AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM C. SOUDER III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARTHUR D. ANDERSON III AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. TOCKEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. BOWEN III AND ENDING WITH COURTNEY R. STALTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JESSE L. WHITFIELD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSICA B. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH AMELIA E. UMAYAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS E. ARNOLD AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH K. SPEDE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALAN CAMERON AND ENDING WITH LEROY C. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN H. BEATTIE AND ENDING WITH BENJAMIN V. WAINWRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JAVIER LOPEZMARTINEZ, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WENDY A. ARNOLD AND ENDING WITH JANET M. WEST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TERESITA ALSTON AND ENDING WITH DONAVON A. YAPSHING, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CLEMIA ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH CHARLES R. WILHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2022.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER J. KANE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER E. BOWMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER L. CAUDILL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROSA M. ALLEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

SPACE FORCE NOMINATION OF CHRISTINA N. GILLETTE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATION OF DANIEL R. HAMMER, TO BE MAJOR.