United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2022 *No. 152*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 21, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION DAY, 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is fundamental to our democracy. While the path to full voting rights for all American citizens has been and still is long and challenging, this week we honor the heroes who fought to secure this right by encouraging and supporting all eligible Americans to register to vote.

This call to action would be incomplete if I did not mention the nearly 4 million Americans living in U.S. territories and those in the District of Columbia who still do not have equal voting representation in this Congress and in our country.

As such, Americans living in the territories and the District of Columbia are accustomed to being last in line or given short shrift for hurricane relief, Medicaid, and infrastructure funding.

We must remain committed to building an America where every vote matters and where every citizen has the ability and the right to participate freely in the democratic process.

That is why I stand with House Democrats to continue to work on securing the vote for all Americans. Our Nation depends on it.

BETTER-PAYING JOBS

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to affirm my commitment to expanding work opportunities to all corners of the country, including the often excluded territory of the Virgin Islands. That means forming better-paying jobs and economic opportunities so Americans can work and live with dignity and security.

The Democratic Caucus has remained committed to people over politics in this with safer communities, better-paying jobs, and opportunities for all Americans.

That is why they have supported and I support the three significant pieces of legislation that have been passed by House Democrats: the CHIPS and Science Act which provides billions of dollars in new funding to strengthen American research and development and rebuild our supply chain; the Inflation Reduction Act which has stimulated job growth through investments in clean, affordable, and secure American energy while simultaneously cutting families' energy bills and fighting the climate change; and, lastly, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, let us not forget, which aims to rebuild our roads, bridges, and transit systems while bringing broadband and clean drinking water to more communities.

BLACK WOMEN'S EQUAL PAY DAY

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the disparities that exist for Black women due to the double-pronged existence of institutional racism and misogyny in our country. Black women bear the unique burden of experiencing both gender and racial discrimination. We have seen this in health, wealth, education, and work among all socioeconomic, geographic, and age groups.

Black women earn 58 cents to the dollar of a White man—the same job, the same position—58 cents to the dollar. Their earning gap is even more severe for mothers, with Black mothers only earning 46 cents for every dollar a White, non-Hispanic father earned nationally.

It is imperative that we demand pay equity for Black women. So today, I stand with all of my sisters and demand and implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Black Women's Equal Pay Day.

KANSAS CORN HARVEST REPORT

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to deliver the 14th installment of my farm bill impact series during a time when the effects of a poor corn harvest in Kansas are only compounded by rising inflation.

Kansas farmers are laboring under the burden of skyrocketing input costs while they work hard to keep our country fed, fueled, and clothed, and they deserve workable solutions to this inflation crisis before the situation gets any worse. Farming is already a risky, volatile business without the added burden of inflation, and USDA estimates that input costs will continue to

Printed on recycled paper.

rise to astronomical rates throughout 2022 and beyond.

For an example of the risk of volatility in farming, the corn harvest is underway in some parts of Kansas, and the results are a fraction of the yield that farmers hope for and bank on during normal seasons. The farm bill which Congress will reauthorize in 2023 exists, in part, specifically for situations like this current corn crop to provide energy assistance to our ag producers even when Mother Nature doesn't cooperate.

The weather in Kansas can be extreme and unpredictable, which means that growing corn can be a very difficult prospect. Kansas is suffering from a major drought right now. According to the USDA, for the week ending September 11, only 14 percent of Kansas topsoil was rated as adequate. And USDA rated the corn condition 27 percent very poor, 27 percent poor, 24 percent fair, 20 percent good, and only 2 percent excellent. Meanwhile, according to Drought Monitor, 34 counties in my district alone are in extreme drought, and 16 are in exceptional drought.

The farther west you go in Kansas, Mr. Speaker, the worse it gets. Even irrigated fields are having issues, and far more corn crops than normal will be complete losses. Many Kansas producers are saying that this is the worst corn harvest in recent memory. This is a dire situation. Farmers invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in producing this essential crop, and its failure means that farmers are left wondering how they are going to put food on the table and pay for gas to drive their kids to school. To make matters worse, consumers end up without access to many of the products that they have learned to enjoy and on which they depend.

This is where farm bill programs like crop insurance come in. Crop insurance serves producers and consumers alike because it helps prevent producers from going out of business and grocery store aisles from sitting empty. Farm bill programs like crop insurance have secured our national food supply and helped generations of producers avoid bankruptcy when times get tough. We are in one of those times right now. Inflation is skyrocketing in America, President Biden is trying to impose his farm killer tax and dismantle the stepped-up basis, and producers are going out of business. The need to reauthorize the farm bill for 2023 has come at a critical moment in time.

A bad harvest in Kansas isn't just about money. It is about morale and spirit. Missing harvest time in Kansas doesn't just mean missing out on the yield of a cash crop. It means missing out on a special Kansas tradition of celebrating the culmination of all of your family's hard work. It creates financial insecurity while leaving a void where a renewal of family camaraderie should be. Washington, D.C., unfortunately, doesn't understand this. This city has never been crippled by something like a lost harvest.

D.C. moves right along through drought, heat, late winter snows, and torrential downpours unfazed. That is why I am standing here today, to remind Congress that 1 in 10 employed Americans—nearly 20 million people in this country—work in food and agriculture where weather creates a make-or-break situation for their livelihoods. And, most importantly, every American has to eat.

American agricultural producers are hurting not only from skyrocketing input costs that come from inflation, but also from lowered morale that comes from extreme heat, drought, thin margins, and a broken supply chain. In 2023, Congress must reauthorize the farm bill with American farm families at the front of their minds because they are in a crisis.

I will be back on the floor soon to deliver another installment of my farm bill impact series and highlight more programs and titles within the bill that I believe Congress must understand and support to ensure that agriculture thrives in America. The people who feed, fuel, and clothe us all deserve our unwavering support. They also deserve a robust safety net in the farm bill and workable solutions to the inflation crisis before it is too late.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CARMEN LOUISE BOSSENBROCK

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the lives of two outstanding Eighth District residents.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the legacy of Carmen Louise Bossenbrock who passed away on July 31, 2022, at the age of 94. Carmen was a pioneering figure in the fight against polio, a tireless community advocate, and a beloved lifelong Wenatchee Valley resident.

As the polio epidemic rampaged across Washington State, Carmen became a medical leader in the Wenatchee Valley. Working at Deaconess Hospital and later Central Washington Hospital as a physical therapist, Carmen was often the only thing standing between polio patients and debilitating paralysis.

For 2 years, in the thick of the epidemic, she was the only licensed physical therapist practicing in north central Washington. As patients flooded through her doors, Carmen devoted herself to the recovery of hundreds of patients. As a reflection of her tireless leadership, Carmen became the head of physical therapy at Central Washington Hospital until her retirement.

Carmen remained a tireless advocate against polio in her later career. She was an active member of the Wenatchee Rotary Club—one of the first women to join. There she passionately led fundraising for global vaccine programs to ensure no family would have to experience the devastation of polio.

Friends remember Carmen as a pillar of the community, splitting her time between her beloved pear orchard in Dryden and her mission to eradicate polio.

We are deeply grateful for Carmen's service. Her legacy will forever be a part of the Wenatchee Valley and Washington State. I join Carmen's family and friends in mourning their loss of an extraordinary woman.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GUNNERY SERGEANT ARTHUR BRANSON SUMMERS

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the story of Gunnery Sergeant Arthur Branson Summers, a U.S. marine killed in action in World War II. After 76 years, his body has returned home to his family members and has been laid to rest in East Wenatchee, Washington.

Gunnery Sergeant Summers of Company I, 3rd Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, was killed in the winter of 1943 in the Betio Island battle with Japanese forces. Sadly, Summers was 1 of 1,000 servicemembers who died that day and 1 of almost 500 whose remains were never found. Tragically for his family, friends, and loved ones, they were deemed nonrecoverable in 1949.

But this changed in 2009 thanks to the tireless work of the nonprofit organization History Flight. After a small piece of military rain poncho was found near the site, History Flight began excavations in 2009 and discovered the body of Gunnery Sergeant Summers along with several other lost servicemembers. His remains were brought home to his family, nephews David and Donald McCannel. He received an honorable burial in East Wenatchee, Washington.

Gunnery Sergeant Arthur Branson Summers answered our Nation's call at a time of great need, and for his service, valor, and sacrifice, we are forever thankful.

I would like to recognize History Flight for their work to return Summers to his home and to thank David and Donald McCannel and their families for providing Gunnery Sergeant Summers an honorable burial on American soil.

On behalf of a grateful Nation and the entire Eighth District, we are proud to have Gunnery Sergeant Summers in his final resting place in East Wenatchee, Washington.

HONORING THE ISSAQUAH ALL-STARS AND THE BONNEY LAKE/SUMNER LITTLE LEAGUE TEAMS

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to honor some tremendous young athletes. The Eighth District had not one but two teams representing our State at the Little League World Series. The Issaquah All-Stars represented the northwest region at the Little League Softball World Series, and the Bonney Lake/Sumner Little League team, at

the baseball Little League World Series.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of these young athletes who represented our district and State so well on the national stage. Congratulations to them and their families on their success.

THE PANDEMIC IS OVER

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

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate an important statement made by our President: The pandemic is over.

This weekend on ''60 Minutes,'' President Biden finally said what most Americans have known for months: We are no longer in the COVID–19 pandemic.

So if the President just admitted it, that means the national emergency is over, correct?

If that is the case, then why did the President just tell the country that the pandemic is so bad that we should forgive billions of dollars of student debt, or that it is because of the ongoing pandemic that we must continue to enforce a vaccine mandate on our Nation's military?

□ 1015

I will tell you why—it is because it was never about the pandemic. It was about the President bypassing Congress and the Constitution to push his radical socialist agenda.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden himself has said the pandemic is over. It is past time that we strip him of his emergency powers and end the vaccine mandates and reject all COVID-related funding requests.

CONGRATULATING THE LAS VEGAS ACES

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and congratulate the Las Vegas Aces on winning the Women's National Basketball Association Championship this past Sunday.

On September 18, 2022, the Las Vegas Aces defeated the Connecticut Sun 78–71 in game four of the WNBA finals. The Aces won the championship three games to one and secured the first major professional sports championship in the history of the city of Las Vegas.

Even before the playoffs, the Aces had an incredible season led by rookie head coach Becky Hammon, who became the first former NBA player and rookie head coach to win the NBA championship.

Every member of the team, including Kiersten Bell, Sydney Colson, Chelsea Gray, Dearica Hamby, Theresa Plaisance, Kelsey Plum, Iliana Rupert, Aisha Sheppard, Kiah Stokes, Riquna Williams, A'ja Wilson, and Jackie Young was critical to the success of the Aces this year.

Since coming to Las Vegas in 2018, the Aces have played well, but, unfortunately, up until now they were unable to win at all.

In 2020, during the COVID-shortened season and without key players due to injury, the team still made the WNBA finals but were ultimately turned back.

In 2021, the team was set for greatness, but, unfortunately, fell short in heartbreaking fashion in game five of the Western Conference Finals.

In the lead-up to the 2022 season, the team lost key players to free agency, and former coach Bill Laimbeer retired, but the organization shifted its focus and approach and took the league by storm.

Led by prolific three-point shooting, the Aces dominated the regular season and ended with a league best record of 26–10, securing the Commissioner's Cup along the way.

Heading into the playoffs, the team was primed for success.

Led by forward A'ja Wilson, who won this year's regular season Most Valuable Player, also Defensive Player of the Year, and first-team All-WNBA honors, fellow All-WNBA honors guard Kelsey Plum, and WNBA Most Improved Player Jackie Young, the Las Vegas Aces dominated the playoffs.

In the finals, Chelsea Gray delivered a tremendous performance, averaging 18 points per game in the series and winning the WNBA finals Most Valuable Player. In the championship-clinching game, Riquna Williams scored a crucial 17 points, with her incredible three-point shooting, to lift the Aces to victory.

Following this victory, Aces players Chelsea Gray, Kelsey Plum, Jackie Young, and A'ja Wilson, who competed and won gold medals for the United States in the Tokyo Olympics in 2021, joined an exclusive club of players who won both Olympic gold and the WNBA championship.

In closing, I congratulate owner Mark Davis who, through continued investment and caring, has put women's basketball on the map in Las Vegas; Coach Becky Hammon; all the amazing players, led by the A'ja Wilson; and the entire Las Vegas organization led by its president, Nikki Fargas, and general manager, Natalie Williams. Congratulations on this tremendous achievement.

The city of Las Vegas and all of southern Nevada are extremely proud of the Aces. They certainly raised the stakes and hit the jackpot.

RECOGNIZING 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF FINCASTLE, VIRGINIA

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 250th anniversary of Fincastle, Virginia.

In 1772, western-moving settlers John Mill and Israel Christian founded the town of Fincastle, and by 1784 there were 59 homes as well as taverns and the early formation of a justice system.

Once Virginia's gateway to the West, Fincastle is the county seat of Botetourt, which once extended to the Mississippi River. Meriweather Lewis and William Clark visited Fincastle during their great expedition into the West. William returned to Fincastle and married Julia Hancock in 1808 in the historic home, Santillane. The town has been nationally recognized as a Lewis and Clark community.

Passing settlers stopped in Fincastle on their way into the interior of what would become the United States, conducting business and buying goods from the merchants in town.

Today, Fincastle proudly maintains its heritage and history.

Their version of the Botetourt County Courthouse, designed by President Thomas Jefferson, is located in Fincastle and contains records going back hundreds of years.

Fincastle's annual Historic Fincastle Festival will be a bit more special this year, celebrating the town's 250th anniversary, and being held this weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent this historic town, a bedrock of the oldest colony and the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

BIDEN'S RADICAL AGENDA

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to criticize President Biden and House Democrats in Washington for turning their backs on hardworking families.

Month after month, they have continued to advance a radical agenda that has crushed the American Dream.

Grocery costs are up 13½ percent, electricity costs are up 15½ percent, fuel oil costs are up nearly 70 percent. Everything has gone up since this failed President took office. Why? Because Biden and the Democrats are obsessed with spending taxpayer dollars and pushing Socialist Green New Deal policies.

Last week, after yet another inflation report showed that prices were up again, Joe Biden and the Democrats threw a party at the White House. To add insult to injury, on his recent interview on ''60 Minutes,'' President Biden had zero remorse for the devastating effects of his raging inflation crisis.

He continues to claim that the economy is great and that tons of jobs are being created. That is a lie. Here is what he is not telling you. Full-time jobs are way down, and it is only part-time jobs that are growing.

Biden and Democrats have sent a clear message that they don't care about American families. There is one solution to this problem: Stop reckless government spending. Virginia families are sick and tired of paying the price for Biden's radical agenda.

When Republicans retake the majority next year, we will end this inflation-fueled spending, fix this broken economy, and deliver power back to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

FALL PREVENTION AWARENESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, it was 4 a.m. in the morning when I got a call from the West Palm Beach paramedics. They had received a call from my mother's Apple watch—believe it or not—and they rushed to her apartment, and they found her lying on her apartment floor. She had fallen and broken her hip.

I stayed close as she suffered through surgery and hospitalization and rehabilitation. I counted the endless medical bills paid by Medicare and her own personal funds. I watched as my independent mom became fearful of living alone and moved into an assisted living facility.

Mr. Speaker, I will say, there is some very good news about my mom, she is alive and well and adapting to her new lifestyle. She uses a walker and aging has reduced her stamina, but her bridge partners will tell you she still has a very sharp mind.

Listen to this. Her surgeon told me her recovery at her age, which was 96 at the time of the fall, was an exception, that most her age, after a brutal injury, quickly sundown to death.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask why am I telling this story? Because tomorrow is the first day of fall, and not only are the leaves turning, but it marks the start of Fall Prevention Awareness Week, a nationwide effort to raise awareness that falls are preventable, and also, to bring awareness to fall prevention strategies and resources.

Mr. Speaker, after my mom fell, I started hearing story after story from friends and colleagues about their own personal experiences of people who had fallen, and you know what I learned? Falls are the most frequent cause of injuries and injury-related death among people over 65.

There are 36 million falls a year in people over 65 here in America, leading to broken bones and broken spirits, and 34,000 of those becoming deadly. The cost—this is an amazing figure—the cost to the American health system is $50 billion a year from injuries related to falls. That is billion with a b.

Here is the most important message I have today: Falls are preventable. I am going to say it again: Falls are preventable. There are simple things that seniors can do with assistance from their doctors and their family and their friends and caretakers to stop the falls before they happen.

Here are some of the top tips from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Make sure that medications don't have side effects that can cause dizziness or loss of balance, stay hydrated, get eyes checked every year. And because most falls happen in the home, make critical changes like installing grab bars, clearing tripping hazards, and make sure that the rugs are flat on the floor. If necessary, use mobility aids like walkers and canes, when needed, even in your own home.

There are also simple exercises that seniors can do to improve joint strength, especially in the ankles, to help improve balance and stability.

I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that the House Labor, Health, and Human Services' budget plusses up fall prevention research and programs in the 2023 budget. I am hoping that the Senate will go along with that.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all my colleagues to recognize this week as Fall Prevention Awareness Week and help me spread the word: Falls are preventable. It is on all of us to keep our loved ones on their feet.

SOCIAL SECURITY FAIRNESS

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

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express disappointment and frustration of thousands of my constituents after our effort to bring H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act, to the floor for a vote, which was delayed this week.

The Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset are unfair, bureaucratic deductions that cheat nearly 2 million Americans out of their earned Social Security benefits.

These rules impact our public servants—the teachers who educate our children, firefighters and police officers who keep our communities safe. At a time when we desperately need more men and women to enter these fields, knowing these penalties exist deter them from pursuing these occupations.

WEP and GPO have been in place since the 1980s and Congress has ignored this problem for decades. I want to be clear, we are not trying to create new entitlement programs or forgive debt. We are trying to ensure that retirees obtain the benefits that are rightly theirs.

Just last week, I received a letter from Carla Moreau, a teacher from Bunkie, Louisiana, who retired after spending 23 years in the classroom.

Carla recently lost her husband, Gerard, to cancer at age 60. However, due to WEP and GPO, she is ineligible to receive his Social Security survivor benefits simply because she was a teacher. If Carla had chosen any other profession outside of public service, she would automatically receive those benefits just like any other American would.

Mr. Speaker, Carla's story is just one of the many from across my district and around our country, and each one is heartbreaking and unjust. Not a single day goes by that I don't hear from a constituent who is impacted.

□ 1030

Since I took office over 1 year ago, almost 3,000 people have contacted my office to ask us to fix WEP and GPO—by far, the most calls concerning a single issue.

High inflation and record price hikes continue to plague our Nation, and now, by refusing to address WEP and GPO, this Congress is essentially telling hardworking Americans that they must either not retire, reenter the workforce, or find other means to make ends meet.

It is astounding to me that this administration and the Democratic majority spend trillions to forgive student loans, bail out private industry, and create new government programs, but the people impacted by WEP and GPO continue to be ignored.

My colleague from Illinois, RODNEY DAVIS, brought forward H.R. 82 to repeal WEP and GPO. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, along with nearly 300 other Members of this House.

Since the 117th Congress convened, we worked together as Democrats and Republicans to find a way to bring this bill to the floor for a vote. After nearly a year and a half of being denied, we worked to have it placed on the Consensus Calendar, a process that could force the bill to come to the House floor.

Only when we were on the cusp of forcing a floor vote and had 300 Members ready to support this measure did Democratic leadership take action to remove the legislation from the Consensus Calendar and essentially bog it down in a backlog.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable to me that some would play procedural games and deny this body the opportunity to vote on a bill that fixes such an obvious wrong.

What am I supposed to say to the people like Carla Moreau? That despite the fact that we were sent here to solve problems, we will just kick the can down the road?

Is that really the answer that we are okay with relaying to her and the 2 million Americans who are adversely impacted?

Mr. Speaker, I was sent here to represent the people of the Fifth District of Louisiana, and today, I can say with grave sincerity that their voices, along with 2 million other Americans, continue to be silenced.

Instead of my standing behind this podium today, we should be doing the will of the people and bringing H.R. 82 to the floor for a vote.

STUDENT DEBT CANCELLATION

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in solidarity with the

millions of student loan borrowers across this Nation who slept a little easier last night knowing that essential student loan debt relief is on the way.

I am thinking of every person who has pulled me aside in community and dropped their eyes to the floor as they describe the financial burden and shame they were carrying, crushed by student debt—the teachers, the electricians, the nurses, and, indeed, even the grandparents, our elders, some 76 years old on fixed incomes whose benefits were garnished.

The coalition that rallied around our calls to cancel student debt is as broad and diverse as this Nation because so, too, are the families personally impacted by this economic justice issue.

We thank President Biden for taking action. We thank him for listening deeply and responding. With the stroke of a pen, he moved to cancel student debt for millions of borrowers, and this action is going to change and save lives.

In my home State of Massachusetts, the Department of Education reported yesterday that 813,000 student loan borrowers in Massachusetts stand to benefit from student debt cancellation.

I get emotional thinking about the profound impact this will have for our families, especially families that have been systemically denied the opportunity to own or build generational wealth. This is the type of transformative policy that sends ripples for generations. Student loan cancellation will change and save lives.

I thank my dedicated partners in this effort, Senator WARREN and Senator SCHUMER; my colleagues in the House who have worked on this issue for years alongside me: Congresswoman OMAR, Congresswoman ADAMS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JONES, and our partners in the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus, including Senator WARNOCK, Chairwoman JAYAPAL, Chairwoman BEATTY, and Chairwoman WATERS.

Our work to make education accessible and affordable across the Nation continues with urgency, and millions of families are going to start 2023 student loan debt-free thanks to the Biden-Harris administration. That is a beautiful thing.

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Hispanic Heritage Month.

The Massachusetts Seventh is one of the most diverse districts in the country due, in large part, to the rich Hispanic and Latinx communities who reside there: the Colombians, Salvadorans, and Ecuadorians in East Boston and Chelsea; the Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans in Jamaica Plain and the South End; and the Mexicans and Brazilians in Cambridge, Somerville, Everett, and beyond.

Many of these champions are on the front lines of fights that matter not just for their own community but for our very humanity. They are justice seekers and movement builders, and given the number of servicemen and -women and veterans, they are defenders of democracy and freedom.

Their sweat equity makes our country stronger and our policymaking more informed. I am proud to call them partners in the work to build a more just and equitable world because, Mr. Speaker, if the story of America is one of progress, then we owe it to the collective power, resilience, and collective advocacy of our Hispanic and Latinx siblings.

So to those in Massachusetts and across the country, and those on my dedicated staff now and in the past, from Aissa to Lona, to Luz, to Alana, to Ricardo, to Dagoberto, to Kayla, we thank you. This month and every month, we give you your flowers.

RECOGNIZING ALOPECIA AREATA AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. PRESSLEY. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize September as Alopecia Awareness Month.

Across the country, approximately 7 million people have alopecia, an autoimmune disease, which I live with, that attacks one's hair follicles.

People of all ages, genders, races, and from every walk of life are living with this condition. Thankfully, although this does not threaten our lives, it does not mean that it does not impact it.

Collectively, we are fighting for bold investments in skin disease research, comprehensive medical coverage, and meaningful public education to combat the stigma, discrimination, bullying, and, indeed, even depression and suicide ideation that so many of us experience.

Whether we are sharing a meal in the heart of the Massachusetts Seventh or sharing our stories, to someone who is newly diagnosed, we choose strength over shame and purpose over pain.

I can personally attest to the fortitude that defines our community each and every day. Although there is no cure, there is community. We work to create space so that all of us may show up in the world as our full and authentic selves.

This transformation that I live with is not one of my choosing, but it is one that I have learned to embrace unapologetically with the support of my loved ones, team, and broader community in my decision to not wear a wig, recognizing the power of that representation for the 7 million-strong alopecia community in this country.

That is why, this September, on the floor of the House of Representatives, I can affirm that alopecia is my superpower. I am free to be me. I commemorate Alopecia Areata Awareness Month.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURE EDUCATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of agriculture education.

Last week, we celebrated National Teach Ag Day. This recognition of agriculture education is more important than ever.

The average age of the American farmer is around 57 years old. It is critical for our food security to inspire the next generation of agricultural leaders, and this starts in the classroom.

I have had the privilege of spending time with agriculture educators in Pennsylvania and throughout our country. Programs like the Future Farmers of America and 4–H are strong advocates for advancing agriculture education and exposing our youth to the agriculture industry.

Over the past few months, I have had the opportunity to witness these agriculture programs firsthand. I visited fourth graders at Glendale Elementary School in Cambria County who were working closely with seniors from the Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology to bring textbooks to life. The lesson I participated in focused on science, soil, and agricultural operations. I had the opportunity to work directly with the students, where we discussed a plant's journey from seed to full growth. We examined soil, and students made observations of plant growth.

We interact with agriculture at least three times a day, and it is critical that students have the opportunity to really learn about the industry and the career opportunities that it offers.

In July, I joined CenClear and the YMCA of Centre County at the ribbon cutting of the antihunger program at Morgan Run Farm. This initiative will serve as a hands-on, community-centered educational tool to further families' understanding of agriculture processes, farming, nutrition, and community development.

Right now, more than ever, we understand food security is national security, and a country that cannot feed itself often finds itself in turmoil. Programs like the antihunger program at Morgan Run and the science lesson at Glendale Elementary are the first steps in educating our youth about our food sources.

As I mentioned earlier, we are at a critical point in our agricultural future, with the average age of our farmers hovering around 57 years old. It is important that we develop the next generation of farmers. That is why, in August, I held a listening session focused on the next generation of farmers.

We discussed how we can engage and support our next generation of farmers and encourage youth to get involved in the agriculture industry. We had remarkable panelists who were incredibly accomplished in their fields. Together, we highlighted their work to promote innovative technologies that inspire and engage the next generation of agriculturists.

As a senior member of the Education and Labor Committee, co-chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, co-chair of the 4–H Caucus, and proud member of the FFA Caucus, I am passionate about advancing agricultural education in schools.

I take this moment to thank all of our agricultural educators across the country, the Commonwealth, and in the 15th Congressional District. Their work invests in our agriculture education and helps prepare the next generation of farmers, producers, and ranchers.

I always enjoy my meetings with FFA and 4–H students, as they are clearly our future, and our conversations give me great hope in the direction of our agricultural community.

Mr. Speaker, I, once again, thank all those involved in agricultural education and empowering our next generation of farmers.

CELEBRATING ACCUWEATHER'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate AccuWeather on its 60th anniversary.

Since 1962, AccuWeather has provided trusted and accurate weather forecasts for individuals, businesses, and communities.

AccuWeather is repeatedly recognized as the most accurate weather forecast. Their warnings have saved thousands of lives and have protected people from harm and property from damage. Most notably, Congress cited AccuWeather during Hurricane Katrina for saving 10,000 people, thanks to their accurate forecasts.

Today, more than 1.5 billion people rely on AccuWeather to stay safe and plan their day.

AccuWeather currently has the largest collection of data at its Global Weather Center, which receives more information than any other facility on Earth.

Most importantly, AccuWeather is a proud Pennsylvania 15th Congressional District business with more than 500 employees and is headquartered in Ferguson Township in Centre County.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating AccuWeather; their founder and CEO, Dr. Joel Myers; and their entire team on 60 years of service to our communities and excellence in forecasting the weather.

UNCERTAINTY IN WAKE OF HURRICANE FIONA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue to raise awareness to the destruction that Hurricane Fiona has brought about to the Caribbean—namely, to Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic.

Let me start, Mr. Speaker, by saying that yesterday marked the fifth anniversary of Hurricane Maria, a natural disaster that left 3.5 million Americans without power and killed over 3,000 lives.

While hurricanes in the islands are not new, Hurricane Maria exposed the vulnerability of Puerto Rico, and 5 years later, uncertainty remains in the wake of Hurricane Fiona, which occurred this past weekend.

There was a 100 percent blackout on the island when the hurricane landed. As of 10 a.m. yesterday, 73 percent of the island had no power and 60 percent of the island had no water.

I commend the Biden administration for its swift actions to declare a state of emergency for the region, and I am hopeful that they will approve Governor Pierluisi's request for a major disaster declaration soon, which will follow additional lifesaving resources for Puerto Rico.

For this reason, I join Senator SCHUMER and Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ in speaking with FEMA Administrator Deanne Criswell, urging the administration to reimburse 100 percent of the costs, allow document flexibility for accessing aid, and advance funding to Puerto Rico in this critical moment.

We must do all it takes to ensure relief assistance to help residents recover. We cannot turn our backs on our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico.

Yesterday, I held a strategy planning call with leaders from New York, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, and emergency services organizations in response to Hurricane Fiona.

We have witnessed catastrophic devastation across Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic, and it will require a multilevel government approach to ensure vital resources to the region in a timely manner.

□ 1045

As of today, more than 1 million people in the Dominican Republic are without access to utilities and shelter.

At least 1 million people in the Dominican Republic have no access to running water.

More than 700,000 homes and businesses have been left in the dark as they suffered loss of power.

Additionally, at least 3,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, and four bridges collapsed.

The situation is dire. We must do all we can to help the people of the Dominican Republic during this moment of crisis.

For this reason, I am urging the United States Agency For International Development to deploy a Disaster Assistance Response Team and coordinate with other U.S. Government agencies and partners to advance relief efforts.

The Federal response must be swift, robust, and continue for as long as is needed.

The impact of this devastating natural disaster hits close to home, as a multitude of my district—we have many folks in Washington Heights, in the Bronx, in El Barrio, and Harlem—have family members in Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic who are in need of supplies and other disaster relief.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is with the people of the Caribbean, and we will continue to monitor this situation closely.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS CAUTHEN

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Brigadier General Thomas Cauthen, an American patriot who served 38 years in the Tennessee Air National Guard.

He was inspired as a child by watching his dad's career as a pilot in the Tennessee Air National Guard's 134th Fighter-Interceptor Group, which later became the 134th Air Refueling Wing.

In 1984, General Cauthen followed in his dad's footsteps and started his commission right after getting his bachelor of science in civil engineering from the University of Tennessee.

After getting his pilot training, he flew combat support missions during Operation Desert Storm, Southern Watch, Joint Forge, Allied Force, Enduring Freedom, and Noble Eagle. He eventually went to the 134th Air Refueling Wing and ended up serving as its commander for 7 years. He then became the director of staff at the Joint Force Headquarters Tennessee and then chief of staff for the entire Tennessee Air National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, last month, he retired after 38 long years of faithfully serving his country. He plans to spend more time with his wonderful wife, Penny, their two kids, and their grandchild. He also plans to get more involved with the community by volunteering with the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve and get more involved with the East Tennessee Military Affairs Council.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Brigadier General Thomas Cauthen as Tennessee's Second District's September 2022 Veteran of the Month. I thank him for his incredible service and congratulate him on a well-earned retirement.

CONGRATULATING ETHAN AND ARI KLASKY POWERLIFTING CHAMPIONS IN EAST TENNESSEE

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to appreciate some powerlifting champions in east Tennessee. That is correct, I said powerlifting.

Last week, I was on the plane back to Knoxville from Washington. This fellow sitting next to me talked excitedly about his set of twins, 17-year-old Ari and Ethan, who go to Webb School of Knoxville. They are powerlifting champions.

Their dad, Scott, used to powerlift as a hobby, and he got his boys into the

sport when they were about 9 years old. They all trained together, and as time went on, they ended up loving the sport as much as their dad.

This year, the boys decided to compete for the first time in the Southern Powerlifting Federation championship, and they blew the competition out of the water. Both boys won their divisions, and Ari set a world record—a world record, Mr. Speaker—for his age and weight class by lifting a total of 1,660 pounds between his deadlift, bench, and squat.

It is very cool to me to have a world record holder who goes to school in my district, but it is even cooler to hear how the shared love of powerlifting bonded this father and his sons in a very unique way.

Ari and Ethan didn't grow up as bickering brothers as most do. They grew up as training partners. They supported each other, kept each other safe, and pushed each other to keep pursuing their goals.

Unfortunately, Ari tore his ACL and won't be able to compete in the squat or deadlift this year, but he isn't letting that fact get him down. He still plans to compete in the bench press competition, and he credits his perseverance to his brother's constant inspiration. Ari isn't giving up on his dream of competing in the USA Powerlifting competition.

I have a teenage daughter, Isabelle, and she is also an athlete. She does horseback riding competitions. She is a barrel racer, and she is pretty good at it. I know exactly how awesome it is to be a dad who is incredibly proud of their kids' accomplishments.

We all want our kids to do well in life. To see them push themselves and exceed everyone's expectations is a feeling like no other.

Scott, Ari, and Ethan are prime examples of what we can accomplish when we set goals and work hard every day to achieve them.

Mr. Speaker, I take just a moment to recognize their accomplishments.

UKRAINE TRIP

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, since Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the world has changed—socially, economically, and the political landscape. Putin's war has killed thousands of Ukrainians, innocent citizens, and displaced millions who have struggled to get food and resources in this region.

Last April, I spoke on the floor after the attacks in Bucha, which I visited, and labeled President Putin for what he is, a war criminal. As Russia continues this unprovoked attack on Ukraine, we must continue to stand strong and united against him.

I traveled to Kyiv, Ukraine's capital city, as a part of the Yalta European Strategy Conference recently.

As one of the only Members of Congress to have actually stayed overnight, spent a couple of days, I witnessed the 24-hour cycle of the capital city finding energy once again, revitalizing itself through its day-to-day routines.

I saw parts of the city where Russia's tanks entered the suburbs and killed innocent civilians, as well as children, destroying homes, apartments and schools, mass graves with over 166 individuals. Even through this tragedy, Ukraine has remained resilient, and Kyiv returns to life.

I felt relatively safe as I walked the streets in the central city. Looking back to where the city was 6 months ago is a reminder to me of how precious all of our freedoms are. As I met Ukrainians across the capital, it was inspiring to see their hope that better days are coming, and that Ukraine will prevail.

During my visit, we met with NATO allies and many of the panel sessions that we had focused on how we will continue our support for Ukraine amidst Russia's brutal war that was unprovoked.

Critically, we discussed matters related to Ukraine's defense, its economy and recovery plans, and humanitarian aid as it continues to prevail from Russia's countless attacks.

Strong economic security is critical to rebuilding Ukraine and preserving its sovereignty. That is what we must do after the war. We saw Ukrainian Armed Forces execute one of the most pivotable 48-hour counteroffensives during the past 6 months, and it continues.

The liberation of Izium and territory to the north in Kharkiv is one of the countless displays of bravery and sacrifice that have come to define Ukraine's fight.

Ukraine is putting up a stronger fight than Russia was anticipating; through strength, unity, and love of country, Ukraine will prevail.

Today, we heard that Putin is enlarging his forces by 300,000 and is inferring that everything is on the table. We must call his bluff.

Congress and President Biden have provided significant support to Ukraine since the beginning of the war, and it has made a difference on a bipartisan basis, and we must continue that when we pass the continuing resolution later in the next week.

Ukraine has been able to strengthen its defense systems, bolster its refugee services, and tackle food insecurity. Millions of tons of grain have come out of Odessa through the agreement that was reached through Turkey and the U.N. However, challenges remain, and the war has not yet been won.

We, the United States with our NATO allies, must continue to unite against Vladimir Putin and provide Ukraine with the tools to defend itself and to protect its sovereignty from this brutal invasion.

As we craft the upcoming continuing resolution, we must continue additional funding.

This is a pivotal moment in our history. Our actions today will determine the future of the 21st century.

The world has changed in the last 8 months. Future generations will look back in history and judge us if we made more good decisions than poor decisions to preserve their rights and their liberties.

We must not let Putin win. Democracy must prevail. This is the test of our time and our generation among our NATO allies and here in America to stand up for liberty and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

AZERBAIJAN'S ATTACK ON ARMENIA

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to condemn Azerbaijan's attack on Armenia.

Nearly 204 Armenian troops are confirmed killed or missing. It was an attack on a sovereign territory.

Speaker PELOSI's visit to Armenia is a symbol of the United States' commitment to a peaceful, prosperous Armenia that is setting up its own democratic nation. That is why I am pushing to include demining assistance and other aid for Armenia and Artsakh in the fiscal year 2023 budget.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand with the people of Armenia for all the right reasons.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

With the psalmist, let us pray.

You, O Lord, are our strength, we watch for You. You, O God, are our fortress on whom we can rely.

God, go before the men and women of Ukraine and be the shield and defense of their country against their aggressors. In Your might uproot their enemies and bring them down.

For the sins of their mouths, for the words of their lips, let those who would slander Ukraine, let them be caught in their pride. For the curses and lies they utter, consume them in Your wrath.

Deliver Ukraine, O God. Save its people from those who conspire against them for no offense or sin of their own.

Arise to help the Ukrainians. Look on their plight. We appeal to You, O Lord Almighty, the ruler of all nations.

In Your sovereign name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the Chamber her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. WILD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PERIPHERAL ARTERY DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate September as Peripheral Artery Disease, or PAD, Awareness Month.

PAD is a disease of the arteries that can cause blockages in the arms and legs, and it could lead to limb amputations. There are more than 160,000 PAD patients who lose limbs to this disease every year. African Americans are three times more likely to have a limb amputated than other Americans. That is because these patients are less likely to receive proper screenings and treatment for PAD.

That is why I created the Congressional PAD Caucus and serve as its co-chairman. I wanted to create awareness of this disease in Congress so we can provide resources for better screenings and treatments. Once we do that, we can save limbs and lives every year.

BREW ACROSS AMERICA COMPETITION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, in June, I was honored to kick off the fifth annual Brew Across America competition hosted by Anheuser-Busch.

Brew Across America brings together Members from both sides of the aisle through a friendly competition to brew their own varieties in partnership with a bipartisan buddy.

My partner and I, fellow Agriculture Committee member, Congressman SALUD CARBAJAL, may not see eye to eye on every policy issue, but we can both agree to set aside our differences over a good beer.

I invite all of my colleagues to join us, our competitors, and the Anheuser-Busch team tonight at Nationals Stadium to sample each of the bipartisan brews and help us crown a winner.

One of the awards is a People's Choice award. To participate, individuals can text the name of their favorite beer to 202–980–4023 until 7 p.m. eastern time tonight.

The smooth functioning of democracy so often relies on finding common ground to solve the toughest challenges, and we all know the process of finding common ground demands mutual respect.

Beer and agriculture—since it is a great agro product—go hand in hand, and as Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee, I remind us all to thank a farmer the next time you crack open a cold one.

UTILITIES AS A HUMAN RIGHT

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Resolution Recognizing the Human Rights to Utilities.

I read an article about a couple in their seventies in Detroit who had to melt snow in a bucket in front of their home so they can flush their toilet. That is when I knew when I came to the United States Congress, I had to introduce water as a human rights act.

Millions of our neighbors across our country right now struggle with utility insecurity, fear of shutoffs, and are subject to inhumane living conditions.

I proudly stand with Representatives BUSH and BOWMAN and other colleagues in the House in changing the conversation around what we all deserve.

The resolution ensures that everyone has access to water, sanitation, electricity, heating and cooling, public transit, and broadband communications all as a basic human right.

It is past time that we take the profit motive out of providing the basics of a good life for many of our neighbors who continue again to struggle. I appreciate everyone that is working on this issue and the advocates out there that know that this is important to our country.

HONORING DICK SCHOFIELD

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Springfield's own Dick Schofield. Dick passed away recently at age 87. He was the grandfather of my good friend Jayson Werth.

Schofield was an accomplished baseball star, spending 19 seasons in the major leagues with seven organizations. Schofield's baseball career began at Springfield High School. Just weeks after graduating, he reported to the St. Louis Cardinals. In 1960, he became a World Series champion as a pivotal member of the Pittsburgh Pirates.

Dick is one of four generations in his family to play professional baseball. He followed in his father Ducky's footsteps, and both his son Dick, and grandson Jayson, had long and successful careers in MLB as well.

Though Schofield had opportunities to stay in the league as a coach, he chose to return to his hometown of Springfield to treasure his time with his loving wife, Donna, and their three children: Kim, Dick, and Tami. Schofield proudly represented his community as an accomplished salesman and 20-year board member of the Springfield Metropolitan Exposition Authority.

As a grandfather to eight and great-grandfather to five, Dick was a true family man that cherished the time spent with all of them. I send my deepest condolences to my friend Jayson and the entire Schofield family.

Dick, may you rest in peace.

COUNTERING UNTRUSTED TELECOMMUNICATIONS ABROAD

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

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Countering Untrusted Telecommunications Abroad Act, which passed the House yesterday. I thank my colleague and friend from the other side of the aisle, Representative ANN WAGNER of Missouri, for co-leading this legislation. This bill is proof that when it comes to national and economic security challenges, we can find common ground.

The purpose of the bill is simple: to investigate and respond to vulnerabilities caused by Chinese telecommunications companies in U.S. embassies overseas and among our close allies. For too long, the world has stood by as Chinese telecoms giants have operated as vehicles for the Chinese Communist Party to commit horrific human rights violations against the Uyghur people, conduct mass surveillance and espionage, and supply technology to other repressive regimes around the world.

Securing these networks is imperative when it comes to national security and human rights, as well as for our economic security. This legislation will help us to ensure that the

telecoms infrastructure of our country and our allies is secure, effective, and made right here in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I urge our colleagues in the Senate to pass this bill.

RECOGNIZING MORTON HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Morton High School in Morton, Illinois.

At Morton, classes past and present have achieved tremendous success and a legacy of excellence carried on by the students that followed them.

As the Morton High School athletics department has grown, so has the prominence of their girls' basketball team, known as the Lady Potters. In an unprecedented record of success in eight seasons from 2015 to 2022, the Lady Potters won four Illinois State championships, three in succession. In that time, they have won 244 games and only lost 23.

Coach Bob Becker has been awarded Coach of the Year multiple times by the Illinois High School Association and was named to the Illinois Basketball Coaches Hall of Fame in 2020. This year, the class of 1972 also celebrates their 50th anniversary as graduates of Morton High School.

Morton continues to honor the legacy of the classes before them and their tremendous achievements throughout the year. Congratulations to classes past and present of Morton High School. The school pride is worthy of celebration. Keep up the great work, Potters.

HONORING SADIQA REYNOLDS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a leader in my community and a person I consider one of the most impactful individuals in the history of Louisville, Sadiqa Reynolds, in her final days as president and CEO of the Urban League of Louisville.

It was only 7 years ago that Sadiqa was an esteemed judge, a role where she conducted herself with impartiality and kept her feelings and opinions to herself. My, how times change.

As head of the Urban League, Sadiqa has held nothing back, leading with an open heart and open mind, speaking out for Louisville's marginalized communities with the passion and eloquence necessary to create positive, lasting change in people's lives.

You cannot drive Louisville's streets without seeing Sadiqa's impact. Our West End has begun a much-awaited transformation in the last few years, anchored in large part by a new world-class track and field and education complex, which she conceived and spearheaded.

Sadiqa, you have been the conscience of our community, leading the fight against injustice in historic times. We are a better city because of your leadership. We are grateful for your service and can't wait to see what you will achieve next.

RECOGNIZING SUICIDE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Suicide Awareness Month.

For families deeply affected by suicide like my own—this issue is very personal.

When I came to Congress, I decided to turn grief into a purpose by co-chairing the bipartisan Mental Health Caucus.

I have worked with my colleagues to author and pass legislation to expand pediatric mental health care, effectively implement the new 988 suicide lifeline, and reduce the shortage of mental health professionals, but there is still much more to be done.

Stigma surrounding mental illness still persists in the country big time. We are just beginning to understand the pandemic's true impact on behavioral health. If we are to make meaningful progress to reduce suicide, we need to focus on areas that produce the most in the least amount of time.

The American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, along with a growing segment of the medical community, has recognized the need to expand suicide risk screenings within our healthcare community systems. By having more patients receive these screenings, healthcare professionals can better identify and treat at-risk individuals.

Madam Speaker, suicide prevention is an issue near and dear to my heart, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in this important, lifesaving work.

HAWAIIAN HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. KAHELE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Hawaiian History Month in my home State of Hawaii.

Today, I recognize David La'amea Kalakaua, who was elected king in 1874 and served until his death in 1891. He was the first governing monarch to visit Washington and circumnavigate the globe.

In 1882, he completed the construction of Iolani Palace, the only home of royalty in the United States, which still stands today on the island of O'ahu. A man of science, King Kalakaua outfitted Iolani Palace with indoor plumbing, a telephone, and electric lights. Iolani Palace even had electricity before the White House.

A patron of Hawaiian music and dance, Kalakaua is fondly known as the Merrie Monarch. In my hometown of Hilo, the annual Merrie Monarch Hula Festival is held in his honor and attracts thousands from around the globe. This year marks the festival's 60th anniversary.

We are forever grateful to King David Kalakaua for inspiring the continuation of our people and our Native Hawaiian culture.

□ 1215

BIDEN'S BORDER CRISIS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the ongoing, unprecedented disaster that is occurring at our southern border and underscore the need for immediate action.

In August, Customs and Border Patrol agents encountered 203,597 illegal immigrants at our southern border. That was an increase of 307 percent compared to the last August of the Trump administration.

This also put the U.S. at over 2 million encounters for fiscal year 2022. This is the first time ever that we have eclipsed 2 million in a single fiscal year, and we have about 1 month to go.

Despite all these facts, Vice President HARRIS said last week that the border is secure. If our so-called border czar thinks that this is secure, it is no wonder that we are continuing to see no viable options, and this problem continues to explode without a solution.

The Biden administration must take swift and immediate action at the southern border. We must restart the border wall construction, invest in proven technologies, empower Customs and Border Patrol agents to enforce the law, and hire more Customs and Border Patrol agents to support the men and women who are already giving us honorable service there.

OPEN BORDER IS A NATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, last week, Vice President HARRIS bizarrely said the southern border is secure. The reality is more threatening and absurd.

Since Biden took office, over 3 million illegal aliens have crossed. In August alone, there were over 200,000 illegal alien encounters. This is three times the illegal crossings compared to

the last August when Donald Trump was President.

Dangerously, there are 66 trained murderers from the terrorist watch list that have crossed. Separately, half a million illegal aliens have invaded in the last year, admitted the Department of Homeland Security.

Biden and the Democrats are responsible for a national security crisis due to the open border, with American families at a greater risk of murderous attacks than ever before.

In conclusion, we will not forget 9/11. God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues, moving from a safe haven in Afghanistan to America. God bless Ukrainian victory.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 91. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 810 South Pendleton Street in Easley, South Carolina, as the ''Private First Class Barrett Lyle Austin Post Office Building''.

H.R. 92. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 Johnson Street in Pickens, South Carolina, as the ''Specialist Four Charles Johnson Post Office''.

H.R. 2142. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 Manhattan Avenue in Buffalo, New York, as the ''Indiana Hunt-Martin Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3508. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 West Main Street, in Honeoye Falls, New York, as the ''CW4 Christian J. Koch Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 3539. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 223 West Chalan Santo Papa in Hagatna, Guam, as the ''Atanasio Taitano Perez Post Office''.

H.R. 4693. An act to advance targeted and evidence-based interventions for the prevention and treatment of global malnutrition and to improve the coordination of such programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5809. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1801 Town and Country Drive in Norco, California, as the ''Lance Corporal Kareem Nikoui Memorial Post Office Building''.

H. R. 5577. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3900 Crown Road Southwest in Atlanta, Georgia, as the ''John R. Lewis Post Office Building''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5641. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to increase the threshold for eligibility for assistance under sections 403, 406, 407, and 502 of such Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3884. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 U.S. Highway 41 North in Baraga, Michigan, as the ''Cora Reynolds Anderson Post Office''.

S. 4552. An act to extend the program for authority to acquire innovative commercial items using general solicitation procedures.

S. 4553. An act to extend other transaction authority for the Department of Homeland Security.

S. 4899. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to Remedy election revocations relating to administration of COVID–19 vaccines.

S. 4900. An act to reauthorize the SBIR and STTR programs and pilot programs, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8873, PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION REFORM ACT

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1372 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1372

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8873) to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the process for the counting of electoral votes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1372, providing for consideration of H.R. 8873, the Presidential Election Reform Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, as well as one motion to recommit.

This bipartisan legislation, brought forward by Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. CHENEY of Wyoming, is the product of more than 2 years of work by the Committee on House Administration and more than a year and a half of deliberations and investigation by the January 6th Select Committee.

The electoral college, of course, has been with us from the beginning of the Republic. In a sense, this is legislation America has been working on since 1887, for the last 135 years, because that was the last time that Congress legislated to try to lend statutory coherence and legislative direction to the provisions of the Constitution governing the electoral college.

The electoral college, as you know, Madam Speaker, is a Byzantine, complex, and multifaceted institution, but it is clear, in the wake of the debacle of January 6, 2021, that we must modernize it, update it, and make it work as well as possible for as long as we have it.

That is why both supporters of the electoral college system and those who would replace it with a national popular vote for President, and that is a camp I am in, a camp that represents around two-thirds of the American people, are strongly supporting this legislation and should be supporting this legislation in order to clarify the mechanisms of our Presidential election process.

First of all, this legislation reaffirms that the Vice President's role at the count of the electoral college electors on January 6 is a ministerial role and does not include any substantive authority to count or reject or dismiss or nullify or vaporize electoral college votes sent in by the States, nor does the Vice President have any independent, substantive power to halt or delay the joint session or to return electoral college votes to the States.

We believe there was never any ambiguity about that. Former President Trump was told there was no ambiguity about it by his own Vice President, by his White House counsel, by the Attorney General of the United States, yet insisted that there was some kind of ambiguity and wiggle room for the Vice President to step outside of his assigned constitutional role and simply declare the electoral college votes of certain States, including Arizona, Georgia, and Pennsylvania, null and void and return them to the legislatures of those States for some undefined further action.

All of that is clearly outside the history of the electoral college and what is contemplated constitutionally. We clarify that in this legislation.

Moreover, the current provisions in the Electoral Count Act governing objections brought forward to the receipt of electoral college votes from particular States would be changed in this legislation.

Under the current rules, all it takes is a Member of the House and a Member of the Senate to bring an objection

to the receipt of electoral college votes from a State. That would be changed to a requirement, under this act, of one-third of the House and one-third of the Senate together raising an objection, obviously meaning that this could not be done for purely fanciful purposes. There would have to be a substantial body of Members in both Chambers who agree that there is a serious objection being made.

By the way, the Senate proposal differs slightly in that they are suggesting a one-fifth requirement on both sides as opposed to the one-third requirement that is being advanced in this legislation.

Furthermore, the rules in this statute define explicitly the constitutional grounds upon which an objection to electoral college votes can be made. These objections are limited to a very narrow set of discrete issues that are grounded in the constitutional text of the 12th Amendment or other parts of the Constitution, such as whether an elector has voted for two candidates from the elector's own State, which is clearly in violation of the 12th Amendment.

The rules also clarify the denominator, or the method of calculating the whole number of electors that have been cast for the purpose of winning a Presidential election.

Our counting rules would also clarify the applicable parliamentary procedure at the count, ensuring that strategic bad faith actors are unable to exploit procedural loopholes in an effort to delay or subvert the count.

Confusion has plagued electoral counts in Congress at different points in our history, almost since the beginning of the Republic. We are confident that under this bill, future counts will be far more orderly and ministerial in nature, even during controversial elections, and will act simply to certify the choice of the American people as expressed through the State elections, which is the full extent of Congress' counting role under the Constitution.

We want to make sure that Congress does not pretend to arrogate to itself the power to decide who is going to be the President. The role of Congress is simply to count the electoral college votes that have come in. Maybe if I get a moment later, I can get into a little more specificity about the grounds for objection.

There is also clarification of when a State's Presidential election can be extended in case of a truly catastrophic event. Today's Federal law allows a State legislature to appoint electors by itself if a State has had a failure to elect at its November election. That very vague provision is dangerous, dangerously unclear, and it was targeted by former President Trump's supporters in 2020.

Our legislation provides, instead, that voting in a State's Presidential election can only be extended if a State experiences a genuinely catastrophic event, which we define specifically with respect to natural disasters and terrorist attacks and like calamities. The event must also be widespread enough to potentially affect the outcome of the State's election. All of this is mediated judicially by appearance before a Federal court. Any extension may only cover the area that was directly affected by the event, and any extension cannot last longer than 5 days after election day.

We know that a provision like this is, unfortunately, necessary. The September 11 terror attacks on America occurred on primary election day in New York City, and Hurricane Sandy in 2012 very nearly derailed New York and New Jersey's Presidential elections that year. We are confident that our bill ensures that Federal law will account for unforeseen emergencies in future Presidential elections.

There are other provisions that I hope to get into in a little more detail, but I close, Madam Speaker, just by saying that this is an absolutely necessary and urgent update of the Electoral Count Act, which hasn't been touched since 1887.

We saw in January 2021 how some of the imperfections in the current process can be exploited by actors who are determined to derail the electoral college counting process or, indeed, overthrow the whole election. We want to do whatever we can, within the confines of the electoral college system, in this legislation to improve the situation and to prepare for the next Presidential election.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and my good friend from Maryland for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of H.R. 8873, which—let's just call it what it is—this is a partisan messaging bill from my friends across the aisle.

My colleagues want to ram this bill through Congress to change the way Presidential elections are conducted. H.R. 8873 is attempting to reform the Electoral Count Act for the first time since 1887. This is the first time in 135 years we are taking a look at this. Yet, despite that, no hearings were held on this bill, and the text was introduced just a mere 24 hours before it was presented in the Rules Committee yesterday.

During testimony before the Rules Committee, the sponsor of the bill, Chair LOFGREN, mentioned repeatedly the lengthy process they undertook to draft this bill, including consulting the country's leading so-called experts. Yet, she did not bother to bring this legislation before her own committee for consideration.

Given the majority's constant claims of democracy itself being under attack, one would think that the Democratic Party and my colleagues across the aisle would bring bills through the appropriate channels and mechanisms. But my colleagues across the aisle will also try to tell you that this bill is a reform, it is a reaction to the objections to certifying the 2020 election. However, both sides of the aisle have long used their legal authority to object to Presidential elections.

Notable individuals that have exercised this authority include no other than Hillary Clinton, Joe Biden, KAMALA HARRIS, NANCY PELOSI—and that is just to name a few.

Again, they have all used this authority to object to Presidential elections. Even our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, and someone I consider a good friend, objected to the 2016 elections. My other Rules Committee colleague and good friend from Maryland also objected.

In fact, following the 2016 election, Democrats objected to certifying the electoral votes of more States than Republicans did in 2021.

Following her loss to President Trump, Hillary Clinton continued to attack the integrity of our democratic process by insisting ad nauseam that President Trump was, ''an illegitimate President.''

Stacey Abrams—another great example—the current Georgia Democratic gubernatorial nominee, has built a national brand on denying election results and making baseless accusations of suppression and voter fraud. She claimed that she won the 2018 election for Governor and has yet to concede the 2018 race.

But we can go all the way back to 2005. Democrats objected in that year to certifying Ohio's electoral votes with Senator Barbara Boxer joining Representative Stephanie Tubbs Jones to require a vote.

Madam Speaker, 31 Members of the House voted against certifying these results; 12 of whom are still in Congress today, and I presume those 12 are now supporting this legislation, hypocritically. But this precedent goes back even further than 2005 and 2001.

We can take this back to 1961 with President John F. Kennedy. JFK—this is a great history lesson—drafted his own secret slate of electors declaring himself the winner of Hawaii's electoral votes when the State was originally called for Richard Nixon.

Let's just talk about today. Despite the history, today, the actual purpose of this bill is nothing more than an attempt to federalize our elections. This is a way to backdoor H.R. 1 into legislation.

This is nothing more than an attack on President Trump and the 2020 election, an attack on a man who has not been in office for nearly 2 years. This is about giving Congress unprecedented authority on how to interpret State law, how to restrict State discretion, and how to impose control on State election officials.

Madam Speaker, for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I was delighted to hear my friend offer those comments. I am afraid I don't really understand his objection to this legislation. He says we are trying to ram this through. After 135 years of doing nothing about the Electoral Count Act, I guess you have to be a true conservative to see 135 years as moving too quickly in reforming the provisions of this very opaque, and in places, vague and inscrutable language.

But in any event, the gentleman from Pennsylvania argues there have been times that Members of both parties have raised objections in the past. That is absolutely right. Both Republicans and Democrats have made objections on the floor in the past. Obviously, none of the objections attributed to those on our side had anything to do with a violent assault on the institutions of the country or an attempt to get the Vice President to step outside of his constitutional role, or other efforts to conduct what has been called a political coup in the country.

In any event, the gentleman is correct that there have been a lot of objections raised. If that is your problem, then you should be absolutely supporting this legislation because we are proposing to go from a situation where any single Member can raise an objection if he or she can get a Senator to join them, to a situation where you need a third of the entire House of Representatives and a third of the entire U.S. Senate before an objection can be raised. The objections can be raised only according to very specific constitutional criteria. They have to be grounded in the text of the Constitution.

For example, if a State has not been admitted yet, and yet is purporting to offer electors, that would be grounds for rejecting it and for adjusting the denominator. If there are attempts by electors to vote for two people from the same State, which is clearly in violation of the 12th Amendment, then that would be rejected.

Right now, anybody can object for any reason he or she wants. There were people in 2021 who were running around talking about precinct problems in particular States or claims of votes appearing in the middle of the night.

Now, there was nothing to any of those. More than 60 Federal and State courts rejected every claim of electoral fraud and corruption. But in any event, that is not the job of the House of Representatives to be out trying to police the counting of ballots in Pennsylvania or Arizona or Georgia, or any other State.

All we are supposed to do is take the certificate of ascertainment that is provided by the Governor based on the State legislature's determination of what the vote is in the casting of the electors from the State. So once that certificate of ascertainment comes in, our job is to accept it.

Now, if someone tries to not comply with what the will of the State really was—say, if a Governor says I disagree with how the people voted, I am not going to turn it in—then that person can be taken to court by one of the Presidential candidates, or both, or all of the Presidential candidates, and can be ordered to comply with the political will of the people of the State. If the Governor still refuses to do it, then the Court is empowered to give it to another appropriate official like the Secretary of State, who would then have the authority to file the certificate of ascertainment with the Congress of the United States and with the archivist.

So what we are trying to do is take, shall we say, an antique kind of instrument, the electoral college, and we are trying to bring it up to date, so it works for us in America in the 21st century. If your objection is it is too easy for people of any party to object, I think you totally should be supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who I should say was very much with us on January 6. He was there that night. He was the last person at the dais before we were forced to evacuate from the Chamber.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania mentioned me by name in his speech. And I just want to say, because I think it is important to clear things up, please do not compare my objections or the objections of others in the past to what happened on January 6. It is insulting.

Our objections were symbolic. What happened on January 6 was violent. It was an attempt to overthrow the government of the United States of America. It was an attempt to basically overturn the will of the American people.

Madam Speaker, we are here today because democracy faces a crisis of legitimacy, not just here at home, but around the world.

According to Freedom House, 2021 was the 16th consecutive year in which more countries declined in freedom than gained. Democracy's reach has ebbed and flowed through the decades, but it is clear that right now we are in a democratic recession.

More countries are turning toward authoritarianism than ever before. Countries we had thought were free are losing ground. Even the United States, the global bastion of democracy, has been labeled a backsliding democracy for the first time our history. This fact alone should set off alarm bells in all of our heads.

I have seen what happens when democracies fall, and I have seen the good that can come when the United States upholds democratic values around the world.

We can't preach democracy abroad when democracy is under attack at home. Because the deal is, there are people sowing the narrative that democracies cannot handle the problems of this century. There are people who advocate for authoritarian regimes that ignore the will of the people. In the global struggle between democracy and autocracy, these bad actors are a cold reminder that it isn't inevitable that democracy prevails. We have to fight like hell to make sure that it does.

Madam Speaker, all this is to say that the world is watching what we do here today. We have to make a choice, and if we make the wrong one, the consequences will be grave. No one is coming to save us. We have to save ourselves.

The Presidential Elections Reform Act addresses some serious issues with our Presidential elections. It used to be that our leaders would respect the will of the voters—win or lose. In a functional democracy, that is how it works. But now, people who don't like the results of an election feel empowered to lie and reject those results—sometimes violently.

The dismantling of our democracy won't happen all at once; it will continue to erode bit by bit until one day we will look around and see that it is too late. And the thing is, it starts with the elections.

Our elections are the keystone of our democracy. They are how the will of the people becomes the action of the government. We have a responsibility to shore up the institutions of our democracy against the forces that seek to erode them.

The Presidential Election Reform Act gives us the opportunity to do just that.

This bill is about strengthening democracy, prohibiting election officials from refusing to certify elections, clarifying that the Vice President can't just throw away electoral college votes, ensuring States only send one accurate election certificate to Congress so we don't see illegal, fraudulent slates of electors like we did in 2020.

These reforms will strengthen our elections and breathe life into our democratic institutions. Perhaps equally as important, they will send a signal to the world that American democracy is more resilient than the forces that seek to subvert it.

Madam Speaker, I know that sometimes when we talk about things like democracy or democratic institutions, it sounds abstract and lofty. Let me be perfectly clear. There is nothing abstract about this.

If we cannot ensure free and fair elections, we cannot ensure a free and fair society. We have to ask ourselves whether we believe our country should be governed with force or with consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, our government cannot work and our democracy cannot survive if we fall on different sides of this question. The choice we make matters. What we do here today matters.

This should not be partisan; it should not be controversial. We all have a stake when it comes to the survival of our democracy. If you believe that freedom and democracy are worth it and you believe in the promise of what America can be, I implore you to vote in favor of the Presidential Election Reform Act.

Vote like the future of our democracy depends on this bill, because it does.

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

Madam Speaker, I would remind my colleague and good friend from Massachusetts that he objected to Alabama in 2017, just like my good friend from Maryland objected in 2017 to Florida.

Now, as far as this bill being rammed through, I would take a minute to rebut the accusation that it hasn't been rammed through. It absolutely was.

We were given almost exactly 24 hours to look at this bill before it came to the Committee on Rules. When we had the hearing in the Committee on Rules, to my knowledge, that was the only hearing that we have had in the House because Chair LOFGREN didn't even have the foresight or the willingness to take this through her own committee process, her own committee that she chairs.

So I am just saying let's follow the process. And let's be frank about something. If this bill were just about increasing the number of necessary objectors to one-third in this Chamber and one-third in the other Chamber, it might have a chance of passing with bipartisan support. But that is not what this bill does. This bill is a backdoor for H.R. 1.

□ 1245

Let me just give you a few examples of extra material in this bill that makes it unpalatable.

This bill allows for Presidential candidates to sue to extend the voting period, even after polls have closed, due to a broadly defined catastrophic event. Then a panel of Federal judges, not State election officials, are then responsible for deciding whether States must allow for up to 5 additional days of voting. The real kicker here is that this suit must be filed no more than 1 day after the election. So you can see how a ''catastrophic event'' would probably be any Democrat that is losing on the night of the election.

Rather than working with Republicans in a bipartisan manner on a skinny form of an actual reform bill, House Democrats and the January 6 committee are desperately trying to score cheap political points on a bill that does nothing to improve the Electoral Count Act and does everything to take away constitutional and State sovereignty over elections.

Let's be blunt about something else. The American people don't care about this, especially when they are dealing with catastrophe after catastrophe and failed policy after failed policy of this administration. So while House Democrats are focusing on a partisan messaging bill that has zero chance of actually becoming law, our southern border just hit a record 2 million border crossings this fiscal year. That is the highest amount ever recorded in a single year.

Meanwhile, for the past year-and-a-half, the Biden administration has been transporting illegal immigrants from the southern border to places all over the country, often in the dead of night, and with zero notification to elected officials.

That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule immediately to consider H.R. 6592, the Immigration Transparency and Transit Notification Act of 2022.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend, who is here to explain more on this amendment.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for his leadership and for his support of this commonsense legislation.

Madam Speaker, I do rise to oppose the previous question so that we may immediately consider my bill, H.R. 6592, the Immigration Transparency and Transit Notification Act, which would provide much-needed transparency for the secret immigration flights sent by the Biden administration to my hometown and to communities across, primarily, rural America.

Thanks to their open border policies, the Biden administration has been sending hundreds of flights full of illegal immigrants into American communities, often in the dead of night. Over the last year-and-a-half, these flights have been landing in towns across America, placing thousands of illegal immigrants into communities with no prior notice, yet no one has flinched, no mainstream media attention, no outrage from the podium at the White House or Democrats in this House.

Now that Chicago, Washington, D.C., and Martha's Vineyard have received flights, now it has become a seemingly national crisis.

Remember, the Biden administration was flying thousands of these illegals secretly to middle America for well over a year now, and no one has batted an eye.

Sanctuary cities and States offering benefits to illegal immigrants and the open border rhetoric from the Biden administration continue to induce illegal immigration and likely violates Title 8 of the U.S. Code.

Republicans have endlessly called on the Biden administration and my colleagues in this House, Democrat colleagues, to secure our border and ultimately put an end to this practice of airdropping illegal immigrants into American communities. This should not be a partisan issue.

I became aware of these flights in my area only from local whistleblowers at our local airport. I engaged in good faith with DHS and HHS and was met with nothing but nontruths and empty promises. We were first told no illegals were being flown into Pennsylvania. This, of course, turned out to be completely untrue. I saw it with my own eyes.

I was also told that it was just a coincidence these flights were coming in at 2 o'clock in the morning into remote rural airports. One flight was around midnight on Christmas night.

After these meetings, I was told that I would receive notification of future flights. No such notifications were ever received, yet the flights continued.

At this point, I introduced this responsible piece of legislation to bring transparency, accountability, and decency, and local help and support to the situation.

The current situation at our border is not humane. Millions of illegals are enduring a treacherous journey, as we all know, facing perilous conditions, assault, rape, and death, all because the Biden administration's words and actions, and that of the cartels certainly, that we allow to exist, have led them to believe that they can come.

This is not humane, Madam Speaker. Nothing about the Biden administration's border policy is. When such illegals arrive on ghost flights, as mentioned, in these communities, no one on the ground has any idea where they are coming from or where they are going.

In addition to all of this, we have deadly drugs like fentanyl pouring across the border, killing over 100,000 Americans just in the past year.

The cartels are getting rich as migrants are giving away their life savings under the pretense set out by the Biden administration that they are welcomed here. The illegals are not to blame for making this journey. It is the cartels and the Biden administration's encouraging them who are to blame. The false message is out: Show up to our border and all will be fine.

As a result, our border is overrun and border communities and others across the country—yes, even now Martha's Vineyard—are now feeling the effects of this. It needs to stop.

Of course, if our southern border is secured, there would be no need for

such ghost flights to take place. Effective border policy should be fully implemented. Catch and release must end. Our border must be secured.

Until these policies change and our border is secured, I offer this legislation to bring accountability and transparency to these flights and ensure American communities are properly informed, ensure that the sponsor is legitimate and verified and safe, that we are not aiding and abetting human trafficking, and we give the State's Governor the authority to approve flights and determine if they have the means to provide the support necessary.

The schools should also be notified, Madam Speaker. How is it when 10 young children here illegally, who do not speak English, show up at a school district on a Monday morning, without notification? It is wrong. It is a terrible shame that it took flights to liberal enclaves like New York, Chicago, D.C., and Martha's Vineyard for this to be taken seriously and receive the attention that it finally deserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, our border must be secured. I think I am making my point.

Until then, this bill will bring order and transparency to this practice. I hope my Democrat colleagues are truly outraged by some of these practices, as I have outlined. I urge them to join me in defeating the previous question in support of my bill. In doing so, we will address the reality that so many communities across America have been facing for nearly 2 years. Let's act responsibly.

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

Madam Speaker, we are here to fortify the integrity of American Presidential elections, the process by which the people choose their own President. One can only regard with amazement the gentleman from Pennsylvania's casual assurance that the American people don't care about this. The American people don't care about solidifying the process by which we elect our own President? The American people don't care about whether or not a Presidential election is going to be stolen by a lot of backroom games and manipulation of the rules? I beg to differ. Even the Wall Street Journal today endorsed the legislation that we are bringing forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I would reiterate Mr. RASKIN's point that certainly the voters in Pennsylvania that I have heard from care deeply about whether or not their votes are counted.

Madam Speaker, the Presidential Election Reform Act will reinforce one of the defining American characteristics of our American experiment in democracy: the peaceful transition of Presidential power.

It is critical to that experiment that Americans have faith that our leaders will honor the will of the people when they vote. The process of counting and transmitting votes is a question of procedure and should not be treated as an opportunity to manipulate the outcome of a free and fair election as it was in the wake of the 2020 election.

I am heartened that the legislation under consideration today is a bipartisan bill. I don't care if you are a Democrat, a Republican, a conservative, a liberal, an Independent. If you love this country and believe in a government by the people, for the people, and of the people, we all have an obligation to confront the dangers posed by antidemocratic agents who try to undermine our elections, abandoning the rule of law and the peaceful transfer of power for their own personal or political gain.

I regret that we must bring this bill to strengthen the guardrails of our democracy after the subversive actions of the disgraced former President and his supporters threatened to derail our government entirely.

But we must confront those continuing threats to our electoral system, in Pennsylvania and across the Nation, where bad actors continue to promote lies about election security. To be clear, there was never justification for the efforts to overturn the 2020 election. But bad actors lied about the election results and willfully misinterpreted the law, and Members of the former President's party, whether explicitly or by their silence, continue to support these lies and baseless legal challenges.

These tactics demand the bipartisan set of reforms we are considering today to insulate our democracy from demagoguery.

I look forward to working with my colleagues of all political stripes to strengthen the guardrails of our democracy and to support and defend the Constitution.

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

Madam Speaker, I can tell you that in my area of Pennsylvania, nobody is talking about this. What they are talking about is failed economic policy, failure to support law enforcement, which is leading to both inflation, economic hardship, and some of the highest crime rates we have ever seen on record.

I would implore my colleagues across the aisle to actually talk to real Americans, not just the woke yuppies that comprise their voting base, to see what Americans care about. But something tells me that the American people will say loud and clear what they care about come November.

It is also rich hearing about all of these ''assaults on democracy.'' Let's just go back to 2019. In 2019, Hillary Clinton said: ''No, it doesn't kill me, because he knows''—meaning Trump—''that he is an illegitimate President.'' So you have the former Presidential candidate calling the former President an illegitimate President. That is clearly echoing some of the sentiments that my friends across the aisle are now accusing us of doing.

ADAM SCHIFF, for example, my colleague from California, in his opening statement for the Senate's January 2020 impeachment trial said: ''The President's misconduct cannot be decided at the ballot box, for we cannot be assured that the vote will be fairly won.'' How about that for criticizing and questioning the democratic process?

Representative John Lewis, in 2017, said: ''I don't see this President-elect as a legitimate President. I think the Russians participated in helping this man get elected, and they helped destroy the candidacy of Hillary Clinton.'' That was a baseless claim based on the Steele dossier that was discredited.

Representative JERRY MCNERNEY of California, in 2017: ''The election of Mr. Trump lacks legitimacy.''

VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, just this month—this isn't even the last Presidential election cycle. This was this month, regarding a special election. This month, when discussing MAYRA FLORES' upset victory in his upcoming election against her, said: ''They stole that last election.'' So it is quite rich hearing all of these accusations now coming from my friends across the aisle.

When we call into question election results, it is somehow a threat to democracy. When they do it, they are magically upholding democracy.

But it just doesn't stop with my friends across the aisle here in this Chamber. Let's talk about KAMALA HARRIS. She agreed with the radio show host that she should be concerned over Trump's legitimacy. She said: ''We should believe exactly what the intelligence community has told us, which is Russia did interfere in the election of the President in 2017.'' That is the now Vice President saying that.

Also, it is absolutely rich that she cites the intelligence community, when they knew the Steele dossier was a product of the Hillary Clinton campaign; the same intelligence community that wasn't able to discern that the Russian interference story was a hoax; the same intelligence community that told us that the Hunter Biden laptop was Russian disinformation, despite knowing that the FBI had that laptop in their possession at the time they made that baseless accusation; the same intel community, by the way, that told us that Kabul would stand strong for months on end and Ukraine would fall within hours. So that is the intel community that my friends across the aisle are citing.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO), my good friend, to speak more on the issue of immigration and transparency.

□ 1300

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6592, the Immigration Transparency and Transit Notification Act of 2022.

The crisis at our southern border is a threat to our national security, public safety, and public health. While this administration continues to tell the American people that all is well, fentanyl, the number one killer of young people in America, has flooded across the border at record rates; drug smugglers and human traffickers are thriving; and the migrants themselves are facing dire conditions all because President Biden told them it was okay to come here illegally.

Since Joe Biden took office, over 1 million undocumented immigrants have been allowed to resettle here. Long before border State Governors started busing migrants to sanctuary cities so they might share the burden of this crisis, President Biden was putting them on flights and buses in the dead of night and sending them to communities far north of the border without a warning to the people who live there or the officials who would become responsible for them.

The New York Post first exposed secret, dead-of-the-night flights of migrants into Westchester, New York, last year. But to date, the administration has refused all requests for transparency and accountability regarding these resettlements, this despite multiple letters from myself and other Members of Congress requesting that they stop these covert flights and provide information to Congress and local officials about who these migrants are and what vetting they received before being dropped off in our communities.

H.R. 6592 would require officials to be notified before undocumented immigrants may be placed in their jurisdiction and would provide Governors with the authority to refuse placement.

We cannot continue to turn a blind eye to the border crisis or the strain that these relocations are placing on communities across the country.

Madam Speaker, I urge this body to act and immediately consider H.R. 6592 to require transparency and accountability of the administration for the relocation of undocumented immigrants throughout the United States and put the power to oversee these relocations in the hands of people in these communities which are most affected by it.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I just want to quickly point out the false equivalency just invoked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

On the one hand, you have people of both political parties pointing out the 100 percent documented interference of Vladimir Putin in our 2016 Presidential election, with millions and millions of dollars spent on his so-called Internet Research Agency to engage in cyber surveillance, cyber espionage, and cyber sabotage of our election. On the other side, we have a violent insurrection incited by the President of the United States, where 150 of our officers were wounded and injured, ending up with broken arms, legs, jaws, and necks; concussions; contusions; and traumatic brain injury.

Those are two very different things. One is an exercise of people's First Amendment right to speak. The other is a violent effort to overthrow the electoral process and the constitutional order of the United States.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, on January 6, America witnessed the first and most serious attempt since the Civil War to stop our democracy. It was an insurrection engineered by the then-President, Donald Trump, so that he could put forth a coup and remain in power. It did not succeed.

We came here that night over blood-stained floors and smashed doors and windows, and we voted. We voted to put in place the will of the voters of America to transfer power. Fortunately, the attempt by the President was unsuccessful.

Nevertheless, in Hollywood, there is always a sequel, often to a very bad movie. We are headed for a new sequel in 2024. Unless we change the 1887 Electoral Count Act, we will see a sequel. We know, all across this Nation, that it is being set up.

There are candidates running for critical offices—secretaries of state, various county offices—with the intent to use the 1887 Electoral Count Act to put in place a sequel to the January 6, 2021, violent insurrection. It is in place now. It is an attempt happening now to have a new coup, to use the 1887 law.

We must pass this bill. We must change the law. It is ancient. It has already been proven by January 6 and the attempted coup then to use that law to install in the Presidency a person who was not legitimately elected by the people of America.

We have to do this. It is our task. It is our work, and this bill does it.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect and admiration for my good friend from California, and he knows that. But if you want to talk about sequels, let's just talk about all the times the Democrats objected to election results. We can go all the way back for decades.

Many Democrats, including Hillary Clinton, BARBARA LEE, MAXINE WATERS, and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, have cast doubt on every single Republican Presidential victory in the last two decades. In fact, every single Democrat President since 1977 has cast doubt on the legitimacy of U.S. elections.

I will just go through some of that because my good friend from California said this looks like a sequel to a bad movie. Let's just look at the current administration. In both 2013 and 2016, Biden claimed that Gore won the 2000 Presidential election. In May 2019, Biden said that he ''absolutely'' agrees that Trump is an ''illegitimate President.'' That is the current Democratic President casting doubt on elections.

It doesn't stop with him, though. Let's again go to his Vice President, KAMALA HARRIS. In 2019, the Vice President agreed that Trump was an illegitimate President.

It is just not those that were elected to office. Let's look at key senior staffers.

For nearly two decades, Biden Chief of Staff Ron Klain claimed that Al Gore won the 2000 election.

President Biden's press secretary, Karine Jean-Pierre, tweeted that the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial race was stolen. Jean-Pierre also cast doubt just not on that election but also on the 2016 election by tweeting: ''Stolen election, welcome to the world of #unpresidented Trump.''

Jamal Simmons, the communications director for KAMALA HARRIS, for years tweeted that Bush had stolen the 2000 election.

Then-Representative Marcia Fudge of Ohio, now the HUD Secretary, said that Trump ''may not be a legitimate President.''

If you are talking about sequels to bad movies, this goes all the way back to the 1970s, when my friends across the aisle undermined faith in our elections by loose talk and baseless claims that elections were stolen.

I will end the list of quotes with this because it is my good friend from Maryland. In 2002, my friend from Maryland wrote that the Supreme Court had ''[frozen] the election results'' in an ''outrageous assault on democracy,'' saying that the Court had determined the outcome of a Presidential election.

In 2003, my good friend also called Bush America's first ''court-appointed President.''

I have a litany of other quotes from my friends across the aisle, not only current Members serving in this Chamber but also well-known Democrats from across the United States that have questioned results of elections.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my friend.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Presidential Election Reform Act, but first, let me respond to my colleague from Pennsylvania, who partially quoted me in the first impeachment trial.

I did, in fact, predict that if the former President was not held accountable for trying to extort Ukraine by withholding military aid to get Ukraine's help to cheat in the election that he would go on to try to cheat in

even new and worse ways in the upcoming election. In fact, I believe I said that the odds were not 5 percent, not 10 percent, not even 50 percent, but 100 percent that he would go on to try to cheat again. In that, sadly, I was all too correct.

Over the last year, the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol has conducted a thorough investigation into the multiple lines of effort by President Trump and his allies to overturn the election, efforts that included a pressure campaign against the Vice President to violate the Constitution and assume powers he does not hold to unilaterally reject valid electoral count votes.

Our democracy held, but barely. These events have revealed underlying vulnerabilities to our democracy, vulnerabilities that could be exploited in a future Presidential election.

This bill will help ensure that the will of the American people, as expressed through their votes, cannot be overturned by any official of any political party at any time or for any purpose.

Consistent with the Constitution, it raises the threshold for challenging a slate of electors during a joint session of Congress. It reaffirms the role of the presiding officer, that it is a ministerial one. Perhaps most important, it affirms that State officials cannot change the rules of an election after the fact in an effort to overturn the will of the people, as expressed through their popular vote.

This bill will help ensure that the cornerstone of our democracy, free and fair elections and the peaceful transfer of power, remains in place for future generations of Americans. This is not a partisan task but a patriotic one.

Over the past several months, we have told the story of what happened on January 6, documenting the events for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHIFF. Now is the time for our committee and this Congress to look to the future. It is my hope that this legislation becomes one of the most significant pieces of our legacy, that it makes our Constitution, our country, and our democracy stronger and more secure.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, inflation is at the highest rate in over 40 years, literally the highest rate since I have been alive. The majority of American workers confirmed their income has fallen behind the rising cost of things like buying groceries, paying utility bills, and just filling up their gas tanks.

We have set a record for the highest illegal border crossings in 1 year, including 78 individuals on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

So far in 2022, homicide rates have increased roughly 50 percent compared to this time in 2019.

The Federal Government is also set to run out of funding in 9 days, yet here we are, focused for the second week in a row on trying to attack President Trump, a President that hasn't been in office for nearly 2 years. That is how we are spending our time.

House Democrats have chosen once again to put on yet another partisan, political show while the American people are at home suffering the consequences of their failed agenda, suffering the consequences of inflation that is out of control, wages that are dropping, energy costs that are skyrocketing, and crime rates that are making them less safe in their communities.

H.R. 8873 tramples on States' rights and would do serious harm to the integrity of our elections.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, to my dear friend from Pennsylvania, if you think that this legislation is an attack on President Trump, you simply haven't read the legislation because there is nothing in there attacking President Trump. This is about reforming the Electoral Count Act so it works for the American people.

As long as we are going to have the electoral college, we must update it and modernize it to make it work and to make sure that the will of the people is vindicated at every level—at the State level, with the Governor who has to provide the certificate of ascertainment; and then, when it comes here, we have to be able to receive it and not have the Presidential electoral process consumed by a bunch of ideological antics and tantrums.

My friend mobilizes a number of episodes of Democrats raising objections in the past. Of course, I could equal each one of those with Republicans raising objections in the past because this has become a fine bipartisan tradition in the history of the electoral college. But if you think it is too easy for people to get up and object, support our legislation because we are saying you can't make an objection until you get one-third of the House of Representatives to sign the objection to attest to its validity and its substance.

□ 1315

Then in order for it to be validated, you need not just a third of the House, you need a third of the Senate. You need bicameral adoption of the objection by a third of each body before it is even heard and then debated. So if you think that too much frivolous stuff is going on, well, then you should be supporting our legislation.

The rest of what you are saying is just complaint about political rhetoric, and I happen to like the political rhetoric pointing out that Vladimir Putin is an enemy of democracy not just in Ukraine but in the United States and all over the world. Maybe we disagree about that. I know that there are some cheerleaders for Vladimir Putin over on that side of the aisle.

In any event, remember this: Today, you can object for any reason at all, and one person can get up and do it if they can find one other person in the other Chamber, but under this legislation, under the Presidential Election Reform Act there will be a neatly cabined set of approved constitutional objections, all of them grounded in the text of the Constitution:

For example, if a State purports to submit more electoral college votes than they actually have.

For example, an elector in the Presidential election process constitutionally cannot hold another Federal office, so if they hold another Federal office that will be grounds for an objection.

For example, a President must be a natural-born citizen at least 35 years of age. So it would be a valid objection to claim that the candidate that a State is purporting to cast electors for is only 26 years old.

Also, under section 3 of the 14th Amendment, Federal office holders must not be guilty of insurrection or rebellion against the Union; something that was insisted upon by the radical Republicans after the Civil War. Therefore, that would be a legitimate ground for objection.

Presidents are limited to two terms in office, so that would be a legitimate ground for objection if a State purports to cast electors for someone who has already served two terms in office. Under Article II, section 1, clause 4, and the 12th Amendment, electors must vote on the same day throughout the Nation distinctly by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom must not be an inhabitant of the elector's State.

In other words, we finally have provided real precision and definiteness as to what is a valid objection. That doesn't mean the objection is necessarily ratified bicamerally by concurrent majorities, which is what you need in order to uphold it, but it is not a free-for-all. You can't just start finger painting on it.

To the extent that the gentleman's only substantive objection I have heard is that in the past it has been too easy for Members of both parties to raise objections, then you should absolutely be supporting this legislation.

This is a thorough legislative project that reflects the common sense and the wisdom of people who are the real experts in this field.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the previous question.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. RESCHENTHALER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1372

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6592) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to notify the relevant Federal, State, and local officials of a jurisdiction before placing a covered alien in such jurisdiction, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6592.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

The motion to commit on Senate 1098; and

Passage of Senate 1098, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—209

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sempolinski
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Crow
Herrera Beutler
Kinzinger
Vargas

□ 1406

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)
Bass (Correa)
Brown (MD) (Ruppersberger)
Bush (Bowman)
Chu (Beyer)
Conway (Valadao)
DeFazio (Pallone)
García (IL) (Correa)
Gomez (Evans)
Granger (Ellzey)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamb (Pallone)
McEachin (Beyer)
Meng (Escobar)
Moore (UT) (Curtis)
Napolitano (Correa)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Sánchez (Pallone)
Swalwell (Correa)
Trone (Ruppersberger)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)

Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—209

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sempolinski
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Kaptur
Kinzinger
Thompson (PA)
Vargas

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)
Bass (Correa)
Brown (MD) (Ruppersberger)
Bush (Bowman)
Chu (Beyer)
Conway (Valadao)
DeFazio (Pallone)
García (IL) (Correa)
Gomez (Evans)
Granger (Ellzey)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamb (Pallone)
McEachin (Beyer)
Meng (Escobar)
Moore (UT) (Curtis)
Napolitano (Correa)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Sánchez (Pallone)
Swalwell (Correa)
Trone (Ruppersberger)

CONGRESSIONAL BASKETBALL TEAM DEFEATS LOBBYISTS

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my teammates to recognize the accomplishments of the Congressional Basketball Team.

The Congressional Basketball Team won Monday's 22nd Annual Congressional Basketball game against a team of lobbyists.

We ended a drought for the Members' team going back to 2014. So we were due. We won 46–36 but most importantly, this event was sponsored by the Hoops for Youth Foundation, a not-for-profit organization that supports at-risk kids in our communities.

The Hoops for Youth Foundation was founded with the mission of creating opportunities for at-risk kids through basketball. They work to teach kids that the skills they use on the basketball court can be used every day in life to help them succeed.

It is a fun game. We come together. We won in a nice bipartisan fashion. BLAKE MOORE was the MVP. He played an outstanding game, and we congratulate him for that. It was a great team effort.

Madam Speaker, we say thank you to the non-profit that put this together for us and the success we had with raising money and having fun at the same time.

Go team House of Representatives!

JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOAN SEPARATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to commit on the bill (S. 1098) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans, offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 228, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

YEAS—202

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sempolinski
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—228

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)

Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosendale
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Kinzinger
Vargas

□ 1432

Mses. BOURDEAUX, JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BASS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)
Bass (Correa)
Brown (MD) (Ruppersberger)
Bush (Bowman)
Chu (Beyer)
Conway (Valadao)
DeFazio (Pallone)
García (IL) (Correa)
Gomez (Evans)
Granger (Ellzey)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamb (Pallone)
McEachin (Beyer)
Meng (Escobar)
Moore (UT) (Curtis)
Napolitano (Correa)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Sánchez (Pallone)
Swalwell (Correa)
Trone (Ruppersberger)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

YEAS—232

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—193

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sempolinski
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Conway
Good (VA)
Kim (CA)
Letlow
Rush
Valadao
Vargas

□ 1441

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted ''NAY'' on rollcall No. 448.

Ms. CONWAY. Madam Speaker, My proxy was unable to vote on my behalf because of an unexpected delay during the vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 448.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Napolitano (Correa)
Bass (Correa)	Kinzinger (Meijer)	Newman (Beyer)
Brown (MD) (Ruppersberger)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Bush (Bowman)	Lamb (Pallone)	Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Chu (Beyer)	McEachin (Beyer)	Sánchez (Pallone)
DeFazio (Pallone)	Meng (Escobar)	Swalwell (Correa)
García (IL) (Correa)	Moore (UT) (Curtis)	Trone (Ruppersberger)
Gomez (Evans)		
Granger (Ellzey)		

□ 1445

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 8876

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) as cosponsor of H.R. 8876, the JACKIE WALORSKI Maternal and Child Home Visiting Reauthorization Act of 2022.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE STATUE OF HARRY S. TRUMAN FROM THE PEOPLE OF MISSOURI

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present the statue of Harry S. Truman from the people of Missouri, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 44

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR CEREMONY FOR PRESENTATION OF STATUE OF HARRY S. TRUMAN FROM THE PEOPLE OF MISSOURI.

The State of Missouri is authorized to use the rotunda of the Capitol on September 29, 2022, for a ceremony to present the statue of Harry S. Truman from the people of Missouri for placement in the rotunda of the Capitol. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REVISED AND UPDATED VERSION OF THE HOUSE DOCUMENT ENTITLED ''BLACK AMERICANS IN CONGRESS, 1870–1989''

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 82, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 82

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. PRINTING OF REVISED VERSION OF "BLACK AMERICANS IN CONGRESS, 1870–1989".

(a) IN GENERAL.—An updated version of House Document 101–117, entitled ''Black Americans in Congress, 1870–1989'' (as revised by the Library of Congress), shall be printed as a House document by the Director of the Government Publishing Office, with illustrations and suitable binding, under the direction of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(b) NUMBER OF COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed such number of copies of the document referred to in subsection (a) as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of $500,000, of which—

(1) 80 percent shall be for the use of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives; and

(2) 20 percent shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION REFORM ACT

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1372, I call up the bill (H.R. 8873) to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the process for the counting of electoral votes, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1372, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8873

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 ''Presidential Election Reform Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Article II and the Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution govern how our Republic selects the President and Vice President of the United States. Article II provides that ''each state shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.'' (Constitution, article II, section 1, clause 2). Article II provides that Congress has the authority to regulate the timing of such elections by setting the ''time'' of the Presidential election and the ''day'' on which presidential electors cast their votes (Constitution, article II, section 1, clause 4). The Twelfth Amendment identifies Congress' responsibility for counting electoral votes: ''The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed.''. Congress' authorities in these respects are further bolstered by the Necessary and Proper Clause of the Constitution (article I, section 8, clause 18).

(2) ''On January 6, 2021, a mob professing support for then-President Trump violently attacked the United States Capitol in an effort to prevent a Joint Session of Congress from certifying the electoral college votes designating Joseph R. Biden the 46th President of the United States.'' Trump v. Thompson, 20 F.4th 10, 15 (D.C. Cir. 2021), cert. denied, 142 S. Ct. 1350 (2022). This constituted ''the single most deadly attack on the Capitol by domestic forces in the history of the United States.'' Trump, 20 F.4th at 35. ''Then-Vice President Pence, Senators and Representatives were all forced to halt their constitutional duties and flee . . . for safety.'' Id. at 16. ''The events of January 6, 2021 marked the most significant assault on the Capitol since the War of 1812.'' Id. at 18–19.

(3) The Electoral Count Act of 1887 should be amended to prevent other future unlawful efforts to overturn Presidential elections and to ensure future peaceful transfers of Presidential power.

(4) The reforms contained in this Act are fully consistent with States' constitutional authority vested by Article II to appoint electors; the reforms herein do not restrict the mode in which States lawfully appoint their respective electors or resolve related contests or controversies, but instead ensure that those appointments, and the votes cast by those electors, are duly transmitted to Congress.

SEC. 3. TIMING OF APPOINTING ELECTORS.

Section 1 of title 3, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', in accordance with State laws duly enacted prior to such day.''; and

(2) by striking ''in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President'' and inserting ''in each year that is evenly divisible by four''.

SEC. 4. PERMITTING EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN EVENT OF CATASTROPHIC EVENT POTENTIALLY AFFECTING OUTCOME.

(a) EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ELECTION.—Section 2 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2. Limited extension of time for appointing electors

''(a) CRITERIA FOR EXTENDING TIME FOR VOTING IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS.—If a State provides for the State's electors to be appointed by popular election pursuant to

State laws duly enacted prior to the day fixed by section 1 of this title, the time for voting in such election shall, in accordance with the procedures described in subsection (b), be extended beyond the day fixed by section 1 of this title if a candidate for President who appears on the ballot in the State demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence in an action filed under subsection (b) that—

''(1) a catastrophic event has occurred in the State;

''(2) the catastrophic event has prevented a substantial portion of the State's electorate from casting a ballot on such day, or caused a substantial portion of ballots already cast to be destroyed or rendered unreadable by such event without sufficient notice to affected voters by such day; and

''(3) the number of voters prevented from casting a ballot by such event, the number of ballots destroyed or rendered unreadable by such event, or the total of both such numbers, is sufficient in number to potentially affect the ability of that candidate to win the election with respect to one or more presidential electors.

''(b) PROCEDURES.—

''(1) AUTHORIZING FILING OF ACTION BY CANDIDATE.—A candidate for President who appears on the ballot of the State, and no other person, may file an action against the chief State election official of the State in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located to seek an extension of the time for voting in the election under this section. Such district court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction of any such action.

''(2) DETERMINATION BY THREE-JUDGE COURT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any action under this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of 3 judges convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, except that subsection (b)(2) of such section shall not apply to any such action, and any determination with respect to such an action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States.

''(B) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the district court described in paragraph (1) and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest extent possible the disposition of any action or appeal under this subsection.

''(3) CRITERIA FOR DECISION.—The court shall require the time for voting in the election to be extended under this section only if the court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the criteria of subsection (a) are met.

''(4) SCOPE OF EXTENDED VOTING PERIOD.—

''(A) PERIOD OF EXTENSION.—If the court finds that the criteria of subsection (a) are met, the court shall, except as provided in subparagraph (C), order an extended voting period that shall be for the shortest duration necessary in light of the catastrophic event justifying the extension, so long as such extended voting period concludes not later than 5 days after the day fixed by section 1 of this title.

''(B) IMPLEMENTATION OF EXTENSION.— The time for voting in an election which is extended under this section shall only be extended in the area in the State specifically and directly affected by the catastrophic event, and, to the extent practicable, all ballots cast on or prior to the day fixed by section 1 of this title that are otherwise valid under State law duly enacted prior to such day shall be counted, and voters who cast such ballots shall not be required to take further action to take into account the extension of time for the election under this section.

''(C) IMPOSSIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION.—If the court finds that the criteria of subsection (a) are met, but that it is impossible for the State to administer an extended voting period as a result of the catastrophic event, the court shall issue a declaratory judgment to that effect and, to the extent practicable, all ballots cast on or prior to the day fixed by section 1 of this title that are otherwise valid under State law duly enacted prior to such day shall be counted.

''(5) RIGHT TO INTERVENE.—Only a candidate for President who appears on the ballot of the State may intervene in an action filed with respect to the State under this subsection.

''(6) SANCTIONS.—If, on the court's own initiative or the motion of a party, the court finds that the candidate filing an action under this subsection did not have a good-faith basis for the factual or legal contentions asserted in the action, the candidate's attorneys of record and their law firms shall be jointly and severally liable for an amount equal to 3 times the full attorney's fees and other expenses incurred by each other party to the action.

''(7) DEADLINE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An action under this subsection must be filed not later than the day after the day fixed for the election by section 1 of this title.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—If the catastrophic event prevents the appropriate court from accepting the filing of an action under this subsection, the action must be filed in another district court of the United States capable of accepting the filing most proximate to the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located.

''(8) CHIEF STATE ELECTION OFFICIAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'chief State election official' has the meaning given such term in section 253(e) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21003(e)).

''(c) CATASTROPHIC EVENT DEFINED.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'catastrophic event' means a major natural disaster, an act of terrorism, or a widespread power outage, so long as such event is on a scale sufficient to prevent a substantial portion of a State's electorate from casting a ballot on the day fixed by section 1 of this title, or such event causes a substantial number of ballots already cast in a State to be destroyed or rendered unreadable.

''(2) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In paragraph (1)—

''(A) the term 'act of terrorism' means an activity that involves acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, and that appear to be intended—

''(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

''(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

''(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and

''(B) the term 'major natural disaster' means any natural catastrophe (including any hurricane, tornado, historically significant widespread snowstorm, historically significant widespread flooding, historically significant destructive fire, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, or volcanic eruption that causes great damage or loss of life).

''(d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

''(1) to limit the application of any State or Federal protection of the right to vote in an election during the period during which the time for voting is extended under this section;

''(2) to preclude a court in an action filed under subsection (b) from ordering sanctions otherwise authorized by law; or

''(3) to affect the manner in which, or circumstances under which, other elections under other provisions of law may be postponed or extended.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE MAYOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Section 21 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) 'Governor' includes the Mayor of the District of Columbia.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 1 of such title is amended by amending the item relating to section 2 to read as follows:

''2. Limited extension of time for appointing electors.''.

SEC. 5. TIMING OF ENACTMENT OF LAWS PROVIDING FOR VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE.

Section 4 of title 3, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''by law'' and inserting ''by laws duly enacted prior to the day fixed by section 1 of this title for the appointment of electors''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Vacancies occurring after the day fixed by section 1 of this title for the appointment of electors shall be filled only by alternative electors appointed under State law pursuant to this section.''.

SEC. 6. REPEAL OF "SAFE HARBOR" RULES FOR DETERMINATION OF CONTROVERSY REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORS.

(a) REPEAL.—Title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking section 5.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 5.

SEC. 7. CERTIFICATES OF APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 6. Credentials of electors; transmission to Archivist of the United States and to Congress; enforcement; public inspection

''(a) DUTIES OF GOVERNOR WITH RESPECT TO CERTIFICATION OF ELECTORS.—

''(1) OBLIGATION TO CERTIFY.—Not later than December 14, the Governor of each State shall certify the appointment of the electors for the State in compliance with section 1 or, if applicable, section 2 of this title.

''(2) TRANSMISSION TO ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES.—The Governor of a State shall, immediately after certifying the appointment of electors for the State under paragraph (1)—

''(A) transmit under the seal of such State the certificate of the appointment of electors under paragraph (1) to the Archivist of the United States by the most expeditious method available and by secure electronic transmission; and

''(B) make such certificate publicly available on the date of such transmission to the Archivist.

''(3) TRANSMISSION OF DUPLICATE-ORIGINALS TO ELECTORS.—The Governor of a State shall deliver to the electors of such State 6 duplicate-originals of the certificate described in paragraph (2) under the seal of the State not later than the date specified in section 7 of this title.

''(b) PRESERVATION AND TRANSMISSION OF CERTIFICATE.—The Archivist of the United States shall—

''(1) preserve any certificate received under subsection (a) for 1 year as part of the public records of the office of the Archivist open to public inspection; and

''(2) immediately transmit to the two Houses of Congress copies in full of each such certificate received by the most expeditious

method available and by secure electronic transmission.

''(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) ACTIONS AGAINST GOVERNOR.—

''(A) ACTIONS AUTHORIZED.—Any candidate for President or Vice President who appears on the ballot in a State who is aggrieved by a violation of subsection (a) with respect to such State, including by failing to certify the appointment of electors or because the certification does not accurately reflect the final election results of the State as modified by any recount or judicial or administrative proceeding conducted pursuant to State or Federal laws duly enacted prior to the day fixed by section 1 of this title, may file an action against the Governor for such declaratory, injunctive, or other appropriate relief in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located to ensure the issuance and transmission of the certificate of appointment in compliance with the requirements of subsection (a), the Constitution of the United States, and any other Federal law.

''(B) RELIEF.—Such district court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction of any such action and shall issue any appropriate relief, including, in appropriate cases, injunctive relief ordering the Governor of the State to issue, transmit, or revise the certificate of appointment of electors under subsection (a)(1), or other appropriate relief sufficient to ensure the transmission of the lawful certificate of appointment. If the Governor refuses to issue, transmit, or revise such certificate in compliance with the district court's order, the court shall direct another official of the State to issue, transmit, or revise the certificate of appointment of electors under such subsection.

''(2) ACTIONS AGAINST ARCHIVIST.—Any candidate for President or Vice President who appears on the ballot in a State who is aggrieved by a violation of subsection (b) with respect to the failure of the Archivist to transmit a certificate of appointment may file an action for such declaratory, injunctive, or other appropriate relief in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and such district court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction of any such action, and shall issue any relief necessary to ensure the transmission of the certificate of appointment in compliance with the requirements of subsection (b).

''(3) DETERMINATION BY THREE-JUDGE COURT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any action described in this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of 3 judges convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, except that subsection (b)(2) of such section shall not apply to any such action, and any determination with respect to such an action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States.

''(B) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—The court described in subparagraph (A) shall issue any relief under this subsection as promptly as possible but in no case later than December 19 such that a final order of the court on remand of the Supreme Court of the United States may occur not later than December 22.

''(d) CONCLUSIVE EFFECT OF CERTIFICATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the joint session of Congress to count electoral votes pursuant to section 15 of this title, the certificate of appointment transmitted by the Governor of a State under subsection (a)(2), subject to any modification pursuant to a court order under subsection (c)(1), shall be accepted as conclusive with respect to the appointment of electors for such State, except that, in the case no such certificate is transmitted by the Governor of a State, or the certificate transmitted by the Governor does not comply with revisions ordered by the court pursuant to subsection (c)(1), the certificate of appointment for the State transmitted by another official of the State pursuant to a court order under subsection (c)(1) shall be accepted as conclusive with respect to the appointment of electors for such State.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO FINAL DETERMINATION OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDING.—In the case that a certificate of appointment is subject to a final determination by a Federal and a State judicial proceeding, the certificate as modified by the final determination of the Federal judicial proceeding shall be accepted as conclusive with respect to the appointment of electors for such State to the extent that there is any inconsistency between such determinations.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt any action conducted pursuant to State law duly enacted prior to the day fixed by section 1 of this title or affect the right of any person to bring an action under any other Federal law.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 1 of such title is amended by amending the item relating to section 6 to read as follows:

''6. Credentials of electors; transmission to Archivist of the United States and to Congress; enforcement; public inspection.''.

SEC. 8. DATE OF MEETING AND VOTE OF ELECTORS.

Section 7 of title 3, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December'' and inserting ''the twenty third of December''; and

(2) by inserting '', except that if the twenty third of December falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the electors shall meet and give their votes, in the case of a Saturday, on the preceding day, and, in the case of a Sunday, on the following day'' after ''State shall direct''.

SEC. 9. DISPOSITION OF CERTIFICATES AND LISTS.

(a) ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION OF CERTIFICATES OF ELECTORS.—Section 11 of title 3, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the undesignated paragraph beginning with ''First.'', by striking ''registered mail'' and all that follows and inserting ''the most expeditious method available to the President of the Senate at the seat of government and shall, on the same day, transmit a facsimile of the same in a secure, electronic manner.''; and

(2) in the undesignated paragraph beginning with ''Third.''—

(A) by striking ''registered mail'' and inserting ''the most expeditious method available''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''They shall, on the same day, transmit facsimiles of the same to the Archivist of the United States in a secure, electronic manner.''.

(b) FAILURE OF CERTIFICATES TO BE DELIVERED.—

(1) DEMAND ON STATE.—Section 12 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''the fourth Wednesday in December'' and inserting ''December 30''; and

(B) by striking ''registered mail'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''the most expeditious method available to the President of the Senate at the seat of government and to immediately transmit a facsimile of the same in a secure, electronic manner.''.

(2) DEMAND ON JUDGE.—Section 13 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''votes'' each place it appears and inserting ''votes and list'';

(B) by striking ''the fourth Wednesday in December'' and inserting ''December 30''; and

(C) by striking ''list by the hand'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''certificate and list by the hand of such messenger to the seat of government and shall immediately transmit a facsimile of the same in a secure, electronic manner.''.

(c) INCREASE IN PENALTY FOR NEGLECT OF DUTY.—Section 14 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''electors'' and inserting ''electors and list''; and

(2) by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$25,000''.

SEC. 10. COUNTING ELECTORAL VOTES IN CONGRESS.

(a) PROCEDURES AT JOINT SESSION.—Section 15 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 15. Counting electoral votes in Congress

''(a) PROCEDURES AT JOINT SESSION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress shall be in session on the sixth day of January succeeding every meeting of the electors. The Senate and House of Representatives shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives at the hour of 1 o'clock in the afternoon on that day, and the President of the Senate (or, in the absence of the President, the President pro tempore) shall be their presiding officer. Such joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives shall not be dissolved until the count of electoral votes shall be completed and the result of such count declared.

''(2) AUTHORITY OF PRESIDING OFFICER AT JOINT SESSION.—

''(A) POWER TO PRESERVE ORDER.—The presiding officer shall have power to preserve order, and no debate shall be allowed and no question shall be put by the presiding officer except as provided by this section.

''(B) NO DISCRETIONARY POWER.—The role of the presiding officer is ministerial. Except with respect to the procedures described in this section, the presiding officer shall not have any power to determine or otherwise resolve disputes concerning the proper list of electors for a State, the validity of electors for a State, or the votes of electors of a State. Except as provided for in this section, the presiding officer shall not order any delay in counting or preside over any period of delay in counting electoral votes.

''(3) READING OF CERTIFICATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The presiding officer shall, in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A, open the sealed certificate in which is contained the signed certificates of votes and the annexed list of electors appointed for each State, and shall read aloud the names of the list of electors appointed for each State according to the certificate received. The presiding officer shall present the certificate of electoral votes cast by the State's appointed electors to the tellers for the purpose of reading such certificates pursuant to subparagraph (B).

''(B) READING OF CERTIFICATES BY TELLERS.—Two tellers shall be previously appointed on the part of the Senate and two on the part of the House of Representatives. Upon the reading by the tellers of any such certificate of electoral votes, the presiding officer shall call for objections to such certificate pursuant to the rules described in subsection (c), if any.

''(C) RESULT OF ELECTORAL VOTE COUNT.—After having read the certificates of each State in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, the tellers shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the certificates, and the votes having been ascertained and counted according to the requirements of this section, the result shall be delivered

to the presiding officer, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote. Such announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and shall, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

''(4) MOTIONS IN ORDER AT JOINT SESSION.—No motion shall be received in the joint session except—

''(A) a motion pursuant to subsection (b) of this section in relation to the appointment of electors from a State; or

''(B) a motion to recess.

''(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR ACTIONS IN ORDER AT JOINT SESSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An objection, appeal, or motion shall not be received by the presiding officer unless such action—

''(i) is submitted in writing and states clearly and concisely, and without argument, the ground for such action;

''(ii) is signed by at least one third of each House of Congress; and

''(iii) in the case of a motion to recess, states a time certain, in accordance with paragraph (6), at which the joint session will resume proceedings.

''(B) RESTRICTION ON MOTION TO RECESS.—A Senator or Representative may sign only one motion to recess received by the presiding officer during joint session proceedings with respect to a single State.

''(C) APPEALS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If an appeal is submitted in accordance with subparagraph (A)(i), the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall maintain the written appeal at the desk and the presiding officer shall provide Senators and Representatives with a sufficient opportunity to sign it before proceeding which shall not exceed 15 minutes.

''(ii) PROHIBITION AGAINST WITHDRAWAL OF APPEAL.—An appeal submitted in accordance with subparagraph (A)(i) may not be withdrawn following submission, and only one such appeal may be submitted with respect to a ruling of the presiding officer.

''(iii) FORM.—The presiding officer shall put the question on any appeal as follows: 'Shall the decision of the presiding officer be overturned?'.

''(D) THRESHOLD TO ADOPT.—A majority vote of both Houses shall be required for the adoption of any question received during the joint session, except that a majority vote of either House shall be required for the adoption of a motion to recess.

''(6) RECESS.—A motion to recess must state the time certain for the resumption of proceedings in the joint session, the Senate, or the House, and may not state a time beyond the next calendar day at the hour of 10 o'clock in the forenoon. If the proceedings of the joint session have not been completed in three calendar days, no further recess may be taken.

''(7) DEBATE.—

''(A) DEBATE OF CERTAIN ACTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), any question received by the presiding officer pursuant to paragraph (5) shall be reported in the joint session, and such question shall be submitted to each House, which shall each withdraw for a period of debate described in subparagraph (B).

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR MOTION TO RECESS.—A motion to recess shall not be subject to debate.

''(B) LENGTH OF DEBATE.—The time for debate of any question shall be limited to—

''(i) in the case of any motion that is made under subsection (b), two hours equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader of each House or their respective designees;

''(ii) in the case of any objection that is made under subsection (c), two hours equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader of each House or their respective designees; and

''(iii) in the case of any appeal of a decision of the presiding officer, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader of each House or their respective designees.

''(C) SINGLE DEBATE FOR MULTIPLE MOTIONS IN RELATION TO APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORS.—If more than one motion in relation to the appointment of electors from a State is made under subsection (b) that satisfies the requirements of paragraph (5), such motions shall be debatable for a single period of two hours as provided in subparagraph (B)(i).

''(D) SINGLE DEBATE FOR MULTIPLE OBJECTIONS.—If more than one objection with respect to any vote from a State is made under subsection (c) that satisfies the requirements of paragraph (5), such objections shall be debatable for a single period of two hours as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii).

''(E) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING LENGTH OF DEBATE.—If the proceedings of the joint session have not been completed in five calendar days, the presiding officer may reduce the length of debate for any question to not less than 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader of each House or their respective designees.

''(b) RULES FOR IDENTIFYING THE DULY APPOINTED ELECTORS OF A STATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The presiding officer shall announce the electors whose appointments are reflected in a certificate that is received under section 6 of this title. Pursuant to section 6 of this title, such electors shall be the conclusive appointed electors for the State, and in no case shall the presiding officer or the joint session consider any other person to be an appointed elector for a State.

''(2) MOTIONS IN RELATION TO THE APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORS.—After the declaration of the presiding officer under paragraph (1) with respect to a State, the following motions may be submitted:

''(A) A motion to reject the declaration of the appointment of electors for the State by the presiding officer under paragraph (1) on the grounds that the certificate of appointment presented by the presiding officer is not conclusive under section 6 of this title and to receive a certificate of appointment from the State that is conclusive under section 6 of this title.

''(B) In the absence of any presentation of a certificate from a State by the presiding officer, a motion to receive a certificate of appointment from the State that is conclusive under section 6 of this title.

''(3) VOTING BY THE HOUSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—When all motions offered pursuant to paragraph (2) with respect to a State have been received and read in the joint session, the Senate shall thereupon withdraw, and such motions shall be submitted to the Senate for its decision, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall submit such motions to the House of Representatives for its decision.

''(B) ANNOUNCEMENT OF DECISION.—When the two Houses have voted, they shall immediately resume proceedings in the joint session, and the presiding officer shall announce the decision on any such motions.

''(4) ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORS.—If a motion under paragraph (2) is adopted, the presiding officer shall declare the list of electors that was received under such motion to be the appointed electors for the State.

''(c) OBJECTIONS TO CERTIFICATE OF ELECTORAL VOTES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Once the joint session has identified the duly appointed electors of a State pursuant to the procedures described in subsection (a) and the rules described in subsection (b), the presiding officer shall call for objections, if any, to one or more electoral votes cast by the electors of the State on the grounds specified in paragraph (2). No votes from a State shall be acted upon until any objections made to the votes from a State under this subsection have been decided.

''(2) GROUNDS FOR OBJECTIONS.—To raise an objection under this subsection, a Member must submit such objection pursuant to the requirements of subsection (a)(5) and specify in writing the number of electoral votes objected to and one of the following grounds for the objection:

''(A) The State in question was not validly a State at the time its electors cast their electoral votes and is thus not entitled to such votes, except that such objection may not be raised with respect to the District of Columbia.

''(B) The State in question submitted more votes than it is constitutionally entitled to, and thus a corresponding number of its purported votes should be rejected.

''(C) One or more of the State's electors are constitutionally ineligible for the office of elector under article II, section I, clause 2 or section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, except if a State has replaced the ineligible elector with an eligible elector pursuant to the authority described in section 4 of this title prior to the casting of electoral votes by its electors, then it shall not be in order to cite the initial appointment of the ineligible elector as grounds for raising an objection under this subparagraph.

''(D) One or more of the State's electoral votes were cast for a candidate who is ineligible for the office of President or Vice President pursuant to—

''(i) article I, section 3, clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States;

''(ii) article II, section 1, clause 5 of the Constitution of the United States;

''(iii) section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; or

''(iv) section 1 of the Twenty-second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

''(E) One or more of the State's electoral votes were cast in violation of the requirements enumerated by article II, section 1, clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States by failing to vote on the date specified in section 7 of this title, or one or more of the State's electoral votes were cast in violation of the Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States by failing to be cast—

''(i) by ballot; or

''(ii) distinctly for the offices of President and Vice President, one of whom is not an inhabitant of the elector's State.

''(3) VOTING BY THE HOUSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—When all objections offered pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to a State have been received and read in the joint session, the Senate shall thereupon withdraw, and such objections shall be submitted to the Senate for its decision, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall submit such objections to the House of Representatives for its decision.

''(B) ANNOUNCEMENT OF DECISION.—When the two Houses have voted, they shall immediately resume proceedings in the joint session, and the presiding officer shall announce the decision on any such objections.

''(d) EFFECT OF REJECTION OF ELECTORAL VOTES.—

''(1) EFFECT OF REJECTION OF ELECTORAL VOTES.—If a State's electoral votes are rejected under subsection (c)(2)—

''(A) in the case a State's electoral votes are rejected pursuant to an objection under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of such subsection, the whole number of electors appointed for purposes of the Twelfth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States shall be reduced by the number of rejected electoral appointments; and

''(B) in the case a State's electoral votes are rejected pursuant to an objection under subparagraph (D) or (E) of such subsection, the whole number of electors appointed for purposes of the Twelfth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States shall be unaffected.

''(2) CONSTITUTIONAL INELIGIBILITY.—For the purposes of section 3 of the Twentieth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, in the case an objection is sustained under subsection (c)(2)(D)—

''(A) the electoral votes cast for such candidate shall be counted for the purposes of determining whether the candidate has been elected under such amendment;

''(B) such candidate shall be deemed to have failed to qualify under such amendment; and

''(C) subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall apply with respect to any electoral votes cast for such candidate from any other State that are otherwise valid under this section, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit a Member from objecting to any such electoral votes on other grounds described in subsection (c)(2).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking sections 16 through 18.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 16 through 18.

SEC. 11. PROTECTION OF TABULATION AND CERTIFICATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—With respect to an election for the office of President, Vice President, or presidential elector, no person acting under color of law shall willfully fail or refuse to—

(1) tabulate, count, or report any vote that is timely cast and is otherwise valid under applicable State and Federal law; or

(2) certify the aggregate tabulations of such votes or certify the election of the candidates receiving sufficient such votes to be elected to office.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) AUTHORIZING FILING OF ACTION BY CANDIDATE.—Any candidate for President, Vice President, or presidential elector who appears on the ballot in a State who is aggrieved by a violation of subsection (a) may file an action for such declaratory and injunctive relief as may be appropriate in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THREE-JUDGE COURT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An action described under this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of 3 judges convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, except that subsection (b)(2) of such section shall not apply to any such action, and any determination with respect to such an action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States.

(B) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the district court described in this subsection and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest extent possible the disposition of any action or appeal under this subsection.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt any action conducted pursuant to State law duly enacted prior to the day fixed by section 1 of title 3, United States Code, or affect the right of any person to bring an action under any other Federal law.

SEC. 12. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8873 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8873, the Presidential Election Reform Act.

This bipartisan bill is a product of over 2 years of work, first on the Committee on House Administration and subsequently on the January 6th Select Committee.

Working in partnership with Representative LIZ CHENEY, we have had extensive consultation with bipartisan law professors, former judges, and other experts. We have engaged in a fulsome, thoughtful, nonpartisan process, and where Ms. CHENEY and I didn't always agree, we compromised, in the great tradition of the legislative process.

I thank my friend, colleague, and the vice chair of the January 6th Committee, LIZ CHENEY. Her partnership, leadership, intelligence, and, frankly, her courage have been invaluable to the select committee's work and to the development of this bill.

I want to be very clear: In revising the Electoral Count Act and related laws, that in no way condones the actions of the ex-President and his allies. Indeed, Dr. John Eastman openly admitted that his plan violated the Electoral Count Act. President Trump was told the same.

But this bill will make it harder to convince people that they have the right to overthrow the election. Here are a few things the bill does.

First, this bill reaffirms that the Vice President's authority at the electoral count is ministerial. The Vice President's authority has always been ministerial and always will be ministerial, but as we saw in 2020, former President Trump and his allies sought to unlawfully exploit the ECA to suggest otherwise.

The bill will also enact new electoral counting rules for Congress. Previously, just a few Members of each House were able to derail the proceedings with frivolous objections. That will no longer be the case.

Under this bill, no objection will be heard unless one-third of each House supports it, and the only objections that will be permitted are those that are rooted in the Constitution itself, a narrow set of issues.

The bill also prevents State and local election subversion. For example, Governors will be required to submit their State's lawful certificate of appointment, and Federal courts will be empowered to force them to do so if they refuse.

Ultimately, this bill is about protecting the will of the American voters, which is a principle that is beyond partisanship. The bottom line is this: If you want to object to the vote, you better have your colleagues and the Constitution on your side. Don't try to overturn our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important today to begin by taking a step back, provide some important context about the bill we are considering today, and reestablish some important facts.

Election administration and the way elections work is a complicated process. For most of us, this experience typically consists of showing up, casting a ballot, and then digesting news coverage of results. Very few people realize everything that goes on behind the scenes.

But recently, as election administration has come into the forefront, there are a lot of people who all of a sudden seem to think that they are an expert on the subject. This includes many of the people in these buildings and in the press.

Many of those folks have never been on the ground in election offices across the country and couldn't tell the difference between an e-pollbook and a high-speed ballot scanner, yet they know they are right.

This has led to all sorts of rumors, narratives, and misinformation across the political spectrum to percolate within our society, and that has caused people to lose faith in our elections. This is a huge problem.

I have spent the past few years traveling the country to learn about different State election processes and have met with countless Republican and Democrat election administrators.

I have learned about the checks and balances in place.

Free and fair elections are the bedrock of our democracy, and we must ensure people can have faith in elections and election processes and outcomes in order for our democracy to continue to thrive.

Unfortunately, one false narrative that has been pushed by my colleagues on the other side is that Republican Members of Congress are election subverters or deniers, trying to overthrow elections because of an objection to a State's electoral slate on January 6. This has been fueled by members of the media who don't understand the subject.

They are claiming that this particular action was unprecedented and an affront to democracy. However, so many of them, including powerful committee chairs that are in power today, have objected in the past. In fact, Democrats have objected to every single Republican Presidential win in the 21st century.

Another false narrative is that somehow the legal actions taken by the Trump campaign, the rhetoric of former President Trump, Republican Members of Congress voting to object to a State's electors, and the illegal actions of many people who attacked the Capitol on January 6 were all connected in some kind of mass conspiracy by Republicans to stage a coup.

These two narratives are now presented on a daily basis as though they are fact, but that is quite simply not true. The fact of the matter is, there are longstanding legal frameworks in place to adjudicate disputes in election outcomes that have been utilized regularly, regardless of party.

There is not enough time today to go through all of them, but the point is these processes have existed for a long time, and they are used frequently and often by candidates of all political stripes.

There are checks, balances, and safeguards woven in throughout the system. The goal of every election framework is to ensure the person who takes the oath of office is the one who actually won. That is true in the States, in the courts, and here in Congress.

The best news of all is these systems have worked. At the end of the day, the outcomes were exactly as they should have been. It is why people can and should have faith in our election system.

This isn't to say that our system is perfect. There is always room for improvement, but unfortunately, that is not what is happening here today.

The Electoral Count Act has been in place for over a century and directly implements constitutional provisions. Members of all political parties have exercised their rights under the provisions of that law to raise constitutional objections to State electoral slates if they determine something may be improper. This is not an affront to democracy. Frankly, it is democracy in action.

In fact, Democrats have quite an extensive history of objecting to the electoral count. I include in the RECORD a list of over 80 Democrats denying election results, including many chairs, people like Chairperson MAXINE WATERS, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, Representative JAMIE RASKIN, and many others here today.

COMMITTEE ON REPUBLICANS HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Ranking Member, RODNEY DAVIS,

DEMOCRAT OBJECTORS SINCE 2000

2000 (JAN. 2001)

Rep. Alcee Hastings,
Rep. Jesse L. Jackson Jr.
Rep. Maxine Waters
Rep. Ted Deutch
Rep. Carrie Meek
Rep. Corrine Brown
Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson
Rep. Elijah Cummings
Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee
Rep. Barbara Lee
Rep. Cynthia McKinney
Rep. Patsy T. Mink
Rep. Eva Clayton
Rep. Bob Filner

2004 (JAN. 2005)

Sen. Barbara Boxer
Rep. Stephanie Tubbs Jones

2016 (JAN. 2017)

Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee
Rep. Pramila Jayapal
Rep. Jim McGovern
Rep. Jamie Raskin
Rep. Barbara Lee
Rep. Raul Grijalva
Rep. Maxine Waters

---

1. Hillary Clinton denied the results of the 2000 and 2016 presidential elections, believed there were legitimate questions regarding the integrity of the 2004 presidential election, and said that Stacey Abrams would have won the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election against Gov. Brian Kemp if it had been fair.

2. President Joe Biden has previously claimed that Gore won the 2000 presidential election and agreed that Trump was an ''illegitimate president.''

3. Vice President Kamala Harris has previously agreed that Trump was an ''illegitimate president'' and claimed that without voter suppression, Abrams would have won the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election and Andrew Gillum would have won the 2018 Florida gubernatorial election.

4. Former President Bill Clinton claimed that Gore actually won the 2000 presidential election.

5. Former President Jimmy Carter claimed that Gore was the real winner of the 2000 presidential election and that Trump lost the 2016 presidential election.

6. Former President Barack Obama, when he was an Illinois senator, said that not every vote was counted in the 2000 presidential election.

7. John Kerry, President Biden's special presidential envoy for climate, claimed voters were ''denied their right to vote'' in the 2004 presidential election and reportedly told New York University professor Mark Crispin Miller that he believed the election was stolen.

8. Kerry's wife, Teresa Heinz Kerry, also said the 2004 presidential election could have been stolen.

9. Stacey Abrams, the current Georgia Democratic gubernatorial nominee, has claimed that she won the 2018 election for governor of her state.

10. Former Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe, who was the DNC chairman 2001–2005, claimed that Gore won the 2000 presidential election.

11. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D–Calif.) praised then-Sen. Barbara Boxer's (D–Calif.) objection to the certification of Ohio's electoral votes in the 2004 presidential election.

12. Rep. Bennie Thompson (D–Miss.), chairman of both the Homeland Security and Jan. 6 committees, objected to the electoral votes from the state of Ohio for the 2004 presidential election.

13. House Majority Whip James Clyburn (D–S.C.) questioned the integrity of the 2000 presidential election when he was chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral votes in the 2004 presidential election.

14. Sen. Ed Markey (D–Mass.), when he was a congressman, voted to reject the electoral votes from the state of Ohio for the 2004 presidential election.

15. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I–Vt.), when he was a congressman during the certification of the 2004 presidential election, said he was ''worried'' that there wasn't a paper trail for electronic voting machines in case of recounts. After the 2016 presidential election, Sanders said he was ''concerned'' about ''the role Russian hacking played in getting [Trump] elected.''

16. Then-Sen. Barbara Boxer (D–Calif.) was the only senator to join 31 House Democrats in rejecting the electoral votes from the state of Ohio for the 2004 presidential election.

17. Rep. Maxine Waters (D–Calif.), Financial Services Committee chair, objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election and the certification of Ohio's electoral votes in the 2004 presidential election. She also tried to get a senator to join her in a letter of objection after the electoral votes for Wyoming were announced during the certification of the 2016 presidential election.

18. Rep. Jamie Raskin (D–Md.), who is a member of the January 6th Committee and was a House impeachment manager during Trump's second impeachment, said Bush was a ''court-appointed president'' following 2000 election, and objected to certifying the electoral votes for Florida in the 2016 presidential election.

19. Rep. Jerry Nadler (D–N.Y.), chairman of the Judiciary Committee, claimed there were irregularities in the 2004 presidential election and called Trump ''an illegitimate president.''

20. Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D–Texas), a senior member of the Judiciary, Homeland Security and Budget committees, objected to ''Florida's inaccurate vote count'' in the 2000 presidential election, objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral votes in the 2004 presidential election, and objected to several states' electoral votes in the 2016 presidential election.

21. Rep. Barbara Lee (D–Calif.) objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election, objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral votes in the 2004 presidential election, and objected to the certification of Michigan's electoral votes in the 2016 presidential election.

22. Rep. Raúl Grijalva (D–Ariz.), Natural Resources Committee chairman, objected to Ohio's electoral votes in the 2004 presidential election and objected to North Carolina's electoral votes for the 2016 presidential election.

23. Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D–Texas), when she was chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, said there was ''overwhelming evidence'' that Bush did not win the 2000 presidential election and objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election. She also objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

24. Then-Rep. John Lewis (D–Ga.) didn't believe Trump was legitimately elected in 2016 and voted to not certify Ohio's electoral vote in the 2004 presidential election.

25. Rep. Frank Pallone (D–N.J.), Energy and Commerce Committee chairman, objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral vote in the 2004 presidential election.

26. Then-Rep. Elijah Cummings (D–Md.) objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election.

27. Then-Rep. Jesse Jackson, Jr., (D–111.) asked if it was too late for a Democratic senator to sign an objection to the electoral votes for Florida in the 2000 presidential election. He also objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

28. Rev. Jesse Jackson, Sr., said that the 2000 election was ''essentially taken and stolen'' from Gore and suggested that the 2004 presidential election was won through fraud.

29. Then-Rep. Patsy Mink (D–Hawaii) objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election.

30. Rep. Danny K. Davis (D–Ill.), chairman of a Ways and Means subcommittee, objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral vote in the 2004 presidential election.

31. Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D–Ill.), the current senior chief deputy whip, objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral vote in the 2004 presidential election and said the 2016 presidential election was ''tainted by foreign interference and voter suppression.''

32. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D–Calif.) believed the 2016 presidential election outcome was altered by Russian interference.

33. Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D–Fla.), former DNC chairwoman, said that Gore won the 2000 election and that the 2016 election outcome was affected by Russian interference for Trump.

34. Then-Rep. Corrine Brown (D–Fla.) didn't believe Bush was elected in the 2000 presidential election and objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election. She also objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral votes in the 2004 presidential election.

35. Then-Sen. Ted Kennedy (D–Mass.) approved of Democrats' efforts to contest the 2004 presidential election.

36. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., claimed the 2004 presidential election was stolen.

37. Then-Rep. Stephanie Tubbs Jones (R–Ohio) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

38. Then-DNC Chairman and former Vermont governor Howard Dean claimed there was voter suppression by Republicans in the 2004 presidential election, that the electronic voting machines weren't reliable, and said there wouldn't ''be any more election stealings.'' Following the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election, he said that Abrams shouldn't concede and that it was ''almost certainly stolen.''

39. Then-Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid (D–Nev.) was concerned about the integrity of electronic voting machines in the 2004 presidential election.

40. Sen. Dick Durbin (D–Ill.) praised Boxer for objecting to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

41. Then-Sen. Tom Harkin (D–Iowa) praised Tubbs Jones for objecting to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election and raised concerns about Republicans suppressing the vote and possible fraud with electronic voting machines.

42. Then-Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D–N.J.) claimed there was ''systematic voter disenfranchisement'' and issues with voting machines.

43. Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D–Mich.) raised concerns about voting machines used in the 2004 presidential election.

44. Sen-Rep. Sherrod Brown, (D–Ohio) when he was a congressman, said there were voters ''who lost their right to vote'' in Ohio during the 2004 presidential election. He also said that if Abrams wasn't the winner of the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election, then the election was stolen.

45. Rep. Danny Davis (D–Ill.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

46. Then-Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D–Ohio) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

47. Then-Rep. William Lacy Clay (D–Mo.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

48. Then-Rep. Cynthia McKinney (D–Calif.) objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election and objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

49. Then-Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D–Md.) praised Boxer and Tubbs Jones on their efforts to object to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

50. Then-Rep. Cedric Richmond (D–La.), who was the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and later served in the Biden administration as director of the White House Office of Public Engagement, said Lewis' remarks that Trump wasn't legitimately elected were ''reasonable.''

51. Rep. Ted Lieu (D–Calif.) said there was ''a cloud of illegitimacy'' over Trump's presidency.

52. Sen. Cory Booker (D–N.J.) said he believed the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election was stolen from Abrams.

53. Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D–Mass.) said evidence appeared to suggest that the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election was stolen from Abrams.

54. Former attorney general for the Obama administration, Eric Holder, said he believed Abrams won the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election.

55. Andrew Gillum withdrew his concession in the 2018 Florida gubernatorial election, questioning how the vote was handled in some counties.

56. Then-Rep. Anthony Brindisi (D–N.Y.) wanted authorities to investigate voter irregularities and voter disenfranchisement after he lost his House race in 2020. He said it was is ''one disappointment'' that a court didn't grant him a recount.

57. Then-state Sen. Rita Hart (D–Iowa) initially challenged her election loss in the 2020 House race, claiming that ballots were rejected improperly.

58. Biden's Chief of Staff Ron Klain said that Gore won the 2000 presidential election.

59. Biden Press Secretary Karine Jean-Pierre tweeted that the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial election was stolen by Kemp from Abrams and implied that the 2016 presidential election was stolen.

60. Harris' Communications Director Jamal Simmons tweeted that the 2000 presidential election was stolen by Bush.

61. Then-Rep. Marcia Fudge (D–Ohio), who is now Biden's secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, questioned the legitimacy of Trump's presidency.

62. Then-Rep. Alcee Hastings (D–Fla.) objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes for the 2000 presidential election and objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

63. Then-Rep. Julia Carson (D–Ind.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

64. Then-Rep. John Conyers, Jr., (D–Mich.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

65. Then-Rep. Lane Evans (D–Ill.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

66. Then-Rep. Sam Farr (D–Calif.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

67. Then-Rep. Bob Filner (D–Calif.), who later became mayor of San Diego, objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election and objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

68. Then-Rep. Maurice Hinchey (D–N.Y.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

69. Then-Rep. Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick (D–Mich.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

70. Then-Rep. John Olver (D–Mass.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

71. Then-Rep. Major Owens (D–N.Y.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

72. Then-Rep. Donald M. Payne, Sr., (D–N.J.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

73. Then-Rep. Diane Watson (D–Calif.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

74. Then-Rep. Lynn Woolsey (D–Calif.) objected to the certification of Ohio's electoral college votes in the 2004 presidential election.

75. Rep. Jim McGovern (D–Mass.) objected to the certification of Alabama's electoral votes in the 2016 presidential election.

76. Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D–Wash.) objected to the certification of Georgia's electoral votes in the 2016 presidential election.

77. Christine Pelosi, who is Pelosi's daughter and was an elector in 2016, was one of the 80 Hamilton Electors who led an effort to receive a briefing on the Trump-Russia collusion investigation prior to the Electoral College vote.

78. Then-Rep. Carrie Meek (D–Fla.) objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election.

79. Then-Rep. Eva Clayton (D–N.C.) objected to the certification of Florida's electoral votes in the 2000 presidential election.

80. Democratic election lawyer Marc Elias argued in court that voting machines ''misread'' votes in Brindisi's election challenge for his 2020 House race. He also got Al Franken's apparent loss in a Minnesota Senate election overturned in court.

81. Former state Sen. Hank Sanders (D–Ala.) said the 2016 presidential election was stolen from Clinton.

82. Sen. Patty Murray's (D–Wash.) supported fellow Democrats for their ''questions about voting irregularities'' in the 2004 presidential election.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Again, the result in all of these cases was that our system worked. The House and Senate did what they were supposed to do, heard the objections, disposed of them properly, and ultimately certified the election as originally presented.

Objecting does not make you an election subverter or denier. Each Member of Congress has a constitutional duty to do what they think is best for their constituents.

At the same time Democrats were accusing Republicans of undermining democracy, they themselves were attempting to overturn the results of a duly-certified election in Iowa's Second Congressional District. The challenger, Democrat Rita Hart, even said that she brought the contest to a partisan committee in D.C. instead of Iowa courts in order to ''get the result we need.''

This was after the State of Iowa followed their normal and lawful process throughout the election for Iowa-02. The votes were counted, recounted by multiple bipartisan recount boards, and duly certified.

Yet, this majority orchestrated having their candidate bypass State courts and instead attempted to utilize the House itself to steal a congressional seat to boost their slim majority. This was the single biggest act of election subversion that occurred in the 2020 election cycle, and it was carried out by the same people here today claiming that Republicans are a threat to democracy.

Fast forward to today. Democrats are once again attempting to move a major piece of legislation that overhauls a key piece of our election system in a partisan manner behind closed doors. They didn't hold a hearing or a markup on this bill. They didn't release legislative text until 24 hours before it was considered in the Rules Committee. They didn't consult Republicans on the committee of jurisdiction, despite repeated overtures to work together on discussions of this important issue—all rebuffed.

Why rush such a significant piece of legislation when the next Presidential certification won't happen for over 2 years? It is pretty simple, Madam Speaker: The midterm elections are just weeks away, and the Democrats are desperately trying to talk about their favorite topic, former President Trump.

As someone who voted to certify Joe Biden as President and who recently lost a primary race to a candidate endorsed by the former President, I believe what House Democrats and the January 6th Committee are doing is irresponsible and wrong.

They have allowed their dislike for one man, President Trump, to cloud their judgment and guide their actions, no matter the consequences to this institution or the Constitution that they claim they want to uphold.

□ 1500

It is time that we started being honest with ourselves and with the American people. The facts are:

The President and his campaign filing legal challenges in State and Federal courts around the country was not improper nor unprecedented. Everyone is entitled to their day in court. Those suits were considered by judges and ultimately rejected. The process worked.

The rhetoric of former President Trump following the 2020 election was highly inappropriate.

Republican Members of Congress objecting to a State's slate of electors is not election subversion or unprecedented.

The actions of the individuals who attacked the Capitol on January 6 were wrong. Those individuals should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Democrats have just as long of a history as Republicans of challenging and questioning elections, including attempting to overturn a duly certified congressional election in Iowa. This is not a partisan issue, and the processes in place have worked.

Madam Speaker, I would just reiterate that people's faith in our elections is critical to the long-term success of our democracy. It is time for House Democrats to quit playing partisan political games and pushing false narratives just to preserve their own power.

It is incumbent upon all of us to be honest and work in good faith to serve the American people, restore faith in our elections, and protect our democracy.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, on January 6, the President had whipped up a mob, told them that the Vice President could overturn the election, and a majority of the Republicans in this House voted to reject the decision made by American voters as reflected in the electoral college for no reason whatsoever, other than sham fraud claims.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), the vice chair of the January 6th Select Committee.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from California, Chairwoman LOFGREN, for her work on this bill. The chairwoman and I certainly have our disagreements on issues, but there is no one I respect more in this body for their diligence, for their commitment, for their expertise, for their commitment to our Constitution, to her constituents, and to this country. It has been a real pleasure working with her, as well as the staff of the House Administration Committee. I particularly thank my counsel on the January 6th Select Committee, Joe Maher, for his tremendous work on this bill.

This bill has benefited from a wide range of input from constitutional experts, including many conservative constitutional experts, jurists, and scholars who worked with us on this bill. Their input has been invaluable.

I also want to praise those in the Senate who have been working hard on their version of Electoral Count Act reform. Our bill builds on what they have already put forth.

Commentary from conservatives on our bill has been exceptionally positive. Here are a few examples.

Judge Luttig, a widely respected conservative legal expert, wrote that our bill was ''masterfully drafted'' to ensure we never have another day anything like January 6 and to avert other future efforts to overturn our Nation's democratic elections.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board offered a range of positive comments, including explaining that the House bill would make it harder for ''partisans in Congress who want to get C-Span-famous to lodge phony electoral college objections'' or for them to raise objections on the House floor because ''somebody had a funny feeling about the vote totals in west southeastern Pennsylvania.''

The conservative Cato Institute said this: ''In some respects,'' this bill is ''more conservative and originalist'' than the existing Senate bill.

Conservative commentator Quin Hillyer said in the Washington Examiner that the House bill adds to the work already done by the Senate and ''fills in almost all gaps with admirable and sensible specificity.''

There are many other examples from conservative commentators, as well. Madam Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to read those articles and editorials in full.

If your aim is to prevent future efforts to steal elections, I would respectfully suggest that conservatives should support this bill. If instead your aim is to leave open the door for elections to be stolen in the future, you might decide not to support this or any other bill to address the Electoral Count Act.

January 6, contrary to what my colleague from Illinois just said, was not ''democracy in action.'' Our oath of office is to support and defend the Constitution, which provides the method by which we elect our President. Legal challenges are not improper, but Donald Trump's refusal to abide by the rulings of the courts certainly was.

In our system of government, elections in the States determine who is the President. Our bill does not change that. This bill will prevent Congress from illegally choosing the President itself.

As we detailed in our January 6 hearings, a Federal judge has reviewed evidence submitted by the January 6th Select Committee and concluded that former President Trump likely violated two criminal statutes when he pressured Vice President Pence to reject legitimate State electoral votes in our joint session. That is what Vice President Pence called ''un-American.''

In our hearings, we have demonstrated that President Trump knew specifically that what he was doing was illegal, but he did it anyway. President Trump's conduct was illegal under the existing Electoral Count Act, and it would be illegal under this new bill, as well.

Our bill reaffirms what the Constitution and existing law make plain: The

Vice President has no authority or discretion to reject official State electoral slates. It also makes clear that if Members of Congress have any right to object to electoral slates, those grounds are limited to the explicit constitutional requirements for candidate and elector eligibility and the 12th Amendment's explicit requirements for elector balloting.

Under our system of elections, Governors must transmit lawful election results to Congress. If they fail to fulfill that duty, our bill provides that candidates for the Presidency should be able to sue in Federal court to ensure that Congress receives a State's lawful certification.

Finally, our bill makes clear that the rules governing an election cannot be changed retroactively. The Constitution assigns an important duty to State legislatures to determine the manner in which the States appoint their electors. This must not be read to allow State legislators to change the rules retroactively to alter the outcome.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, this bill will preserve the rule of law for all future Presidential elections by ensuring that self-interested politicians cannot steal from the people the guarantee that our government derives its power from the consent of the governed.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, Ranking Member DAVIS, for yielding me the time.

I will address something that I heard just a few moments ago from my colleague from Wyoming listing off a number of conservative commentators about how great this bill is, and that is why we should vote on it. Well, see, that is the problem of why we are here right now. None of those conservative commentators are responsible for casting a vote for something that will affect the future of this country.

You see, we are here now making a decision on this issue when we should have been included in this process all along. I am not calling into question whether this bill is good or whether this bill is bad. What I am saying is we have not been involved in this process, and we are being told to just take the word of someone because they call themselves a conservative commentator.

It is those of us here who have been elected by the people of this Nation that are given the responsibility to analyze these things, to work together in a bipartisan manner to come up with what is the best solution for this Nation. That is not where we are.

A partisan-run committee is the one who has rushed this bill to the floor, and we are being told that we need to work on it and that it is imperative we pass it now.

Don't get me wrong, I agree that we ought to take a closer look at the Electoral College Act. I agree that we should clarify some of the mechanisms of the act, and I certainly agree that we should be working to prevent another breach of security of this Capitol as we saw on January 6.

With all that said, we can't afford a one-sided, no-compromises discussion crafted by a partisan select committee, which is what we are being presented with in this bill, at least from the perception that we have at this moment.

So, my question is: Why now? Why has the January 6th Committee chosen this moment to pursue this legislation instead of working together in a true bipartisan manner, engaging Republicans and Democrats together in a broader perspective?

You see, the American people are smart enough, and they know the answer to this question. The January 6th Committee has really wasted more than a year. Instead of looking into how the security of this building was breached, they have been looking for a year for evidence of some vast conspiracy on January 6, 2021, with nothing to show for it. They have spent days falsely accusing me and some of my other colleagues of wrongdoing in the days prior to the January 6 incidents without producing any substantial evidence to back up their claims. Why? Because it doesn't exist.

Now, with midterm elections looming and the prospect of a new majority in the House and the Senate, they feel they need to justify the time they have wasted by inserting themselves into what was once a bipartisan, bicameral discussion of the Electoral Count Reform Act.

In the meantime, House Republicans have taken concrete steps to promote confidence in elections at every level of government. We have introduced legislation that would reaffirm States' constitutional sovereignty over elections rather than trampling it. We have done this because the American people are tired of hearing about January 6.

The American people care about the growing cost of living, the declining economy, and the uncontrolled spending, which has caused mass inflation.

The American people want to be confident that their vote counts in every election, that they can trust the ballot box, and their concerns won't be ignored by lawmakers in Washington.

I will close with this. The American people don't need the January 6th Committee to tell them what is broken in this country. They look at their declining paycheck and the rising cost of groceries, and they see this body focused on the past instead of correcting their future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, they see that this body and its reckless spending is why we have record inflation in this moment.

For that reason, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Presidential Election Reform Act, and then let's work together on something that will work for the American people.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, the January 6th Committee has as its obligation to recommend legislative changes that would make the country safer. We have done that.

I will say that the partisan split in the House Administration Committee has always been six majority, three minority. On the select committee, it is not that far off, seven majority, two minority.

We have worked together, and I hear Mr. DAVIS' concern that he didn't participate. It wasn't me. It was Leader MCCARTHY that withdrew his name. Had his name been left in, he would have been a member of the committee, and he would have been able to participate in the obligation our committee has undertaken.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

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

Madam Speaker, Congress has a sacred duty to uphold our elections and to safeguard our democratic process. I rise in strong support of that mission.

I am not surprised that we hear on this floor the rationalization of insurrection, the rationalization of what I believe was treason.

I rise with extraordinary respect for the gentlewoman from Wyoming, as Republican as any Member of that side of the aisle, save a willingness to stand and speak truth to power, to honor facts, to honor the Constitution.

□ 1515

I applaud her for it and have deep respect for her willingness to stand up today and for history.

The gentleman from Georgia called January 6 an incident. The Republican National Committee passed a resolution, almost overwhelmingly, that referred to January 6 as legitimate political discourse: see no evil, speak no evil, hear no evil.

I hear my friend, Mr. DAVIS, speaking about this being a partisan issue. This is an American issue. This is a democracy issue. This is a values issue.

To those who come to this well or speak from the floor to try to rationalize the invitation given by President Trump—the incitement stated by President Trump—and the deployment of a mob to fight like hell and stop the steal—I advise my colleagues and I urge my colleagues to look at Vice President Gore's comments when he lost the election 5–4. He honored the Court's decision, not because he agreed

with it, but because he said it was good for America and our democracy.

I call attention to the remarks of Hillary Clinton when she lost to President Trump. That night, knowing that she had gotten 3 million more votes, she conceded because the law is the electoral college makes that decision.

In 1864, despite the turmoil of Civil War, President Lincoln—President Lincoln would be standing with LIZ CHENEY if he were on this floor. President Lincoln went to great lengths to ensure that Americans had the opportunity to make their voices heard in a national election. He argued that ''We cannot have free government without elections,'' and that ''if the rebellion could force us to forego or postpone a national election, it might fairly claim to have already conquered and ruined us.''

LIZ CHENEY has said that, not exactly in those words, but it is exactly the same substance of what Abraham Lincoln said over a century and a half ago.

We came face to face with a similar danger on January 6 last year. It was rationalized then, and, sadly, it is being rationalized now. History will judge.

The insurrection revealed a willful and false refusal to accept the certified and judicially confirmed election results. The gentleman from Illinois said that the Trump administration went to the courts. They lost time after time after time after time, and to this day, they do not accept what Al Gore accepted, that we are a nation of laws and not of one man.

There are ambiguities in our electoral system, and they can jeopardize our democracy. That is what this bill is about: upholding our democracy.

Questions surrounding the Vice President's role in counting electoral votes served as a pretext for the insurrectionists' assault on the Capitol. Fortunately, their conspiracy and their plot failed. In that incident that the gentleman from Georgia talked about, police officers died, civilians died, and hundreds were injured severely in that incident.

What a polite word for treason and insurrection.

That tragic and dangerous episode, however, underscored the importance of clarifying any uncertainties that future malevolent actors could exploit to undermine the will of the American people as expressed through their votes.

I went to the Charles County Fair last weekend. I went to the Democratic booth. As I always do, I went to the Republican booth, and the biggest sign was: Trump won.

We are a nation of laws. Try to respect a nation of laws. The bipartisan legislation the Presidential Election Reform Act provides the clarity necessary.

It reaffirms, as former Vice President Mike Pence correctly concluded—which is why those incidents were calling for the death of the Vice President with a noose hanging out in front of the Capitol and why they were calling for the life of the Speaker of the House in that incident—that he did not have, and he does not have the authority to delay or reject the counting of electoral votes.

Why?

Because we are a nation of laws and a nation of the Constitution. That principle was established in both the Constitution and the Electoral Count Act of 1887.

Not only would this legislation raise the threshold required to object to a State's slate of electors from the ridiculously low one House Member and one Senator to one-third of the membership—at least 152 million people ought to be given that respect who voted in that election—at least one-third of us would have to rise to overturn their judgment.

This bill also restricts the grounds on which objections can be made, limiting the ability of Members to lodge frivolous and partisan objections.

The bill also contains important provisions to restrict the ability of State and local elected and election officials to undermine or overturn the process of tabulating and certifying results in their jurisdictions. People elect the President, not State legislators, and not this Congress. The American people elect the President.

Not only do these measures align with the overwhelming consensus—not just conservative commentators, but commentators of all stripes whether ideological or not, believe this is a good piece of legislation. I share their view.

No individual or group of conspirators ought to have the power to subvert the will of the American people.

I thank the Committee on House Administration Chair ZOE LOFGREN, and I share the remarks of the gentlewoman from Wyoming about her integrity, her intellect, and her conscientious carrying out of her duties as a Member of the Congress. Indeed, Vice-Chair CHENEY's work on this bill and the January 6 Committee will go down as one of this institution's greatest examples of political courage and integrity.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her work.

Similarly, I thank Chairwoman CAROLYN MALONEY and her colleagues on the House Oversight and Reform Committee for their work investigating vulnerabilities in our democratic process.

We must now come together not as Republicans, not as Democrats, and not as partisans, but as protectors. We raised our hands and said that we would protect the Constitution and laws of this Nation. This is one of those days that we get to meet that oath.

Let me conclude because not only did Lincoln argue that elections were essential to free government, but he also made clear his belief that ''elections belong to the people. It is their choice.''

That is what this legislation is about. Stand up for your country. Stand up for the people. Vote for this bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 17 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, it is always good to follow my good friend, Leader HOYER. I appreciate his friendship, and I appreciate his time here in this institution. He has seen a lot of things happen in the governing of this country. I respect him and his viewpoint.

It is frustrating when we also hear comments from my colleague, Leader HOYER. Back on January 25 of this year he was quoted in a Politico story where he said that President Biden is correct that the midterm elections will be illegitimate if Congress doesn't pass the Democrats' election takeover bills.

This is part of the rhetoric that we have got to stop. We have got to make sure that we remind everybody, as Leader HOYER did, my good friend, that this is an American issue. It is not a partisan issue. The processes have worked.

I want to know, if it is an American issue and not a partisan issue, Madam Speaker, why, then, were we not even consulted as the committee of jurisdiction minority members?

I would have loved to have been able to sit down and come up with a bipartisan solution. No Republican—no Republican—that I know or that I respect thinks that the violence on January 6, which we all witnessed, is okay.

I think it was a terrible day. I think, again, anyone who committed those acts and those crimes should be held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. Let's be clear: They broke the law. It doesn't matter what you are protesting, Madam Speaker, if you break the law.

Madam Speaker, if you are rioting in the streets, looting stores and businesses, and committing the crimes across this country that we have seen exacerbated because of the Biden administration's lack of effort in enforcing these activities to be adjudicated, then do you know what? They should be held accountable. Arrest them, prosecute them, and put them in jail.

Leader HOYER also said this bill and this process should not be about one man. I agree. I agree. But, unfortunately, this bill is nothing short of being only about that one man. This is too important of an issue to make this about an individual that you may or may not like or that you may or may not want to run for President ever again. This bill and this process is too important for the future of America.

Madam Speaker, my good friend, Mr. HOYER, brought up Hillary Clinton. She actually denied the results of the 2016 Presidential elections and believes

there were legitimate questions regarding the integrity of the 2004 Presidential election. She said that Stacey Abrams would have won the 2018 gubernatorial election against Governor Brian Kemp if it had been fair.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Madam Speaker, when I saw that there was going to be a bill rushed to the House floor with 5 days remaining in a legislative calendar without a committee hearing, I thought maybe the Democratic majority would be rushing to the floor a bill to address inflation that is clobbering the American people.

No.

I thought maybe they would be rushing to the floor a bill to address the crime crisis that is plaguing cities across the United States.

But no.

I thought maybe there would be a bill rushed to the House floor without a committee hearing 51 hours after the text was introduced to address the crisis taking place at our border and the millions of immigrants coming into the United States illegally and the fentanyl that is coming across our U.S.-Mexico border and killing thousands of Americans.

But no.

So what is so important that a bill needs to be rushed to the House floor without any committee hearing to review and analyze the bill?

And it is the Presidential Election Reform Act.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Administration Committee, I have to admit I am disappointed we didn't have the opportunity to thoughtfully review the legislation before us.

□ 1530

In fact, we haven't had a hearing in the Subcommittee on Elections since July. So I think now is our moment, unfortunately, with only 30 minutes on the minority's side, to actually dive in and analyze the legislation before us.

With any important piece of legislation, in particular, one like this that impacts our national elections and the elections of our President, the first question I ask myself is: Will the bill before us boost people's confidence in our election process? The bill fails the test.

I would highlight, in particular, section 4 of this bill that gives candidates a loophole to define what a catastrophic event is, which might include a natural disaster or national health emergency like COVID. Why is this so important?

The candidate for President could—up to a full day following the election—request an extension for the election by up to 5 days if they feel there is a ''catastrophic event'' that was sufficient to prevent a substantial portion of a State's electorate from casting a ballot on election day.

The bill doesn't properly define catastrophic event. Often in this body, we take the time in committee in regular order to understand what the terms of the bill mean, to give an opportunity to improve the text to provide certainty and clarity to the American people going forward. We are let down by the fact that we are not following regular process in this case.

Instead of continuing to undermine faith in the elections process, we should instead pursue commonsense legislation that supports election integrity and respects the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, pursue legislation that respects the Constitution and Federalism, such as legislation like the American Confidence in Elections Act that Ranking Member DAVIS introduced back in July to enhance the integrity in our elections.

We heard earlier the majority leader mention that there is ambiguity in our election system and that is what this is about. If that is what this is about—if we are actually trying to remove the ambiguity in our election system, which is a very worthy cause, why not have a hearing on this bill?

I haven't yet heard one person from the majority's side explain why this bill is being rushed to the floor 51 hours after the text was introduced without using the consideration of the Senate bill as the basis of this legislative text. I think that question needs to be answered today.

We need to actually dive into what this bill does to actually allow the American people to have confidence in our election system. I remain disappointed the House did not take the thoughtful approach that the Senate takes, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, just a quick correction. Right now and in the 2020 election, we had States that said, gosh, there is fraud. It was completely bogus, but they tried to monkey with the system. This bill prevents that.

It defines a major natural disaster as any natural catastrophe, including hurricane, tornado, historically significant widespread snowstorm, historically significant widespread flooding, historically significant destructive fire, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, or volcanic eruption that prevents a large sector of a State from voting enough that it could impact the election.

Then it limits how long you could accommodate that disaster. The decision isn't made by partisans. It is Federal judges who would make that determination.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR), an esteemed member of the January 6 Select Committee.

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I thank Chair LOFGREN and the vice chair of the January 6 Select Committee, my colleague from Wyoming, LIZ CHENEY, for their leadership in bringing this bill to us.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8873, the bipartisan Presidential Election Reform Act. This bill makes important changes to the laws that govern the cornerstone of our democracy, a peaceful transfer of power.

These changes benefit no political party, and they do not give political advantage to any particular candidate. This bill simply protects the rule of law from those who would seek to upend it.

Our Republican colleagues who are opposed to this legislation, once again find themselves on the side of violent extremists. Madam Speaker, after what we saw on January 6 and what the Select Committee has demonstrated, that those seeking to overturn the election were exploiting the vulnerabilities in the law this bill remedies, I am not sure how anyone could oppose this piece of legislation.

The choice before this body is clear: Protect the rule of law, strengthen the Constitution, and vote against insurrection.

Madam Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thought the esteemed Member from California was going to speak a little longer. It caught me a little off guard. I apologize. I am not used to him being that succinct in anything he does but thank you.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my good friend, another esteemed Member of this institution.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, the Electoral Count Act of 1887 asserts that Congress may vote to disqualify electoral votes. It was misused by the Democrats in 2016 and by Republicans in 2020, attempting to interfere with the constitutionally required tally of electoral votes. I believe both sides were wrong.

Congress has no such power, period. Think about it. Under our Constitution, if no candidate receives a majority of electoral votes, the election immediately passes to the House and Senate. If Congress had the power to pass judgment on the validity of electoral votes, it could simply invalidate enough to place the election in its own hands, an obvious conflict of interest.

That is why the Constitution clearly mandates that the vote shall be counted in the presence of the Congress. Disputes arising from the conduct of elections are the sole province of the courts. Does anyone seriously believe that a Congress of 535 intensely partisan politicians is a safe repository for

the power to adjudicate the integrity of the vote? Well, neither did the Founders.

This measure does narrow the grounds upon which the count can be interfered with by the Congress, but it still allows Congress to invalidate electoral votes. So it does not solve the problem, and it creates new problems by allowing a State to delay its election for up to 5 days after the rest of the Nation's vote is already known.

Can you imagine the chaos and suspicions that that would create? How sad that such an important issue as the electoral count should be handled in so clumsy and partisan a bill as this.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, January 6 is one of the darkest days in American history. We now know in great detail how the former President and his cronies were attempting to use the electoral certification process to undermine our democracy to take away the people's vote.

They tried to delegitimize a free and fair election with their lies, subvert the results certified and sent by the States, and pressure a Vice President into rejecting his constitutional responsibilities, all of which erupted in violence, hate, and bloodshed right here in our Capitol.

We walked through the blood and broken glass right outside of this Chamber to cast our votes to uphold our democracy. Today, we must vote for the Electoral Count Act to ensure that the rule of law and the will of the people will always prevail in this Chamber and in this country.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank the chair for her patriotic leadership on the House Administration Committee and her invaluable service and leadership as a member of the Select Committee on January 6.

Madam Speaker, I thank her for yielding, but I more importantly thank her for bringing this important legislation to the floor. I salute her leadership and that of Congresswoman LIZ CHENEY, vice chair of the January 6 Select Committee, a principled and courageous voice for freedom in our country.

This legislation is a manifestation of their courage, their patriotism, and their determination in our mission to save American democracy. I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN and Vice Chair CHENEY.

Madam Speaker, we are really the beneficiaries of such greatness in our country's history. One of our Founders, Thomas Paine, said that the times have found them to declare independence; to fight a war for independence against the greatest naval power that existed at the time; to win that war under leadership of our great patriarch, George Washington, and then to write our founding documents. Thank God they made them amendable so that we could have expanding freedom in our country.

One of their early documents, the Declaration of Independence, has been called by some the greatest document of the millennium, of a thousand years.

Some years later the Union was under threat. Abraham Lincoln—this is long before he was President—Abraham Lincoln delivered a stark warning about the state of our Union. Speaking in Springfield in 1837, more than two decades before the Civil War, he diagnosed a dangerous erosion of our democracy. ''They were pillars of the temple of liberty,'' Lincoln said, referring to the generation of Americas who fought for independence and served as living proof of the importance of democracy. He continued: '' . . . now that they have crumbled away, that temple must fall unless we, their descendants, supply their places with other pillars . . .''

His words ring just as true today as we confront a dire threat to our democracy and a duty to supply new pillars to preserve it.

On January 6, 2021, an insurrection erupted at the Capitol, seeking to nullify the results of a free and fair election. This was a direct assault not only on the Capitol, but on our Constitution, on the rule of law, and on democracy itself; a direct assault on the Constitution because the Constitution said that day that the Congress would, again, certify the election of Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS per the Constitution by presenting the electoral college vote. So that was an assault on the Constitution. That was that day. It wasn't just any day; it was the day that the Constitution was supposed to be honored.

Now, we have a solemn duty to ensure that future efforts to undermine elections cannot succeed. That is why the House established the Select Committee on January 6, to find the truth of the attack and ensure that it could never happen again. Since then, there have been attempts across the country to nullify future elections.

□ 1545

That is why, today, we are taking historic and bipartisan legislative action to safeguard the integrity of future Presidential elections.

The Presidential Election Reform Act takes four necessary steps.

First, the bill reaffirms that under the Constitution, the Vice President has no authority to reject a slate of electors or delay the count in any way. This was the heart of the former President's illegal, false electoral scheme.

Second, the bill directly limits the types of objections to only those outlined in the Constitution, which can be raised during certification. You just can't raise any and all, but those that are allowed in the Constitution. All objections would require one-third of each Chamber to be entertained and a majority to be sustained.

Third, our bill requires Governors to transmit lawful election results to Congress or be compelled to by a Federal court. Under this proposal, no rogue Governor can unlawfully subvert the will of the people, the heart of a democracy expressed in the democratic electoral process.

Fourth, our bill makes crystal clear that States cannot change the rules governing an election after the election has occurred—did you hear that? ''Cannot change the rules governing an election after the election has occurred''—preventing radical State legislators from attempting to nullify the election. I keep using that word, ''nullify.''

These changes are imperative right now. Emboldened by January 6, politicians are waging a sinister campaign across America, the country, to subvert our future elections, peddling the big lie that the 2022 election was stolen; assembling an army of operatives to intimidate voters at the polls and poll workers, as well; and even threatening to reverse results for which they disagree.

Wait a minute. We are talking about a democracy. ''Threatening to reverse results for which they disagree.''

Let me be clear: This is a kitchen table issue for families. We must ensure that this antidemocratic plot cannot succeed.

It is a kitchen table issue because denying the American people their fundamental freedom to choose their own leaders denies them their voice in the policies we pursue. Those policies can make an immense difference in their everyday lives, on top of which we have a responsibility. We take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

This legislation is in furtherance of honoring that oath of office so that our children, our grandchildren, future generations, know that they live in a great democracy that cannot be undermined for political reasons.

Madam Speaker, every Member knows that January 6 was an attempt to subvert democracy, but many across the aisle refuse to admit the truth. They refused to admit the truth that very night with blood on the floor, glass on the floor, and all the rest when we came in to honor our constitutional responsibility.

Overwhelmingly, others on the other side of the aisle voted not to accept the results of the people in the election.

Now, House Republican leaders are whipping against this necessary measure. To all those who oppose this legislation, I ask you: How could anyone vote against free and fair elections, a cornerstone of our Constitution? How could anyone vote against our Founders' vision, placing power in the hands

of the people? How could anyone vote against their own constituents, allowing radical politicians to rip away their say in our democracy?

Decades after Lincoln's stark warning, the future he foretold, a crumbling of the pillars of democracy, came to pass with a Civil War. One year into the horror and devastation, President Lincoln called on the Congress to come together to save the Union.

In his message, he wrote—this is when he is President—''We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of Earth.'' We ''hold the power and bear the responsibility.''

Today, American democracy, ''the last best hope of Earth,'' is again in grave danger, and its fate is in our hands.

So, I implore every Member to heed Lincoln's words, to stand up for the rule of law and our Constitution. In doing so, we pass on a vibrant democracy for generations to come—America, the beacon of hope in the world; this building, a symbol, a temple of democracy, synonymous with freedom and democracy throughout the world, which was assaulted, but we must correct it.

Madam Speaker, I urge a resounding bipartisan ''aye'' vote on the Presidential Election Reform Act.

In gratitude to Madam Chair ZOE LOFGREN, chair of the House Administration Committee and a member of the January 6th Committee, and our very distinguished vice chair of the January 6th Committee, thank you for your patriotism. Thank you for your leadership. Thank you for your courage.

Madam Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a tweet from Speaker PELOSI on May 16, 2017, that says: ''Our election was hijacked. There is no question. Congress has a duty to #ProtectOurDemocracy and #FollowTheFacts.''

I couldn't agree more. We need to follow the facts.

The Speaker asked: How can one vote against this bill? Well, I would say: How can we vote for a bill that was completely done without any consultation?

Here is what I hope, Madam Speaker. I was actually comforted somewhat during the Rules testimony yesterday when my colleague, Chairperson LOFGREN, mentioned that the goal of the majority is to watch this bill pass—I have many concerns with it; I laid those out yesterday, and I will lay them out again—but hope the Senate passes the version that we could have used as the basis and the starting point here in the House, and then we could go to conference committee.

Okay, I hope it happens. I am not going to hold my breath, but I certainly hope it happens. I reiterate my desire for that to be a process where we can finally come together in a bipartisan way. Again, I am cautiously optimistic.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, just a correction. What I actually said in the Rules Committee is I hope we pass this bill. The Senate will pass a bill. They are doing a markup in the Rules Committee next week. If they are different, there is generally a conference committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN and Vice Chair CHENEY for their distinguished leadership on this incredibly important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Presidential Election Reform Act.

Our democracy is fragile. Democracy is not a spectator sport. Democracy is not a self-executing proposition. Democracy does not simply run on autopilot.

It requires all of us to remain engaged, particularly because we are confronting a diabolical adversary who is determined to undermine the principle of free and fair elections, undermine the rule of law, and undermine the peaceful transfer of power.

Certainly, our democracy is not perfect, but it is worth saving. That is why it is so critically important that we act with the fierce urgency of now to defend the Republic against tyranny, protect the principle of free and fair elections, and continue America's long, necessary, and majestic march toward a more perfect Union.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Chair LOFGREN for the hard work that she and her cosponsor, Representative CHENEY, have done on this bill.

I rise today to safeguard a simple yet sacred pillar of our democracy: The candidate who wins the election takes office. Only the voters' votes count. It will not be overturned by our Vice President or any State officer or any threats of political violence, threats, intimidation, and lies. We cannot let violence undermine over 200 years of a peaceful transfer of power in this country.

I rise today to safeguard the rights of every American to have their will reflected in those public servants lucky enough to serve them.

We must not forget January 6. Our Republican colleagues fighting this bill seem to forget that January 6 was a violent day of action. We must pass this bill so that we do not have a repetition of that.

Today, I will vote for the Presidential Election Reform Act to fulfill a hopeful future for our country. American democracy is the best answer to fulfilling our Constitution's promise of inclusion for everyone, regardless of race, ethnicity, creed, or economic circumstance.

A truly inclusive democracy that helps everyone thrive is a constitutional promise we can and must make a reality.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Presidential Election Reform Act.

January 6, 2021, will forever be known as one of the darkest days in our Nation's history, which threatened the very survival of our democracy. Incited by a former President, a violent mob stormed the Capitol, intent on preventing the peaceful transfer of power upon which our democracy depends.

Thankfully, they failed, and Vice President Mike Pence fulfilled his constitutional duty to oversee the counting of the electoral votes. No matter what President Trump and his cronies claim, the Vice President of the United States has no legal authority to reject, delay, or otherwise obstruct the counting of the electoral votes.

Yet, there are those who continue to spew the big lie and undermine the legitimacy of future elections. So, today, we must reject these dangerous voices and pass the Presidential Election Reform Act so that we can safeguard our democracy from any attempt to overturn the will of the people.

We came perilously close to losing our democracy on January 6, 2021. Let us come together to protect the rule of law and prevent any similar assault on our democracy from ever happening again.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), the vice chair of the January 6th Select Committee.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I am struck listening to my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle. The concept that I think we have to make sure we never lose sight of is that some things have to matter, and we, as individuals, determine whether or not our institutions survive.

We have heard consistently since January 6—actually, in the weeks just after January 6, we were in agreement. But shortly after that, we began to

hear excuses about what had happened. We began to hear people defending the indefensible.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize that when you defend the indefensible, slowly but surely, you chip away at the great foundations of this Republic. You chip away at those very things that we are sworn to protect.

This bill is an excellent bill. This bill is a bill that will help to protect the rule of law. This bill is a bill that will help to ensure that future elections cannot be stolen. This bill will ensure that, in the future, the United States Congress is very clear that we have a very limited number of objections that can be made, if any can be made at all, and those are strictly limited to those outlined in the Constitution.

□ 1600

This bill is a very important and crucial bill to ensure that what happened on January 6 never happens again.

It saddens me, Madam Speaker, that my colleagues on this side of the aisle continue to play politics. I can tell you that is not what we are doing on the January 6th Committee. My colleagues ought to watch the hearings on the January 6th Committee. We have been very clear in terms of putting forward what happened and in terms of putting forth former-President Trump's responsibility and role in every aspect of the attack that happened that day.

Contrary, again, to the assertions my friend and colleague from Illinois made previously, what happened on January 6 was not the normal functioning of our democracy. President Trump had every right to bring those cases in court, but he did not have the right, and it was a fundamental violation of his oath of office, to refuse to abide by the rulings of the court.

Madam Speaker, we are a Nation of laws, not of men. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill. It is a very good bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity to testify yesterday before the Committee on Rules about how this process has been highly partisan, and that I would have welcomed an opportunity to work on the Electoral Count Act reforms in a bipartisan way—just like the Senate did.

There is one quote from my friend, Ranking Member TOM COLE, that I want to share. As he said, ''Given all the majority's righteous and high-minded talk over the last 2 years about how democracy itself is in peril, don't you think it would be better served to have operated through regular order with real Member buy-in on a topic that is as important to the American people as this one?''

That is how the Senate handled this task—in a bipartisan matter driven toward finding consensus. Why shouldn't the House operate in the same way? Instead here in the House, every outreach made by Republicans to work on this issue was rebuffed.

This bill tramples on State sovereignty. While the Constitution gives States the authority to make and interpret their own State laws, this bill would grant Congress unprecedented authority to determine what State law is.

Second, there is a provision of this bill that gives candidates the ability to broadly define catastrophic events—which could include major natural disasters or acts of terrorism—and then use that event to extend the balloting after the polls close for up to 5 days.

Think about it. A candidate could pull a Pelosi and request a change in the rules supposedly because of the COVID–19 pandemic, despite the fact that the majority of the country has moved on—including President Biden who declared the pandemic is over, just to extend voting for 5 more days for their political benefit.

Or remember just last year, when President Biden's FBI labeled concerned parents attending their children's school PTA meetings domestic terrorists?

With many polling at schools, a candidate could try to claim that parents meeting is a catastrophic event. We also can't forget that many Democrats have claimed that Republican-led States with newly enacted election integrity laws like Florida are suppressing voters.

Could a candidate then try to claim voter suppression because they don't like their State's laws and then request the polls stay open once they see election results that aren't going their way?

This bill would create a new private right of action for all Presidential candidates or their electors and specifically expand the scope of the right to tabulate.

This creates a big question as to how and if Congress has the authority to require candidates to go to Federal court to force them to follow State law.

I mean, I can just picture the field day election lawyers like sanctioned Democrat Marc Elias would have with these provisions all while creating mass confusion for voters who will question if their vote was even counted. Voters don't need Congress to come in and overcomplicate the ECA process that has worked for the last 135 years.

As a reminder, we came back the night of January 6, after the tragic events that we all witnessed here in this Capitol, and we certified Joe Biden as President and KAMALA HARRIS as Vice President.

What voters want is to show up on election day, easily cast their ballot, know that their ballot is counted in accordance with the law, and for election results to come in later that night. But this bill doesn't do that. Instead, it could very well do the opposite.

This bill does nothing to prevent another mob from attacking the Capitol. Neither Mike Pence doing what every Vice President in history has done nor lawful constitutional objections being filed caused a mob to attack—and clarifying those responsibilities won't prevent another mob.

That is why this bill won't even see the light of day over in the Senate and why we should have used the bipartisan Senate version as a starting point. Maybe then we could actually enact some necessary updates to improve and clarify the certification process and focus on the big unanswered problem—the security of the Capitol. Bad actors by definition don't follow the law so any changes made to the Electoral Count Act aren't a silver bullet.

As I have been saying this entire Congress, we need to be focused on why the Capitol was left so unprotected on that day in January. Why was a mob able to breach one of the most significant buildings on our planet?

Again, I invite all of my Democrat colleagues to work with me to improve the security of this Capitol and the people it holds. That is how we prevent another attack.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill because it is both bad process and bad policy. The American people deserve better. They deserve to have full confidence in the election process and the outcomes.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). The gentlewoman has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to talk about the January 6th Select Committee. Since its creation more than a year ago, the select committee has given substantial attention to the issues related to the Electoral Count Act and its need for reform.

Let's recall that in addition to finding out all the facts of the events leading up to January 6, the select committee is tasked with recommending changes in the law or in procedures that will prevent such an occurrence in the future.

The select committee has devoted multiple public hearings, over more than 4½ hours, to issues related to the Electoral Count Act and the former President's efforts to overturn the election on January 6.

During these hearings, the committee heard from at least four witnesses regarding the electoral college votes and other issues related to the act.

Importantly, conservative judge, Michael Luttig, who is a legal expert and served in the Reagan administration and was appointed by President H.W. Bush to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, testified

before the select committee that the Electoral Count Act, '' . . . is not only a work in progress for the country, but at this moment in history an important work in progress that needs to take place.''

He testified with reference to the Electoral Count Act that, '' . . . Donald Trump and his allies and supporters are a clear and present danger to American democracy.''

Now, why is that?

Because even though the presiding officer of the Senate, the Vice President, has never had more than a ministerial role to play in the counting of the votes, the former President told people that he could change the outcome. He said so in his speech. He said so in tweets. He threatened the Vice President. And we saw that that armed mob that came here to attack us believed what the former President said.

In fact, they read allowed the tweets as he delivered them, and how Mike Pence had disappointed him.

Madam Speaker, Judge Luttig said this about the bill that Ms. CHENEY and I have introduced: ''Had this bill, the Presidential Election Reform Act, been the law during the 2020 Presidential election, there never would have been the fateful January 6 that the country witnessed and experienced that day.''

He also went on to say this bill is masterfully drafted. Now, why would he say that?

Well, it is. But we also sought his considered judgment and expertise as we crafted this bill.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD his remarks on this:

This week, Congresswoman LIZ CHENEY and Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN introduced a bipartisan bill in the House to reform the Electoral Count Act of 1887. This bill represents a comprehensive and compelling Rule of Law overhaul of the anachronistic ECA.

Had this bill, the Presidential Election Reform Act, been the law during the 2020 Presidential election, there never would have been the fateful January 6 that the country witnessed and experienced that day.

Indeed, had this bill been the law before the 1876 presidential election, which was the impetus for the current Electoral Count Act, the country never would have experienced the election upheaval of that quadrennial presidential election.

The Cheney-Lofgren bill is masterfully drafted so as to require the state governors to transmit to Congress only what are defined by the bill as the 'conclusive' electoral votes for the presidency representing the popular vote of the states, a transmittal that will only occur after any and all disputes over those votes have been resolved by the state and federal courts.

Then, during the Joint Session, Congress will be allowed only a few, very narrow grounds to object to these 'conclusive' votes, all of which grounds are related to the technical constitutional qualifications of the electors or their electoral votes.

Thirty percent of each, the Senate and the House, must concur in an objection in order for it to be put before the two Chambers of Congress for resolution and decision. An objection must be agreed upon by fifty percent of both chambers in order for it to be sustained.

With the Cheney-Lofgren bipartisan bill scheduled to be voted on in the House tomorrow, it now appears that there is not only bipartisan, but also bicameral, support for the desperately-needed reform of the ECA.

I urge the Senate and the House to quickly conference and resolve their differences in a law that will ensure there will never again be another January 6 in America.

Madam Speaker, this is a bill that has been well received across the political spectrum.

Now, we have got a Wall Street Journal report saying: ''The good news is that the House now has a bill to update the 1887 Electoral Count Act. . . . '' They go on to say, ''There's no excuse for Congress's delay in fixing this invitation to political trouble.''

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal and an article from the Washington Post.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 20, 2022]

LIZ CHENEY'S ELECTORAL COUNT ACT BILL TO STOP A JAN. 6 REPEAT

(By the Editorial Board)

The good news is that the House now has a bill to update the 1887 Electoral Count Act, the antiquated law implicated in the Jan. 6 Capitol riot. Even better, the legislation unveiled this week by Republican Liz Cheney and Democrat Zoe Lofgren reads like it's an improvement, in some respects, of the Senate version.

The House plan says the Vice President's role when Congress tallies the Electoral College ''is ministerial.'' The VP can't on his own ''order any delay in counting.'' This responds to President Trump's claim in 2020 that Mike Pence could seize control of the joint session. Mr. Trump's legal argument relied on a lack of clarity in the 12th Amendment, which can't be fixed by statute. Still, it would be helpful to have Mr. Trump's theory contradicted by the law and Congress's explicit procedure.

The House bill says Electoral College certificates ''shall be accepted as conclusive'' if submitted by a state's Governor, unless a court orders otherwise. If a rogue Governor refuses to certify the real winner, federal courts could ''direct another official of the State'' to complete the job. A three-judge panel would preside, with appeal to the Supreme Court. The date for electors to vote would be pushed to Dec. 23, providing more room for challenges to play out.

Where the House bill might be an improvement is in making it harder for partisans in Congress who want to get C-Span-famous to lodge phony Electoral College objections. Only a specified set of complaints would be heard, such as if a state sends too many electors; if electors vote on the wrong day or are ineligible; or if the presidential or vice presidential candidate is ineligible. No whining on the House floor that somebody had a funny feeling about the vote totals in west southeastern Pennsylvania.

The Senate bill offers similar finality to the Governor's certificate. Yet it would continue to permit Congress to object vaguely that an elector's vote wasn't ''regularly given.'' That's the same phrase Congress has abused for years, and in 2020 an alarming 147 House and Senate Republicans objected. An ideal reform would stop this grandstanding. Hence, the House bill's idea to enumerate specific grounds for legitimate objections.

Ms. Cheney and Ms. Lofgren also propose to lift the threshold for objections. Under the current Electoral Count Act, a single Senator working with a single Representative can force Congress to debate their wild claims. The Senate bill would require signatures from a fifth of each chamber. The House bill raises that to a third. How about they keep going and compromise at two fifths? More is better, but requiring 33 Senators is better than needing only Sen. Josh Hawley or Rep. Jim Clyburn.

The best approach remains for lawmakers to get out of this objection business and leave such disputes to the courts. The House bill retains a purported authority to reject Electoral College votes if Congress decides that the incoming President is constitutionally ineligible. But isn't 14 days before Inauguration Day a little late for that, folks? Imagine if President Trump wins a landslide in 2024 and then Democrats move to invalidate his electors, saying that Mr. Trump led an ''insurrection'' as defined under the 14th Amendment.

Perhaps it's unrealistic to expect lawmakers to give up the power they arrogated in 1887, but the madness of Jan. 6, 2021, should have made a convincing case. It's asking for trouble to enshrine any political process for overturning the will of the voters two weeks before the transfer of power is scheduled to take place. Last time it was voting machines in Michigan, and before that it was Russian interference, and before that it was voting machines in Ohio . . . but it's always something for Congress's partisans.

Nevertheless, a bill to make that prospect less likely goes in the right direction, especially if it cuts off the microphone for the sour grapes and conspiracy theories that marred the counting after 2000, 2004, 2016 and 2020.

This reform should have been the top priority for Congress and the Jan. 6 committee from the beginning, but their priority has been replaying the riot rather than trying to prevent the next one. Let's hope it isn't too late in this Congress to get this done at last.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 2022]

OPINION A NEW AND IMPROVED VERSION OF ELECTORAL COUNT ACT REFORM

(By Jennifer Rubin)

The compromise proposal that Senate negotiators cobbled together earlier this year to reform the 1887 Electoral Count Act was a good start to prevent a repeat of the 2020 coup attempt. But the bill was far from perfect, as testimony before the Senate Rules Committee highlighted.

Fortunately, two members of the House select committee investigating the Jan. 6 insurrection, Reps. Liz Cheney (R–Wyo.) and Zoe Lofgren (D–Calif.) put forth their own improved version on Monday, as described in an opinion piece for the Wall Street Journal.

Their proposal makes a number of key changes to the law, which stipulates the certification of electoral votes. For example:

It confirms that the vice president has only a ceremonial role.

It specifies that members of Congress can only object to electoral votes if they concern ''the explicit constitutional requirements for candidate and elector eligibility and the 12th Amendment's explicit requirements for elector balloting.'' Interestingly, the proposal makes clear that one objection might be that the candidate is ineligible under Section 3 of the 14th Amendment, which bars from federal office anyone who ''engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof.'' In other words, it would serve as a trip wire for challenging former president Donald Trump on the basis that he instigated an ''insurrection.''

It raises the threshold for Congress to vote on an objection from one lawmaker in each chamber to one-third of each chamber.

The proposal also avoids some of the confusing language included in the Senate proposal regarding state certification. The House version is a helpful and precise description of the correct process:

Governors must transmit lawful election results to Congress; if they fail to fulfill that duty, or another official prevents the lawful results from being transmitted, candidates for the presidency should be able to sue in federal court to ensure that Congress receives the state's lawful certificate. These suits would occur before Congress counts electoral votes, and should ensure, in all cases where one candidate has the majority of electoral votes, that Congress's proceeding on Jan. 6 is purely ministerial.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I was very happy to get that support from the organization, from The Wall Street Journal, but we also got kudos from Cato, that well-known conservative institution, that they say this bill is actually more conservative and originalist as compared to other measures.

It is not every day that the Center for American Progress and the Cato Institute see it the same way. But they do in this case. Both organizations, right to left, agree that this is an appropriate step to take and that it will help make our country safer.

Madam Speaker, I would address a couple other issues before closing.

First, it is unfortunate that my friend, Mr. DAVIS, has said something that is clearly inaccurate. In the bill itself it defines what is a disaster. It is not somebody saying, gosh, there's COVID. It is a tightly defined set of catastrophes that will be decided by a Federal three-judge panel and will be limited just in time and scope so that people could have their votes cast and counted.

I also want to address something I think is very unfortunate, the suggestion that somehow I had a role in trying to overturn the election in Iowa. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Federal Contested Election Act says this:

A candidate challenging an election, is required within 30 days after the result of their election, to file with the clerk and serve upon the contestee written notice of the intention to contest an election.

Once that is done, it is assigned to the House administration committee. It wasn't my idea. That is what our rule says. And there is a process that has to be undertaken.

Now, we didn't finish that process because the contestee withdrew, which was her right, and frankly, I was glad that the matter was terminated. But that is just what the law requires.

Madam Speaker, I would make a final comment about the objections under this proposed law. It is true that Members of both sides of the aisle have randomly objected to certification of the electoral college. I think, honestly, that is unfortunate. But we never saw a majority of one party vote to overturn the election as we did on January 6 of 2020.

What this bill would do would be to make sure you could never have those kinds of objections in the future. We did some research. We believe that under our bill, not a single objection in the last 100 years would have been allowed under this bill. The last example was a disagreement in 1873 about whether a candidate who passed away after the election still qualified as a person for Article II purposes. That would be covered under the limited set.

But this would put an end to using frivolous challenges to the electoral count. And that is another good reason why we should pass this bill today.

Madam Speaker, 234 years ago, the authors of The Federalist Papers asked this: ''Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned, more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity. . . . The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States.''

That is the message that resonates to this day. This bill will ensure that the voice of the American people is the final word on the future of our Republic.

All told, the reforms in this bill confine Congress to its true narrow role in Presidential elections under the 12th Amendment.

I hope and trust that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would join us in this critical effort to protect American democracy and to ensure, in President Lincoln's words at Gettysburg, ''that government of the people, by the people,'' and ''for the people'' long endures.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1372, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 203, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—229

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—203

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill

Hinson	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Hollingsworth	McHenry	Sempolinski
Hudson	McKinley	Sessions
Huizenga	Meuser	Simpson
Issa	Miller (IL)	Smith (MO)
Jackson	Miller (WV)	Smith (NE)
Johnson (LA)	Miller-Meeks	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (OH)	Moolenaar	Smucker
Johnson (SD)	Mooney	Spartz
Jordan	Moore (AL)	Stauber
Joyce (OH)	Moore (UT)	Steel
Joyce (PA)	Mullin	Stefanik
Keller	Murphy (NC)	Steil
Kelly (MS)	Nehls	Steube
Kelly (PA)	Newhouse	Stewart
Kim (CA)	Norman	Taylor
Kustoff	Obernolte	Tenney
LaHood	Owens	Thompson (PA)
LaMalfa	Palazzo	Tiffany
Lamborn	Palmer	Timmons
Latta	Pence	Turner
LaTurner	Perry	Valadao
Lesko	Pfluger	Van Drew
Letlow	Posey	Van Duyne
Long	Reschenthaler	Wagner
Loudermilk	Rodgers (WA)	Walberg
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Waltz
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
Mace	Rose	Webster (FL)
Malliotakis	Rosendale	Wenstrup
Mann	Rouzer	Westerman
Massie	Roy	Williams (TX)
Mast	Rutherford	Wilson (SC)
McCarthy	Salazar	Wittman
McCaul	Scalise	Womack
McClain	Schweikert	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—1

Vargas

□ 1656

Mr. MCNERNEY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Granger (Ellzey)	Napolitano (Correa)
Bass (Correa)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Newman (Beyer)
Brown (MD) (Ruppersberger)	Kinzinger (Meijer)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Bush (Bowman)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Payne (Pallone)
Chu (Beyer)	Lamb (Pallone)	Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Conway (Valadao)	Loudermilk (Fleischmann)	Sánchez (Pallone)
DeFazio (Pallone)	McEachin (Beyer)	Swalwell (Correa)
García (IL) (Correa)	Meng (Escobar)	
Gomez (Evans)		

MOURNING THE LOSS OF BEN AND MAX MORRISSEY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today with deep sadness to pay tribute to two highly-skilled U.S. Steel workers, brothers, Ben and Max Morrissey, who tragically lost their lives at the British Petroleum Refinery in my hometown. Yesterday, while on the job at the BP Husky plant in Oregon, Ohio, their lives were cut short in a horrific explosion.

Responsible citizens, husbands, and fathers who performed America's essential work that drives progress and our American way of life forward, these brave men will never again return home to their dear families. They leave behind very young children who will come to understand the gravity of their fathers' loss.

My heart goes out to their precious families and with their brothers and sisters in the United Steelworkers Local 1–346 who lost two beloved friends.

In our grief, we also extend our deep gratitude to the brave first responders who rushed to the scene, provided aid, and helped keep our community safe.

Today is a heartbreaking day for the people of northwest Ohio. We have flown flags in honor of Ben and Max Morrissey high above the U.S. Capitol today. We lift up the memory of them to their loved ones in our hearts, and we pray that they may find solace and comfort in the memories that they will always have of their treasured husbands, fathers, and sons, and that together they may heal.

May God be with them all.

REFORMING THE ELECTORAL COUNT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Presidential Election Reform Act which is long overdue.

As I stand in the well, I can still see the images of January 6, 2021. I can hear the gunfire. I can hear and see the directions of our very able Capitol Police to tell Members to hit the ground. I can see the banging on the doors.

Thank goodness this act will reform the electoral count to ensure that Congress counts the votes as required by the Constitution, including by ensuring that Congress receive a single accurate electoral count certificate from each State—no phony electors as evidenced by President Trump's attempt to bring down this Nation.

Requiring that the States select electors to accomplish this in accordance with State law existing as of the last election, it will reaffirm that the Vice President's role at the count is ministerial, raise the objection threshold to one-third instead of one person, one Member, and limit the explicit constitutional grounds upon which Members may object to a State electoral vote. They will list the explicit constitutional grounds. There will be order to the process.

This is a democracy admired around the world. We must defend this democracy, and we are defending it by voting today on the Presidential Election Reform Act. This is what we should do, the Presidential Election Reform Act.

FARMERS NEED WATER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, with the 50th anniversary of the Clean Water Act, it is important to remind the Biden administration that Congress did not give the EPA jurisdiction over every puddle in America, despite what they are trying to claim.

The 2015 Waters of the United States rule was nothing short of a land and water grab that gave bureaucrats the ability to meddle in intermittent and ephemeral streams, such as the kind farmers use for draining and irrigation.

Under the 2015 WOTUS rule, the EPA could fine farmers thousands of dollars if they simply rotated from one crop to another on their own land without first gaining permission from a Government entity.

Then the Trump administration, through the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, eliminated the significant nexus standard set by the WOTUS rule which solved much of the overreach and uncertainty around it.

The Navigable Waters Protection Rule clearly identified WOTUS in six categories and made further clarifications of the definitions of tributaries and adjacent wetlands.

So I was very dismayed by the EPA's and U.S. Corps of Engineers' decision to reverse the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule and restart the rulemaking process around the definition of what is a navigable water.

If President Biden were serious about helping farmers grow food to supply Americans and the world during this global food shortage, he would return to the Navigable Waters Protection Rule to give farmers certainty and then customers at the grocery store shelf certainty in price and availability of food.

YOUTH MENTAL HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STANSBURY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, tonight, I am convening a Special Order hour for the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and we are focused on the urgent matter of our children's mental health, which is in crisis.

Madam Speaker, I want everyone listening to me now to think about their childhood.

What stressors, if any, did you experience?

What kept you up at night?

What made your heart skip a beat or your palms sweaty?

What seemed completely overwhelming?

Now think of who was there to help you, listen to you, and comfort you.

Now imagine that stressor, and imagine dealing with that same issue in a time when the worldwide pandemic forced you to remain at home for more than 1 year before you returned to school with constantly fluctuating COVID policies; in a world where the book you read last year is banned in school now; in a world where you spend a significant amount of time on social media consuming stories and pictures of other peoples' lives, and that includes coming across lies and disinformation; in a world where a former President wanted to build a wall, where death is ubiquitous, and where food, gas, and housing prices are so high you often go without the basic necessities; in a world where the Supreme Court has stripped basic human rights that your parents and grandparents were able to enjoy.

Could you imagine being a child right now and juggling your mental health?

Mental health is essential for overall health, and ignoring that basic fact is harmful to our children who are counting on us to do everything in our power to support them during this difficult time.

This pandemic has exacerbated many preexisting challenges, stressors, and trauma experienced by our youth.

It has also caused many new challenges.

In December 2021, the U.S. Surgeon General, Dr. Vivek Murthy, issued an advisory highlighting the urgent need to address the Nation's youth mental health crisis.

Last fall, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and the Children's Hospital Association jointly declared a national state of emergency in children's mental health.

Prior to coming to Congress, I had the privilege of serving New York City children in our public schools for over 20 years. I served as an elementary school teacher, a high school guidance counselor, and a middle school principal.

The education, care, and well-being of our children are my life's work, and it is an honor to speak on the floor tonight to highlight an urgent issue that is critical to the health and safety of our children and the future of our democracy: our children's mental health.

During the 2017–2018 school year, 34 children died within the K–12 school system in the Bronx, and 17 died via suicide. In early 2018, the horrible Parkland High School shooting happened, killing 17 children and wounding 17 more while leaving a nation reeling in despair.

During this time as a middle school principal, I saw a rise in student self-harm and suicidal ideation in kids as young as 11 years old. It was these factors that ultimately led me to run for Congress in the first place.

Since the pandemic, an unprecedented number of our young people feel helpless and hopeless right now, and we need to make an unprecedented effort for a coordinated, comprehensive response. That is why at the end of last year we called for a new COVID relief package that considers the needs of the whole child to support overall health, including youth mental health.

The toll of the pandemic is daunting when we consider its impact on children. In the past 2 years, more than 167,000 children across the country have lost a parent or primary caregiver to COVID–19. These caregivers provided a child's most important basic needs: love, security, food, and shelter. More than 13,000 of these children lost their only caregiver. In fact, for every four COVID–19 deaths, one child in the U.S. loses a parent.

A student in my district in Yonkers shared her experience of suddenly losing her father to COVID followed by her mother testing positive. She described her fear and not being able to sleep while her mother was in an induced coma for 9 days. She couldn't eat, and she couldn't go to school. Because of her father's immigration status, he was excluded from almost all types of medical insurance and was forced to choose between basic healthcare and food.

Her story is not the only one like this, which is why we need to drive resources so that schools can directly support students' mental health and so we can break down barriers to basic, necessary healthcare for all regardless of immigration status.

After experiencing the major traumatic loss of a parent, we know the world as these children knew it has ended. Loss and grief are a part of life, but in children grieving, a major loss can have lifelong impacts of depression, post-traumatic stress, and anxiety.

□ 1715

For parents and those of us who work directly with children, it is heartbreaking to see one child grieving. With this vast number of grieving children, our entire community must be ready to empathize and mobilize the help they need to cope.

In addition to the stress youth are under as a result of COVID–19 and this ongoing pandemic, they are also facing other mental health issues as they navigate puberty and being an adolescent. Youth across the country are battling substance abuse, eating and body image disorders, facing various forms of peer pressure, anxiety, and overall trying to learn how to manage their emotions and feelings during their formative years. This is a reality across racial and economic lines.

Still, meaningful mental health care is out of reach for so many children. Native American or Indigenous children are 4½ times as likely as White children to have lost a parent to COVID. Black children are almost 2½ times more likely than White children, and Hispanic children are nearly twice as likely than White children to have lost a parent or caregiver.

When we also consider that many families who face job losses, loss of insurance, financial hardships, and a lack of school-based mental health professionals, the barriers to youth mental health support are unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for organizing this very important moment on the floor of the House of Representatives to address what is a critical, urgent issue, and crisis in our country right now.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to this public health crisis that our Nation has yet to adequately address. Over the last 13 years, youth mental well-being has plummeted. The Surgeon General's office reported that between 2009 and 2019, the share of high school students reporting persistent sadness or hopelessness increased by 40 percent, while the share of those contemplating suicide increased by 36 percent.

The COVID pandemic has only made this worse. The youth mental health crisis—in many ways, a pandemic of its own—has only worsened in recent years. While the President's COVID response has been significantly more effective than that of his predecessor, we cannot properly address COVID without addressing the mental health consequences of over 2 years of isolation, uncertainty, and historic amounts of death and suffering.

Black and Brown youth are among those hurting the most. In 2019, my Emergency Task force on Black Youth Suicide and Mental Health found alarming increases in suicide rates among Black youth, in part caused by racial disparities in access to care. As of last year, that rate of increase is more than twice as high for Black girls and Black boys.

In response to this, I introduced the Pursuing Equity in Mental Health Act, which would invest in our entire mental health care system. That means not just funding additional mental health research, but also establishing a stigma-shattering outreach program and building a larger, stronger, more culturally competent mental health care workforce.

To fight America's youth mental health crisis, we must prioritize equity and do everything in our power to eliminate racial and gender-based mental health disparities. This is an important moment in our time in Congress. We have devastation, sadness, and incredibly devastating responses to sadness at a very young age.

Madam Speaker, I did not know that a 5-year-old could comprehend that ending his or her life was an answer to the pain that he or she has been experiencing, but I know that it has happened. As a result of seeing those posts over and over and over and over again on Facebook and other platforms, that

is what motivated me to pull together that emergency task force. It has yielded such tremendous information that we need as a country to know—to know that we need to invest in all aspects of healthcare as it relates to the disparities that exist with access to mental health care as well as just healthcare in general.

We must do better. We have so much to overcome. We can do better, and I look forward to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses to work collaboratively to do better for this next generation.

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN for her leadership and her voice in this important matter.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk briefly before yielding to Representative CARTER from New Orleans. I want to speak briefly about the role of schools in addressing the issue of mental health.

Our schools play an essential role in supporting positive mental health for our youth. In order to serve the whole child, we cannot limit our Federal support to only academic outcomes. Children are much more likely to receive mental health services in the school than anywhere else, but the problem is that too few of our schools have enough mental health professionals on staff, including psychologists, social workers, and counselors. The ratio of students to school psychologists is roughly 1400 to 1.

Just this year I hosted a town hall with students in my district who shared how hard it was for them to meet with a counselor or mental health professional at school. The students with more access to mental health resources went to schools in wealthier parts of my district.

As a former principal, I know firsthand how important it is that the schools have the resources to employ mental health professionals. More than 14 million students attend a school with police officers or school resource officers, but no counselors, nurses, psychologists, or social workers on staff.

The way we allocate resources is a reflection of our priorities and our values, which is why I support unprecedented levels of funding that prioritizes the mental health of all our students by making sure there are trained, culturally competent mental health professionals in every public school, including more Black and Brown mental health professionals.

For the last 2½ years, we have seen our schools at the front lines of responding to the COVID–19 pandemic. In many ways, we as a society have shifted how we think about what it means to care for our young people in the face of multiple public health crises.

Together, with our schools leading the way, we worked to create a safety net for our children and prioritize the well-being of the whole child. These are the kinds of investments that can buffer children from chronic stress that can lead to adverse childhood experiences, or ACEs.

It should go without saying, our kids are so much more than any one test score or academic measure. Children are individuals who are members of their community, and our schools should be subsequently funded and equipped as community hubs. Supporting our children's success is fundamentally intertwined with supporting the whole child in a well-coordinated ecosystem of wraparound services.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BOWMAN for organizing this hour to discuss such a critical issue, and I thank him for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of the opportunity to shine light on this critical issue of mental health. Our children are our most precious treasures. For many of us, they are our reason why.

Why we work two jobs. Why we go to school. Why we try to overcome personal challenges and become the best version of ourselves. Yet, our system is failing to help our dear children fight their own demons. From kindergartners to young adults, young people of all ages are struggling with mental health and that they are not being met with the services they need to be happy, to be healthy, and tragically, to save their lives.

It is truly a crisis, and like most crises we face, the situation is worse for some communities than others, and certainly it is the case for communities of color.

Here is a terrifying statistic: Black children under the age of 13 are twice as likely to die by suicide compared to their White peers—twice as likely.

Further, children who survive natural disasters—like many of my constituents in southeast Louisiana—are left with emotional scars that can impact them for their entire lives. A new study published by the Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry found that the stress of experiencing a natural disaster during a pregnancy can substantially increase the risk of childhood depression and anxiety.

It is clear that we are in a crisis, and we must act to meet the moment. I am so grateful that the Institute of Women and Ethnic Studies of New Orleans has been granted $400,000 from HHS for an initiative to help identify health and wellness policies that are successful in improving Black youth mental health, and including suicide prevention.

This year, Congress just passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which will help keep guns out of the hands of individuals who are in danger of potentially hurting themselves or others. But this historic bill also includes $500 million for school-based mental health services, and millions more for certified community behavioral health clinics and mental health telehealth.

This year, we also launched the 988 hotline, a mental health hotline and text line, where people can reach trained counselors in their time of need. We must, we can, we will do more. We must make mental health service easy, accessible, and affordable to everyone, particularly our children.

We must tear down the stigma and equalize mental health and physical health. It is okay to not be okay. Everyone needs support at a different point in their lives. Everyone needs a little extra help sometimes. Everyone can feel a little down sometimes. Everyone has issues that they think are insurmountable. But guess what? With help, with treatment, help is there, and you can survive it. You have got to know that.

Don't ever be afraid to ask for help. Don't ever be afraid to admit that you just don't feel right. Don't ever be afraid to admit that you don't fit in, that you feel different. Help is there. And we have all had moments where we needed help. You have got to know that you can survive, and you will survive this.

We must all be trained about the signs of mental health crises and look out for one another. Implementing many of these programs and supporting the mental health professionals who provide these services may have a significant price tag, and from my perspective, it is essential.

Any dollar that we spend, any money that we appropriate that saves a life, that gives individuals hope that we care and that resources are available, are dollars well spent.

We need to do more. We need to invest in programs and have staff that change and save lives. We need to do it now. We need to continue to fight. Our children are worth it.

When someone has high blood pressure, they exercise, they diet, they take a pill. If someone has diabetes, they exercise, they diet, they take a pill. They modify their lifestyles, and they are not ashamed to admit those things. Mental health is no different.

There is nothing wrong with admitting that you may need help because help is there for you, and we know empirically that the resources are there, and they make a difference. We have got to get away from feeling like if we need help that somehow some way that means something is wrong with me. Well, there is nothing wrong with you. There is nothing more wrong with you than a person that has a headache who takes an aspirin.

□ 1730

There is nothing more wrong with you than somebody who has high blood pressure and takes blood pressure medicine. We can fix it. You are not alone. It is important that you know.

To anyone who is struggling, who has children or young people in their lives who are struggling, you are not alone.

You will never be alone. Things will get better.

Reach out. 988 is available to you 24/7. Experts are waiting to heed your call. Organizations are funded to help you. We are here to help you.

You are not alone, and you can and will survive.

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative CARTER so much for his powerful words and leadership and for being here this evening.

When we consider the toll of a nationwide youth mental health crisis, our mission must be to show love to our youth and to help our young people learn to love themselves, their communities, and our planet.

In the face of so many real-world challenges, like the climate crisis, the pandemic, and extreme inequality and discrimination, it is essential that children's learning prioritizes creativity, innovation, critical thinking, problem-solving, communication, and collaboration as these approaches all support the mental health and the overall development of our children. These are the 21st century learning skills that will empower and teach our students how to think, not what to think.

When the purpose of education is about fostering the value and ethic of lifelong learning as a fundamental pillar of democracy, it is abundantly clear that promoting positive mental health is fundamental to that work.

But when we try to apply a business model to our schools and treat our students as commodities, making the necessary investments in mental health support and social and emotional learning gets sidelined in favor of a more simplistic bottom line that improperly fixates on the results of an annual assessment.

We have subjected our public schools to this model for 20 years, and it hasn't addressed inequity in our schools. It has not closed any gaps. What it has done is limit what gets taught and how it gets taught.

It has prioritized doing well academically over developing the lifelong skills that you need, including your emotional health and well-being. It has made students feel that their chance to live a quality life with opportunities hinges on how they do on a singular exam.

We have the opportunity to change this, finally, and do right by our students. The idea that our schools should be equipped to meet the holistic needs of their students is not one that should exist only in a time of a pandemic. We cannot go back to our old ways of thinking about schools just in terms of narrowly defined academic performance.

Even before the pandemic, rates of young people experiencing mental health issues were rising. Between 2007 and 2019, the percentage of adolescents reporting a major depressive episode increased by nearly 60 percent. By 2019, mental health disorders had exceeded physical conditions as the most common cause of impairments and limitations amongst children.

I saw the gaps in our health system up close. Schools are the most common place for children to access mental health services, but most schools do not meet recommended ratios for school psychologists, social workers, or counselors. Instead, even before the pandemic, we saw pediatricians, teachers, school leaders, and more stepping in to try to provide mental health services, despite many of them not feeling fully equipped to do so. The pandemic only exacerbated all of these issues and put further strain on a health system that was already not built to adequately support youth mental health.

As COVID surged, emergency room visits for young people having a mental health crisis increased dramatically. Since 2019, ER visits for suspected suicide attempts rose 51 percent amongst girls ages 12 to 17. But high COVID hospitalization rates and, later, the surge of new variants, combined with inadequate vaccination rates, mean that we had and continue to have a shortage of hospital beds and emergency rooms to service young people having a mental health crisis.

In an op-ed by a constituent of mine, Jonathan Slater, a child and adolescent psychiatrist, described children and teenagers at his hospital having to wait 3 to 4 days for an inpatient bed.

The strain on hospital capacity caused by the ongoing pandemic means our ability to adequately treat all other physical and mental health is jeopardized. The more people get vaccinated and boosted, that means fewer people in the hospital, and it means the 15-year-old who lost her parent to COVID and hasn't experienced a normal school year since she was 12 can get access to the emergency mental health care that she needs.

I want to express immense gratitude for the many people, teachers, school leaders, pediatricians, school bus drivers, emergency room physicians, and staff who have stepped in to confront the youth mental health crisis head-on. But we cannot address youth mental health without addressing issues we face in our broader healthcare system and without addressing workforce issues in mental health professions.

As we continue to face compounding public health and mental health crises among our young people, we have to recognize that cultivating a better Nation, marked by healthy and happy young people who are equipped to engage critically and collaboratively with their communities and our democracy, requires us to continue on the path of rethinking schools and their purpose and potential.

We need Federal investments and resources in our schools that reflect these priorities, and that means putting the mental health and well-being of our students front and center as we move forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), and I thank her very much for being here.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I thank the ever-amazing partner in good trouble, Congressman BOWMAN, for hosting this Special Order hour on one of the most critical issues facing our Nation, youth mental health.

As a mother of two young boys, I know that there are few people who see this mental health crisis amongst our children quite like our teachers and our educators. They are on the front lines of it every single day, and it is in no way an exaggeration to say America's teachers are the ones saving lives in the face of a tidal wave of trauma and grief brought about by many crises impacting our young people today.

From COVID–19 to schools turning into war zones, severe economic hardship, and an education system that continues to be underfunded for a number of issues that, again, our kids are dealing with, we are seeing that trauma is at the center of it.

I know according to the National Alliance on Mental Illness, 57.8 percent of Michiganders from the age of 12 to 17 who have experienced depression did not receive any care in the last year, and high school students with depression are more than two times more likely to drop out than their peers.

These are just a few of the compounding traumas impacting our young people today. These traumas have stolen our children's sense of safety and our children's support systems. So, the fact that the rates of youth in mental health distress have skyrocketed should be a surprise to no one, especially not anyone in this body.

We have failed to address gun violence. We have failed to protect basic human rights. We have failed to ensure that every child in the richest nation on Earth has access to the clean air, safe water, and healthy food that they need to grow and thrive. We have failed to truly address childhood poverty.

Instead of investing in schools, combating poverty, and taking action on reducing violence, this body continues to double down on failed approaches.

I know I continue to be asked in my community: What good is another 100 F–35s when our children go to sleep on empty stomachs? What is the point of spending more money on militarization of our communities than any other country spends on defense instead of making sure that our children have safe drinking water and that they are not exposed to lead and PFAS?

While our children are crying out for help as loud as they can, over in the Senate, their elected leaders, many of whom have been bought and paid for by the fossil fuel lobby, are working hard to—you guessed it—sell out their chances at a livable future and improve the lives of many of our folks in the future.

This body, this Congress, isn't just failing to address this youth mental health crisis. It is turbocharging it.

I know in my community, we have the most polluted ZIP Code in the

State of Michigan, 48217, where we see high rates of asthma. When I go read to children in the third grade class during March Reading Month, I ask how many children there know what I do for a living, and they don't know, usually, and I have to give them a civics lesson. I tell them that I am trying to fight for clean air. I ask them: ''How many of you have asthma or are suffering from asthma?'' A third of the class always raises their hands.

I ask them: ''It hurts to have an asthma attack, doesn't it? It is hard to breathe. Isn't it hard to breathe?'' They shake their heads.

Every day, we fail. We fail them by not taking action on climate for a livable future.

Please know this: Our children cannot learn if they are hungry, but they also cannot learn if they are breathing dirty air, if they are being poisoned by lead-infested water, so we must take action.

I know that we also have failed to enact real, meaningful gun control that our children can be proud of, that our teachers can feel is meaningful and that it actually does keep them safe.

Every day that we have failed to enact bold reforms to resurrect and protect our democracy is a day closer to dooming our children to a fascist future where their rights are stripped from them.

This isn't new for our communities, but I know for many of the young people of color in my community, the LGBTQI youth, our immigrant youth, our religious minorities, these failures have been amplified by the horrifying pandemic of racism, bigotry, and hate that has exploded in our country.

Make no mistake, the crisis of hate facing our country is 100 percent the result of continued political motivation that is literally a factor in pushing elected officials and social leaders in spewing out fear rather than trying to address the root causes of the issues that our children are facing.

I know the only solution here is fundamental overhaul of what we govern. We must put our children before corporations, people before profits, and community solidarity before hate and fear.

Madam Speaker, I cannot thank my colleague enough for his incredible leadership. Sometimes it is our lived experiences that we bring into this Chamber that give us the passion and inspiration to work hard. I am so honored to be able to serve with somebody that not only was a principal but is also a father himself and understands and has been on the front line and seen the lack of action in this body for our youth mental health crisis in our country.

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank RASHIDA for her voice. It is good to see her and be with her.

Tonight, we have heard from Members who represent communities across the country. The youth mental health crisis is a national crisis that requires an all-of-government response. Our children deserve nothing less.

There were so many voices that contributed to these remarks this evening from my district, New York-16. I recognize them at this moment.

Making the necessary investments in our youth mental health will take all of us at every level of government and in every community.

I give a special shout-out to constituents of mine who shared their priorities around youth mental health. Jonathan Lewis, a Scarsdale Village trustee, shared how important it is to understand the relationship between a mental health crisis and learned outcomes to our students, not just in an academic sense but also with respect to school climate and the importance of creating a learning environment that is safe from violence.

Stephanie Marquesano from the harris project in Ardsley highlighted how important it is that communities, youth, and all levels of government be in dialogue with each other about the intersection of mental health and substance use disorders, particularly as it relates to our youth.

Ron Hartridge, educator and advocate in the Bronx, expressed his deep concern regarding the impact that trauma and fear have on our children and how important it is to equip our schools to support students instead of prioritizing compliant behavior, which is so often used to justify and perpetuate the school-to-prison pipeline.

Jonathan Alvarez from 914United in Yonkers called for meaningful juvenile justice reform in the Lower Hudson Valley.

Darryl Taylor, a Tuckahoe Village trustee, wrote in about the toll of the COVID–19 pandemic, particularly on our youth who lost loved ones, parents, siblings, or friends, and the urgency we must have to reach out to our youth who may be feeling alone in their grief and hopelessness.

Mary Graves, Mount Vernon's Democratic chair, shared how important it is that we make mental health resources and support available to the whole community and consider how there isn't a one-size-fits-all approach to mental health.

Julie Cordin from my district shared how troubling it is to learn that suicidal ideation and attempted suicides amongst children increased during the pandemic and that this will not go away on its own. We have to work on this together. I am so grateful to all of my constituents who care so deeply about our youth, both locally and nationally.

The youth mental health crisis is a national crisis that requires an all-of-government response. Our children deserve nothing less.

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

□ 1745

MORAL BREAKDOWN OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about several issues which have either not been covered enough lately or not covered in the appropriate way.

The first thing I would like to talk about is the loan forgiveness program and the recent change in the law increasing public loan forgiveness.

When my constituents back home ask me, what is the biggest problem? I say, well, we certainly have problems with the economy, we certainly have problems with education, we certainly have problems with crime—but I say the biggest problem is we are in a moral breakdown in this country.

I would like to address the way the loan forgiveness program and public loan forgiveness is changing America, I think, for the worst.

The first thing I would like to address is the fact that this institution has apparently felt that you are a lot better off, or it should be much easier for you to have your loan forgiven if you work for a nonprofit organization or a governmental entity.

Now, whenever I go around my district, the manufacturers, the farmers, a couple of big insurance companies, they are all looking for more people to work. But the message out of Washington is, don't work for business, which, after all, is the engine that really makes our country go around. It shows kind of a hatred for manufacturers, a hatred for agriculture, a hatred of retail, a hatred of insurance.

People working in this building who work with our government employees, their staff is government employees, apparently felt: Well, I think those hardworking people in government, they ought to be offered a tremendous benefit that people who don't work for the government don't get. We are going to find a way to forgive the people's loans if they are the nice, noble people who work for government. And if they are somebody who, say, works for a manufacturer—which is so important for the country—well, we don't care about those people. We hate those people.

The next message in our loan forgiveness policy is the dislike of people who don't go to college. One of my goals in the legislature—which I think I am succeeding at a little bit—is educating people about all the good, necessary jobs we have in our country that don't require a 4-year college degree.

Recently, The Wall Street Journal pointed out—I am told—that if you are a plumber and compare your lifelong earnings to someone who is a general practitioner, it is about the same. We so desperately need more people in the

trades. We so desperately need more people who are skilled in the manufacturing field.

But what do we do here?

We turn around and put them or their children in greater debt with this loan forgiveness program or it will likely drive up insurance more with the loan forgiveness program that is going to cost over $300 billion a year.

We benefit the people who go to college. We treat the people who don't go to college like dirt: No, you are not getting anything, inflation is going to go up and hurt you because we have to give money to the people who went to college.

The next bad message that it sends is, I think it is discriminating against the hardworking.

I ran into somebody recently, heard about somebody who got a nice job out of college, but with pride he said he was going to work extra hard and pay off that student loan. So he got a job as an Uber driver and he got a job as a bartender. I am sure between them both he was working well over 60, 65 hours a week but he was proud to prepay that student loan.

And what does the government say to somebody who works especially hard and pays off their student loan?

Sucker. We are going to give the same benefit to someone who didn't work that second or third job.

Again, you are eating away at the moral fiber of America.

The next group is the frugal. I always thought it was wise to be frugal, wise to be debt-free, pay off that debt before you take out your credit card and buy a fancier car or buy more furniture or buy a fancy vacation or something. But we look at the people who are frugal and use their frugality to pay off their student loan. Again, we say: Sucker, you shouldn't have paid off your student loan. The government will pay off the student loan for somebody who wasn't as frugal, and we consider you kind of foolish for being frugal.

And the final thing I would point out is that under the proposed forgiveness by President Biden, we give out twice the forgiveness if you originally took out Pell grants.

Now, one of the problems I have talked about with the Pell grants in the past is that it is easier to get a Pell grant if you are not married, which probably isn't a good thing, but that is the way it is.

Now, you already get the benefit of the Pell Grant for not being married in the first place. Now we double the amount of loan forgiveness if you wind up originally getting this additional boost with the Pell grant.

So, again, it is sending the wrong message to people. In addition to the fact that it is another $360 billion log on the fire of inflation. And then people will pretend they don't know where inflation came from. But when the Treasury is spending 360 billion bucks, that is where the inflation came from.

The next thing I am going to address is what is going on at the border. And as I mentioned before, this is another topic that the press underreports.

Earlier this week, one more time, we had the information come out on the number of people who came across the border in August. It varies from month to month, between 140,000 and 180,000 people crossing the border. But that is just totally inappropriate. It makes a mockery of our immigration laws to people who are doing it right.

We know that some of these people, after all, had to break the law to come here, and are going to be disproportionately in a situation in which they have to take advantage of the public benefits of this country. And we don't know whether they have been adequately blended into America, think like Americans, think with the self-reliance that Americans should have. I don't think any serious country believes in open borders, except for we do here.

In addition to the obvious problem of the adults coming here, we have—depending on the month—about 10,000 unaccompanied minors coming here to be dropped off, presumably at relatives, somebody or other. I don't know where the press is that always worries about broken families, when our open borders results in 9,000 or 10,000 people, who at least claim to be minors, without a parent around.

The next problem, a humanitarian problem, when you have such a huge number of people crossing the border, people die coming over the border. The last time I was down on the border, they found two bodies of people around San Diego and the Pacific Ocean. We were told it was more common to find bodies on the Mexican side of the border. We hear about people dehydrating to death in the Arizona desert. We hear about people drowning in the Rio Grande.

Nevertheless, these things are not talked about. They are an inevitable consequence of sending a message to people all around the globe that we don't care what happens at the border.

Another problem is, depending on the person, they frequently are charged $5,000, $10,000, $20,000 to come here. Who is benefiting by this?

The Border Patrol believes that the drug cartels are right now making more money smuggling people across the border than they do selling drugs.

So what is the effect of the drug cartels making more money? It gives them even more of a stranglehold on our southern neighbor, Mexico, which is quickly becoming more and more of a narco State.

I think part of that is our fault in America for having too many people consume drugs that are snuck in across the southern border. But some of the fault also has to lie in this open-door policy pursued by the Biden administration as the Mexican drug cartels get wealthier and wealthier and wealthier.

Another thing to point out is we are not inappropriate otherwise as far as letting people in this country. Depending on the year, we have over 800,000 new people sworn in as American citizens. That is certainly very generous, particularly when compared to other countries. Meanwhile, we have a situation in which we are encouraging people to come here right now.

Madam Speaker, 65 percent of the bursts of illegal immigrants are people on Medicaid, which would indicate that it is still a greater burden on our budget to have more people come here.

The American Medical Association points out the huge number of illegals who show up in emergency rooms. Of course, as a practical matter, they are in charge of this if something passes through to the other people who are paying for their medical care. But, again, we have to say one of the reasons for the spiraling costs of medical care in this country is people who show up in the emergency rooms and don't pay. That would be illegals.

I recently talked to someone who operates a free clinic in my district. And they told me that a significant number of the people that they deal with at the free clinic are people here illegally.

This could become even greater if eventually President Biden gets his dream—it could very easily happen if the elections go away. I don't want to have them go away—in which we give Pell grants to people who come here illegally which results in close to a free college education that the American middle class doesn't get. But apparently an inducement to have more people come here is we are going to give Pell grants to people who come here illegally.

I hope that the American press corps pays more attention to the numbers introduced earlier this week, as far as the number of people who came here illegally in August. It should be a banner headline. It will be a permanent change in America when over 150,000 people come here.

And I should point out that as more people come here, it doesn't mean we are kicking out more people who break our laws. At the same time, we are deporting only about a quarter of the number of people who President Trump was deporting for breaking the law. So we are, in essence, allowing more people who are criminally prone to come into this country.

The next issue I want to talk about that the press should be paying attention to: I recently talked to someone who claims that in the military, where they had required vaccines, we have recently heard of increases in miscarriages, cancer, blood clots, neurological complications, and deaths.

I would hope the press would dig into this, make some freedom of information requests. If it really is true, as my friend tells me, that there is an increase in medical problems at the same time that our military was required to get the vaccine, it is something we should know not only for the benefit of the military but the rest of America as well.

I haven't seen this being adequately covered given the huge amount of

money we are putting in these vaccines, as well as the fact that we are encouraging children to get these vaccines. I would hope that a lot of attention is being paid to the effect of vaccines on the primarily young military population, and a population that is generally in shape.

The next thing that not only the press should be paying attention to but, quite frankly, the business lobbyists should be paying attention to is something called the PRO Act.

The PRO Act passed the House of Representatives two terms in a row. It is being held up in the Senate right now only because of the filibuster rule. Depending upon what happens in the elections in November, one could easily see the PRO Act become law.

□ 1800

The American public does not know what is in the PRO Act. Lobbyists in this building, who should know better, don't know about the PRO Act. We are very close to changing the labor laws in this country where you can wind up having an election to unionize with only 14 days' advance notice. These elections would take place with an open ballot. You fill out your ballot, and people can know how you vote. If it is perceived that the management team did something untoward during the election, the labor relations board can deem there to be a union, even though nobody even voted to be unionized.

It can create a situation in which different franchisees can be lumped together, and even though no employees in one location want to unionize, they can be forced into a union.

It would be a fundamental change in the way we do business in this country. I have nothing against people who belong to a union, but this would overwhelmingly shift the bias toward forcing people to join a union when they don't necessarily want to. It is something our business groups, whatever association it is, should familiarize themselves with and make sure their members know what could very easily happen.

I also think the PRO Act has been very underpublicized by our press corps. If it turns out in January that we begin down a process of mass unionization and we go down a path in which all employees' numbers have to be turned over—their address, their email address, their phone number—without their say so, the American public ought to know what they are voting for in November.

I don't believe the press corps in this country has adequately explained to both management, employees, everybody, how close we are to that PRO Act becoming law. Everybody ought to know it. I think it would be devastating for American business, particularly American business that has to compete abroad, if the PRO Act were to pass. But if it passes, I bet very few people will understand what effect this election has on it.

There is another significant bill that is being held back only because of the filibuster rule in the Senate. Even though this bill passed this session, the average American does not know how close we are to this becoming law. I speak about the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act.

In this act, both for the purpose of censuses and other government forms, American citizens and American children will be asked to declare a sexual preference or sexual identity, be it bisexual, be it binary, be it transgender, what-have-you. I think this is highly offensive. There was a time when the gay rights movement meant we weren't supposed to ask what people do in bed. Now, it is going to be the government's business, and you are going to be asked to declare your sexual preference, which by itself is outlandish.

But just as outlandish is this declaring goes all the way down to kids who are 7 or 6 or 5 years old. Now, there the form may be filled out by parents or by a teacher. It includes forms other than just the census, forms that school districts are required to fill out.

Nevertheless, I think it is a fundamental change in America that we are going to be collecting data on sexual preferences from any age group. Outlandish for age 5; outlandish for age 12. But this, to me, is a fundamental change in the way America operates, and the information that people are supposed to turn over to the government is a fundamental change.

I would be surprised if one out of 300 Americans knew we are so close to making that requirement in the United States. I hope that our slumbering press corps—I don't mean to refer to them that way—but I hope that the average American knows how close we are to that bill becoming law.

The next issue that I think we ought to look at a little bit concerns the continued effort to claim we have a huge racism problem in this country. I do not believe we have a racism problem in the country. The easiest way to see that is when you look and see how well the immigrants who just come here are able to do, despite the fact that many of the immigrants who come here don't even know English.

I have recently spoken to people from the Hmong community, from the Indian community, and from the Filipino community, and all of them are so happy to be in America and think America is the land of opportunity, that people do so well in America.

I talked to a Hmong individual recently, and he had between himself, his children, and his siblings' children, about 30 children or nieces or nephews. Every one of them is thriving in America. Nobody has broken any laws. They all have decent jobs. They are educated in one fashion or another. These are people who came here from an entirely different culture. Many were not Christian. Their parents or grandparents did not know English when they came here, but they thrive in America.

I have been talking to some Indian immigrants, and they say how wonderful the opportunity is here. Again, I talked to somebody recently who came here, didn't know any English. He had to start out as a dishwasher. He worked his way up and is doing fantastically well in America. The fact that he is of Indian heritage had no effect on him whatsoever, and he couldn't think of any way in which he had been discriminated against. Same thing is true with somebody from the Philippines.

But what do we get here out of Washington? We get Joe Biden talking about we have to pass a bill—I will talk about in a second—we have to make it easier to sue police, in part, because we perceive the police are prejudiced.

We continue to promote the Black Lives Matter movement, which is built on the lie that we have a huge problem with racist police in this country. But nevertheless, we coddle them, people give them money, and they are treated with respect.

In our election law, we are told we have to get rid of photo ID, something that many other countries have, because it is racist to require photo ID. That is some horrible slander that Joe Biden has against the people of this country.

I would ask that the press begin to treat these claims of racism a little more skeptically. I think they should ask people details when they claim racism is a big problem, because it is not without harm. I think it causes people to walk around with a chip on their shoulder. I think that it causes unnecessary divisions in Americans. I think America has been a melting pot my whole life and well before I was born.

People come here from all around the globe. I should point out that insofar as there are ethnic problems, they are frequently greater in other countries. That is one thing that people from India pointed out to me, that there are problems between different religious groups or ethnic groups in India in which people even get killed. There is nothing like that in the United States.

It is time the politicians of this building, rather than trying to take political advantage of the grievances that they try to bring up, they should tell people that anybody who works hard in America has an opportunity to succeed and that that is something they can be proud of about of America. They can just use their common sense.

If you are down at the border, the people who come here, come here from all around the globe, because they know that despite the fact they might not know the native language, despite the fact that they don't have a job lined up when they get here—whether you are coming here from Peru or Cuba or Ecuador or Bangladesh, Uzbekistan, anywhere—you are going to be better off in the United States. Not Christian, not northern European, not European at all, you are still going to be better off in the United States.

So many immigrants have told me there is unlimited opportunity in the

United States. That is why they are here. One of the major reasons, I think, why some people don't succeed in taking advantage of that opportunity is because they are told by opportunistic politicians that America is a racist country and you cannot succeed in America.

The final comment that I think the press should be picking up going into the election cycle is a law that right now has passed the House twice but has only not passed the Senate because of the filibuster rule, which could change with a shift in just two votes in the U.S. Senate, is the law making it easier to sue police.

There are a variety of reasons why crime has gone up so dramatically in this country in the last 2 years, and there is no question that part of it is we are not adequately funding our police departments. But even more than that, we are not speaking positively about police. Now, we have a bill out there making it easier to sue police if they handcuff somebody or if they wrestle with somebody.

This rhetoric from politicians and also this proposed law causes police, I think, to be very reluctant to physically engage somebody, very reluctant to be aggressive. As a result, we have in Milwaukee, the city of my birth, and many other urban cities, including Washington and Baltimore, right up the freeway, dramatic increases in the number of homicides. It didn't just happen. It happened, in part, because of rhetoric from politicians tearing down police, encouraging lack of respect for the law.

The final highlight of this drive to dislike police could easily happen in January when we get rid of the limited immunity that police currently have if they have to engage someone. It would dramatically change policing, make it more difficult to find police, and make it easier to sue police.

I hope our press corps pays special attention to these laws, which did not pass out of this Congress, but passed only out of the House. But if there is a slight shift in the partisan makeup in January, they could easily become law. The American citizens ought to know about these laws before they go to vote in November. I am afraid they are not going to know it, because they are not adequately covered by our slumbering journalists.

I ask one more time that they pay attention to laws related to racism; laws related to suing police; laws related to the LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act, in which they go around and try to collect data on sexual preferences from all Americans; and the PRO Act, in which we, I think, just shamefully tip the balance of the scales toward forcing people to become members of a union.

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

REFLECTIONS OF MY TIME IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I arrived in this storied Chamber 12-and-a-half years ago fresh off a Florida special election to fill former Representative Robert Wexler's seat. I was the lone freshman in the middle of the 111th Congress. I was eager. I was a little uncertain. I had a bit more hair. I wanted to do right by the people who sent me here.

It was during those first days that I met the late John Dingell, then the dean of the House, himself by all accounts a very important man. I don't know about you, Madam Speaker, but at that point, having secured the will of the American people to serve as their Representative in the House of Representatives, and having received my spiffy new congressional pin, I might have been feeling a little important myself, even with the novelty of my new job.

□ 1815

But John Dingell looked me square in the eye and gave me a piece of advice that I would never forget. He said: You are not important. It is what you can do for the people who sent you here, that is what is important. If you never confuse those two, he said, you will be fine.

Over the course of my time in Congress, as Mr. Dingell predicted, I have met some very important people, but those people, with all due respect to my colleagues, don't serve in this Chamber.

I met Mitch Libman, the childhood friend of Private First Class Leonard Kravitz, Company M, Fifth Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division. For decades, Mitch worked to find out why Private First Class Kravitz, who sacrificed himself for his platoon during the Korean war in an extraordinary act of heroism, never received the Medal of Honor he was recommended for.

Mitch's efforts led to a 2002 congressional review to uncover soldiers of Jewish and Hispanic origin who were wrongfully denied the Medal of Honor due to prejudice. His tireless devotion to his late friend led me to introduce an amended version of the National Defense Authorization Act in the 113th Congress to ensure each and every soldier discovered during that review to deserve the Medal of Honor received their award.

I was proud to stand before President Obama surrounded by the families of these bravest Americans when the President awarded 24 recipients, including Private First Class Kravitz posthumously, with that deserved honor.

Mitch Libman and Private First Class Kravitz, and what we were able to do for them, that was important.

I met Mona Reis, the founder of the Presidential Women's Center. Outraged by the prevalence of unsafe, back-alley abortions, by the injustice of women having to travel across borders to access basic reproductive healthcare that is their right, Mona lobbied for legalized abortion here in Washington.

The day after Roe v. Wade was decided, she joined the first outpatient abortion clinic in Miami as a staff counselor, helping women in Florida finally access the care they needed. When she moved north to my district, she founded the Presidential Women's Center in Palm Beach County, a leading comprehensive reproductive care facility.

It is because of her dedication to women's basic human rights in south Florida, and her shining example nurturing patients through the most difficult decision of their lives, that I fought hard against efforts to attack women's bodily autonomy, first in Tallahassee and then in Washington.

It is why I became a task force chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus. Together with my colleagues, we passed the Women's Health Protection Act in the House to codify Roe into law and pushed for the repeal of the global gag rule. That was important, and especially in this moment, it continues to be important.

I met Robert Boo and Bruce Williams, CEO and active aging manager of the Pride Center at Equality Park in Wilton Manors, Florida. Every day, they work with their team to create a welcoming, empowering home with a wealth of resources for south Florida's LGBTQ+ community and particularly LGBTQ+ seniors. From art galleries to health workshops to education to counseling, Robert and Bruce ensure that the community's needs are met.

But the challenges that they face are tremendous. LGBTQ+ seniors have endured a lifetime of marginalization and discrimination, and their needs are many and unique.

Their work led me to Ruthie Berman, a lifelong advocate who fought alongside her wife, Connie, for the LGBTQ+ community. Even though Connie is no longer with us, Ruthie's activism has not let up. She is still briefing congressional staff and sharing her wisdom.

Ruthie and Connie, Bruce and Robert, all of their tireless efforts prompted me to introduce the Ruthie and Connie LGBT Elder Americans Act every Congress and to chair the Equality Caucus' Task Force on Aging. Because of them, Congress better understands the needs of this community and has the tools to take action. That is important.

I met David Hogg, Matt and Ryan Deitsch, Cameron Kasky, and X Gonzalez. I met Jackie Corin, Alex Wind, and dozens of their classmates. When 17 of their friends and teachers at Marjory Stoneman Douglas were murdered by a killer with access to an assault weapon, as our community was wracked with shock and grief, these

young people refused to sit by and wait for the next school shooting. They got together. They started a national movement.

They started March For Our Lives to prevent the next tragedy. Because of them, roughly half a million people showed up in Washington and 2 million in cities around the country and around the world to demand change, one of the largest protests in American history. Because of them, we had the highest ever youth turnout in the 2018 midterms, and we elected a gun safety majority to Congress, a majority that includes dedicated advocates like my dear friend LUCY MCBATH.

I met Lori Alhadeff, Fred Guttenberg, Manny Oliver, Tony Montalto, and dozens of other family members who had their loved ones taken from them too soon and who are still pushing through their anguish to try to make our community and our country safer.

Because of them, I introduced legislation to crack down on 3D-printed guns, raise the legal age for purchase, ban high-capacity magazines, and establish a Federal buyback program.

Because of them, a universal background checks bill and an assault weapons ban have passed in the House, and because of them, the first major gun safety law in 30 years is now law. That was important.

Because of them, I remember those they lost every day. I remember Alyssa, Scott, Martin, Nicholas, Aaron, Jaime, Chris, Luke, Cara, Gina, Joaquin, Alaina, Meadow, Helena, Alex, Carmen, and Peter. That is important.

I met Christine Levinson and her children, Sarah, Doug, Stephanie, Dan, Susan, David, and Samantha, whose husband and father, Bob Levinson, was being held hostage in Iran.

When I got to Washington, the Levinsons had already been searching for answers for 3 years. Bob became the longest held American hostage in history, as his family navigated a confusing and disjointed landscape of resources and information across multiple Presidential administrations.

But the Levinsons did not give up. Even after we learned of Bob's likely death in captivity, the Levinsons never stopped trying to give other families facing the same terrible circumstance that they faced more resources than they had.

They didn't stop trying to bring Bob and every American hostage home, and because of them, President Obama issued an executive order to better track unlawful detainment of U.S. nationals abroad and support the families of those detainees, an executive order that was codified into law by my bill, the Robert Levinson Hostage Recovery and Hostage-Taking Accountability Act, soon after we learned of Bob's passing.

There are still hostages around the world today. Bob is still not home, but the strides we made for these families, that was important. Those of us in this Chamber and all Americans continuing to fight to bring them home and to bring closure to the Levinsons, that is important.

Of course, I met people before I came to Washington, people who informed my work in Tallahassee. Their stories have continued to be important. They have continued to inspire the actions that we have taken in this Chamber.

On a plane in Florida, soon after my election to the State senate, I met Berthy De La Rosa-Aponte. She told me her story and the story of her daughter, Lucy, who was living with cerebral palsy, autism, and multiple other developmental and intellectual disabilities.

Berthy told me about a harmful change in language on its way through the State legislature, a change that could have had disastrous consequences for the health and quality of life for her daughter and many others with severe disabilities. She told me: If this goes through, I will have two choices. I could put Lucy into an institution or she will die.

Because of her, I introduced legislation to fix it. We got that language changed. The American flag Lucy painted still hangs in my office in Washington. While Lucy passed away 2 years ago, the change she inspired, that lives on, and that was important.

The people I met during my career in public service informed important work, work that we do with a lasting legacy, but so did the people that I came here with. The day I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, since it was following a special election, there was no limit on the number of tickets in the House gallery for my friends and family.

I was elected on April 13, 2010, and sworn in 2 days later, which is not a whole lot of time for people to plan to come, but they dropped everything to come even on short notice, and we packed the place. So many dear friends and family were with me that day, filling up this gallery.

It is hard to single any of them out. There were people who cared about every issue under the Sun, with so many different visions for what the future of our country could be. But many of the faces in the gallery that day who decided it was worth coming for that moment, many of them were people that I had gotten to know in my 25 years living in Boca Raton through our shared involvement in our local Jewish community. They are people who share my strong commitment to bettering not only the American Jewish community, not only the global Jewish community, but our Nation and our world through our community's advocacy and service.

I have seen their faces every day of this journey, as I fought anti-Semitism as cofounder of the Bipartisan Taskforce for Combating Anti-Semitism; bolstered our Nation's relationships in the international community as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism Subcommittee chair; strengthened the U.S.-Israel relationship as a loud, proud, and consistent advocate for Congress' bipartisan commitment to the U.S.-Israel strategic partnership, to Iron Dome funding, to bilateral cooperation between our two nations, and for calling out anti-Semitism wherever it appears on whichever side of the political aisle; and advocated for Holocaust survivors to ensure they can live out their remaining years in peace and dignity.

Guess what, Madam Speaker? A lot of them are back here in the gallery tonight for the end of this ride.

I lost my dad, Bernie Deutch, years ago. He couldn't be there to watch my swearing-in, but it was the conversations that I had with him years ago ringing in my ears that day.

When my dad served in the Battle of the Bulge and went to Europe to defend America and to fight the Nazis, it was the opportunity to do the work on the House floor that he was fighting for, that brave Americans in uniform are fighting for as I speak.

Why did he do it? Why did he remind me of those stories? Because my dad taught me, taught all of us, my brothers, Jeff, Stan, and Eddy, and my sister, Elaine, of the dual importance, the equal importance, the tremendous importance of being both a proud Jew and a proud American. One informs the other. They are inextricably linked.

My colleagues and constituents know me as a proud Jewish member of the American Congress. My involvement in the community, my travel to Israel, those have been such a fundamental part of what I have done since I have been here. They are cornerstones of the legacy that those faces in the gallery that day and my dad helped me leave, and that is grounding, it is humbling, and that is important.

There are eight people who were there with me that day when I was sworn in 12½ years ago that I want to single out even all these years later. All of us in this place are doing this for the world we are helping to create for our children and for their children, for all the generations to come.

My kids were 15 and 12 when I got elected. Watching Gabby, Serena, and Cole grow, go through college, take on their own leadership positions on campus, in the Jewish community, and in the workforce, watching them do their part to help change the world, that has inspired me to do my part all these years.

My wife, Jill, a leader in our local Jewish community with boundless passion for cultivating the next generation of Jewish leaders, all the work she does every day has been a source of strength and inspiration for me every time I come to Washington.

The support from Jill, Gabby, and Serena, who are in the gallery with us today, and from Cole, who is watching in Austin, that is what brought me joy

when we celebrated success, and it is what sustained me during the challenging times.

□ 1830

Jill's mother, Sarah Gale, is watching today—I hope—and her father, Frank, who we recently lost, both of whom supported me every step of the way. My nephew, Eli, was there that day. He can't be here today because he left us when he accidentally ingested fentanyl laced into a legal supplement, and we all fight to honor his memory by bringing attention to this epidemic every day. And my mom, who stood in the corner of this Chamber, giving the royal wave to all of my new colleagues, undoubtedly the woman of the hour, even though she was not the one being sworn into the United States Congress.

During my swearing-in speech, I turned to her, and I finished by saying, ''In all her 86 years, my mother, Jean Deutch, never could have imagined hearing her name in this Chamber.'' ''Mom,'' I said, ''thank you for making me believe that I could be anything I wanted to be because today,'' I said, 12½ years ago, ''I am a Member of the U.S. Congress.'' While I miss sharing the ups and downs of Congress with her, I hope that as my mom looks down on us today, she believes that the service in this Chamber lived up to the dream she had that day.

This job is not easy. We all know there is plenty of progress yet to be made, that seemingly more often than we find areas of common ground, we get caught up in bitter, often vitriolic partisanship. We fight, we demonize, we create barriers to some of the change our constituents rightfully demand. Sometimes we field violent threats from the very people we are here in Washington to try to help.

I was here that day in January 2021. We have no shortage of dark days in this Chamber, some very dark ones like that one. The battles here feel important and often all-consuming. The trail of stymied progress is infuriating. What this body of government is able to do for our constituency, as increasingly rare as it may feel, that is important. It is more important than me. It is more important than my successor. It is more important than any of us. I have been here long enough to see that it is worth fighting for.

I have also been here long enough to have so many people fighting for me, and I want to thank my colleagues, so many of whom have become close friends. There are too many to mention, but there are a handful who have gone out of their way to fight for me and with me, who have been so supportive of my efforts to obtain leadership positions under their watch. Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, Chairman MEEKS, Chairman NADLER, Chairman JEFFRIES, my dear friends and neighbors, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and LOIS FRANKEL, and the late Alcee Hastings: Thank you.

Thank you to the back row hecklers: Scott and Ami, Pete and Derek, Stephanie and Dan and Kathleen. To Josh and Elaine, Debbie and Dean, Brad and Kathy: Thank you for always being there for all of us.

The Republican colleagues who I served and fought with who helped me bridge the partisan gap: Ranking Member WILSON, my fantastic partner on the Middle East, North Africa and Global Counterterrorism Subcommittee; Representative CHRIS SMITH, my partner and co-chair on the Anti-Semitism Task Force; Representative GUS BILIRAKIS, also from Florida, with whom I launched the Congressional Hellenic Israel Alliance Caucus; and FRENCH HILL, who worked with me to launch the Congressional Task Force on American Hostages. I thank them.

I thank my Republican colleagues from the Florida delegation, like Representative MARIO DIAZ-BALART, who has so often fought with me, and Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to champion human rights from Caracas to Havana to Tehran. So many former colleagues who were so instrumental during their time here, especially those who were my foreign policy mentors: Howard Berman, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Eliot Engel, and Nita Lowey.

The Members who served with me on the Ethics Committee, some of the most honorable public servants I have had the privilege to meet: Representatives SUSAN WILD, DEAN PHILLIPS, VERONICA ESCOBAR, and MONDAIRE JONES; Representatives MICHAEL GUEST, DAVE JOYCE, JOHN RUTHERFORD, KELLY ARMSTRONG; my late colleague, Jackie Walorski and former Representatives Kenny Marchant, Susan Brooks, and Charlie Dent. Thank you to DAVID CICILLINE and JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN and all the Members I have been privileged to travel the world with representing the United States.

Thank you to the U.S. servicemembers and employees of the State Department, USAID, and other embassy employees from Tashkent to Buenos Aires to Jerusalem, who serve our Nation, each in their own way and each magnificently.

I have seen a lot of change in Congress over the last dozen years. Over 7 years and nearly four Congresses have passed since John Dingell last stood on this floor. I wonder if he would be surprised by the bitter divides that have expanded exponentially since that time. Even now, his words are worth repeating. They are as true now as they were then and will continue to be for every Member who comes after me. ''You're not important; it's what you can do for the people who sent you here that's important.''

I think we can all agree it is the people who help us do that work, our dedicated staffs, that are important, too. So this one is for Team Ted. Thanks to my D.C. staff: Josh Rogin, Case Kustin, Aviva Abusch, Sophie Mirviss, Jack Steinberg, Tiffany Mendoza-Farfan, Fabiana Corsi-Mendez, and Alex Rogoff. My ethics counsel, David Arrojo and Tom Rust, and the nonpartisan ethics staff. My district staff: Wendi Lipsich, Jayne Chapman, Theresa Brier, Alex Rocha, Jen Raducci, James DeJesus, Eric Johnson, Brandy Edelson, and Lewis Goldberg. And the longtime members of Team Ted who have moved on to other roles, but whose contributions to this work over the years are unmatched: Josh Lipman, Joel Richard, Jason Attermann, Ellen McLaren, Ashley Mushnick, Darcy Farnan, Jill Benson, and Daniel Fontana, and so many others. Thank you does not suffice. No words suffice. You, your work, your service has been so important to so many.

To the staff who keep this whole Chamber running, the floor staff here, the Cloakroom staff right next door, committee staff across the Capitol complex, thank you. To the Capitol Police, who protect us every day but who deserve such enormous gratitude since the events of January 6 especially, thank you.

To the entire team of experts and management over at CRS and Library and Congress, who are so critical to the legislative process, I thank you. To everyone on the facilities and food service teams, the Architect of the Capitol staff, everyone who keeps us fed, keeps our offices clean, makes sure that we get our mail, our flags, and everything else you do every day, thank you. To all who I do not have time to mention, thank you for your service to this body and to our country.

As I prepare to leave this place for the last time, as I transition from this Chamber to my next chapter, I will keep John Dingell's words in mind; I hope you will, too. Those of us that serve here can do important things for the American people. The work that lies ahead for Congress on behalf of the American people, that is important for this Chamber, for our country, and for our democracy.

I am not important, but I believe the people in my community in South Florida, the family who stood by me, the staff who served with me, my colleagues who fought alongside me have helped me contribute something important to our Nation on behalf of the people who sent me here.

To my colleagues, the friends who have served with me, inspired me, and collaborated with me in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, those whom I have mentioned and all those who I cannot, even on the darkest days, it has been the honor of my life to know you, to work with you, to leave something important behind for our constituents. You may not be important either, according to John Dingell, but you are still important to me. I am heartened by how many good and thoughtful people will still be serving here when I leave.

After next week I will be your constituent. I hope you keep pushing to bridge the divides, keep pushing to do important work for all of us, and I have

faith that if you keep doing that, despite sometimes extraordinary odds, we will be just fine.

I thank you, Madam Speaker, and for the last time, I yield back the balance of my time.

CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his service to this country. We should all be down here engaging with our colleagues more often to learn more about them. I did not know that about your father. God bless you. Godspeed. Thank you for serving in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, much has been made in the last week over the actions of two Governors; in particular Governor Greg Abbott of the State in which I live and where I am a Congressman—Texas—as well as the Governor of Florida, Ron DeSantis.

Much is being made of the fact that these Governors transported certain individuals who had come to this country and were released into this country by this administration—I believe contrary to law, I believe in direct violation of both the text and the spirit of the law—that they were released into this country by the thousands.

Governor Abbott of Texas and Governor DeSantis of Florida transported some of these individuals to particular locations. Now, it was very clear that they did so in significant part to make a point. That point is that our States are bearing the brunt of an administration's policies that are purposefully allowing our border to be operationally controlled by cartels to the detriment of the American people. That is what is happening.

So kudos to Governor DeSantis, kudos to Governor Abbott for bringing to light a problem which is being ignored by the leftist press that refuses to bring the truth to the American people.

So 50 people get transported to Martha's Vineyard, and the entire wine-and-cheese circuit loses their collective mind. Oh, no, what have you done? Oh, the cries of politicization of using human beings as pawns. But who is it that is using these individuals as pawns? Could it be my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or the people in this administration that are leaving our border wide open, such that 53 human beings died in a tractor-trailer in San Antonio, which I represent?

So which is it? Which is worse? Fifty people being sent to Martha's Vineyard to bring attention to a problem so that all of these Americans on Martha's Vineyard could put their glass of wine down and put their cheese plate down and suddenly recognize that there are literally thousands of people being distributed into our country every single day by this government and by nongovernmental organizations. Every single day.

My colleagues do nothing about it. Fifty-three human beings died in an oven that was a tractor-trailer, and my Democratic colleagues don't say a dadgum word. Nothing.

But they sure say something when suddenly 50 show up to Martha's Vineyard. Then everybody gathers around for a photo op and brings sandwiches and pats themselves on the back for their grand compassion because, oh, we are enlightened leftists in Martha's Vineyard. We love everybody. So we are going to bring sandwiches, then we are going to call the National Guard and say haul them out of here.

That is the truth.

But why isn't anybody talking about the 53 human beings that died in that tractor-trailer in San Antonio, Texas? One example of the thousands.

There is a cemetery that has been created in south Texas with PVC crosses for bodies of migrants pouring across the Rio Grande in south Texas. That is what is happening to these people, getting sold into the sex trafficking trade, being abused by cartels, bodies littering ranches, dying in the Rio Grande River, dying in trucks.

All while here in Washington, D.C., the Mayor of D.C. complains about, oh, we are now a border city; or the city councilwoman who said, well, we don't have the infrastructure for this. Well, welcome to the party.

□ 1845

Well, welcome to the party, because that city councilwoman declared D.C. a sanctuary city, and that city councilwoman called for the abolition of ICE. And prior to the individuals being delivered to D.C. by Governor Abbott to the steps of the Vice President's home—who supposedly is in charge of securing the border but can't find her way to the border if you gave her a map and a plane ticket to get there—73 human beings were found in the Nation's Capital in a stash house right here within a couple of miles of this building, 12 of whom were kids.

Where are my Democratic colleagues?

They are burying their heads in the sand because it is not politically expedient to acknowledge that open borders results in dead migrants, dead Americans, empowerment of cartels, empowerment of China, and a danger to the American people and our national security, while almost 100 individuals associated with terrorist countries or terrorist organizations have now been apprehended coming across our border not even dealing with the million people who were got-aways.

I have given this speech so many times, but I keep having to update it. I keep having to come down to the floor and talk about what is happening in Texas and what is happening to our people.

Now let's talk about what is happening to Americans. These are the faces of the individuals and the lost voices of people who have died from fentanyl. I showed these to the Secretary of Homeland Security, and he scoffed. There are 72,000 lost voices and 72,000 dead Americans in 1 year. That is more than we lost in the entirety of the Vietnam war right here.

Where are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

Where is the President of the United States?

These individuals are dead. Their mamas found them in their house dying and tried to resuscitate them. They left their home in a body bag because they took a pill that was laced with fentanyl that was cooked up in the backyard of a cartel. Fentanyl is coming in from China, and they are dead. That is what is happening, and my Democratic colleagues are nowhere to be found. They are nowhere to be found.

At the same time that we have got wide-open borders and our country is getting destroyed, we have vaccine mandates in place that are absolutely decimating our ability to maintain, control, and to hold our servicemembers in the military. It is an absolute abomination. We are losing hundreds and thousands of servicemembers at a time when our recruiting levels are at historic lows. The Army is having trouble recruiting. They are at 50 percent of their goals.

I have met with members of the United States Marines, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Army, and they are all coming in under their recruiting levels.

Meanwhile, we are firing people. They are losing their jobs. It is happening as we speak right now; members of the United States military are getting fired and having to leave service.

Why?

Because of a vaccine mandate, a vaccine mandate being carried out by the administration with complete and total disregard for the fact that that vaccine does nothing for transmission and which the CDC wholly recognizes is totally useless for the individuals in question.

In fact, now the President of the United States says the pandemic is over.

The pandemic is over, so why are we firing our men and women in uniform?

I will take a moment to recognize my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), who is a veteran himself who served his country, to see if he has any thoughts on this matter.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time and for bringing up what we know is wrong, what we clearly know is wrong.

Our finest and the absolute healthiest population, by the way, in the

United States of America is in the military. We are down to less than half a percent of Americans who even serve in uniform. And recruiters, even before the pandemic, were telling us they were concerned about what they were looking forward to because the population really just couldn't meet the recruiting goals because people were either criminals, overweight, or what have you.

So we already have a problem, and then you get this vaccine mandate. It is experimental, and they force the best of the best to leave the service. Meanwhile, we can't defend ourselves. China is on the rise, Madam Speaker, you have got Russia threatening nuclear war, and the President declares the pandemic over while we are kicking our finest people, people who said: Put me on the front line, I will sign the blank check and give everything, including my life, in defense of our country.

And we say, no, thank you. Unless you get this jab and bend the knee—and bend the knee—your service here is not wanted.

Mr. ROY. As the gentleman probably knows, and I am sure he has talked to his own constituents, I have had people coming into my office saying, I don't know what to do. I have served my whole life wearing the uniform, but I don't think it is in my best interest, I don't think it is helping the military, I am not going to do it, and I am getting fired.

They have discharged 5,000 Active Duty servicemembers for refusing to take the COVID–19 vaccine while the Army's recruiting levels, as I have said, are at 52 percent of the 2022 recruiting goal. Forty percent of men 18 to 24 are unvaccinated, the prime recruiting demographic. Service academy applications are down 10 to 30 percent depending on the service academy, and now DOD comes in and says, hey, we need more money for recruiting.

Well, how about you stop screwing up?

How about you not tuck tail and run from Afghanistan and leave $85 billion behind?

How about you stop pumping out woke garbage into the men and women in uniform? And how about you not fire them because they dare to say that they don't want a vaccine?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. How about this: anybody who has served, anybody who has worn the uniform knows that as important as recruiting is, to replace those who are retiring after spending the best years, their most productive years, and their most healthy years of their lives in uniform, the most important thing is retention. It is how you treat the people who are going into battle. We are not interested in retaining anybody, apparently, unless they bend the knee.

So we are going to kick someone out after the American taxpayer has spent a boatload of money training someone.

Madam Speaker, do you know what the cost of training an F–18 pilot is or an AH–64 pilot or the ultimate weapon, the American infantryman? Do you know what the cost of that is, Madam Speaker?

After 18 years of service, the best years of their life, right before they are ready to retire because they won't take the jab, we say that we are not interested in retaining you, even knowing that we can't meet our recruiting goals.

This is a complete dereliction of duty, and it is inviting to the enemies of the United States. This weakness is provocative, and you are seeing it all around the globe. This is all done by the Biden administration and leftwing Democrats who somehow think that the control that comes from the emergency pandemic order is better than securing our Nation. And even under the circumstance where the President himself said the pandemic is over, yet as my good friend from Texas just said, while we stand here at this very moment, while the pandemic is over, we are processing people out of the military at this moment.

Mr. ROY. It makes absolutely no sense.

One might question why would this Congress and why would this body give more money to the Department of Defense and this administration to continue to fire men and women in uniform?

Madam Speaker, why would we not attach to a continuing resolution refunding bill in 9 days a requirement that our men and women in uniform not be fired for not taking a vaccine for a pandemic the President says is over?

Madam Speaker, $6 billion, by the way, goes to Fauci's NIAID, and $9 billion goes to the CDC.

Why are we funding this?

Why are we funding an open border?

Why are we funding $60 billion to the Department of Homeland Security which is causing Americans to die from fentanyl and causing migrants to die on people's ranches, endangering the American people and allowing people known to be associated with terrorists in our country, and at the same time we are funding vaccine mandates to fire men and women in uniform when our recruiting levels are at an all-time low?

It begs the question.

But that is not the only problem. That is not the only thing we are dealing with. We are dealing with an energy crisis. We are dealing with a reality that energy prices are up.

Why would that be?

A tsunami of shutoffs the headlines say, 20 million U.S. homes are behind on energy bills, Federal oil leases slow to a trickle under Biden. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen warns that gas prices could spike again this winter.

We are decimating the ability of the American people to be able to fund their lives, heat their homes, and drive their cars to work all in the name of choosing to pursue unicorn energy policies which are destroying our country.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle and this administration are purposely driving up the cost of gas, purposely driving up the cost of electricity, and purposely making our grid less reliable all so they can pat themselves on the back for pursuing a ''green'' agenda that is doing nothing but empowering China, making our country worse, and not doing a dang thing for CO_2, by the way, nothing.

While China has 1,100 coal-fired plants and is building one new coal-fired plant a week, we have 250, and we are building zero. We are adding no new gas plants. We are adding no new nuclear plants to speak of.

We are adding wind and solar, making our grid less reliable. We are reducing our ability to produce liquified natural gas to the world. And we are decimating our strategic advantage and undermining the health and well-being of the American people so my Democratic colleagues can pursue a leftist, radical agenda to appease their leftist base.

The American people have had it.

Here is another point.

Why would we fund it?

Why would we continue to fund a government that is doing that to the American people?

I know my colleague here cares a lot about energy policies from his home State of Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, in Pennsylvania, of course, we stand on top of hundreds and hundreds of years of our natural resources that are abundant and readily available. They are cleaner than any other place on the planet, and we have got an administration that says: Keep it in the ground, don't use it.

Madam Speaker, half of Pennsylvania if you had gone back 20 years ago looked like the 1950s, maybe not half of Pennsylvania, but a good portion of the north central portion of Pennsylvania because there were no jobs. The leftist policies, of course, in Pennsylvania chased all the opportunity away, and families were struggling to hold on to their farms. Then horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing came into favor, and these farms and these communities were saved and brought into the 21st century.

The Obama administration and this administration has come in and said, oh, no. Back to poverty for you. You are not going to be able to afford to heat your home.

And if you are, guess what?

You are going to be making a choice between heating your home this winter and feeding your family, all by design, all on purpose, and all intentional by this administration.

It is unacceptable, and as my good friend from Texas said, we are being

asked in the next few days here, whenever they come up with whatever they come up with, to keep funding this and to keep funding that kind of policy.

Why would we provide one vote for it?

There is not one Republican vote. Quite honestly, not one Democrat should vote for it if they love their country, if they love the people in their communities, and if they care about the people who are suffering and struggling to pay their bills.

Mr. ROY. Electricity, one in six families are behind on their bills. Gas prices are $1.66 higher in this administration. Energy prices are six times higher than last year in Germany which just banned fracking and phased out nuclear which is a telltale warning for where we are heading. They are nationalizing their gas companies. Germans are stockpiling wood to heat their homes.

Madam Speaker, you never met a set of policies that you could possibly imagine where you could do more to undermine and damage your own country than the policies that this administration and the colleagues on the other side of aisle are adopting.

So the question is: Will my GOP colleagues, will my Republican colleagues give $14.1 billion to the Department of the Interior to continue to lease fewer Federal acres for oil and gas? Will we do that?

Will we give $9 billion to an EPA that is imposing a methane fee and taxes on the oil and gas industry that will be crippling my friend's constituents, my constituents, and every American across the country, or the EPA that is targeting the largest U.S. oil field or proposing rules to shut down half of Texas' coal-fired plants?

They want to weaken our grid even further while also giving $10 billion for Federal wind subsidies that are destroying our grid. That is the question.

How about $5 million for climate czar John Kerry to fly around in his private jet talking about how great he is advancing a Green New Deal agenda?

That is the reality.

So here is the question—and this is really what I want to engage my colleague, my friend from Pennsylvania: What do we do?

What do we do in the face of an administration and colleagues who are at war with the American people, who are endangering America with open borders while people die of fentanyl, who are at war with the American people and their ability to afford energy, have gas in their car, have a job, have electricity, and have a strong grid; and at war with the members of our military, making them lose their job if they don't take a mandatory jab because Dr. Fauci says so?

What do we do about an administration that is at war with the people, targeting them, defining them as domestic terrorists by the FBI, if you are challenging the school board, targeting them with 85,000 new IRS agents to go audit them to raise revenue?

Madam Speaker, what do you do in the face of an administration that is doing that every single day?

Madam Speaker, I will tell you what you do if you are a Republican or if you are a Democrat who actually believes in Article I of the United States Constitution.

I give you James Madison. I give you the father of the Constitution.

In Federalist No 58 it says, ''The House of Representatives cannot only refuse, but they alone can propose, the supplies requisite for the support of government. They, in a word, hold the purse. . . .

''This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.''

That, Madam Speaker, is what the Founders gave us to push back on an executive branch that is out of control and operating in direct detriment to the American people or a Senate that refuses to do its job.

The people's House has this tool, and we should use it. I think my friend from Pennsylvania agrees.

□ 1900

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, this is what we have. We are not the executive branch. We don't enforce the laws. But when the executive branch governs against the will of the people—and ladies and gentlemen, what we hear all day around this place is, oh, they are trying to destroy democracy because they have a disagreement, they have a political disagreement, they are trying to destroy democracy.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a Republic. Madam Speaker, this is a Republic. And the power of the purse, the power of taking from the people a portion of what they earn and distributing it through the Federal Government through its policies resides right here, right here in this House of Representatives. It is the only thing we have.

We can't arrest people. We can't prosecute people. We can say enough is enough. You are governing against the will of the American people. You are governing against the best interest of your country. We are not going to help. We signed up not to help. You are not going to get our vote.

If you want to do it, you can own it. You can go explain to the American people why they can't afford their bills; why they can't find things on the grocery shelves; and why their police aren't on the streets; and why they are worried about when they step out somebody from some other country who doesn't belong here is going to kill their children or abduct them or rob their store. You can explain it because we are not going to because we are not going to vote to continue this charade, this assault on the American taxpayer and American citizens.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Pennsylvania how proud I am to serve with him and how proud I am to serve with him in the House Freedom Caucus. People like to malign the Freedom Caucus on the other side of the aisle—heck, even a little bit on our side of the aisle—for daring to want to stand up for freedom, the belief in the individual, the belief in civil society, the belief in Federalism, and the belief in free enterprise. The belief that not all answers come from this town; it doesn't come from this government.

In fact, if you empower people, empower States, and empower civil society, than human beings prosper, their lives are made better. They are able to go carry out the greatest things that you could possibly imagine to bring freedom to the rest of the world as this country has done for almost 250 years.

That is why we are here. That is why I am in the Freedom Caucus. That is why I am pushing forward, along with my colleague, my friend from Pennsylvania, and my other colleagues. Forty-two of us have signed a pledge and put out a letter, a letter that says that we are going to reject any continuing resolution that expires before the next Congress.

Then we are going to reject any appropriations package put forward by my colleagues on the other side of aisle this year, whether it is before or during any lame-duck session, because the American people should speak on November 8 about the atrocities that have been carried out against them by an administration that cares more about their political dynamics than they do about the American people every day. The American people should speak, and then we should spend taxpayers' money on the priorities that they choose.

Right now, I can tell you that those priorities are not continuing to carry out open borders, endangering them. It is not firing our men and women in uniform for daring not to take a vaccine. It is not continuing energy policies that are undermining our national security and stable grid. It is not hiring IRS agents to go after the American people.

We are just simply saying we should use the power of the purse. My message to my Republican colleagues: Use the power of the purse. Use the power of the purse to check the executive branch. Join us. Why are there only 42 people who have signed that letter? It should be all 218 who are saying no. No to an administration. No to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are at war with the American people and their well-being.

Stand up in defense of the people you represent. Don't fund the government you campaign against every day. Hold that funding and demand change. Hold that funding and demand that you stand up for the people. Stand up for America. Stand up for energy freedom. Stand up for the ability of our men and women in uniform to serve. Stand up

for a secure border. Stand up for the ability to carry out your business without being targeted by armed FBI and IRS bureaucrats and agents.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, what my good friend from Texas who joins me in the Freedom Caucus is alluding to is we are being asked to fund a government for a period of time in which the election will occur. We are going to run out of money here in 9 days, and we are being asked to fund the government, and all things that my good friend from Texas has already outlined, all those atrocities, but not until the rest of the year, just until sometime in December after the election when people have lost their election and there is no accountability.

You know what they are going to do then? They are going to waltz right in here, and say: Oh, you know what? We are running out of money again. We got to do it again. You know what? I don't have to stand for election. So if you think this one is bad, if you think all the things that Mr. ROY has outlined that are in this one, more money for COVID when there is no more pandemic—so says the President of the United States—if you think that is bad, just wait until these folks don't have to stand for election in December.

We are saying, if we are going to fund a package, first of all, it has to fix these things. First of all, it has to fix these things. Second of all, send it into the next term so that the people's voice can be heard after November's election. But that is not going to happen. That is not going to happen.

There is no way—as my good friend from Texas says, not one more penny. Not one more penny to support these failed policies, these policies that go against the people that are governed by this town.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I want to credit our leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for yesterday saying that he also believes that it would be wrong for my Republican colleagues to support a continuing resolution that does not address the damage being done to this country by open borders. He is right to say that. He is correct to say that.

We should demand that we change how we are dealing with the border because it is an absolute abomination; endangering Americans, endangering migrants in the false name of compassion. We should change that because we can.

Madam Speaker, I thank our leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for saying that because it is correct. We should not fund a government that is continuing to allow open borders to endanger the American people. We should fund a government that demands change. That is what the power of the purse is and that is what you use it for.

My friend, Senator MIKE LEE from Utah, in the Senate, has circulated a similar letter demanding the same thing in the Senate. This is the time for the people's House and for the Senate to stand up. We should demand change. If we don't get change next week, and we get a continuing resolution into December, we should demand change in December.

If we don't get change in December, we should demand change in January or February or March, but we should demand change every day. We should be down here fighting on the floor of the House, not out at steak dinners; not out doing all the business of this town, but here doing the business of the American people who sent us here to change this place; to stand up for them, to stand up for America, to stand up for a better future.

On July 2, 2026, when we turn 250 years old, we can look proudly at our kids and grandkids and pass down a great country to them, instead of leaving it bankrupt, which is what this administration is currently doing. We can take that back. That is our calling. That is our calling today. And that is why I am proud to be in the Freedom Caucus with my friend, Mr. PERRY, and I will give him the last minute.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for bringing this to light. He is absolutely right. We didn't come here, none of us came here on either side of the aisle, because we thought Washington was perfect. We came here because we know it is broken.

If you know something is broken, why do you keep doing the exact same things that have broken it? Yet, we are being asked, once again, when we come here—well, this is what we always do. We are running out of money. We have to pass this. I remind everybody, we are, what, $32-, $31-, $30-something trillion in debt. They don't even print this money anymore; they just digitally create it.

We don't have the money to do this. Not one more penny to rule against the consent of the govern is what I say.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman. Not one more penny. Not one more penny for a government running at odds with the American people. Let's use the power of the purse. Let's stand up for America.

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

SLAVERY REMEMBRANCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, the great Maya Angelou summarized the very essence of my being when she proclaimed '' . . . the gifts my ancestors gave, I am the dream and hope of the slave.'' I am proud to say tonight that I am a descendent of enslaved people.

I also want to acknowledge tonight a couple of righteous allies of enslaved people. Mr. STENY HOYER, the majority leader of the House. Mr. HOYER and I worked closely to bring the Slavery Remembrance Day resolution to the floor. I am very proud of what he has done to help us. I consider him a righteous ally of enslaved people.

President Joe Biden: President Biden issued a press statement that I will be eternally grateful for as it relates to enslaved people. In fact, I would like to read from the statement that the President actually issued. Of course, it is the President's statement, Joe Biden, marking Slavery Remembrance Day. He issued this on August 20, 2022.

It reads:

More than 400 years ago, 20 enslaved Africans were forcibly brought to the shores of what would become the United States. Millions more were stolen and sold in the centuries that followed, part of a system of slavery that is America's original sin.

Great Nation's don't hide from their history. They acknowledge their past, both the triumphs and the tragedies. Today is a day—

He is talking about August 20.

Today is a day to reflect on the terrible toll of slavery, and our Nation's profound ability to heal and emerge stronger.

He goes on to say:

Despite the horrors they faced, these men and women and their descendants have made countless contributions to the building of this Nation and the continuous effort to realize the American ideal. I was honored last year to declare Juneteenth a national holiday, another moment to reflect and rededicate ourselves to becoming a more perfect union. And it is why my administration will continue the hard, ongoing work to bring true equity and racial justice to our country.

I am grateful for the efforts of Congress—in particular, Representative Al Green and Senator Elizabeth Warren—to recognize the significance of this day.

Madam Speaker, I mention the President because this day was many years in the making, many years. In fact, it was on August 20 of 1619 that the White Lion, a slave ship, a ship with enslaved human beings on it, docked at Point Comfort, near what we now call Norfolk, Virginia, and it had these 20 human beings on it from Africa. They were traded for materials and goods and left there.

□ 1915

This was a seminal moment in our history, August 20, 1619, some 246 years, 108 days ago. From August 20, 1619, to January 31, 1865, when the 13th Amendment was ratified, we considered these the years and days that this country had lawful slavery.

It is interesting to note that over this entire period of time, there were persons who were very helpful to those who were enslaved. I shall talk about them later on in this half hour.

The value of that 246 years of labor, unpaid labor, unpaid slave labor, has been estimated to be such as $14.2 trillion. That is in 2009 dollars. So it is important for us to realize that these persons who were enslaved over these 246 years, 108 days, these persons gave America a foundation, an economic foundation that has persisted to this

day—246 years, 108 days of free labor, some $14.2 trillion.

In fact, these persons are the greatest contributors to the American economy, the greatest contributors ever to the American economy, because of 246 years, 108 days of free labor.

Here are some of the well-known landmarks and buildings built by enslaved human beings. I will talk about them. This is according to an article styled ''15 American landmarks that were built by slaves,'' published in the publication known as the Business Insider and by James Pasley. Let me now start.

The first is the White House. According to the White House Historical Association, enslaved human beings were likely involved in all aspects of the construction, including the carpentry, masonry, cording, rafting, plastering, glazing, and painting.

The task force reported this. Slaves appeared to have shouldered alone all the grueling work of sawing logs and stones.

The White House: Constructed by slaves.

The U.S. Capitol Building: Enslaved human beings quarried the stone used for the floors, walls, and columns of the Capitol. They shaped that stone. They laid the brick foundations of the buildings.

Enslaved human beings, in large part, also completed the carpentry as they framed the roof and installed its shingles and its coverings. Enslaved human beings were responsible for more skilled labor like plastering and painting.

The White House and the Capitol.

The Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol: If you have been to Washington, D.C., you have seen the Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol. An enslaved human being created the Statue of Freedom.

This is remarkable and almost painful to say, knowing that a person who was enslaved created the Statue of Freedom that is atop the Capitol. It was done so because Philip Reid was the only person available with the skill to make a bronze statue out of the plaster cast.

The Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.: Although enslaved individuals did not work on the actual building, they were the ones who quarried the iconic red sandstone that still adorns the building to this day.

Wall Street in New York: Enslaved human beings built the titular wall for which the street is named. In addition, Wall Street was the location of one of the largest slave markets in the country in the 1700s.

Trinity Church in New York: Enslaved human beings helped to build the original Trinity Church on Wall Street, which stood from 1698 until 1776.

Fraunces Tavern in New York: Although few specific details still exist on the process, enslaved human beings built one of the oldest buildings in Manhattan.

Faneuil Hall in Boston: Enslaved human beings helped build the cradle of liberty indirectly by working for Peter Faneuil, who helped fund the building with funds made from slavery.

Fort Sumter in South Carolina: Enslaved human beings helped build the fort where the Civil War began. They were forced to help create the bricks that made up the structure, as well as forced to repair the fort while it was under attack. As many as 20 slaves died during the attack on the fort.

Harvard Law School in Massachusetts: Enslaved human beings helped build the Harvard Law School through the wealth of the slave owner Isaac Royall, Jr., whose wealth came from his sugar plantations and farms.

Castillo de San Marcos fort in Florida: The oldest missionary fort in the United States was built by enslaved human beings who toiled for around 25 years under the Spanish to build the fort.

Georgetown University: Enslaved human beings were sold in order to raise $3.3 million in funds, in today's money, to finance the construction of the Georgetown campus.

The University of North Carolina: Enslaved human beings helped build the oldest public university in the country. Many of the University of North Carolina structures were built and maintained by slaves.

Monticello in Virginia: Thomas Jefferson's home had its bricks and limestone quarried, built, and placed by enslaved human beings.

Montpelier in Virginia: President James Madison's family had their homes cleared, created, and constructed by enslaved human beings.

Mount Vernon in Virginia: President George Washington's home, Mount Vernon, was built by enslaved human beings who were forced to quarry the materials, as well as build and maintain the home.

In summary, enslaved human beings built some of the most well-known structures in our country. To recap, they built the White House in Washington, D.C., or helped to—there were others involved—the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C., the Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol, the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., Wall Street in New York, Trinity Church in New York, Fraunces Tavern in New York, Faneuil Hall in Boston, Fort Sumter in South Carolina, Harvard Law School in Massachusetts, Castillo de San Marcos fort in Florida, Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., the University of North Carolina, Monticello in Virginia, and Montpelier in Virginia.

It should be noted also that these structures are among those that are known to us. The list does not include the untold number of roads, bridges, and water wells, as well as houses and more, that were constructed by enslaved human beings. It also does not include the many crops planted and harvested in the agrarian economy built on the backs of enslaved human beings.

All told, the total value of labor of every hour toiled under the whip of slavers in this country has been estimated to be between $5.9 and $14.2 trillion, 2009 dollars. This is why I say that the enslaved human beings are the greatest contributors to the American economy.

As a group, as a lot, as a people, the enslaved human beings contributed upward of around $14.2 trillion of free labor to this country. They were the foundational mothers and fathers of this country.

This is a widely cited number, and it was calculated by the University of Connecticut researcher Thomas Craemer using the number of unremunerated work hours multiplied with historical free market labor wages. This is wealth that was stolen from human beings who have seen little to none of it repaid.

The American economy had hundreds of years of free labor that gave it a start, that allowed it to compete and, in a sense, to have a competitive edge that many other countries did not have simply because of enslaved human beings.

I am honored to say that I am proud to be a descendant of enslaved human beings, the persons who built this country, the foundation of it, who gave it its start, its place in the economic order as a world power—enslaved human beings.

So, now, let's look at some of the people who were the enslavers.

John L. Manning owned at least two plantations holding 670 human beings against their will, one in South Carolina and another in Louisiana—a slave owner.

Meredith Calhoun held more than 700 enslaved people and produced cotton, more cotton than any other property in Louisiana.

William Aiken was one of the State's wealthiest citizens, the owner of the largest rice plantation in the State, with over 700 enslaved on 1,500 acres under cultivation, almost twice the acreage of the next largest plantation.

This is, for many of the persons who have inherited wealth, how that wealth was initially brought into being. Enslaved human beings gave them their start with free labor—John Manning, Meredith Calhoun, William Aiken.

Another, John Burnside, was the largest sugar producer in the country during his time. Before he died, he owned 10 different plantations and enslaved 753 people at his peak.

Joshua Ward, also known as the king of the rice planters, had 1,130 enslaved people.

Stephen Duncan was a businessman who collectively enslaved more than 2,000 human beings. He was one of the largest cotton producers, not in this country but in the world.

□ 1930

The most that he enslaved that one time was 858.

These were the people who had the opportunity to acquire great wealth at the expense of the lives of other people, many of whom lived their entire lives in bondage and died as enslaved human beings.

And what is unfortunate about all of this is we in this country have come to glorify those who were the enslavers. We glorify the Confederate military. We glorify, and to a certain extent, we deify many of the Confederate generals. These were the people that were fighting to maintain slavery. They get all of the honors, until as of late when we started to change that. But they have been given the honors.

The persons who were the liberators were demeaned and portrayed as insane, portrayed as murderers. But these were the people who were the liberators. We have vilified the liberators and have glorified the enslavers.

It is with great difficulty that we try to change this, but the difficulty is such that people don't really want to hear about the slaves. They have been so indoctrinated with the glory of the enslavers that they can't accept—many people—the fact that the slaves are the persons who were the foundational mothers and fathers of this country.

The slaves should be honored and they should be memorialized. They should be placed in the same position, not for having done the same thing that persons have done on Memorial Day, those that we memorialize in the wars, but they should be given the same dignity and respect because they died for this country. They died in bondage for this country. They were born into slavery. They lived as slaves, and they died as slaves. They ought to be honored and memorialized to the same extent as we honor and memorialize those who died in the wars. That is hard for some people to accept.

Many don't want to hear that said. But they should be given the honor that they deserve for living and dying for this country, because they did. But not only did they live and die for this country, their children lived and died for this country. Their children were taken away from them, sold at the auction block. Their children and grandchildren lived and died as well.

Why wouldn't we honor the people who lived and died in bondage and gave this country its economic foundation to the same extent that we honor the people who died in the wars? We should. They made America great. They deserve the honor and dignity, the same honor and dignity that those who died in wars have been given.

So let's talk for a minute about the liberators.

John Brown. I remember when I was in high school—or I don't know if it was high school, maybe it was junior high. We studied our history. And I remember the indication to us was that John Brown was a crazy man, just out to murder people senselessly.

John Brown was a liberator. He was fighting to liberate the people who were enslaved. He has never been given the honor that he deserves. John Brown ought to be honored to the same extent that we honor other persons who were liberators in wars. He was a liberator in this country.

The difficulty associated with honoring John Brown is this: When we honor others who liberated people from injustice, we are looking through a window into the world of other people. But if we honor John Brown, we have to look into the mirror and we see ourselves and our transgressions.

We have a lot that we have to do to atone for slavery: for taking people, selling their children, raping their women. We have a lot to atone for. And it is difficult for us to accept the fact that atonement is still something that we have not achieved.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate this President because he has acknowledged our history. This President, in my opinion, will be among the pantheon of the greatest Presidents this country has had because he has fought injustice that others wouldn't speak of.

He put a Black woman on the Supreme Court. Others could have done it; they didn't. President Biden did it.

He acknowledged Slavery Remembrance Day. Others could have; they didn't. President Biden did.

He will be seen by those in the distant future as one of the greatest Presidents this country has had, especially as it relates to addressing injustices.

Sojourner Truth, abolitionist. She became the first Black woman to win a case against a White man in this country. It is amazing how people like Sojourner Truth are now starting to be recognized, but for years, have been denied their rightful place in history as persons who fought for the liberation of Black people.

Nat Turner, a preacher. A preacher who rebelled. He led a 4-day rebellion of enslaved people to free Black people. This was in 1841. When I studied this in high school or junior high—I am not sure which—Nat Turner was portrayed as a traitor, as someone who attacked this country.

Nat Turner was a liberator. Nat Turner was trying to free people who were in bondage.

Robert E. Lee, on the other hand, was trying to maintain slavery. Yet, we have had Lee high schools across this country. I know of no Nat Turner high school in this country. There may be one, but I know of no Nat Turner high school.

There ought to be Nat Turner high schools across the country to the same extent that we have had Lee high schools because Nat Turner was the liberator. Lee was the enslaver. He was the person who would maintain slavery. Why would we honor Lee to the exclusion of Nat Turner, who was a liberator?

I know this is difficult for some people to manage because we have always been told that the liberators were people who were working against our country. They were working to free people. The Confederate soldiers were working and killing to maintain people in bondage.

Madam Speaker, I speak the truth. No one can deny the truth of what I say. You can deny wanting to see and hear that truth, but it is the truth.

Harriet Tubman, abolitionist, who sought to free slaves as well. She made 13 missions and rescued some 70 enslaved people.

Madam Speaker, there are many more. I know that my time is nearing its end, but there are many more.

Madam Speaker, I will just say this about Harriet Tubman. It has been said that she said she could have freed many more ''if they had known they were slaves.''

William Still, Elijah Anderson, Frederick Douglass, and, of course, the great Abraham Lincoln: All persons who worked as liberators.

I will be saying more about this. If you missed out on some portion of it tonight, I will present it in a similar fashion at a later time.

Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, for being a righteous ally of enslaved people. I will be eternally grateful to the President for being a righteous ally and a person who issued the statement recognizing Slavery Remembrance Day on August 23 of each year.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1 of House Resolution 1230, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–5271. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report titled: ''U.S. Compliance with the Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq'', pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5272. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5273. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6,

2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Implementation of HAVANA Act of 2021 [Public Notice: 11720] (RIN: 1400-AF52) received August 5, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5275. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report titled: ''Resolution of the Cyprus Dispute'', pursuant to 22 USC 2373(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5276. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Determination under Section 610 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5277. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–5278. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, Department of the Interior, Migratory Bird Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Subsistence Harvest in Alaska; Harvest Regulations for Migratory Birds in Alaska During the 2022 Season [Docket No.: FWS-R7-MB-2021-0172; FXMB12610700000-201-FF07M01000] (RIN: 1018-BF65) received September 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–5279. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; 2022-2023 Seasons for Certain Migratory Game Birds [Docket No.; FWS-HQ-MB-2021-0057; FF09M30000-223-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BF07) received September 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–5280. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report titled: ''Fiscal Year 2021 Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Grants Program Report'', pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 10566(b); Public Law 90-351, Sec. 2806(b) (as amended by Public Law 107-273, Sec. 5001(b)(5)); (116 Stat. 1814); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5281. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the first annual STOP FGM Act Report for 2021, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 41312; Public Law 116-283, Sec. 4; (134 Stat. 4924); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5282. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-367; St. Mary's AK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1157; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-36] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5283. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Milford, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0523; Airspace Docket No.: 22-AEA-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5284. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Independence, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0474; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ACE-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5285. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Rocksprings Four Square Ranch Airport and Sonora Canyon Ranch, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0473; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ASW-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5286. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report titled: ''US-Mexico-Canada Agreement Section 821: Transboundary Wastewater Flows in the Tijuana River Watershed'', pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 4731(b); Public Law 116-113, Sec. 821(b); (134 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5287. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report titled: ''Annual Report to Congress on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs for Fiscal Year 2020'', pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(i)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1893(i)(2) (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 6402(j)(1)(B)); (124 Stat. 762) and 42 U.S.C. 1396u-6(e)(5); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, Sec. 1936(e)(5) (as added by Public Law 109-171, Sec. 6034(a)(2)); (120 Stat. 76); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NEAL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 82. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions (Rept. 117–482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1377. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4118) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5768) to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program to establish, create, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6448) to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8542) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–483). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 8930. A bill to establish certain conditions on receipt of Byrne grant funding related to minimum bail standards and public safety reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Ms. ROSS):

H.R. 8931. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require the Attorney General to remove a drug from scheduling within 180 days of a certain date pursuant to the recommendation of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 8932. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify requirements for disclosure of transfer of credit policies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself and Mrs. KIM of California):

H.R. 8933. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Regulatory Flexibility Act''), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 8934. A bill to increase authorizations for the passenger ferry competitive grant program and the ferry boats and terminal facilities formula grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 8935. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. ROSS, and Ms. DEAN):

H.R. 8936. A bill to authorize additional circuit judges for certain circuit courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 8937. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 8938. A bill to amend the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act 2018 to prioritize support to projects under that Act that increase digital infrastructure and connectivity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 8939. A bill to nullify the termination of the Fulbright exchange program with regard to China and Hong Kong with respect to future exchanges for participants traveling both from and to China or Hong Kong, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 8940. A bill to require the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary and Water Commission to negotiate an agreement with Mexico relating to the number of aliens detained in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself and Mr. MEUSER):

H.R. 8941. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase, prime contracting opportunities for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself and Ms. VAN DUYNE):

H.R. 8942. A bill to extend the transfer date for the verification of small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans or service-disabled veterans to the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina):

H.R. 8943. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permanently bar aliens who are ordered removed after failing to appear at a removal proceeding, absent exceptional circumstances, from becoming permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILD, Ms. DEAN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 8944. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 East Main Street in Mount Joy, Pennsylvania, as the ''Harold Billow Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 8945. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit the use of political tests in the selection, hiring, or promotion of students or faculty at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 8946. A bill to require online dating service providers to provide safety awareness and fraud ban notifications to online dating service members and to verify the identity of online dating service members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MAST, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ELLZEY, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BOST, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 8947. A bill to continue in effect certain Executive orders imposing sanctions with respect to Iran, to prevent the waiver of certain sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to Iran until the Government of Iran ceases to attempt to assassinate United States officials, other United States citizens, and Iranian nationals residing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 8948. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution disapproving of the rule submitted by the Department of Homeland Security relating to ''Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.J. Res. 98. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H. Res. 1378. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to Resolution Copper mine; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H. Res. 1379. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the wait times for veterans to receive primary care, mental health care, and specialty care appointments at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1380. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2022 as ''Peace Month'' and calling on Congress to take action to promote peace; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1381. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 23, 2022, as ''Mary Church Terrell Day'', and calling on Congress to recognize Mary Church Terrell's lasting contributions to the civil rights and women's rights movements; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. BUSH, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 1382. A resolution condemning the atrocities that occurred in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1906, in which White supremacist mobs brutalized, terrorized, and killed dozens of Black Americans, and reaffirming the commitment of the House of Representatives to combating hatred, injustice, and White supremacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 8930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:
H.R. 8931.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 8932.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18
The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States. or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. CLINE:
H.R. 8933.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. GARAMENDI:
H.R. 8934.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:
H.R. 8935.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:
H.R. 8936.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, section 8, clause 9 and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:
H.R. 8937.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 8938.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As written in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.''
By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 8939.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As written in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.''
By Mrs. LESKO:
H.R. 8940.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. MFUME:
H.R. 8941.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. MFUME:
H.R. 8942.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. ROUZER:
H.R. 8943.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII
By Mr. SMUCKER:
H.R. 8944.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 7 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 8945.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. VALADAO:
H.R. 8946.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution
By Mr. WALTZ:
H.R. 8947.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.R. 8948.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. NEHLS:
H.J. Res. 97.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. POCAN:
H.J. Res. 98.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 336: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 792: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1019: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1111: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1332: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1348: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1368: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 1378: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1453: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1704: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1948: Mr. RYAN of New York and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 2144: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 2234: Mr. RYAN of New York.
H.R. 2252: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2326: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2566: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 2965: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2972: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 2974: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3089: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3244: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 3287: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3337: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3354: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 3355: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. CAREY, and Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 3472: Mr. KILMER and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3733: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3860: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3884: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 4006: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 4213: Mr. BERA, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 4239: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4277: Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 4311: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 4379: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4385: Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 4436: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 4934: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 4949: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 4965: Mr. RYAN of New York.
H.R. 5026: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 5255: Mr. RYAN of New York.
H.R. 5444: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
H.R. 5546: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 5727: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 6100: Ms. DELBENE and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 6117: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 6161: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6215: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 6273: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 6394: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 6448: Mr. JACOBS of New York and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6583: Mr. KEATING, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 6720: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 6725: Mrs. STEEL.
H.R. 6860: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 6889: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 6898: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 7041: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 7051: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 7076: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 7079: Mr. SWALWELL and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 7223: Mr. BACON, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 7249: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 7346: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 7612: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 7639: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 7724: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 7744: Ms. LETLOW, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 7892: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 7925: Ms. CONWAY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 7961: Ms. HERRELL and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 8033: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 8105: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 8109: Mr. POCAN and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 8110: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 8181: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 8183: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 8316: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 8323: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 8384: Mr. KELLER and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 8432: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 8433: Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 8446: Mr. JONES and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 8463: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 8494: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 8514: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 8565: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 8581: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 8594: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 8600: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 8667: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 8685: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. CHU, Ms. BUSH, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 8701: Mr. KELLER and Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 8702: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 8731: Mr. CARL.
H.R. 8736: Mr. NEAL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 8770: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 8799: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 8800: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 8814: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 8829: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 8832: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 8834: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 8843: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 8845: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 8849: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 8868: Mr. CLINE and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 8875: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 8876: Mr. BURGESS and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 8891: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 8906: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 8909: Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. BACON, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 8923: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 8926: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. KINZINGER.
H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. PAPPAS.
H. Res. 240: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H. Res. 404: Mr. SCHRADER.
H. Res. 703: Mr. TRONE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H. Res. 1030: Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. WILD, and Ms. STRICKLAND.
H. Res. 1138: Mr. LIEU, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. BOWMAN.
H. Res. 1156: Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. LUCAS.
H. Res. 1234: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 1349: Mr. MOONEY.
H. Res. 1351: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. STEVENS.
H. Res. 1360: Mr. MOONEY.
H. Res. 1367: Ms. LETLOW.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 4118 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Education and Labor in H.R. 4118 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 6448 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 8542 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Energy and Commerce in H.R. 8542 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8876: Mr. OWENS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

PT-146. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners of the Township of Haverford, County of Delaware, PA, relative to Resolution No. 2270-2022, calling on the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to pass ''The Women's Health Protection Act of 2021'' (H.R. 3755) immediately, and that it be transmitted to President Biden's desk for his signature, to become federal law; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PT-147. Also, a petition of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury, relative to a resolution in support of the reinvesting in America's Shoreline Economies and Ecosystems (RISEE) Act for projects dedicated to coastal resilience and protection; Technology; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Science, Space, and Technology.

PT-148. Also, a petition of the New York City Council, relative to Resolution No. 92, calling on the United States Congress to pass and President Joseph Biden to sign the Black Maternal Health Momnibus Act of 2021; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Veterans' Affairs.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2022 *No. 152*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Our Heavenly Father, You are our mighty fortress. Continue to be for us a bulwark that never fails.

Lord, inspire our lawmakers to do Your will. Direct them in their work. Empower them to meet each challenge and shield them from discouragement. May they not depart from Your purposes for their lives in their thoughts, words or deeds.

Lord, give our Senators the discipline to relinquish any spirit of self-importance for the spirit of self-sacrifice. Give them also the certainty that You are guiding their lives.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUJÁN 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

AMENDMENT TO MONTREAL PROTOCOL (''KIGALI AMENDMENT'')

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty document No. 117–1, Amendment to Montreal Protocol (''Kigali Amendment'').

Pending:

Schumer amendment No. 5503, to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 35 years ago this month, every nation on Earth came together for the first time in human history to sign onto a global accord to save the planet's dying ozone layer. It was a convergence unlike any before, uniting not just every member of the United Nations but, in time, also the European Union and even the Holy See.

That accord, of course, was the Montreal Protocol, hailed by then-UN Secretary General Kofi Annan as ''perhaps the single most successful international agreement to date.''

Today, the Senate will finish the work of ratifying the Kigali Amendment to the protocol when we vote later today here on the floor.

Ratifying the Kigali Amendment will require two-thirds of the Senate, and I want to thank every single Member, Democratic and Republican alike, who voted yesterday to move forward on this measure. Our country, our businesses, and our planet will benefit because of it. I hope we can see that same level of support today.

In a year where we have already seen plenty of major bipartisan bills become law, the Kigali Amendment might just be one of the most important bipartisan achievements to date—less heralded, but maybe more important—because this measure will go a long way to lowering global temperatures while also creating tens of thousands of American jobs and deal with the fact that China rarely participates in global cooperation when it comes to putting their own economy and jobs ahead of ours.

As I have explained, the Kigali Amendment will signal the commitment of the United States to phase down the use of dangerous industrial chemicals known as HFCs by 80 percent over the next 15 years. HFCs are found practically in every home in America and around the world, inside the vast majority of refrigerators, air-conditioner units, aerosols, insulating foams, and more.

Experts say that if we can meet the goals set forth by the Kigali Amendment, we can reduce global temperatures by about half a degree Celsius by the end of the century. That is huge. We struggle to get that reduction

Printed on recycled paper.

down, to get that increase down. And this is a big, big step forward for that. Half a degree might sound like a rounding error to some, but in truth, it is very, very, very significant.

But equally significant, however, are the tens of billions in new investments that will be up for grabs if we ratify this amendment.

Every year, millions and millions of refrigerators and AC units are sold around the world, and the United States ranks near the top of refrigerator exports. All of these products will need viable HFC refrigerant alternatives moving forward, and we need to take every step available to make sure those alternatives are provided by American companies and American workers, driven by American ingenuity.

By one measure, ratifying the Kigali Amendment will generate nearly $39 billion in investments here in America in the next 5 years when combined with other steps we have taken to transition away from HFCs. It will create tens of thousands of new American jobs and increase U.S. heating, ventilation, and refrigeration exports by 25 percent in a few short years, by 2027.

Let me say that all again. Tens of thousands in new American jobs, nearly 39 billion in new investments, a surge in U.S. exports—all of that is on the table if we finish our work to ratify this amendment today. There is every reason in the world to say yes.

There is really no down side to ratification. The Kigali Amendment will not overrule or change any current U.S. law. It will require no one to replace their appliances at home. The United States will be able to lead the international process of implementing Kigali, ensuring U.S. businesses will set the terms of implementation that benefit them. And Congress will be perfectly free to change domestic policy to adapt to new technologies without having to worry about this agreement.

Even without the Kigali Amendment, the United States has already taken steps to transition away from HFCs, and U.S. businesses have been the ones leading the way. So it is no surprise that groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Chemistry Council, the Air-Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration Institute, and even companies like Walmart and Honeywell all support the Kigali Amendment.

So in many ways, this is sort of a legislative layup. It is low-hanging fruit to secure billions in growth and tens of thousands of good-paying jobs. Again, there is every reason in the world to say yes and practically no reason to say no.

So for the sake of U.S. businesses, for the sake of U.S. workers, for the sake of U.S. exporters and U.S. investment, and for the sake of leadership in safeguarding our planet, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on ratifying Kigali later today.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. President, now on DISCLOSE. In the 12 years since conservatives on the Supreme Court ruled in Citizens United, our elections have been become rank—rank—with the stench of dark money.

Soon, the Senate will vote to erase this foulness when we hold the first procedural vote to take up the DISCLOSE Act. This has been a long time coming, and credit goes to Senator WHITEHOUSE, perhaps the Senate's most valiant enemy of dark money. I commend him; I thank him; and I stand with him in his efforts to shine a light on the corrosive power of dark money in our elections. No one has done more to shine the light on this evil, evil thing.

In free and fair elections—one person, one vote—American voters alone should have the power to determine the Nation's leaders without fear that their voices will be drowned out by powerful elites or special interests.

Sadly, unfortunately, dark money has rendered this ideal a fantasy. The idea of one person, one vote has been washed away by cascades of dark, undisclosed money pouring into our electoral system. Today, the average American—someone who might chip in $30 or $50 every now and then to support a candidate—is left practically powerless against billionaires and special interests who can cut million-dollar checks to promote candidates of their choice. Who here thinks that is a healthy democracy?

Because of today's broken campaign finance laws, many of these donations happen entirely in secret. It is a veil cast over our democracy that leaves vast majorities of voters behind.

And the problem is not just limited to our elections. Oh, no. Dark money has also corroded the judicial nomination process, as special interest groups spend tens of millions to push extremist judges onto the Federal Bench.

I believe that the awful decision in Dobbs was greatly affected by the fact that dark money is undisclosed.

The DISCLOSE Act operates off a simple premise: A healthy democracy is a transparent democracy, one where billionaires and mega-corporations don't get a free pass to exploit loopholes in campaign finance law in order to spend billions in anonymous contributions. That is the antithesis of democracy.

This shouldn't be a Democratic or a Republican view. After all, when was the last time any of us heard voters celebrate the spread of dark money? When was the last time any of us heard voters say it is better for billionaires and special interests to buy elections in secret rather than be held accountable to the public?

Of course the public doesn't think that, unless they themselves—a few, few—are cutting million-dollar checks in secret.

Even the Republican leader, who has dedicated much of his career to killing many campaign reforms, used to say in the distant past that disclosure and transparency are good things for elections. Unfortunately, that was a long time ago, and now all we hear from the other side are the absurd—and these are truly absurd—arguments that transparency somehow equates to suppressing freedom of elections. Tying logic and fairness into a pretzel knot to say that transparency is like suppressing freedom of expression is absurd. Imagine. Imagine this. Imagine being on the side of millionaires and billionaires who would no longer have the luxury of influencing our elections by cutting million-dollar checks in total anonymity. What a tragedy. Isn't that a shame? These poor billionaires and millionaires might have to disclose what they are doing.

Of course, of course, imagining being on the side of those millionaires and billionaires is ridiculous. If a multibillionaire wants to spend colossal sums on candidates who are deeply anti-choice or who support insurrectionists—which some of these dark money, special interest, MAGA Republicans do—shouldn't the public have a right at least to know, simply to know it?

If someone wants to come here on the floor and argue otherwise, God help our democracy.

Louis Brandeis said over a century ago that sunlight is the best of disinfectants. The DISCLOSE Act would put that into practice.

So if you agree that the American people have a right to know who is trying to influence their elections, support the DISCLOSE Act. If you agree that America's representatives should only have one boss, the people, and not special interests, then support the DISCLOSE Act.

Democracy cannot prosper without transparency. Dark money, hidden secrets are the hallmark of dictatorships, left and right. We, in democracy, need transparency.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for all he has done. I strongly support passing this legislation to keep the dream of our Founders alive—alive—in this century.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Sunday's edition of ''60 Minutes,'' President Biden made a bizarre attempt to deny the American people's pain from Democrats' runaway inflation. After the latest nationwide data reported that consumer prices are rising at 8.3 percent year-on-year, the President suggested the country should

be celebrating that they weren't rising even faster.

Working Americans aren't buying that insulting spin. Middle-class families aren't rejoicing that their daily life costs 8.3 percent more than it did a year ago and—listen to this—13.2 percent more than when President Biden took office.

In Parma, OH, one local grocer is working hard to keep her prices competitive but admits that ''[w]e have been getting hit with all of our suppliers with chicken, ground meat, everything.''

And in Fairfield County, the head of one organization that helps feed folks experiencing economic hardship put it this way:

I think things are going to get a whole lot darker and more bleak before they get a lot better. We're desperately worried about food.

Across the border in West Virginia, in Fayette County, persistent high prices have one retired grandmother worried about how the rest of her family is making ends meet.

She said:

I'm already stressed and stressed and trying to figure out how [my daughter is] going to pay to keep the lights on, get groceries, get school clothes on her kid's back.

In Perryopolis, PA, one shopper told a reporter that besides cutting back at the grocery store, she had taken on a second job of working nights at a warehouse to help feed her family of four.

This is what she had to say:

Clothing, gas, just about everything has gone up, and food is a large part of it.

Meanwhile, the head of a small manufacturer in Big Bend, WI, reports that amid price spikes and backed-up supply chains, ''trying to source products has been very difficult.''

In each of these States' cases—West Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania—one Senator tried to spare working families from all of this preventable pain. Each of those States has one Republican Senator who warned about inflation, who voted against inflation, and who voted for amendments that would have reduced inflation.

But, unfortunately, each one of those States also has a Democratic Senator who decided to vote in partisan lockstep to plow ahead with the trillions of dollars in reckless, inflationary spending. One Senator each from West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin cast the tie-breaking votes to bring this pain down on their citizens' heads. Now, sadly, they are all paying the price.

Working families in West Virginia are paying Washington Democrats' inflation tax to the tune of an extra $563 a month. Ohioans are paying $661 more. In Pennsylvania, inflation is squeezing folks for an extra $605; and in Wisconsin, it is $673. Families in these States are paying a painful price for the deciding vote that their Democratic Senators chose to cast.

ENERGY

Now, Mr. President, on a related matter, Democrats' runaway inflation includes skyrocketing costs to keep the lights on and to heat or cool homes.

We are also witnessing the dangerous vulnerabilities that Democrats in places like California have built into their electrical grids. California Democrats have spent years putting ''green'' lifestyle preferences ahead of the basic needs of working families. The result is a grid that is both more expensive and less reliable. We have seen the same California Democrats, who have spent years pushing their citizens to buy expensive electric cars, now begging the public not to plug them in.

Even as California teeters on the brink of an energy crisis of European proportions, Washington Democrats are pushing the rest of the country in that very same risky direction. They made their signature priority for this year spending even more of the people's money to take us even farther in the wrong direction even faster.

Last month, our Democratic colleagues rammed through a gigantic party-line bill that raises taxes on reliable domestic American energy in order to subsidize wealthy people buying electric cars or fancy, new appliances. Every Democratic Senator cast the deciding vote for that reckless spending spree.

That includes the senior Senator from West Virginia, who claims he only did so because the Democratic leader promised him that Democrats would line up behind permitting reform to make it easier to build things and complete projects in our country. But now, very predictably, this backroom deal is crumbling before our eyes. Almost 60 days after our colleague from West Virginia gave up his vote for this vague promise, it still appears the far left and House Democrats want no part of his backroom deal they didn't sign on to.

As for the Republican side, our colleague Senator CAPITO has put forward a real, actual, substantive permitting reform bill that would make the commonsense changes our country needs. Senator CAPITO's substantive bill stands in stark contrast to what every indication thus far suggests will be weak, reform-in-name-only legislation from her home State colleague.

As luck would have it, Senator CAPITO's real plan is also closer to passing the Senate than Senator MANCHIN's reform-in-name-only plan. Senator MANCHIN recently told reporters that his version may need 20 Republican votes to become law, but Senator CAPITO's plan only needs Senator MANCHIN and nine other Democrats to get on board. We are talking about real, substantive reform that is already closer to becoming law. But so far, our Democratic colleague from West Virginia has refused to back his colleague's commonsense proposal. He has shown little appetite to actually get something accomplished.

So talk is cheap. If our colleagues across the aisle want real permitting reform, Senator CAPITO's fantastic bill only needs Senator MANCHIN plus nine more Democrats to clear this Chamber. Otherwise, it would appear the senior Senator from West Virginia traded his vote on a massive liberal boondoggle in exchange for nothing.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. President, on one final matter, finally, with all of these national crises hammering families, the Democratic majority is using the Senate schedule to demonstrate that they do not care.

The Democratic leader is not spending floor time on a bill to combat Democrats' inflation crisis or their immigration crisis or their violent crime crisis or their energy crisis, not on legislation to help American families' daily lives in any way. Instead, the Democratic leader is setting up a vote on a bill to erode the First Amendment and make political speech more difficult. Instead of trying to address the root causes of their unpopularity, Democrats are attacking the American people's ability to speak out against them.

The Democrats try to ram through political takeover bills like this zombie DISCLOSE Act once or twice every year. This legislation would give Democrats' friends in the unelected bureaucracy even more power to police the political speech and activism of private citizens.

Remember, donations to political action committees and electioneering nonprofits are already publicly disclosed. That is already the law. What Democrats want is a huge, new step that would reduce private citizens' privacy and chill Americans' constitutional rights. The same Democrats who wouldn't condemn angry mobs gathering outside the private family homes of Federal judges now believe that vastly more information about private citizens' political views should be made public.

It is no mystery as to how these things fit together. Even the liberal ACLU warned years ago that what the Democrats want to pull off ''unconstitutionally infringes on freedom of speech and the right to associational privacy.''

I don't often say the ACLU has it right, but they do here.

Instead of addressing the reasons why Americans are upset with Democrats, the Democrats are trying to legislate our citizens into sitting down and shutting up.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

ABORTION

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, in the months since the conservative majority on the Supreme Court struck down Roe v. Wade, the assault on reproductive rights by anti-choice, MAGA Republicans has been relentless.

Anti-choice States across the country have already enacted strict and rigid abortion bans that strip our rights away, threaten to jail women and their doctors, and put women's

health at risk. And just as we have always known, this threat is not just at the State level.

Last week, legislation was introduced in this very Chamber that would enact a national abortion ban, one that would strip women of the fundamental right to control their own bodies. This abortion ban—and that is exactly what it is, a nationwide abortion ban—poses a real and serious threat to the rights of women across this country. This is a dangerous nationwide government mandate that would threaten women and their doctors—threaten them—with jail time, including those in my State of Nevada.

Pro-choice States like Nevada, where the people voted overwhelmingly to protect reproductive freedoms as part of State law, would be forced—forced—to abide by this Federal mandate. Because Federal law supersedes State law, this legislation would override the will of Nevadans and the freedom—the freedom—that they have had for decades.

If anti-choice Republicans in Congress have their way and their national abortion ban passes—listen to this—then Nevada's doctors could be prosecuted; Nevada's women could be jailed; and Nevada's women could die as a result of a lack of access to care.

So let's be clear. The only thing standing in the way of their national abortion ban is the pro-choice majority in the U.S. Senate, and I will do everything I can to fight this legislation threatening our reproductive rights not just in Nevada but across the country.

That is why I helped to introduce the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act, along with Senators MURRAY, PADILLA, and the Acting President pro tempore, Senator LUJÁN, to protect doctors in States like Nevada, where abortion remains legal and protects women from facing prosecution and potentially jail by anti-choice States. No doctor—let me repeat this. No doctor should ever be jailed for providing women with the reproductive and often lifesaving care they need wherever these women are from. No doctor should ever be jailed for providing care.

Anti-choice Republicans in the Senate have blocked these efforts in the past as they have continued to push for dangerous bans.

Today—today—we have another opportunity to protect doctors and their patients by passing this legislation—without obstruction or delay—because let's be clear: We will not—we will not—give up. We will not allow a national abortion ban to pass the Senate. We will not allow doctors to face prosecution for doing their jobs. We must—we must—protect a woman's right to choose and continue fighting against this ban every step of the way.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

INFLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, on Sunday, the President appeared on ''60 minutes,'' where he was asked what he was going to do to help alleviate inflation in light of August's continued grim inflation news and the resulting stock market nosedive.

The President's response?

Well, first of all, let's put this in perspective. Inflation rate month to month was just—just an inch, hardly at all.

''Let's put this in perspective''? That might be something to say if the inflation rate had ticked up from, say, 2 percent—the target inflation rate—to 2.1 percent, but I am pretty sure that that is not the appropriate thing to say when you are talking about the sixth straight month of inflation above 8 percent and the ninth straight month of inflation at or above 7 percent and the 11th straight month of inflation above 6 percent.

Even more concerning than August's consumer price index rising 8.3 percent from the same month a year ago was the increase in core inflation—a measure of inflation minus the volatile categories of food and energy. This measure increased to 6.3 percent in August, up from 5.9 percent in both June and July, suggesting that inflation is sinking its roots even deeper into various sectors of our economy—or in the words of a CNBC headline from last week:

Inflation isn't just about fuel costs anymore, as price increases broaden across the economy.

But, of course, you don't have to take my word for it about the mess that we are in. Here is what one of President Obama's top economic advisers had to say last week after August's inflation numbers came out:

Today's CPI report confirms that the US has a serious inflation problem. Core inflation is higher this month than for the quarter, higher this quarter than last quarter, higher this half of the year than the previous one, and higher last year than the previous one.

''Let's put this in perspective.'' That is what President Biden had to say? Here is the American people's perspective: Fifty-seven percent of Americans disapprove of President Biden's handling of the economy, and 37 percent of voters say that President Biden's policies have hurt them personally, versus just 15 percent of voters who say his policies have helped them.

These numbers are no surprise. The President may somehow still believe that he is creating an economy that will ''work for working families,'' but the reality is that, in the Biden economy, working Americans are suffering. Americans' utility bills are soaring; their grocery bills have ballooned; and they are paying $1.30 more per gallon every time they fill up their car than they were when President Biden was elected. Real wages have dropped every single month since Democrats passed their $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan spending spree—the bill, I would add, that helped plunged our economy into our current crisis. And 40 percent of Americans report having difficulty paying for their normal household expenses. Americans are dipping into their savings or working side jobs to make ends meet. They are charging more day-to-day expenses on their credit cards. In too many cases, they are having to visit food banks, which are seeing huge lines thanks to continued high inflation. What are Democrats and the President doing about this? Nothing.

Of course, last month, Democrats did pass a bill they called the Inflation Reduction Act. The problem? The bill will do nothing to reduce inflation—nothing. Again, you don't have to take my word for it. The nonpartisan Penn Wharton Budget Model said this about the bill's impact on inflation:

The impact on inflation is statistically indistinguishable from zero.

''[S]tatistically indistinguishable from zero.''

Or you could take the word of the Democrat chairman of the Budget Committee, who admitted right here on the Senate floor that the so-called Inflation Reduction Act would not reduce inflation.

But it is not just that Democrats have done nothing to help solve our inflation crisis; they are also on track to make Americans' economic situation significantly worse.

In August, President Biden announced a massive student loan giveaway that could cost anywhere from an estimated $500 billion to more than $1 trillion and that the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget notes would ''meaningfully boost inflation.'' This is a statement from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget talking about the President's massive student loan giveaway, and they say it will ''meaningfully boost inflation'' or, as the president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget recently put it, ''Amid 40-year-high inflation and despite the administration constantly touting its 'fiscal responsibility,' these changes will recklessly add to the debt and make the Federal Reserve's job in fighting inflation even harder, which will amplify our risk of entering a recession.''

Many of us would argue we are already in a recession—two consecutive quarters of negative GDP growth.

Inflation has spent 8 straight months at 40-year highs, and the President has decided that now is a good time to implement a policy that will ''meaningfully boost inflation.''

The economy continues to show signs of weakening, driven in large part by the inflation crisis Democrats helped create. Major companies have recently announced job cuts. Sixty-three percent of small businesses are putting a hold on hiring, and 10 percent of those are cutting jobs. We have had negative economic growth, as I mentioned, for the past two quarters. So naturally—naturally—Democrats decided this was

a good time to raise taxes on businesses. Yes, Democrats' so-called Inflation Reduction Act imposes new taxes on businesses to help pay for their Green New Deal spending.

I say ''taxes on businesses,'' but, of course, taxes on businesses largely fall on workers and consumers in the form of fewer jobs and opportunities, lower wages, and higher prices—in other words, pretty much the exact opposite of what we need right now, with prices soaring and wages failing to keep pace with inflation.

The Inflation Reduction Act also imposes new taxes on energy that will drive up energy prices for both American families and American businesses, imposing further pain on family budgets and likely prolonging our inflation crisis even further.

The President may have wanted to build an economy ''from the bottom up and the middle out,'' as he has described it; instead, he and his fellow Democrats have helped create an economy in which working families are struggling to make it from one paycheck to the next. And thanks to the additional tax-and-spend policies the Democrats have recently implemented, working families are likely to be struggling for some time to come.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4723

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, last week, Republicans made clear that despite the clear outcry from people across the country, overturning Roe was just their first step. Republicans want a national abortion ban. Republicans want to force my constituents to stay pregnant even when they do not want to be and to go after the doctors who provide abortion care.

I am here today to continue to say in no uncertain terms that Democrats are not going to stand for it. While Republicans are busy threatening the rights of women in every State across the country and threatening doctors with jail time, Democrats are here to defend abortion rights and defend the doctors who provide that care, because even before Republicans dropped their national abortion ban bill, I was hearing from providers in my home State of Washington who are facing a huge influx of patients due to Republicans' extreme bans.

Just yesterday, the Texas Tribune shared the heartbreaking story of a woman who learned that the pregnancy she had wanted so badly was incompatible with life, that her daughter was developing without a skull or brain. But because Republicans in Texas think they know better than this woman or her doctor, she had to travel for treatment from Dallas all the way to Seattle to get the care she needed.

Providers on the ground in my State tell me there are so many more patients being forced to make a trek like that. They are worried about caring for them, and not just because it is for so many more patients, not just because Republicans are straining resources and causing a healthcare crisis that puts women's lives at risk; healthcare professionals are also deeply worried about how Republicans' extreme laws threaten their practices. They are terrified Republicans will take away their livelihoods and even their freedom just for doing their jobs, just for providing the care their patients need—care that is, once again, completely legal in my State.

They are right to be scared. When it comes to Republicans' extreme, no-holds-barred anti-abortion agenda, the writing is on the wall, and it has been for some time. Even before this latest bill, Republican State lawmakers were already drafting legislation that would make it a crime to provide abortion care to a resident even in another State where it is legal, and they were doing this while at the same time trying to claim they didn't want to throw doctors in prison.

On top of all of that, they were standing in the way of the bill I will offer today to protect healthcare providers. This is a really straightforward bill. It simply protects doctors providing legal abortion care.

The last time I tried to pass it, the junior Senator from Indiana said he was concerned about this bill ''allowing abortions for anyone who crosses the State lines and is not a resident of that State.'' In other words, Republicans are worried about all the patients I mentioned earlier who are traveling to Washington State seeking abortion care that they urgently need. Republicans don't think they should be able to travel to Washington State to get healthcare, and they want to allow other States to target Washington State doctors, to threaten them for providing legal abortion care.

That is extreme. It is not what doctors want, and it is definitely not what the American people want. Women and men across the country do not want politicians making their healthcare decisions and throwing their doctors in prison. They want to be able to make their own decisions about their own bodies, their own families, their own future. They want doctors to be able to focus on doing their jobs, not fearing a jail sentence.

So I urge my Republican colleagues to step aside and allow us to pass the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act. This legislation is so straightforward. It protects doctors providing legal abortion care, and it ensures that they can practice medicine and save lives without fear of legal threats and intimidation. It makes clear that the attacks we have seen on doctors are unacceptable and that politicians should not be harassing or scaring or investigating, threatening, or punishing doctors for providing care that is perfectly legal, that patients want, and that in many cases is even necessary to save lives.

If Republicans have been doing what I have been doing, if they have been actually listening to doctors and patients, then they should reverse course and let us get this commonsense bill passed. But if they continue blocking these steps, if they continue ignoring the outcry from every corner of the country, if they continue to undermine the health of patients seeking care and the freedom of healthcare providers doing their jobs, they should know we are not going to stop pushing back. There is too much at stake.

So, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 4723; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right object, I am glad the Supreme Court has returned the issue of life back to the people's elected representatives, where it should have stayed 49 years ago.

This legislation denies State representatives the right to make laws protecting life. This bill is an attempt to undermine State laws that protect life by allowing abortions for anyone who crosses State lines and is not a resident of the State.

Moreover, it gives the Department of Justice $40 million in grant funding to help people sue States—to help people sue States—that enact policies to protect life. The Department of Health and Human Services is given another $40 million in funding for any eligible center at Secretary Becerra's discretion. This funding is not protected by the Hyde amendment, and most likely, we are going to borrow every penny of it, like we do for most things in this place. We should not spend $80 million to undermine State laws on life or impose a legislative backdoor for abortion-on-demand across our Nation.

For these reasons, I oppose this bill, and I do object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed. I am not surprised. We continue to see Republicans show their true, harsh colors, and the contrast with Democrats could not be more stark.

We simply want people to get the healthcare they need and let them make their own medical decisions. Republicans want to ban abortion nationwide. We want to protect doctors. Republicans want to threaten and penalize or even jail them just for doing their job, even when they are following their State's laws.

Mr. President, rest assured, I will continue speaking up for our healthcare providers, for families, for patients. And as we continue to see

this extremism, I want to assure everybody that I am not going to stop fighting.

Mr. President, someone should be allowed to travel out of their own State to get the healthcare they need. It is unbelievable that the Republicans block this bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. 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.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to oppose the Kigali Amendment. That is the United Nations treaty that is under consideration in this body today.

Two years ago, this body, the U.S. Senate, passed a bipartisan bill. The goal of the bill was to reduce hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs, and do it domestically. We passed it. It was signed into law.

Now, these HFCs are gases that are used in refrigerators, air-conditioners, fire extinguishers, and in insulation. They also contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions.

So I worked in a bipartisan way to build a coalition of Senators to pass the bill. Two years later, here we are; the law is now in effect in the United States. Parts of the law are still being implemented. Yet, now, today, we are being asked to sign on to treaty obligations at the United Nations that I believe are wholly unnecessary.

We have already passed bipartisan legislation to reduce HFC consumption, and it has already become the law of the land. Many of the benefits and the jobs that are being touted are U.S. innovations, and it is the result of our domestic legislation, not ratification of some U.N. treaty. We did it here. We did it right.

I say we don't need to get entangled now in another United Nations treaty. Our own law can be amended if we would like. It can be repealed. It can be replaced. Depending on the impact and cost, the United States can make changes quickly. It is much harder, if not impossible, to do it with an international treaty. In fact, when you take a look at the Kigali treaty and amendment, there is actually no way to withdraw from it if we ratify and join in.

When I take a look at this, it is especially bad because it doubles down on the practice of treating China—yes, China—as a developing country. And the key word here is ''developing.'' China is not a developing country, but this treaty says they are a developing country, and it makes a big difference in terms of the treaty and the way that China is treated internationally because it gives China special treatment.

And I will tell you, Mr. President, they don't deserve the kind of treatment that they would get with this. Under this treaty, China would get an extra 10 years—an extra decade—to produce HFCs. Well, this places us, the United States, at a competitive disadvantage to China for 10 additional years.

Interestingly and, I think, surprisingly to people when they hear this, the United States would also be expected to give more American taxpayer dollars to a U.N.—United Nations—multilateral fund that is set aside to help developing nations. The key word here again is ''developing.'' And they want to treat China like a developing country. So it would send more U.S. dollars to China because they have access to this U.N. multilateral fund.

Well, the United States is already the largest contributor to this fund. We have given over 1 billion of American taxpayer dollars to this United Nations so-called—it is a slush fund.

But what about China? Do they contribute? Oh, no, China has actually taken $1.4 billion out of the fund that we have contributed to because we are a developed nation and China is still, theoretically and legally, by this treaty, developing.

When you take a look at the debt that we have as a nation and you go and talk to any high school class or any junior high school class, as I have done in Wyoming—we did it in Wheatland, WY, with a bunch of really smart kids—they say: OK, when we have this debt, who are we borrowing the money from?

Do you know what they say? Oh, we are borrowing it from China.

So we borrow from China to give to the Multilateral Fund under this Montreal Protocol. And what happens then? The Fund gives it to China. The United States borrows from China. We give it to the United Nations. The United Nations gives it to China. So we are further in debt to China. This makes zero sense. Even to the high school kids it makes zero sense.

With ratification of the Kigali Amendment to the U.N. treaty, more and more American taxpayer dollars will be going to communist China.

Now, this is happening despite the fact that everyone knows that China is not a developing country and shouldn't be labeled as a developing country or be treated as a developing country. China is the second largest economy in the world. China is our greatest economic and geopolitical rival.

The United States should not let China play by a special set of rules that is designed to give a helping hand to truly developing nations. China doesn't fit. But this is exactly what is outlined in the Kigali Amendment. And that is why I have filed at the desk an amendment to what is being discussed on the floor of the Senate today. My amendment says the United States will not ratify this treaty until China is defined, rightly, as a developed country—not a developing country but a developed country—because they truly are. No special treatment for China, period. Everyone should stand up for that in this body, each and every Member.

So Senators have some decisions to make: Are you going to vote to allow China to play by a whole different set of rules? Are we going to put America at a competitive disadvantage? Are we going to vote to continue to give American taxpayer dollars to China?

Now, Members and my colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle say: Oh, it is not about China. This is about HFC, the chemicals involved. Again, we have already passed bipartisan legislation to reduce HFCs. The law is still going into effect. There is no excuse for any Senator to give China a handout at the expense of the American taxpayers and the American hard-working families—no excuse whatsoever.

We should not be outsourcing our environmental policy. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and, once again, say no special treatment for China.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. 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.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 p.m. today, Wednesday, September 21, all postcloture time in relation to Treaty Document No. 117–1 be considered expired; that the Schumer amendment No. 5503 be withdrawn; that the Sullivan-Lee amendment No. 5518 be the only amendment in order to the resolution of ratification and the Senate vote on adoption of the amendment; that upon disposition of the Sullivan-Lee amendment, the Senate vote on adoption of the resolution of ratification, as amended, if amended, all without intervening action or debate; further, that upon disposition of the treaty, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Bennett nomination and that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the Bennett and Prabhakar nominations in the order listed; that if cloture is invoked on either of the nominations, the confirmation votes be at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader; further, that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 484, S. 4822, be at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 22.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, there has been much made in the Biden administration about the value of diversity, and I agree that having diversity in any organization is positive. You get different viewpoints. But diversity encompasses much more than race or gender or religious orientation. Those are all important. Diversity actually means having people around you with varied experiences. As I mentioned, in my mind, that is certainly important, but it is particularly important in the Oval Office, particularly important in the White House. It is particularly important in the leadership of our Federal Government.

Let's take the example of military experience in this administration. You would think the Biden administration would think it is important to have members in his Cabinet or senior White House officials who have served in the military. After all, he is the Commander in Chief, a very important part of his responsibilities. But, in fact, virtually no one in this administration, with the exception of Secretary Austin, at the highest levels—Cabinet officials, senior White House officials—have any significant military experience at all.

Why does this matter? The President doesn't have it, of course. His Secretary of the VA, Chief of Staff, National Security Advisor—just go down the list. Nobody has any experience.

In the Federal Government of the United States, why does this matter? It matters because it is obvious by the people this President surrounds himself—the people who are giving him advice on big decisions for America—that this President doesn't prioritize military, our national defense, and our troops and their families. This manifests itself in many, many ways.

First, most importantly, it matters in how we fund our national defense. I was on the floor last week, speaking about this very topic. This is President Biden's first budget. You can see this here, what he proposed. It has the increases through every Federal Agency. This was a multitrillion-dollar budget. And it says this is what we are prioritizing as the Biden administration. You can see, heck, double-digits. That is Education and Commerce. And EPA is over 20 percent, and Interior over 15 percent—on and on and on, all the green. It is just a massive expansion of Federal Agencies, except two Agencies: Department of Defense and Homeland Security, the two Agencies that actually protect Americans.

If you look to this line of inflation, which when the Biden administration put out their budget last year was about 4.5 percent, these are actual inflation-adjusted real cuts by about 2 to 3 percent to our military. That was the Biden budget not prioritizing our troops, our national security at all. My view is that that is the No. 1 job of this government. It is not the President's view, not his team's view.

In the interim—that was last year's budget—we had a war in Ukraine. We had the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense testify in front of the Armed Services Committee that we are probably seeing the most dangerous time globally in any time in the last 40 years.

So what about the Biden budget this year?

Mr. President, you did it again.

This is actually EPA, a 25-percent increase—wow.

But here we go, all the big double-digit increases. When you get down to the Department of Defense, with now the 9 percent Biden inflation, we are talking a 5-percent real cut to our military. That is not prioritizing our military.

You are starting to see how this inflation and other things are really impacting our troops. The Army, last week, in an article, suggested that the American military members who are having trouble making ends meet because of high levels of inflation should go on food stamps. You heard that correct. We are going to give the EPA a 25-percent raise. We are going to cut defense spending by a 5-percent real cut, and if you are a soldier struggling because of high inflation to actually put food on the table, you can go get food stamps. That is the perfect example of not prioritizing our military.

I want to unpack this further. The Army is saying that, if our troops don't have enough food to eat, they should look at going on food stamps. But the President finds it absolutely essential to forgive $560 billion in student loan debt just a couple of weeks ago. Who are the preponderance of Americans who will benefit from that lawless bailout? High-earning Americans, the elite—White House staffers, certainly. They are going to get a half-trillion-dollar bailout, and our troops are being told to go on food stamps. This should shock every single American.

So we know the President and his team don't prioritize the military. Look at these budgets or our troops or our national security. But that doesn't mean they don't find the military useful. I am going to put up a picture of a recent speech that, I will tell you, every time I look at it, my blood boils, and so should every American's blood boil.

It is this picture.

Now, every President gives partisan speeches. Now, I don't think it is wise for every President to give the kind of partisan speech that President Biden gave on September 1 in Philadelphia in which he vilified millions, tens of millions of his fellow Americans who don't agree with his administration's policies. Some of you may have seen that speech. The President told the country that many of his fellow Americans, all of whom are Republican, don't ''respect the Constitution,'' are ''destroying American democracy.'' He gave this speech against a blood-red backdrop, fists clenched—look at him—yelling that millions of his fellow Americans embrace anger—while he embraced anger in his speech—and chaos. This President who continually issues lawless Executive orders, like shutting down the ANWR in my State, his half-a-trillion-dollar student loan bailout, then says that Republicans are ''against the rule of law.'' He went on and on—the insults, very partisan, somewhat deranged, attacking tens of millions of his fellow Americans.

Now, look, Presidents do that. I don't think it is a good idea. But here is the thing about this speech: To make matters worse—look at this—he did all this, a clearly partisan speech, while being flanked by two Active-Duty marines as his political props. Look at that. Look at that—in my view, a sickening abuse of authority from a Commander in Chief who has never served in the military—I think he got five Vietnam deferments—and knows nothing about the Marine Corps' ethos of honor, courage, commitment.

Remember when General Milley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs—and was Chairman under President Trump as well—released a video where he apologized for standing beside the President, then-President Trump, when that could have been perceived as political.

This is what General Milley said:

> I should not have been there. My presence in that moment and in that environment created a perception of the military [being] involved in domestic politics.

I thought that was a good speech by General Milley. He made a mistake; he apologized; and that was the right thing to do.

This is much worse. This is much worse. These marines, unlike General Milley, they are being ordered to stand next to the President of the United States while he rants against millions of his own fellow Americans.

The President certainly didn't apologize for this speech. In fact, when criticized by both Democrats and Republicans for the politicization of the military with these marines propped up next to him, the Biden administration actually doubled down in terms of their use of these two Active-Duty marines as political props in a very partisan speech.

Here is what the spokesperson at the White House said:

> The presence of [the] Marines at [that] speech was intended to demonstrate the deep and abiding respect the President has for [these servicemembers] . . . [for] the ideals and the unique role our independent military plays in defending our democracy, no matter who is in power.

This is Orwellian doublespeak. What a bunch of nonsense.

Here is the fact: The presence of these marines was meant to politicize the President's speech and politically benefit from the honor and respect the few and the proud have earned in the hearts of Americans over decades, over millennium. This should disturb every single American, whether you are Democrat or Republican. This was just wrong.

Let me provide another example of the politicization of our military by

the Biden administration. Now, this is something that hasn't gotten a lot of attention. Some people were like, hey, it wasn't a really big deal. I actually think it was a big deal.

We have some of the best service academies in the world. They are the best in the world—the U.S. Naval Academy, West Point, Air Force Academy, Coast Guard Academy. Each of our military service academies has board members, some of whom are appointed by the President of the United States for 3-year terms.

Now, I am honored to serve on the U.S. Naval Academy Board. I was appointed as a member of the Armed Services Committee. Here is the tradition in our country that every single President has abided by: When they come into office, they let the Board members finish out their terms. So, for example, when President Trump was elected, the Obama administration officials, who were President Obama's appointees, finished out the terms on the Naval Academy Board, the West Point Board, and the Air Force Academy Board. That is what we do.

The point is not to politicize the service academies. That has always been the tradition, every single President—except for Joe Biden. When President Biden came into office, he looked at West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and somebody said to him ''You know what, Mr. President, let's fire all the Trump appointees. Let's fire them right now, all 18 of them'' to clearly politicize the service academies of America. So that is what they did—something that had never been done before by any President in the history of the country—and they did it regardless of qualifications of the current members serving on these boards. Let me give you some examples.

Retired Army LTG H.R. McMaster was fired off the West Point Board. Ironically, the same day he was fired by President Biden's White House, he was honored by the West Point Association of Graduates as the distinguished graduate of the year of West Point. So one President fires him, and West Point gives him a great honor. GEN Jack Keane, a former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, was fired from the West Point Board; retired Army COL Douglas Macgregor; an Afghanistan war veteran, clinical psychologist Meaghan Mobbs; a Bronze Star recipient and businessman, David Urban; a retired Army lieutenant general, Guy Swan—18 qualified people, all fired.

The politicization of the service academies of America was undertaken by this administration—the first President, the first White House ever to do it, all fired by Joe Biden and not allowed to fulfill their terms.

Of course, the Biden administration loves to use our military to push other agendas that have nothing to do with lethality in winning our Nation's wars—many, many examples. Let me give you just a couple. From the beginning, issuing Executive orders not focused on how we have a stronger military but using taxpayer dollars to establish a committee within the Pentagon to do what ended up being witch hunts on so-called extremists in the military, of which—when they came back with their report, they said they had actions of .005 percent. They also issued Executive orders to use taxpayer dollars to mandate transgender transition surgeries for Active-Duty soldiers. Importantly, they become nondeployable when that happens.

So back to my original point, no one in senior positions in the White House or the Cabinet—with the exception of Secretary Austin—has significant military experience, and on so many of these issues, there is no adult in the room.

Think about these White House conversations where they are talking about, hey, let's cut the defense budget, and we will grow the EPA by 25 percent. Well, that is a great idea, Mr. President. Let's make sure we give a partisan speech at Independence Hall, and, oh yeah, let's grab a couple Active-Duty marines to stand right next to the President as his props. That is a great idea, Mr. President. Let's come in and politicize the service academies and fire all the Trump administration appointees—even American heroes like H.R. McMaster, General Keane—despite the fact that no President had ever done that before. Great idea, Mr. President.

This is really problematic, what we are seeing right now, and that lack of prioritization extends here in the U.S. Senate, unfortunately, as it relates to our military.

As we know with regard to defense budget cuts, in the 2020 NDAA, we had a debate right here on the Senate floor where my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont proposed an amendment to dramatically cut our military, almost by 15 percent, across-the-board cuts. He even actually wrote an op-ed in POLITICO. Remember, this is when Democrats were pushing to defund the police. Here is the op-ed. It is actually called ''Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the op-ed ''Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.''

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

DEFUND THE PENTAGON: THE LIBERAL CASE

(By Senator Bernie Sanders)

Fifty-three years ago Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. challenged all of us to fight against three major evils: ''the evil of racism, the evil of poverty and the evil of war.'' If there was ever a moment in American history when we needed to respond to Dr. King's clarion call for justice and demand a ''radical revolution of values,'' now is that time.

Whether it is fighting against systemic racism and police brutality, defeating the deadliest pandemic in more than a hundred years, or putting an end to the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, now is the time to fundamentally change our national priorities.

Sadly, instead of responding to any of these unprecedented crises, the Republican Senate is on a two-week vacation. When it comes back, its first order of business will be to pass a military spending authorization that would give the bloated Pentagon $740 billion—an increase of more than $100 billion since Donald Trump became president.

Let's be clear: As coronavirus infections, hospitalizations and deaths are surging to record levels in states across America, and the lifeline of unemployment benefits keeping 30 million people afloat expires at the end of the month, the Republican Senate has decided to provide more funding for the Pentagon than the next 11 nations' military budgets combined.

Under this legislation, over half of our discretionary budget would go to the Department of Defense at a time when tens of millions of Americans are food insecure and over a half-million Americans are sleeping out on the street. After adjusting for inflation, this bill would spend more money on the Pentagon than we did during the height of the Vietnam War even as up to 22 million Americans are in danger of being evicted from their homes and health workers are still forced to reuse masks, gloves and gowns.

Moreover, this extraordinary level of military spending comes at a time when the Department of Defense is the only agency of our federal government that has not been able to pass an independent audit, when defense contractors are making enormous profits while paying their CEOs outrageous compensation packages, and when the so-called War on Terror will cost some $6 trillion.

Let us never forget what Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a former four-star general, said in 1953: ''Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.''

What Eisenhower said was true 67 years ago, and it is true today.

If the horrific pandemic we are now experiencing has taught us anything it is that national security means a lot more than building bombs, missiles, nuclear warheads and other weapons of mass destruction. National security also means doing everything we can to improve the lives of tens of millions of people living in desperation who have been abandoned by our government decade after decade.

That is why I have introduced an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act that the Senate will be voting on during the week of July 20th, and the House will follow suit with a companion effort led by Representatives Mark Pocan (D–Wis.) and Barbara Lee (D–Calif.). Our amendment would reduce the military budget by 10 percent and use that $74 billion in savings to invest in communities that have been ravaged by extreme poverty, mass incarceration, decades of neglect and the Covid–19 pandemic.

Under this amendment, distressed cities and towns in every state in the country would be able to use these funds to create jobs by building affordable housing, schools, childcare facilities, community health centers, public hospitals, libraries and clean drinking water facilities. These communities would also receive federal funding to hire more public school teachers, provide nutritious meals to children and parents and offer free tuition at public colleges, universities or trade schools.

This amendment gives my Senate colleagues a fundamental choice to make. They can vote to spend more money on endless wars in the Middle East while failing to provide economic security to millions of people

in the United States. Or they can vote to spend less money on nuclear weapons and cost overruns, and more to rebuild struggling communities in their home states.

In Dr. King's 1967 speech, he warned that ''a nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.''

He was right. At a time when half of our people are struggling paycheck to paycheck, when over 40 million Americans are living in poverty, and when 87 million lack health insurance or are underinsured, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth, and when millions of Americans are in danger of going hungry, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when we have no national testing program, no adequate production of protective gear and no commitment to a free vaccine, while remaining the only major country where infections spiral out of control, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when over 60,000 Americans die each year because they can't afford to get to a doctor on time, and one out of five Americans can't afford the prescription drugs their doctors prescribe, we are approaching spiritual death.

Now, at this unprecedented moment in American history, it is time to rethink what we value as a society and to fundamentally transform our national priorities. Cutting the military budget by 10 percent and investing that money in human needs is a modest way to begin that process. Let's get it done.

Mr. SULLIVAN. So that was the liberal case, defund the Pentagon. The junior Senator from Vermont wrote that. The majority leader put out a tweet saying he was a proud supporter of the defund the Pentagon amendment. That was right here on the Senate floor.

Of course, there is the National Defense Authorization Act, the No. 1 bill that focuses on national defense for our Nation. That passed out of committee, the Armed Services Committee, in June in a very strong bipartisan vote, 23 to 3. It passed the House in July. We will have pay raises for our troops so the Army doesn't have to tell them go line up for food stamps because they are hungry. And we need to bring it to the floor right here.

So what are we doing? As far as I can tell, the majority leader doesn't want to bring up the Defense Authorization Act until December—December. That is why I joined a letter led by Senator TUBERVILLE, with whom I serve on the Armed Services Committee, signed by 20 of my colleagues, to say to the majority leader: Mr. Majority Leader, we have a dangerous world right now. Bring the NDAA to the floor. It is going to pass. It has great support.

By the way, I know the Democrat Senators feel this way, too, on this topic.

So we need to get this body back to what is important for our country—bolstering our economy, fighting inflation, bringing down energy costs, unleashing American energy, and definitely passing the legislation that funds our military, that provides pay raises for our troops during this very dangerous time.

So I again ask the majority leader to bring the NDAA to the floor. We need it.

I call on the President and his administration—the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief—to truly prioritize our military and their families, and that begins with putting an end to using them in a disgraceful way as political props for your partisan agenda.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from Kansas.

ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY COORDINATION AND LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, American aviation—something we care about greatly in Kansas but across the country—it is entering a new era of innovation and of growth. Industry and government in this circumstance need to work together to make certain the United States stays competitive and remains the leader in this arena.

In today's technology and research and development, there are unmanned vehicles. They are autonomous. They will be flying passengers and cargo from point to point in the United States.

These vehicles will take off vertically and land vertically, and it is important for us to begin the preparation for that development in our airspace, at our airports, in our communities, and across the country.

Bipartisan legislation, which I have introduced along with Senator SINEMA, the Advanced Air Mobility Coordination and Leadership Act, has been waiting Senate approval for weeks.

This legislation would instruct the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation to lead a working group comprised of members of various government Agencies and the civil aviation industry—a public-private effort.

Their objective would be for them to review the steps needed to mature AAM past its initial operations, ensure a robust domestic supply chain, identify current Federal policies that can be leveraged to advance this industry.

I thank Senator SINEMA for her help in moving this bill forward. It has been approved by the Commerce Committee, and the advocacy groups have been engaged in helping us develop the legislation and helping us work its way through the committee and through the Senate.

I also thank a number of Kansans who have provided information and support for this endeavor.

This legislation is crucial to ensuring the United States remains a leader in the aviation sector for years to come, and I am anxious for it to become law with the President's signature.

Therefore, as if in legislative session, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 516) entitled ''An Act to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes'' do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, now I move to concur in the House amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO MONTREAL PROTOCOL (''KIGALI AMENDMENT'')—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to remind our colleagues of the incredible opportunity that we have before us today—incredible opportunity that we have before us today.

Later today, this body, the U.S. Senate, will have the opportunity to vote to ratify the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

What does that mean?

Kigali, as it is affectionately known, is a global treaty to phase down the use of hydrofluorocarbons, also known own at HFCs. For years, HFCs have been widely used as a key component that are called refrigerants, but a key component in modern air conditioners, in refrigerators, and other cooling products. Yet, the United States is already transitioning away from using HFCs. We might want to ask, why?

Well, one reason is that American companies are at the forefront of developing the next generation of coolant technology, the next generation of refrigerants.

This transition away from HFCs is expected to stimulate literally billions of dollars in economic investment in this country—billions of dollars; create tens of thousands of jobs; and significantly increase U.S. exports, all using technology developed in this country—all by using technology developed in this country; putting Americans to work, using technologies developed by Americans.

Now, first, some history on how we got here.

HFCs came about to replace ozone-depleting substances, which created a hole in our ozone layer. I said to some of my colleagues yesterday at a luncheon where we were, Mr. President, that I first remember hearing about the hole in the ozone, I think, when I was in the Navy overseas, and reading about it in Time and Newsweek that I got in the mail while we were deployed and saying: I wonder what this is all about. What could be causing that? It turned out to be a big deal and one that still plays out today in the debate before us as well.

But in 1988, this very body, the U.S. Senate, voted unanimously to ratify the Montreal Protocol, an international agreement to phase out ozone-depleting substances that was negotiated under President Ronald Reagan's leadership.

Since then, the global consumption of ozone-depleting substances has declined by—get this—by 97 percent, while our economy has continued to grow.

Now, that is good news. That is really good news. But, unfortunately, there is some bad news.

The HFCs that have been used for years now to replace the ozone-depleting substances have been found to also be bad for our environment.

So in 2016, the global community got together and amended the Montreal Protocol to also phase down HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons.

This is not the first time we have ratified an amendment to the Montreal Protocol. The Kigali Amendment before us is the fifth amendment to the Montreal Protocol ratified by the United States.

The Kigali Amendment was transmitted to the U.S. Senate on November 16, 2021—almost a year ago—300 days, in fact, ago. Each day that has passed without ratification represents a further delay in supporting American businesses, in supporting American workers, and in growing our economic and national security interests and protecting our economic and national security interests.

Thanks to American innovation, we now have HFC alternatives that are cleaner and more energy efficient than HFCs. And the best part—here is the best part: These cleaner, more efficient HFC alternatives are being manufactured, as I said, right here, right here in the U.S. of A.

In recent years, the American industries' leadership on transitioning away from HFCs created an excellent opportunity for bipartisan action at the Federal level. And to that end, our friend and colleague Senator NEELY KENNEDY and I introduced something called the AIM Act, the bipartisan American Innovation and Manufacturing Act. That was in 2019.

Our bill proposed phasing down HFCs in our country by 85 percent over 15 years—not overnight, not in 1 year, not in 2 or 3 years but phasing down by as much as 85 percent within 15 years, the same timeline as the Kigali Amendment before us.

So 16 Democrats and 16 Republicans joined the AIM Act as cosponsors with Senator KENNEDY and myself. Additionally, a broad coalition of organizations, from the National Association of Manufacturers to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the American Chemistry Council, endorsed our bill, along with a lot of other American companies.

In December 2020, the AIM Act became law under a divided Congress and a Republican administration. It was a bipartisan win—a bipartisan win. It was an American win as well.

Now it is time to build on that success. Now it is time to seize on the opportunity before us and ratify the Kigali Amendment.

The Kigali Amendment is good for our economy. Implementing the AIM Act, paired with ratification, will help generate nearly $40 billion of new growth in investment in the U.S. economy by 2027.

It will also create roughly 150,000 American jobs—150,000 new American jobs—and increase U.S. heating, ventilation, air-conditioning, and refrigeration exports across the world by at least 25 percent over that same time period.

In addition, Kigali ratification is good for consumers. As EPA's data shows us, transitioning away from HFCs means average prices will be lower for consumers—lower for consumers, not higher. Something I think we all support in this body.

Ratifying Kigali will also build on our bipartisan success in the AIM Act by allowing the Federal Government to better protect U.S. companies from illegal dumping and smuggling of HFCs into our country from adversaries like China.

And then, lastly, Kigali ratification will ensure U.S. companies continue to have access to international markets so that modern, efficient, economical air-conditioners and refrigerators across the world will be stamped ''Made in America,'' not ''Made in China.''

So today, we, the U.S. Senate, have an opportunity to make that vision a reality; to build on the decades-long bipartisan record of success from the Montreal Protocol to the passage of the AIM Act a couple of years ago; to show our Nation and to show the world yet another time that bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions. This is a bipartisan solution. This is a bipartisan solution, and it demands bipartisan support.

I hope our colleagues will join Senator KENNEDY and myself and many of our colleagues, and, frankly, a whole ton of businesses across the country and organizations who support what we are doing, and join us in supporting the ratification of the Kigali Amendment.

Let's seize the day or, as we say in Delaware, ''Carper diem. Carper diem.''

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

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

IRAN

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, tens of thousands of Iranian citizens are taking to the streets in dozens of cities across Iran as we speak. The chant that is echoing across that ancient land is: ''Death to the dictator.'' Yet Joe Biden and the Democrats in Washington would rather make another disastrous deal with the ayatollahs and those who declare ''death to America'' and who are, at this very moment, working to assassinate American citizens on our sovereign soil. Barack Obama's betrayal of the Iranian people during the Green Revolution is replaying before our very eyes.

The latest revolt against the ayatollahs was inspired by yet another reprehensible crime by this theocratic dictatorial regime against its own people.

Last week, the ayatollahs' thugs, known as the morality police, arrested a 22-year-old woman on the street for the heinous crime of allegedly not wearing a head scarf in public. They threw her into a police van; they brutally beat her on the way to the detention center; they inflicted terrible injuries on her, from which she soon died.

Countless Iranians were immediately horrified by this cold-blooded murder and are now taking to the streets to protest their illegitimate outlaw regime. They are burning hijabs and protesting the oppression under which they have suffered every day for 43 years. In the murder of this young woman, we see the true face of the ayatollahs, a regime which our President hopes to enrich with hundreds of billions of dollars and to appease with yet another terrible nuclear deal. In fact, just minutes ago, President Biden stood before the world at the U.N. General Assembly, stating at great length that he would continue negotiations toward this dangerous deal while offering only the briefest and emptiest of words to reproach the ayatollahs for the murder of this young woman for the grave crime of refusing to wear a headscarf in public and only the briefest of words for the thousands of protesters—at latest reports, seven of which have been murdered and many more shot and beaten—I would say this does feel a lot like deja vu, a replay of Barack Obama's betrayal of the 2009 Green revolutionaries. And why did he betray them in 2009? Was he caught flatfooted? Was he overwhelmed by events? Was he simply new to the job? naive? even incompetent? No. He betrayed those Green revolutionaries in cold blood because his one overriding objective was his terrible nuclear deal with Iran.

He wanted a deal because he believed America was to blame for the decades of tension and conflicts with Iran; that America had sinned and we needed to atone for our sins against Iran and to pull in our horns; and therefore he stood idly by so as not to offend the mullahs and their street militias as they beat the Iranian people.

And, today, for the very same reason, Democrats are once again selling out those brave Iranian protesters so they can once again try to buy the friendship of the oppressive ayatollahs. The U.S. Congress should stand with the Iranian people and prevent another betrayal by a Democratic President. And

you wouldn't think it would be that hard. I mean, on face value, you would think self-professed progressive Democrats would stand up as one against a so-called morality police who arrested a woman for the grave crime of not wearing a scarf over her hair in public and then beat her so severely that she died in custody.

Imagine what would happen if this had occurred in, say, Saudi Arabia. Imagine what these Democrats would be saying if a country in Western Europe enforced its laws in this way. You would expect that Democrats could marshal just a tiny bit of outrage—the tiniest bit of outrage possible when the ayatollahs arrest a woman for not wearing a headscarf in public and then beat her to death. But, no, they don't.

And to be honest, you don't even have to imagine these things either. We see how the Democrats have treated Iran for 13 years—as if America is at fault and we are the problem and Iran deserves an apology and hundreds of billions of dollars and to be brought into the civilized world. Look at how they treated Saudi Arabia as a pariah for years. In fact, look at Barack Obama's entire response to the Arab Spring in 2011. It was just like his response to the Green Revolution in 2009 in Iran. The Iranian people rise up in protest, silence; the people of Egypt rise up in protest, Barack Obama withdraws political support for Egypt's leader and demands his immediate resignation; protests in Libya where Muammar Qadhafi had been scared straight by George Bush and had come out of the cold, Barack Obama attacks his government and overthrows him militarily; protests in Syria, silence.

What is the common thread in those responses in 2009 in Iran and 2011 in Egypt and Libya and Syria and 2022 in Iran? It is very simple. If you are pro-American, you get condemned—maybe overthrown. If you are anti-American, you get rewarded with hundreds of billions of dollars and a blind eye toward your grave crimes against your people and your aggression against America and our allies throughout the region. Again and again, the Democrats excuse the crimes of our enemies while they obsess over the flaws of our friends.

As Jeane Kirkpatrick, the legendary Ambassador to the United Nations, once said—and it is true today of so many Democrats—''they always blame America first.''

We cannot allow Joe Biden to repeat the mistakes of Barack Obama and once again betray the brave people of Iran, which I would remind you is a mortal enemy of the United States. So I call on my colleagues to join me in standing with the people of Iran, with the brave people of that ancient nation who stand in the streets today chanting ''Death to the dictator,'' not with the dictator and the ayatollahs who still to this day chant ''Death to America.''

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, China is not a developing nation. China is the world's second largest economy. China is the world's largest manufacturer, and China is the world's No. 1 creditor. Yet this body, the U.S. Senate, is poised to ratify a treaty that ignores those facts and treats China with kid gloves. Simply put, the Kigali Amendment places America at a competitive disadvantage, using American taxpayer dollars to subsidize Chinese companies.

The Kigali Amendment restricts supplies of compounds called hydrofluorocarbons or HFCs, which are refrigerants used in most air-conditioning and refrigeration systems. The rationale is that HFCs leaking out of equipment and into the atmosphere add to climate change. However, even the EPA admits that HFCs contribute only five one-hundreths of 1 degree Celsius to projected increases in global temperature.

As a developing nation, designated as such under the Kigali Amendment, China is eligible to receive funding from the $4.5 billion Multilateral Fund, of which the United States is, not surprisingly, the largest contributor.

If this treaty is ratified, the United States will be required under the treaty to meet strict deadlines for phasing out HFCs, while China is given an additional 10-year timeline to come into compliance with the same standards. It is doubtful, given its track record, that China has any intention of actually meeting its environmental obligations under this treaty.

Treating China as a developing country gives it an unfair advantage in the existing HFC market and allows China to continue production, allowing that country to continue to undercut the HFC market well into the 2040s. As the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases, China has a long history of disrespecting and disregarding environmental standards and has continually increased its emissions and investments in coal-fired powerplants since the 2015 Paris climate agreement.

Under this treaty, Chinese-based HFC producers will get the largest share of the controlled market in future supplies needed to keep existing cooling systems running. As it has done under past environmental treaties, China will continue to produce supplies that are not allowed under the updated environmental standards.

This is part of a conspicuous trend on China's part. China wants to get ahead by playing by a different set of rules than the rest of the world—and certainly a different set of rules than the United States has to live under. We know China ignores the rules and has little respect, if any, for international norms, and yet we continue to allow China to dominate markets with the financial support of American taxpayer dollars.

This is a point where it just goes too far. We can't give them that. They haven't earned that. There is nothing about their behavior to suggest that they deserve this treatment. We shouldn't give it to them here.

To that end, later today, the Senate will likely vote on an amendment offered by Senator SULLIVAN and me. Now, it will not fix all of the flaws in the Kigali treaty; it will, however, begin to address the issue of China receiving special treatment at the expense of the American people. It will require the Secretary of State to propose the removal of China's designation as a developing nation to the Vienna Convention. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of our amendment and acknowledge the fact that China is not a developing nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the crisis at our southern border continues to break records. For the first time ever, the United States has encountered more than 2 million migrants at our southern border in a single fiscal year, and that doesn't even include data for the month of September.

Now, my State, the State of Texas, has a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico where most of these migrants show up, although some go to Arizona, some to New Mexico, and some to California. But the vast majority of these 2 million migrants have showed up on our backdoor step. This includes a hodgepodge of people, from asylum seekers to economic migrants, to criminals, to drug smugglers.

In each of the last 6 months, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection has logged more than 200,000 migrant encounters—for each of the past 6 months, 200,000 a month. The media used to lose its collective mind when 100,000 immigrants arrived in a single month, but I guess the public has become desensitize to these numbers because they are so huge, and we have now been operating at twice that level for 6 consecutive months.

Communities in my State of Texas have struggled to carry the weight of President Biden's border crisis, and nobody seemed to care. But the moment the burden reached the liberal enclaves of Manhattan and Martha's Vineyard, the outrage machine fired up.

Earlier this year, Texas Governor Greg Abbott began transporting migrants to other States and cities to ease the burden on communities in Texas. After all, what are we supposed to do? Two million migrants show up at the border. Are they supposed to stay there? Well, most of them have been in contact with relatives and other people in other cities around the country, and so they eventually make their way to their destination. And, if they are asylum seekers, they are given a notice to appear for a future court hearing, which probably will never occur because of the huge backlog in our immigration courts.

So Governor Abbott did what any reasonable person would do and began

sending these migrants to other places where they eventually will end up at their final destination, wherever that may be. You can imagine 2 million migrants showing up on your border and what the strain on local health systems is like, what the strain is on emergency response services. The more migrants that show up on our backdoor step, the lower the capacity to care for taxpayers who pay taxes to make sure those services are available.

At the same time, nongovernmental organizations—we call them NGOs—along the border are expected to pick up the Federal Government's slack and care for the migrants, which harms those charities' ability to support more Texans and other Americans who rely on them.

To state the obvious, the burden of this crisis should not fall on our border communities. The Federal Government, after all, is charged with the responsibility of managing our international borders, and that includes migration.

Simply stated, the Biden administration has refused to deal with this crisis or, frankly, even to really acknowledge it. But that doesn't change the fact that my State—or any other State, for that matter—should not be left to manage the fallout alone.

Now, since April, more than 11,000 migrants have voluntarily boarded buses from Texas to Washington, DC; New York; and Chicago. In the past, the leaders of these cities have made it clear that they would welcome migrants with open arms. They self-designate as a sanctuary city. Well, now this is their opportunity to provide that sanctuary and those services and relieve some of the burden on the border States that have borne the disproportionate burden for all this time. But you would have thought that something nefarious was going on or a genuine public emergency had occurred. They don't care a whit about 2 million people showing up on the Texas border. But when they show up on a bus in Washington, DC, or Chicago or New York, they howl like a dog that has been hit with a rock.

After ignoring the border crisis during the entirety of the Biden administration, the arrival of a few thousands migrants in these sanctuary cities has put them into an absolute panic. The Democratic Mayor of Washington, DC, for example, declared a public health emergency after her city received only a few thousand migrants. Two million migrants at the border in my State, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, and they didn't raise a peep. But a few thousand migrants to show up here in Washington, DC—roughly the same number that arrive on the southern border every single day—you would have thought there was an emergency.

The Democratic mayor of New York said that his city is ''nearly to the breaking point.'' This is a city of 8½ million people. Yet the mayor said his city is near the breaking point even though it has welcomed only a few thousand migrants. Give me a break.

Our colleague from Illinois, the majority whip, called the transportation of these migrants ''cruel and inhumane.'' Giving people a bus ride to their ultimate destination strikes me as not cruel and not inhumane. The White House Press Secretary had the temerity to say it was ''shameful and reckless.'' Well, what is shameful and reckless is the Biden administration's border crisis that it simply ignored for the last 2 years.

Vice President KAMALA HARRIS even went so far as to call this ''the height of irresponsibility'' and a ''dereliction of duty.'' I doubt Vice President HARRIS recognizes the many layers of irony in that statement. After all, last March, she was designated as the border czar for the Biden administration, but she wouldn't visit the border. She was charged, by the President of the United States, with finding solutions to address this ongoing crisis. If she wants to talk about dereliction of duty, her refusal to acknowledge, much less address, the border crisis is a prime example of irresponsibility and dereliction of duty.

But what is even more misleading about her statement is the fact that transporting migrants to cities far from the southern border is nothing new. In fact, the Biden administration has been doing it all along. Here is a chart. It shows the cities that have been receiving migrants from the Biden administration since the President became President of the United States in January of 2021: In Washington State, Yakima, if I am pronouncing that correctly; Minneapolis; Denver; Phoenix; Yuma; even Atlanta; White Plains; Scranton; Baltimore; Harrisburg; Allentown; Jacksonville, FL; Birmingham, AL; Houston, TX; Brownsville; San Antonio; Dallas—all of these cities have been the recipients of migrants transported by the Biden administration.

In April of last year, the Associated Press published a story with the headline ''Unaccompanied children from border arrive in Pennsylvania.'' The following month, the local news station in Chattanooga, TN, posted a story with the headline ''Late-night flights carrying migrant children arrive in Chattanooga.'' Here is another headline from October of last year: ''Biden administration quietly flies illegal immigrants to New York in the middle of the night.'' We didn't hear the howls of protest from Mayor Adams or the Governor when the Biden administration was doing what they are now complaining about. Though they don't talk about it very often, the Biden administration has a history of transporting migrants to cities far from the U.S.-Mexico border, and they didn't call it shameful or reckless then.

Just to be clear, when somebody claims asylum at the border and passes an initial test of a credible fear of persecution, they are then given a notice to appear for a future court hearing that may be years off, with millions of cases in the backlog. That is called a notice to appear, and it shouldn't surprise anybody that, over the years, after people have already made their way into the interior of the United States, that many of them don't show up for their court hearing. This is part of what the Border Patrol said is a lack of consequences associated with entering the United States in an irregular fashion. Oh, by the way, 90 percent of the people who do show up for their court hearing are not granted asylum. They don't qualify.

As I have stressed on many occasions, Mr. President, communities in my State do not have the capacity, the infrastructure, or the resources to handle this crisis alone. As New York City, the largest city in America, raises alarms over a few thousand migrants, I can't help but think about what happened when 15,000 Haitian migrants showed up under a bridge in Del Rio, TX, a town of 35,000 people. The group of migrants who showed up under that bridge in Del Rio equated to more than 40 percent of the city's population. Can you imagine what a challenge that was just to feed people, provide them humane treatment, sanitation. But if you extrapolate that 15,000 in a city of 35,000, that would be the equivalent of more than 3 million people showing up in New York City or 280,000 arriving in Washington, DC, in the course of just 1 week.

So whether they intended to do so or not, the mayors of Washington, DC and New York City—and Chicago, for that matter—have shown that the weight of this crisis is extraordinarily heavy, and they are only experiencing a tiny fraction of what Texas communities have faced every day for the last year and a half. And do you know what? Apparently the Biden administration simply doesn't care. As these mayors now know, caring for these migrants who cross our border is a herculean task because of the sheer volume of people coming across.

Legal immigration is part of the secret to our success as a country. We naturalize a million people a year. But these are people who have chosen to jump ahead of those waiting in line to enter the country lawfully, and we simply don't have the resources in place at the border or other places to deal with this vast tsunami of humanity—food, clothing, shelter, medical care, translation services, legal services, sanitation. Communities in Texas apparently have been expected to bear the entire brunt and the entire burden. It is time consuming, it is labor intensive, it is extraordinarily expensive, and it is dangerous.

The criminal organizations that are getting rich moving these migrants into the country for $5-, $10-, $15,000 a person are flooding the Border Patrol with these migrants, diverting necessary resources from the Border Patrol from interdicting the drugs that

are entering our country that killed 108,000 Americans last year alone. Seventy-one thousand of those 108,000 died of fentanyl overdose, a synthetic opioid. Precursors come from China, get to Mexico, are manufactured there, and are smuggled into the United States. And fentanyl has taken far too many lives in every State and in every city in this Nation, and yet the Biden administration has not awakened to the fact that they are being played; that part of this business model, if you want to call it that, of flooding the border with migrants is to divert the Border Patrol and law enforcement officials from stopping these drugs, this poison, from coming into the country.

Then, yes, in every city in the Nation, we have seen a spike in crime. Do you know who the distribution network is in the United States for the drugs that the cartels smuggle across the border? It is gangs in every city and in every State in the country. And who is responsible for most of the gun violence and crime in our cities? It is these gangs that are the principal distribution network for the drugs that come across the border. Yet the Biden administration has not connected the dots. I don't know why. The DEA, or the Drug Enforcement Administration, the FBI Director—there are a lot of people in the administration who could inform the President and the Vice President of what the facts are, but they apparently are not even curious, or, if they know, they don't seem to care.

From El Paso to the Rio Grande Valley, as I said, Texas shares a 1,200-mile border with Mexico out of our total border of 2,000 miles. The communities situated along that border simply cannot handle the monumental job of dealing with this flow of migrants and the failure of the Federal Government to live up to its responsibilities. But this isn't a partisan matter.

My friend Oscar Leeser, who is the mayor of El Paso, TX—he is a proud Democrat—he has been busing migrants to get them off the streets of El Paso to the cities where they want to go.

He said a few days ago:

People are not coming to El Paso, they're coming to America.

It is only fair for other parts of the country to bear the burden that we have borne alone in my State and in other border States, as long as the Federal Government is simply advocating its responsibility to deal with illegal immigration and to fix this crisis. They know what to do. They simply are refusing to do it, presumably because some of their political supporters don't believe in anything except open borders.

The Biden administration has completely abdicated its duty to secure the border, and it has failed to supply border communities with the resources they need to try to manage this fallout. The truth is, no matter what the resources were, the numbers are just overwhelming. And that is the point. The cartels get rich; they smuggle drugs and additional migrants; and that is the point. So it is not going to stop until the Biden administration wakes up out of its deep sleep and deals with the reality of what is happening at the border.

In the last 12 months, Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 2.3 million migrants at the southern border, and that total grows every single day. All you have to do is turn on your TV set and see people streaming across the border, many of them turning themselves in, getting into this asylum system where they ultimately melt into the great American heartland, never to be heard from again, successfully making their way into the country.

Our amazing men and women at the Border Patrol are grappling with staffing shortages and poor morale. How would you like to be a police officer where the mayor and city council say: Well, we had to hire a police force, but we are really not going to fund that police force or we are not going to do anything to recruit more people to serve in that police force. And do you know what? We really don't care whether they enforce the law or not.

That is the message that the Border Patrol is receiving from the Biden administration. So, of course, morale is bad. Of course, it is hard to recruit. The agents are outnumbered, they are overwhelmed, and, frankly, disgusted with the lack of leadership.

Border communities are buckling under the weight of vast humanitarian needs, and now even the self-proclaimed sanctuary cities don't seem to want to help. Unfortunately, the Biden administration appears to have no intention of fixing the problem. And it sure seems like they don't think anybody else should have to help either.

It is leaving Texas and other border States to buckle under the weight of a crisis that we had no hand in creating. It is forcing Texas taxpayers to make up for the failure of the Federal Government to perform its responsibilities. And what is worse, President Biden, Vice President HARRIS, and Members of this body are trying to paint my State as the enemy for trying to deal with the hand that it has been dealt while they continue to refuse to lend a helping hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor and kick off the process that will culminate tomorrow with our vote on the DISCLOSE Act.

The DISCLOSE Act will get rid of dark money in our politics. President Biden gave a good speech about it yesterday to help stir interests and progress in this area.

There are problems with dark money in and of itself. It contributes to what has been called the tsunami of slime in our politics, because when the slimy ad has a fake, phony front group's name on it and no actual real entity or company or association is accountable for that, well, then you can lie to your heart's content, you can smear to your heart's content, and there is no accountability.

So there are reasons for getting dark money out of our elections on their own: just giving disproportionate power to special interests, sliming up our elections, allowing a lot of bad actors powers that they don't deserve, and putting enormous power in the hands of people who are, A, politically active enough to be willing to spend that kind of money and have a motive in legislative outcomes to spend that kind of money that regular citizens can't begin to match.

But there is a lot more to it than that. There is a lot more to it than that, because, like corruption, dark money is used to achieve other goals. And those other goals have had very important policy effects in our country.

Climate change we are dealing with daily now in floods, in fires, in droughts, in species moving about—particularly in Rhode Island, our ocean fisheries are moving about. The oceans are acidifying. We are putting essential operating systems of our planet in danger and onto a course that mankind has never seen before in the entire history of humankind.

When I got here in 2007, this was addressed as a bipartisan problem. There were three different bipartisan Senate bills, all of which were very consequential. It would have made a huge difference. Senator McCain ran for President carrying the Republican Party banner with a significant and serious climate platform, and it looked like democracy was responding to this problem in a responsible way. All of that activity came to an instant shuttering halt in January of 2010.

What happened in January of 2010? What happened in January of 2010 was that the U.S. Supreme Court let loose one of the worst decisions it has ever rendered—the Citizens United decision—and that decision allowed unlimited money to flow into politics.

Of course, if you can spend unlimited money in politics, you suddenly have an unprecedented motive to hide it. If the most you can give is $3,500 or $5,000 from your PAC, it is not worth putting a lot of effort into hiding that; plus, nobody really cares. But if you can give $35 million, plus, let's say you are a polluting fossil fuel company and you don't want people to know that, now it is worth putting quite a lot of money into the apparatus of hiding who you are. It is an expensive apparatus. It is a real apparatus. Senators have gone to the floor before to describe it. We have used this graphic.

This is the web of climate denial that has been chronicled by scientists who study as a phenomenon climate denial and how the money flies around

through these different groups and how they use it to hide what they are doing on climate.

Well, once that got launched, that was the end of bipartisanship on climate. We lost a decade. I think history will show that the lost decade from January 2010 until now is one that these pages and children across the country will pay a very steep price for.

Why would they be willing to do it? Well, the fossil fuel industry has an annual subsidy of $660 billion, basically, from being allowed to pollute for free—$660 billion.

If you are protecting a $660 billion subsidy, how much would you be willing to spend any given year to protect it? If you spent $6.6 billion a year, you would still be earning 100 times your investment. Sure enough, we have seen dark money explode into expenditures by the billion. And as that happened, climate progress ended.

Look at voter suppression. Across the country, there was a wave of Republican State legislatures passing voter suppression laws. Was it an amazing coincidence that they all happened to do that at the same time? Evidently not, because there is actually a tape from Heritage Action—one of the dark money groups behind those voter suppression campaigns—where the person briefing the big donors admitted this:

> We're working with these state legislators . . . in some cases we actually draft [the bills] for them or we have a sentinel on our behalf give them the model legislation so it has that grassroots, you know, from-the-bottom-up type of vibe.

The whole thing was a dark money fake fed into these State legislatures by dark money and no small amount.

> This is a $24 million investment—

The speaker said—

> We . . . started . . . right after the November election. . . . we've driven hundreds of 1000s of calls, emails, placed letters to the editor, hosted events, and run television and digital ads.

So voter suppression is an artifact of dark money.

And, last, Court capture. I have got a series of speeches that I have given so far—18 of them. When I do, I put my ''Scheme'' poster up because this was a scheme; indeed, a scheme and a half.

At this point, what we know is that at least $580 million was spent on phony front groups using dark money out to capture the Court. We don't know how much additionally went into political coffers to reward people for their Court-packing enterprise or to threaten to punish people if they didn't go along with the Court-packing enterprise, but it was quite a show.

This is just one little node of that $580 million Court capture enterprise. It shows two groups, which is the current, sort of, best practices—worst practices, better to say—in political influence. You have a 501(c)3 and a 501(c)4 side by side, same location, same staff, indistinguishable in any real sense. And then in this case, they pushed what they called fictitious names so that their phony front groups had phony front groups that had names like Judicial Education Project and Honest Elections Project Action. But here is one that was somewhat significant, the Judicial Crisis Network, because Judicial Crisis Network took $15 million checks, $17 million checks and turned that money to TV ads to stop the confirmation of Justice Garland and to push through the confirmation of Justices Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett. So dark money flows into all these other areas.

If you like climate denial, you love dark money. If you like voters having their votes suppressed by partisan legislators, you love dark money. And if you like a captured Court that dances to the tune of the dark money donors who stocked it, you love dark money. And that is before we even get to its pernicious, insidious, clandestine effect in our elections.

With that, I see that my time has expired and that Senator GRASSLEY is here for his time, so I yield the floor to my friend Senator GRASSLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Iowa.

FENTANYL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, roughly 175 Americans will die from fentanyl poisoning. Many of them won't even know that they have taken the fentanyl. They will think they have taken Xanax for anxiety or oxycodone for pain. That is what Devin Anderson—you will see his picture here in a minute—of Shelby, IA, thought when he took a fentanyl pill marked like an oxy.

Devin had fought hard for his sobriety. He had enrolled in treatment and moved back home, but he was struggling with anxiety. To cope, he took a pill from a friend.

Devin's coworker came to pick him up for work in the early morning of February 24 of this year. Devin wasn't ready, so his coworker called him. When Devin didn't answer, he called again. Devin's 14-year-old brother heard the phone ringing. He went downstairs to investigate and found Devin unresponsive.

Devin was 23 years old when he died. His mom wants you to know that Devin was a kind person and he was loved by his friends.

In 2021, fentanyl killed more Americans between the ages of 18 and 45 than any other cause. That is more than COVID–19, cancer, and car accidents combined.

Six months ago, I stood where I am now and asked for a permanent solution for fentanyl scheduling. Today, we are absolutely no closer to a permanent solution than we were back then, 6 months ago.

While Congress has been waiting to take action, the cartels have not. The cartels have simply rebranded, coloring fentanyl like candy to addict America's children. Fentanyl is in our schools, like in Blackwood, NJ, where a 12-year-old overdosed on a schoolbus after his uncle made him clean a fentanyl trap house; or in Chipman Junior High School in California, where a 13-year-old brought 150 fake Percocet pills laced with fentanyl, with 4 out of every 10 fake pills containing a potentially lethal dosage of fentanyl. Both of these schools are hours away from the Mexican border, but despite Customs and Border Protection's efforts, fentanyl has reached our children's hands.

So when the Vice President tells the press that our border is secure, we all know that is just plain wrong and irresponsible, and that attitude, that the border is secure, ends up killing.

In the Federal Government's absence, parents like Arletha and Robert Gilliam have been forced to fill the void. Their daughter Ciara died last month because of fentanyl. And you see Ciara right here. By all accounts, Ciara had a big heart. As her dad puts it, if you were in a bad mood, Ciara would make sure that that bad mood didn't last very long. Even though she had graduated from Iowa's Ankeny Centennial High School and lived on her own, she still FaceTimed her mom every day.

But on August 23 of this year, no one could get hold of Ciara, so her grandparents drove by her house. Her car was in the driveway. Ciara's grandparents knocked, both on her doors and her windows, with no response. Finally, Ciara's grandpa crawled through her bedroom window. There, he found her dead on her bedroom floor. Fentanyl shut down her organs, and she went to sleep. She never woke up again. She was only 22 years old.

Ciara's parents are now searching for answers they never should have had to find in the first place. They have offered a $50,000 award to locate the dealer who supplied the fake pill that killed their daughter. They deserve better than that. They deserve congressional action, and they deserved it in 2017 when the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Administration, first scheduled fentanyl.

Grieving parents are the unsung heroes in the fight against fentanyl. Time after time, they push through their heartbreaks to share their stories, as you have heard me tell for two families, and now they demand action so that more kids don't die. It is time for Congress to match the efforts of those parents.

The Department of Justice has been very clear:

> The permanent scheduling of FRS is critical to the safety and health of our communities and class-wide scheduling provides a vital tool to combat overdose deaths in [America].

End of quote from the Department of Justice.

For those whom we have lost, like Ciara and Devin, and for the countless lives that we will save if we take action, it is time that we give them the

tool they need, and that is the scheduling of fentanyl—and on a permanent, long-term basis.

COMBATING VIOLENT AND DANGEROUS CRIME ACT

Mr. President, on another subject—and a shorter subject for anybody waiting to talk—it is dangerous to live in many places in America, especially in blue cities. Like inflation, violent crime remains very high. For example, compared to 2019 midyear figures, America's largest cities have seen a 50-percent increase in murders and a 36-percent increase in aggravated assaults. And it is no mystery what is causing this spike in crime. Blue city progressive, pro-criminal prosecutors and radical bail reform laws fuel this spike, a spike in violent crime, by letting dangerous, repeat criminals go unpunished and, in some cases, even uncharged.

The recent tragedies in Memphis, TN, earlier this month underscore the dangers that families face at the hands of chronic criminals. And remember the words ''chronic criminals'' because the fact is that the majority of violent crimes are committed by a relative handful of repeat offenders like the two in Memphis. For example, criminals in Chicago charged with shootings and murders have, on average, 12 prior arrests. In Oakland, CA, only around 400 people, or just one-tenth of 1 percent of Oakland's population, were responsible for a majority of the city's murders. Now, just think, one-tenth of 1 percent of the population of that city is responsible for a majority of the murders in Oakland.

Federal law enforcement has a unique and very vital role in targeting repeat violent criminals, but for the last 2 years, the Senate's ability to actually pass bills that expand criminal law to reduce violent crime and target repeat violent criminals has hit a brick wall. It is just impossible to get any consensus even though we all know it is a very major problem.

In July, as part of my effort to promote a solution to this problem of major crime caused by a very small number of people in each community, I introduced a bill that I entitled ''Combating Violent and Dangerous Crime,'' which is cosponsored by 26 of my Republican colleagues in the Senate. The House companion bill was introduced September 15, with seven Republican cosponsors.

The bill has seven simple solutions that will help to reverse this violent crime spike by putting dangerous criminals in jail and keeping them there. These commonsense solutions will fix real problems and bring immediate relief and increased safety to communities plagued by the scourge of violent crime.

Given the unprecedented increase in murders, we can and we should make it easier to prosecute murders. This bill will do that.

Mr. President, 2021 was the deadliest year to be a law enforcement officer since 9/11. We should make it easier to prosecute people who attack law enforcement. This bill will do that.

Carjackings are way up nationwide—200, 300, and even 400 percent in some cities. We should deter carjacking with sufficient sentences. This bill will do that.

Dangerous drugs are being marketed to young people as colorful candy—I just spoke about that—and these children are dying from overdoses. We should make it so that no children die from fentanyl made to look like candy. This bill will do that.

Bank robbery, kidnapping—the list of violent crimes that would be strengthened by this bill goes on and on.

I stand ready to work with Democrats who want to provide relief to their constituents from this crimewave. So if any of them are open to any of these provisions, I want them to know that I am ready to work with them. Let's partner together to make the American people safer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

INFLATION

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, over the past week, Americans were hit once again with a grave inflation report. Worse, the American people got more evidence of just how out of touch the White House and congressional Democrats are with the damage inflation is doing to families across the country.

We were all hoping President Biden's crushing inflation might show signs of easing and give folks a chance to catch their breath after months and months of watching their paychecks shrink. That is not what happened at all. Inflation is up 8.3 percent from a year ago—a disastrous number.

We are feeling the inflation in every aspect of our lives, from paying utility bills to gassing up cars, to rent and insurance, and, especially, to the basics like food. Grocery prices are up 13.5 percent from this time last year, which is a crushing blow to most Americans who visit their local store once a week, like I do. Milk is up 17 percent. Bread and chicken are up 16 percent. Eggs are up an outrageous 40 percent. And the list goes on and on.

I do my own shopping for my family, and I see this weekly, and it is incredible. This is a reality, but President Biden appears to be living in a very, very different reality. When the latest bad inflation numbers were released last week, the President and Washington Democrats threw a party on the White House lawn. That is right, a party—a lawn party. The President and Democrats celebrated as the rest of us watched the Dow plummet and received an inflation report confirming that this is the worst year for food and electricity inflation since the fallout from President Jimmy Carter.

What exactly did they celebrate? Their latest reckless, Big Government spending bill.

I don't have to remind you that, just over a year ago, the Democrats rammed through their $2 trillion spending spree despite economists warning that it would be a catalyst for rampant inflation. Economists warned us then, and they are warning us now, about the misnamed Inflation Reduction Act; namely, that it won't do anything to ease inflation, but it will certainly add to the deficit.

Apparently, hosting a big party is preferable than heeding these nonpartisan warnings and getting to work to get our Nation back on the right track.

When the ''Inflation Act'' was on the floor, Republicans tried countless times to adopt solutions to tackle inflation, crime, and secure our border. But our efforts were consistently shut down because not one Senate Democrat could spare a penny from the Green New Deal. No, they have their own priorities, and they are awfully out of touch with the priorities of American families.

On Sunday, we were given more evidence that the President is living in a completely different world than the rest of us. The President appeared on ''60 Minutes,'' where he discussed several challenges currently facing our Nation, only, according to him, our Nation is doing swell. And indeed, the President seemed to paint a rosy picture of little to no inflation and suggested we should be relieved by the new inflation numbers.

When asked what he could do better and faster to help Americans get some relief at the grocery store checkout line, he claimed inflation was up ''hardly at all.''

''Hardly at all''? Say that to parents paying 40 percent more for a dozen of eggs just to feed their children breakfast. Say that to workers who are watching their savings dwindle month after month because their paychecks can't keep up with these prices. Say that to the Americans who are just barely getting by in this economy.

President Biden, you may not have to visit the grocery store or pay an electricity bill, but my constituents do.

Time and time again, the President and his allies in Congress have proven he is out of touch with American priorities and in denial about the real suffering and fears of the American people. They are right to question whether they can still afford the leadership they are getting out of the White House and the Democrat-led Congress.

It is high time for the President and Democrats to align their priorities with those of the people, allow real solutions to be considered on the Senate floor, and get out our economy back on its feet.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I think you all might remember when the Biden administration's so-called

experts claimed that inflation was ''transitory.'' It ended up that they couldn't have been more wrong by using that word.

Since President Biden took office, Iowans have seen prices rise 13.7 percent. That adds an extra $666 to their monthly budget. Couple that with falling real wages, and Iowans have been strapped very thin.

This combination of rising prices and falling real wages has hit rural Iowa communities particularly hard. As a result, according to a report issued by Iowa State University, the disposable income of rural Iowans fell 33 percent over the past 12 months alone. It is no wonder, then, that the high cost of living is the number one concern that I hear about from Iowans as I travel all of our 99 counties.

However, here in DC—and remember, DC is an island surrounded by reality—here in this town, the primary concern of President Biden and congressional Democrats has been enacting their very partisan agenda.

They have refused to work with Republicans on sensible policies to tame inflation and provide targeted relief. In the process of doing that, they haven't even followed the advice of their own brethren. And I will use Larry Summers as an example, that Harvard professor and former Secretary of Treasury. He said, way back in January, before this President was sworn in, that the economy was turned around: Don't spend any more money or you are going to have inflation.

And, immediately, within 60 days of being in office, this new President and this new Congress passed a $2 trillion appropriations bill to feed the fires of inflation.

So instead of taming inflation, they rebranded the reckless tax-and-spending spree that they had pursued for more than a year as a bill recently passed called the Inflation Reduction Act, which I call the ''Inflation Enhancement Act''—never mind that outside experts uniformly concluded the bill's hodgepodge of the Green New Deal and the subsidies that go with that program and the tax hikes would do nothing to address inflation today.

Of course, if you want to stop inflation, now caused by excessive government spending, the first thing you should do is stop spending; or another way you can say it—and common sense dictates this: When you are in a hole, quit digging.

Instead, Democrats doubled down with Big Government spending and coupled it with job-killing tax hikes. The National Association of Manufacturers said they would lose about 217,000 jobs. Democrats' policy decisions made even less sense given that, only a week before, we learned our economy had shrunk for two straight quarters, indicating recession.

And everyone knows, as President Obama once said—and this seems to be the third term of the Obama Presidency, but this is what he said when he was actually President:

The last thing you want to do is to raise taxes in the middle of a recession.

And yet it was done in that bill in August by more than $300 billion. The last thing our economy needed was another tax-and-spending spree, but Democrats just couldn't let go of their wish list.

What is more, at the height of hypocrisy, Democrats touted the Inflation Reduction Act as an example of fiscal responsibility. Yet the supposed savings they claim will result from the bill was then immediately dwarfed in just 1 day of actions by President Biden's unilateral student loan announcement, which will cost American taxpayers at least $500 billion. And some people are saying it could cost up to $1 trillion.

When President Biden announced that he was wiping out $10,000 to $20,000 of student loan debt for people making as much as $150,000 or $250,000 for households, that likely illegal action will send the bill for this student loan giveaway to Americans who did not attend college or people who graduated from college already paying off their college expenses. And at the same time, it is going to fuel the fires of inflation.

So much, then, for the lip service about deficit reduction and inflation. But we now know that that inflation was not transitory. It is persistent. Iowans are sick and tired of paying the price for the failures of this Biden economy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss how consumers are paying more for less reliable energy as a result of the policies of the Biden administration and congressional Democrats. North Dakotans are paying 60 percent more for gasoline since January of 2021, and diesel remains at nearly $5 a gallon.

Prices are high because we have a supply problem. Our friends and allies in Europe are facing an even worse supply crisis, and unless the Biden administration changes its approach, American families and businesses will continue to face these inflationary pressures.

Fortunately, the solution is clear. More energy supply means consumers pay less. More supply is what helps us get prices under control, get inflation under control, and consumers relief.

In 2019, the United States was producing nearly 13 million barrels of oil a day. Today, that production is down at about 11.8 million barrels a day. That is because the policies of the Democrats in Congress and the Biden administration include blocking energy production on Federal lands, and that is curtailing supply. Our vast supply of taxpayer-owned oil, gas, and coal resources on Federal lands are a national strategic asset. Yet President Biden and his ''keep it in the ground'' allies treat our NG reserves as a liability.

Recent analysis by the Wall Street Journal shows that the Biden administration leased only 130,000 acres for new oil and gas production in the first 19 months of this administration. Let me repeat that number. The Biden administration has only leased 130,000 acres for new oil and gas production in its first 19 months. For comparison, President Reagan leased 47.6 million acres during the same time period. The Biden administration, in just under 2 years, leased 130,000 acres. The Reagan administration leased 47.6 million acres during the same amount of time.

That is the point. We need to take the handcuffs off our producers if we are going to produce more energy here at home. And nobody produces energy better, more cost effectively, more dependably, and with better environmental stewardship than America. We do the best job of anybody in the world. New energy leases are needed to grow oil production and supplies for the long-term, otherwise production will continue to fall, and that means higher energy costs for our consumers.

Instead of defending previously held lease sales, the Biden administration is relying on litigation from environmental allies to block permits needed for energy development. That only further increases our reliance on adversaries like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela, countries with little or no regard for environmental stewardship or human rights. They are our adversaries. How in the world can we put ourselves subject to their energy production? Energy production is part of national security. Energy security is national security.

Natural gas prices also remain high and families are being hit with higher utility bills. Electricity prices are up nearly 16 percent compared to last year. As we approach the winter months, natural gas bills are up 33 percent over the same period, and with winter coming on, they are going to go up more.

The Biden administration's policies are undermining our energy security, and because the cost of energy is built into our entire economy, inflation has been driven to record heights. Everything you buy has an energy component in it. When energy costs go up because the administration won't let us produce more here at home, it causes inflation in everything you buy—everything you buy, not just at the gas station but in the grocery store or anywhere else because of the energy component.

Despite these challenges, President Biden and congressional Democrats doubled down by passing their partisan

tax-and-spend bill that will make it more expensive to produce energy in the United States. The bill includes a new tax on natural gas. That doesn't make energy cheaper; that makes it more expensive. The bill includes a new tax on natural gas and also makes oil and gas production on Federal lands more expensive through higher fees and royalty rates. So they are driving up the cost of energy.

In addition to levying $739 billion in new taxes on hard-working families, the bill was loaded with $370 billion in Green New Deal spending. Instead of tax hikes and wasteful spending, President Biden needs to take the handcuffs off our domestic energy production. Instead of higher taxes and fees, more mandates, and less energy development, we need to take the handcuffs off our domestic energy producers to lower energy costs and help reduce the burden of inflation, which harms every American but particularly those low-income Americans who are struggling with the higher cost of everything from putting food on the table to gas at the pump, to anything and everything they buy. We need to change this policy direction, and it needs to happen now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the Biden economic crisis that the American people are facing every day.

Last week, Democrats threw a big party at the White House; even Hollywood celebrities flew in to celebrate. If you take a look at what was going on, on the split-screen television all across the country, they saw Democrats celebrating and the stock market collapsing; people's savings, retirements evaporating; Democrats dancing.

It was the worst day on Wall Street since the pandemic, and by the time the party at the White House was over, $1.6 trillion was erased from the value of those who hold American stocks.

So why did this happen? The reason that this happened was because just hours earlier the world found out that inflation in America went up once again.

Prices people have to pay for things are up more than 13 percent since the day Joe Biden took office. Costs which economists predicted would go down last month, actually went up instead.

Well, the economists made a prediction, but the American people know what they are facing every day when they go to the grocery store, pay their rent, pay their energy bills, try to buy back-to-school supplies for their kids.

Inflation is now going up after the Democrats passed a reckless tax-and-spending bill. This is nothing to celebrate even though they were down at the White House celebrating. The American people aren't celebrating; they are suffering. They are suffering the worst inflation in over 40 years.

Prices have risen faster than wages for 17 consecutive months—17 months in a row, prices rising faster than wages. With each passing month, the American people can afford less and less. Now people have cut into their savings, borrowed money, just to get by.

Credit card debt is climbing. Reports across the Nation are more and more people are buying on layaway. People on fixed incomes cannot keep up; they are falling further behind. And it is no wonder then that many seniors are delaying their retirements.

Rising costs are hitting our troops. Right now, our troops are watching their paychecks disappear, melt away. According to a recent report, the Army is now recommending our troops sign up for food stamps.

The U.S. Army—can you imagine such a thing?—is recommending troops sign up for food stamps. After the deadly and disgraceful evacuation of Afghanistan, people knew Joe Biden had very little respect for our men and women in uniform. What we are seeing today is a national failure by Joe Biden and the Democrats. Our heroes in uniform should not have to rely on welfare in order for them to serve the Nation.

Our soldiers should not have to find themselves in a battle against Joe Biden's inflation.

Now, the U.S. Senate still hasn't passed a defense bill this year. We are waiting to go. Senator SCHUMER says, well, we will do that next month. It just shows that Democrats do not prioritize our national defense. It always goes to the bottom of the list—leave it for last. Democrats have other priorities like their James Taylor concert last week at the White House on the lawn.

Democrats have been too busy paying off the climate activists to pay our troops. The Senate ought to get to work on a defense bill immediately. We should ensure that our troops, whether they are serving at F.E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming, Luke Air Force Base in Arizona, or Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada, or Buckley Space Force Base in Colorado, that they get a raise so they won't further be hurt by Joe Biden's inflation.

Now, many Democrats seem oblivious to the pain and suffering that they have caused American families. When Joe Biden took office, inflation was essentially nonexistent. A gallon of gas was $2.39. In today's prices, it is almost $3.70 a gallon, higher in States like Nevada, Washington State, and others.

When Joe Biden took office, economists were predicting an economic boom. Now our economy continues to shrink, and just in a matter of months, Joe Biden took us from recovery to recession.

And recovery right now is nowhere in sight. Consumer confidence is worse today than it was during the lockdowns of 2020, hard to believe but true. This summer, we saw the lowest consumer confidence ever recorded in the history of polling for these sorts of things.

Families feel very stressed about the future, and prices continue to climb. Now, ultimately, this means that we are going to have layoffs at a time when people are running out of savings.

A poll last week showed that people across the country are cutting back on spending on just about everything just to keep up, just to avoid falling further and further behind. Some are cutting back on groceries. Some are growing their own, trying to grow their own food instead of going to the grocery store.

At the same time, the Federal Reserve is getting ready to raise interest rates again, maybe as soon as today.

This year, we have already seen the largest rate hikes in 40 years. Rates are going higher and higher and higher as the Democrat-caused inflation wildfire continues to burn.

There is no end in sight and no relief for the pain being caused to American families. Mortgage rates have almost doubled this year. They are the highest they have been since the great recession, and they are going to go even higher.

At the same time, mortgage applications have dropped significantly. More and more people are giving up on the American dream of even owning their own home. To make matters worse, it doesn't look like interest rates are coming down any time soon.

You know, it is very easy to cause inflation, very difficult to get rid of. Last March, Joe Biden caused inflation with the stroke of a pen on a bill that every Democrat in this body voted for, and working families all across the country have suffered ever since.

Interest rate hikes are designed to slow down the economy. And yet we have an economy that is already shrinking, and they want to slow it down some more. It shrank for the first 6 months of this year. That has always been the definition of a recession. The administration is even trying to redefine recession while we are in the middle of one because they don't want to own it, but they do.

The pain and suffering that people are being subjected to has no end in sight, and the policies of this President and the policies of the Democrats who have all voted for it—every one of them—have brought us inflation and recession.

The wealthy elites that run the Democratic Party are doing just fine. It is the hard-working men and women all across the country who are suffering. Republicans are committed to help lower prices for working men and women all around America.

Certainly, in my State of Wyoming, it is a major concern, major discussion. It is what I hear about. What I heard about Friday at our Victoria's football game and the tailgate party is what things cost, trying to just stay ahead, trying to keep ahead, trying to fall less far behind.

We are committed to getting the economy back on track. It is time for the Democrats to get their priorities straight. We need to pass a defense bill to take care of our troops. We need to stop the reckless spending and the tax hikes.

These are the policies that have caused the cost of everyday items to continue to go up. The Democrats need to stop strangling American energy. That is what is driving up the price, not just at the pump but electric bills, home heating, natural gas, all of the things that the American people need and want, energy that is affordable, available, and reliable.

The American people deserve much better than what we have been getting from the Democrats, and the Democrats—let me point out—are in full control of the House, the Senate, and the White House.

It is their policies and their positions that brought us 40-year high inflation, food going up faster and faster, 13 percent inflation since the day Joe Biden and the Democrats took over. It is time for a change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 5518

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 5518 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. SULLIVAN], for himself and Mr. LEE, proposes an amendment numbered 5518 to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Document No. 117–1.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that the People's Republic of China is not treated as a developing country)

In section 1, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS AND A CONDITION**''.

In section 1, strike ''declaration of section 2'' and insert ''declarations of section 2 and the condition of section 3''.

In section 2, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS**''.

In section 2, strike ''following declaration'' and all that follows through the period at the end and insert the following: ''following declarations:

(1) The Kigali amendment is not self-executing.

(2) The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following condition: Prior to the Thirty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer a proposal to amend Decision I/12E, ''Clarification of terms and definitions: developing countries,'' made at the First Meeting of the Parties, to remove the People's Republic of China.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, about 4 years ago, I was part of a meeting with several Senators—there were about 11 of us—here in the U.S. Capitol with the Chinese Ambassador. And in the meeting, I had raised a number of issues about the lack of reciprocity that China has with regard to the United States: market access on our trade; their ability to invest here but we couldn't invest there; the fact that they have all kinds of journalists in America and we can't have journalists over there—just across the board on so many things—Confucius Institutes in American universities, no equivalent in Chinese universities. No reciprocity on so many topics.

And I will never forget the response of the Chinese Ambassador to the United States. With 11 U.S. Senators right there, he said: Well, Senator, I agree there is a lack of reciprocity in a number of areas, but that is because China is a developing country.

China is a developing country. That is what he said just 4 years ago. And my response was: Mr. Ambassador, with all due respect, can you please stop using that talking point about your country being a developing country? It is kind of an insult to all of our intelligence. And to be honest, you are not a developing country. The American people know it; the world knows it; and you need to stop telling everybody and using that as a crutch.

What does that have to do with the amendment that I just called up?

Well, today, before we vote on the Kigali treaty, I have an amendment that I am asking all of my colleagues here in the Senate to support. I am not talking about the merits of the Kigali treaty itself. There is an element of this treaty that raises a principle that is at stake right now that is so important with regard to China, the United States, and the rest of the world.

This treaty that we are getting ready to vote on continues to classify China as a ''developing country.''

Why does that matter?

Well, as I mentioned, it is a facade. China is not a developing country; it is the second largest economy in the world. It is one of the most industrialized countries in the world. It has one of the biggest militaries in the world. The World Bank even now considers China an upper middle income country.

But what China keeps trying to do in international organizations and in international treaties is continue to get the same benefits as truly developing countries, such Ghana, Somalia, Nigeria, Bangladesh. These are the countries that need global assistance, not China.

So my amendment today is very simple to this treaty. It first says that the U.S. Senate concludes:

The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

And then my amendment goes one step further, and it makes the advice and consent of the Senate for this treaty contingent upon the Secretary of State of the United States going to the U.N. and the Vienna Convention Secretariat to file an amendment to the treaty that clarifies that China should be taken off the annex that defines it as a developing country.

So we have a declaration—China is not a developing country—and then it says to the Secretary of State, before you get the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, you shall go to the U.N. and file an instrument that says China should be removed from the list of countries to this treaty that are called developing countries.

And, again, this matters. This matters, for example, on this treaty.

Why?

Because in this treaty, the developing country annex gives those countries under that annex much longer time to implement the treaty, and it actually gives them funding from the U.N. to implement the treaty.

Now, where does that funding come from?

Most of it comes from the United States. So, in essence, right now, the way the treaty is organized, the United States gives the U.N. money to help implement the treaty, and a lot of that money is going to go to China.

Does anyone in the U.S. Senate think that makes sense? Does anyone in America think that that makes sense?

It does not.

Furthermore, on this treaty and on so many other international agreements, whether at the U.N. or other places, when you give China more time for implementation, particularly as it relates to the global environment, all you are doing is harming the global environment.

China is a developed country. China is an industrialized country. The U.S. Senate, the international organizations where China is a member, need to start recognizing this.

So I am proud to say I worked closely with Senator BARRASSO and Senator LEE on this amendment. I actually wish it were stronger.

Senator BARRASSO was here on the floor, talking about his amendment. I actually think that is the preferred way to go, but we couldn't get agreement in terms of the Barrasso amendment, so I am encouraging all of my colleagues to vote on this principle: The U.S. Senate, on any international agreement or any international treaty, should no longer agree to the obvious. China is not a developing country; it is an industrialized country, and we should make clear in the Senate and in

international organizations that that is the view of the United States, and we need to encourage the Secretary of State, which is exactly what my amendment does, to make sure the U.N. and other countries agree with us on that.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to conclude my comments before the vote.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today to once again urge my Senate colleagues to take the bipartisan, practical pro-manufacturing step of providing advice and consent to ratifying the Kigali Amendment.

Each of the four previous amendments to this treaty, the Montreal Protocol, have enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate, and Kigali should be no different.

Our companies are clear. They want us to approve this treaty so that they can maximize their export potential of cutting-edge chemicals that they have pioneered. They want us to approve the treaty. It will generate billions of dollars in economic activity and create thousands of jobs here at home in the United States.

They are also clear that if we fail to ratify, they stand to lose. They will be locked out of export markets in key products. American workers will suffer, which is why the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and impacted industries all support the action we are prepared to take.

Now, I have heard the concerns that some colleagues have raised about China and how it benefits from its antiquated status as a ''developing country'' under the Montreal Protocol. Frankly, it is a fair point to raise, but it should have no bearing on whether we join Kigali.

The simple fact is, whether we join Kigali or not has no impact on whether China is treated as a developing country—none. On the other hand, ratifying Kigali will have a major positive benefit for us because China has doubled down on yesterday's chemicals, and we, the United States, lead on all the alternatives. Joining Kigali will turn the world away from China and its companies and towards our competitive strength. It is good for the United States and our businesses, and it is bad for China. However, I also recognize the plain fact that China is no longer a developing country, and I agree that it should not enjoy advantages under the Montreal Protocol that it received because of decisions made more than 30 years ago.

I have been a steadfast champion of addressing the challenges China presents as they are, not as we hope for them to be. I led passage of the Strategic Competition Act and my Taiwan Policy Act, which was recently voted out of the Foreign Relations Committee on an overwhelming bipartisan basis. So I have no problem acknowledging that China should no longer qualify as a developing country, and for that reason, I support the Lee-Sullivan amendment.

The Senate's constitutional role on treaties is both unique and vital. What we are doing today will directly, positively—if we adopt ratification—impact American workers, American businesses, and American consumers. It will meet our challenge against China. It will create greater security at home. It will create great prosperity. There are few things that we do in the Senate that can improve our economy, create jobs, and meet the challenge of China in this one dimension.

For all of those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support providing advice and consent for the Kigali Amendment after the Sullivan amendment is considered.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, as the current ranking member of the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works—EPW—Committee, I submit these comments to provide the Senate with additional information on the existing domestic authority to phasedown the production and consumption of hydrofluorocarbons, HFCs. The EPW Committee has jurisdiction over air pollution, and in the 116th Congress, managed the development of the domestic authority to implement the Kigali Amendment, See 218 Cong. Rec. S7926, daily ed. Dec. 21. 2020, statement of then-EPW Chairman JOHN BARRASSO, then-EPW Ranking Member TOM CARPER, and Sen. JOHN KENNEDY).

As the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations clearly states in Senate Executive Report 117–2, no further legislation is required to implement the Kigali Amendment and the Amendment is not self-executing. New authority is not granted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—through ratification.

In section 103 in division S of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, the American Innovation and Manufacturing—AIM—Act of 2020, P.L. 116–260, was enacted. That law established a new, national program administered by the EPA to phasedown the production and consumption of certain HFC substances due to their significant global warming potential. Specifically, the AIM Act requires the EPA to implement an 85 percent phasedown of the production and consumption of regulated HFC substances, requiring levels to reach approximately 15 percent of their 2011–2013 average annual levels by 2036.

The AIM Act provides all the necessary authorities to phasedown the production and consumption of HFCs in the United States in line with U.S. obligations under the Kigali Amendment and is already being implemented by the EPA. In October 2021, the EPA issued a final rule establishing the allowance allocation for 2022 and 2023, along with establishing a trading program for HFCs. 86 Fed. Reg. 55,116, Oct. 5, 2021. As stated in that final agency action, the Kigali Amendment and the AIM Act have ''a nearly identical list of HFCs to be phased down following the same schedule,'' Id. at 55,124. The EPA is currently developing regulations to update allowance allocations and the trading program for 2024 and later years.

I thank my colleagues at the U.S. Senate committee on Foreign Relations for providing a clear Congressional statement that no new legislation is required and that the Kigali Amendment is not self-executing. As Congress has already enacted the required domestic implementing legislation, I support ratification.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Under the previous order, amendment No. 5503 is withdrawn.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 5518

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 5518.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 342 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Barrasso	Cornyn	Hickenlooper
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Blackburn	Cotton	Hoeven
Blumenthal	Cramer	Hyde-Smith
Blunt	Cruz	Inhofe
Booker	Daines	Johnson
Boozman	Duckworth	Kaine
Braun	Durbin	Kelly
Brown	Ernst	Kennedy
Burr	Feinstein	King
Cantwell	Fischer	Klobuchar
Capito	Gillibrand	Lankford
Cardin	Graham	Lee
Carper	Grassley	Luján
Casey	Hagerty	Lummis
Cassidy	Hassan	Manchin
Collins	Hawley	Markey
Coons	Heinrich	Marshall

McConnell	Rosen	Sullivan
Menendez	Rounds	Tester
Merkley	Rubio	Thune
Moran	Sanders	Tillis
Murkowski	Sasse	Toomey
Murphy	Schatz	Tuberville
Murray	Schumer	Van Hollen
Ossoff	Scott (FL)	Warner
Padilla	Scott (SC)	Warnock
Paul	Shaheen	Warren
Peters	Shelby	Whitehouse
Portman	Sinema	Wicker
Reed	Smith	Wyden
Romney	Stabenow	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Leahy
Crapo	Risch

The amendment (No. 5518) was agreed to.

VOTE ON RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION (NO. 117–1)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The question occurs on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 343 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Sasse
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Cassidy	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Ernst	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wicker
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Toomey
Fischer	Marshall	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Leahy
Crapo	Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 27.

Two-thirds of the Senators present, a quorum being present, having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification, as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein).

SECTION 1. SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT SUBJECT TO DECLARATIONS AND A CONDITION

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (''The Kigali Amendment'') (Treaty Doc. 117–1), subject to the declarations of section 2 and the condition of section 3.

SECTION 2. DECLARATIONS

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declarations:

(1) The Kigali amendment is not self-executing.

(2) The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following condition: Prior to the Thirty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer a proposal to amend Decision I/12E, ''Clarification of terms and definitions: developing countries,'' made at the First Meeting of the Parties, to remove the People's Republic of China.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is a very good day. We have just passed the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on a strong bipartisan basis. This is a win-win-win: win for U.S. jobs, win for U.S. investment, and win for U.S. leadership in the fight against climate change.

We have talked a lot about how this amendment will help U.S. businesses, U.S. jobs, and U.S. competitiveness overseas, but let's talk about how important this amendment will be for protecting our planet.

Ratifying the Kigali Amendment, along with passing the Inflation Reduction Act, is the strongest one-two punch against climate change any Congress has ever undertaken.

Let me say that again: Ratifying the Kigali Amendment, along with passing the Inflation Reduction Act, is the strongest one-two punch against climate change any Congress has ever taken.

In fact—amazing statistic, folks—people don't pay attention to this one, but it is vital. Experts say that phasing out our use of HFCs will help prevent up to half a degree Celsius of warming by the end of the century.

That is worth repeating as well. Experts say that phasing out our use of HFCs will help prevent up to half a degree Celsius of warming by the end of the century.

It is an easily overlooked victory, but a massive one, all coming from eliminating this family of dangerous chemicals, which are a thousand times more deadly per molecule than carbon dioxide.

And on top of it all, ratifying this amendment will give U.S. businesses a huge leg up. It will open exports to new international markets, generate tens of billions in new investments and help create tens of thousands of good-paying jobs, and we will get a much needed edge against Chinese businesses that still lag behind in developing viable HFC alternatives.

Under Kigali, our exports will increase while China will lose out. So, once again, ratifying the Kigali Amendment is a win-win-win: a win for U.S. jobs, a win for U.S. investment, and, most of all, a win for our global campaign to defeat the climate crisis and preserve our planet for future generations.

I want to thank my colleague from Delaware who has been such a persistent advocate on this legislation. And there are so many others—the Senators from New Mexico and Hawaii and Delaware—who have worked so hard on it as well. I thank them for their steadfastness. The globe, our globe, is rejoicing today because of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to thank our leader for his leadership.

None of this would have happened without your leadership. I want to thank your staff.

I want to thank the relative respective staffs on our side here and the Senators especially on the Environment and Public Works Committee.

I want to especially thank our friend JOHN NEELY KENNEDY from Louisiana, who has been a great partner, and his staff and other folks on the other side of the aisle.

My mother used to say to my sister and me when we were kids, she would say that things happen in threes. I remember she would say things happen in threes, and given what the leader just said, I am thinking about threes and especially with respect to making sure that this planet is going to be around for our children and grandchildren.

But if you go back to the bipartisan infrastructure bill signed into law roughly 10 months ago by the President, we did a whole lot there, you will

recall, with respect to roads, highways, bridges, water, wastewater, water infrastructure, flood control. But that legislation had the largest—at that point the largest climate title that we had ever put in a bill of any consequence here in the U.S. Senate. That is No. 1.

No. 2 would be the IRA, the Inflation Reduction Act, that was signed into law just last month by the President and championed by any number of folks, including our colleague from West Virginia, JOE MANCHIN. I want to thank him and the majority leader for their good work. That was No. 2 because the investments, the clean energy investments we make in the Inflation Reduction Act, are just extraordinary—extraordinary.

Then, today, to pass the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol—people might be wondering, who are watching, and say: What in the world is that? And I will just walk you back in time.

People might remember that I was a naval flight officer in the Vietnam war, and near the end of the Vietnam war, maybe after I had moved to Delaware, I remember hearing something about speculation about a hole in the ozone and there might be a hole in the ozone. At first, people dismissed it. I dismissed it. But over time, the concerns persisted, and the hole in the ozone grew and grew.

Somewhere along about 1985, some updated scientific information, evidence, emerged that said there is a hole in the ozone, and it is big, and it is getting bigger.

Our President at the time, as I recall, was not a Democrat; he was a Republican—Ronald Reagan. Under his leadership, we as a nation joined in the Montreal Protocol. It was finalized in 1987, where we actually say that what is happening here is exactly clear, and what that is, is there is a hole in the ozone. It was being created by materials that are in our air-conditioners or refrigerators and our coolers. We call them refrigerants, and when they leaked out of the air-conditioners, refrigerators, and coolers, they actually created the hole in the ozone.

So the question is, Do we have to give up our refrigerators, our air-conditioners, our coolers, our freezers? Do we have to give those up in order to take care and address the hole in the ozone? As it turns out, we did not, but what we had to do was replace something called CFCs, chlorofluorocarbons, which were refrigerants at the time and contributed to the hole in the ozone. What we had to do was replace those CFCs with something new. Science and the scientists came up with that something new. What they came up with was not CFC plus 2; they came up with HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons.

What I know about chemistry you can fit on a fairly small thumbnail, but HFCs came along, and, guess what, the hole in the ozone started getting smaller. We stayed cool. The air-conditioners worked, freezers worked, refrigerators worked, and the hole in the ozone started getting cooler.

What didn't get cooler was our planet because HFCs, as Senator SCHUMER suggested, are about 1,000 times worse than carbon dioxide with respect to global warming. We finally have realized that, and the question is, Can we do anything about it? If so, can we do it to make sure we stay cool or cold, if you will, and at the same time address climate change?

Some people say: You know, we can't do good things for this planet or we can't clean the air, clean the water, address the climate change, and create jobs and economic opportunity. But, as Senator SCHUMER suggested, that is just not true. This is sort of like having our cake and eating it, too, because we can create jobs.

A lot of them we are talking about creating with the phasedown of HFCs and for the next 15 years talking about creating literally tens of thousands of jobs not in some other country but here. We are talking about creating these jobs using technology developed here, and we are talking about the ability to export this technology and sell products using this technology all over the place.

I forget exactly what the economic value is from these activities, but it is in the tens of billions of dollars here, with American technology, created by American workers. Who wouldn't be for that? Who wouldn't be for that?

Some of our Republican colleagues offered an amendment today. Senator LEE and, I think, Senator SULLIVAN joined together on an amendment. I think most of us voted for that, and it has been adopted and added to this package.

The other thing I would mention is that about a month ago, you may recall, we stayed up all night during a vote-arama, working on the reconciliation legislation that led to the IRA, the Inflation Reduction Act.

I remember the next day going home. I was just dog-tired. I went home on the train and got off the train, and before I went home, I drove to Wawa, which is a convenience store. We love Wawa. They are all up and down the east coast, especially in Delaware. I stopped at Wawa to get a cup of coffee. I got a small cup of coffee and went to the cash register, the cashier, to pay for it, and the lady at the cash register said: Your money is no good here.

I said: No, no. I want to pay. I want to pay for it.

She said: No, no. I am mindful of what you have been up all night doing. Your money is no good here.

I said: Could I get a larger cup of coffee?

She said: No, but your money is no good here.

She also went to say—she said: I have a son. I have a daughter. I want to make sure they grow up on a planet that is fit to grow up on and that they can grow old on.

I think that is a sentiment that almost any father or mother or grandfather or grandparent would feel and have. I would just say to them today: I know sometimes you look at what is going on here and our inability to work together. We have come together. We have come together on something that is extremely important for us, my generation, but even more important, for those who follow us.

Bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions. This is a good bipartisan solution, and for everybody who has been a part of this, I want to thank you. I want to convey our thanks as well to the President and his administration for their help in getting this done.

This is a day, as my colleague from Delaware, Congresswoman LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, would say—she would say: This is a day the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

Amen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1950

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, while we are standing here right now in Washington, DC, in the middle of an afternoon, protests are happening all over Iran right now.

The latest news reports coming out from social media and the very limited media that can get out of Iran—massive protesters are in the streets of 20 different cities in Iran right now. The latest count is nine people have been killed in those protests by Iranian forces trying to be able to shut down the protests that are now breaking out all over the country—including, by the way, protests in Tehran.

What is going on? This has been a simmering issue for a long time in Iran. As I have stated several times on this floor and in committee hearings, our opposition with Iran is not with the Iranian people. The Iranian people live in oppression underneath the Iranian regime, which pushes their thumb down on them and limits their progress in the world and in their own country.

The spark of this latest group of protests that are happening in the streets all over Iran is a young lady who was murdered in police custody in Iran named Mahsa Amini.

Mahsa Amini, a 22-year-old Iranian woman, died in custody because she broke Iran's hijab law. In other words, she wasn't wearing her head covering, and so—brace yourself—the morality police arrested her. The morality police in Iran detained her, where she was apparently beaten to death while she was in prison. Now, the police and the regime have come out and said she had sudden heart failure, but with multiple injuries around her head, that is not sudden heart failure.

The nation—once again—of Iran is rising up to say: This has to stop.

Americans would be surprised at the number of social media posts that are getting out of Iran right now, where

large crowds—large crowds—are gathering in cities, tearing down the pictures of the Ayatollah, and chanting in the streets of Tehran, ''Death to the dictator.''

I have friends in Iran who have actually sent me some of the social media posts to be able to show me that this is what the street looks like today. This is breaking out across Iran.

Now, what is interesting is that, at the same time, the President of Iran has been allowed to be able to come into the United States to be at the U.N. General Assembly to be able to speak out for the regime's benefit to the rest of the world. It will be a remarkable side-by-side of what is happening in Iran on the streets right now and the Iranian leadership at the U.N. General Assembly.

At this same moment as well, Iran is working with Russia and has delivered hundreds of unmanned aerial vehicles that are weaponized, little kamikaze drones that are literally taking out Ukrainian artillery right now in the field in Ukraine. The Iranians haven't just supplied these weaponized drones to Russia; they have brought Russian leaders into Iran to be able to train them on how to be able to attack Ukraine with these weapons.

Right now as well, the Russians are calling up additional reservists to be able to fight the Ukrainians and to be able to continue to take the fight to them. Protests are also erupting in Russia right now from Russian moms who are furious that their husbands and their sons are being called up to be able to fight in Ukraine to replace the thousands of casualties that Russia has suffered in Ukraine.

Now, why do I connect the dots in all of these—what is happening in Iran on the streets, what is happening on the streets in Russia, and what is happening right now in Ukraine? Because in the middle of that moment internationally that is happening, the U.S. Government has partnered with Russian diplomats to negotiate with Iran a restart of the nuclear deal with them. I can't make this up. So the United States is using Russia as its proxy to negotiate with Iran to be able to restart a nuclear negotiation with them.

Listen, the JCPOA, this nuclear deal, as it is commonly called, when it was put in place in 2015, was then set aside to say: It is not accomplishing its purposes.

In 2015, when it was put in place—let's just review real quick what happened in the days after that.

Planes full—literal planes full—of pallets loaded with cash were sent to Iran as soon as this deal was signed. It was a government suddenly flush with cash. How did that regime use that cash? They bought munitions to be able to fight against Americans in Iraq.

From 2015 to 2017—that period immediately after the JCPOA was signed and planes full of cash were sent to them—munitions fired against American troops in Iraq increased 341 percent. During that same time period, terrorist incidents increased 183 percent. There were 58 incidents involving Iranian vessels in the gulf that put American troops at risk. Iran used its money not to be able to help the Iranian people but to attack us and to attack our allies.

Our Nation withdrew from this nuclear negotiation 4 years ago. After that happened, Iran's exports of crude oil declined by more than 2 million barrels a day, cutting off a major supply of money into the regime. Iran's defense budget was then cut 28 percent because of those revenue shortfalls. Iran's currency lost 70 percent of its value as the pressure was applied to Iran to actually join into nations around the world, to actually become a nation like the rest of the world.

I am bringing this into the Senate today. It is an issue that I have brought multiple times. We should have ongoing dialogue with Iran. They are ambitious to become a nuclear weapons-capable nation. They are the single largest State sponsor of terrorism in the world. They are the destabilizing force in all of the Middle East. Every nation in that entire region has to prepare themselves for an inevitable, erratic, irrational attack from Iran; and every nation fears the day that they gain a nuclear-capable weapon.

But the gaps in the nuclear negotiations are large. Let me list some of them. The nuclear negotiation excludes any conversation about their terrorist activities. It is just simply not limiting their terrorist activities, just limiting their nuclear capability. They are building long-range weapons capable of carrying a nuclear weapon. Why would you need to build a long-range heavy missile unless you are carrying a nuclear tip? The two are connected—their terrorist activities, their missile ambitions, and their nuclear ambitions. We should connect those in all of our relationships.

My amendment in my sense of the Senate that I bring is very clear today. One is to acknowledge what we all know is actually happening. The second is to say, we can't have any kind of sanctions relief, especially preemptively in negotiations on lifting energy petroleum sales coming out of Iran. The next section of it, the third section of it, is simply not releasing any of the sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. They are the core of the terrorist activities in the area. They are the trainers for those who actually attacked Americans in Iraq. We should not lift sanctions on them. The fourth on this is not providing relief to the financial institutions in Iran so they can't continue to extend their terrorist activities and their financial activities behind the scenes. The goal of this is to be able to put pressure on the regime but to protect the Iranian people as much as possible.

The final statement that is in this sense of the Senate is to affirm our long-term friendship with the people of Iran and our understanding that they are living under the thumb of this regime.

My friend that I had mentioned before who is from Iran has reached out to me in the last 24 hours with this simple question. The Iranian people are on the streets, trying to gain their freedom, trying to be able to speak and live their faith as they choose to. And here is this question: What are the Americans going to do to stand with us? That is a fair question for this body.

The Iranian people who are begging for their own freedom do not want the American response to be sending cash to the regime so they can oppress their people more or lifting the sanctions at this moment so that the regime can continue to advance its terrorist activities or just disengaging from its missile ambitions that destabilizes the region or to continue to be able to use Russia as a proxy for the United States of America while Russia is literally using Iranian drones to attack the Ukrainians.

Let's speak with a clear voice to the Iranian people on the streets. They want to hear the United States say: We stand with your passion for freedom, and not: We stand with the regime in what they are trying to do to you.

So saying all that: As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1950 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; I ask further that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I have such respect for my colleague from Oklahoma. We are often on the same side of issues related to matters of national security and the Middle East, but I disagree with his analysis that he has presented here today. Let me make just a remark or two about his immediate request and then make a few remarks about the broader work to try to protect the world from a nuclear weapons-armed Iran.

First, as I understand it—and I just had a few days to take a look at the underlying legislation—it would significantly remove the administration's discretion to waive sanctions or to enter into certain oil sales or authorize business with Iranian financial institutions in that only a treaty entered into by the United States would provide that authority to the administration.

I think that is generally bad policy.

We can imagine a whole set of diplomatic engagements with any nation, including Iran, in which an executive may wish to toggle sanctions or licenses in order to provoke some behavior beneficial to the United States.

That is, in fact, why we regularly build waivers into our sanctions statutes. So to suggest that on Iran policy, the President is going to have no ability to impact sanctions or licenses until a treaty is entered into ties the administration's hands—both Republican and Democratic administrations—in a way that I simply don't think is helpful.

I understand my friend's argument.

He is not a supporter of the JCPOA, and he does not desire for the United States to enter back into a nuclear agreement with Iran. And at the heart of this request is the essence of President Trump's Iran policy—the idea that if we just keep hammering Iran with sanctions that either their behavior will get better or they will at some point choose to come to the table and do a comprehensive deal—the nuclear program, their ballistic missile program, their support for terrorism.

Now, I think that was a credible argument back during the Obama administration. Many people said Obama shouldn't give Iran anything until Iran comes to the table on everything.

This Congress went a different way. We ended up taking a vote that, by our rules, allowed for the nuclear agreement to go forward. But we now have the benefit of the opposition's argument to the JCPOA having been tested for 4 years. Trump basically took that philosophy—keep sanctioning Iran; don't worry about the fact that it is unilateral, and eventually Iran will come to the table on everything. He tested that for 4 years, and it was an unmitigated disaster—an unmitigated disaster. Not only did Iran not come to the table on everything, they came to the table on nothing. Their behavior in the region got much worse and much more adversarial to U.S. interests.

Just look at the reality on the ground in a place like Lebanon or Yemen or Iraq or Syria. At the end of Trump's term, did Iran have more or less influence in those places? Unquestionably more. More integrated with the Houthis—by the end of Trump's term, they were in charge of the Lebanese government. There was less separation between the Iraqi power structure and Tehran.

At the end of that 4-year period of time, testing maximum pressure, Iran was more deeply involved with its proxies than ever before. They were not negotiating with the United States on any of the conditions that the Trump administration laid down for us, and they were shooting at us.

There was not a single attack on U.S. servicemembers by Iranian proxies while the United States was in the JCPOA. Let me say it again: Not a single attack on U.S. servicemembers by Iranian proxies when the United States was in the JCPOA. They occur with regularity today. Attacks against U.S. forces in housing and on bases in Iraq and Syria restarted once we withdrew from the deal. In this year alone, there have been attacks in February, March, April, May, June, July, and August.

And so, I am not sure why we have to do a lot of guessing now as to whether we are better off with or without a nuclear agreement with Iran, because here's what we got for maximum pressure: American troops under fire, more support for proxies, no hopes of negotiation, and—the icing on the cake—an Iranian nuclear program that is now weeks away from having enough fissile material to produce a nuclear weapon. Compare that with a year away during the time of the agreement.

So we tested this theory that we just hit them with sanctions, hit them with sanctions, and, eventually, they capitulate. It didn't work by, I think, all objective measures. It didn't work. And so it makes sense that the Biden administration wants to engage and try to put back together a deal that was good for the United States and our allies.

And, lastly, I will say this. The Senator from Oklahoma is right. The Iranians are bad people. You can just see what they are doing right now in the streets of Tehran in brutally repressing another wave of protests. Listen to what the President said on TV just this week—denying the Holocaust. These are our adversaries. This is an enemy. But all throughout American history, we have understood there are times when it makes sense to sit down across the table with your enemy and adversary and engage in diplomatic conversation that is good for you and good for the world. It is true that if Iran was further away from a nuclear weapon, it would be good for us and it would be good for other countries in the world, including Russia, which is why Russia is sometimes part of these negotiations. But I don't know that because something is good for everybody, it shouldn't be acceptable to the U.S. Congress.

And so I am going to object to this request because I believe that the JCPOA is the right thing for the security of this Nation; because I believe in diplomacy even with your adversaries; because I think we have tested the proposition that maximum pressure will work better than a nuclear agreement, and we now know the results; and I also believe that some of the details of this resolution would ultimately bind the hands of American Presidents in a way that, you know, probably isn't good precedent for the long-term security of the Nation.

So, again, I think my colleague comes to the floor with good faith objections and longstanding objections. I come down in a different place, and for that reason, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague. We have a lot of agreement in areas in Lebanon and other areas in the region that we work diligently together to be able to resolve—very, very difficult areas in this region.

But I do want to say: Facts are stubborn things. When my colleague makes a statement that we can see what happens during the time of the JCPOA and we can see what happens during the time of sanctions, I am welcome to be able to look at those facts. During the time of the JCPOA, as I mentioned before, from 2015 to 2017, munitions fired against American troops in Iraq increased 341 percent. Many of those munitions were Iranian-provided. So to be able to say that there were no attacks on Americans during the JCPOA is just factually not correct.

I can take you to a multitude of members of the U.S. military that will speak specifically of munitions that were fired on them and all kinds of improvised explosive devices created by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and shipped into Iraq to be able to attack them specifically during that time period. So it is not factually correct there were no attacks on Americans during the time of the JCPOA. In fact, all the folks that look at these issues saw that terrorism increased 183 percent during that time period.

During the time of the sanctions, Iran suffered real consequences in their economy, including a dramatic drop in their own defense spending by 28 percent during that time period. I received a personal outreach from an individual who is a leader in Lebanon, who my colleague and I both know well, who reached out to me personally and said whatever the United States is doing right now to cut off funding to Iran, keep doing it because it is also cutting off funding to Hezbollah and to Lebanon. They are not getting their paychecks right now, and that is helping the stability of our government.

So there was a real effect during that time period. We can discuss strategic aspects of which one is more effective, the agreement or the heavier sanctions, but we can't just ignore it and say there was no benefit during that time period in the last several years on the pressure that was put on Iran during this time period.

The fact still remains, the people of Iran are asking the question. They are on the streets chanting for freedom. What is the Senate going to do to stand with them? And, currently, it is nothing. I would like for it to be something, to stand with the people of Iran as they speak out against the repressive regime that they are under the thumb of.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the resolution of ratification, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make grammatical, technical changes to the resolution of ratification with respect to Treaty Document No. 117–1 in order to reflect the addition of material.

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

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today as we close in on the vote on the DISCLOSE Act scheduled for tomorrow to urge my colleagues to vote yes on that measure. I have introduced the DISCLOSE Act in every Congress since Leader SCHUMER first unveiled it in 2010 on the heels of the wretched Citizens United decision.

Every Congress, just about every time I have set foot in Washington, I have sounded the alarm on the ever-growing tsunami of slime that Citizens United unleashed into our elections. I rise once more today to urge this Chamber to end the flood of dark money drowning our democracy.

This is not inevitable. As late as 2006, the amount of dark money sloshing around in our elections was only $5 million. In 2020, it had crossed the billion-dollar threshold. Big special interests don't spend a billion dollars without expecting return on investment, and that has damaged our democracy.

Voting to clean up that mess presents clear choices: whether or not billionaires and big corporations can purchase influence in secret, whether or not Americans deserve to know who is buying that influence, whether or not corruption has a place in our American democracy.

Twelve years after Citizens United, the evidence is in. Dark money powers up corporations and megadonors to pump billions into phony front groups. Those groups, often with soothing names like People for Puppies and Prosperity, then spew bile and slime into our elections. We often can't know exactly who paid for that bile and slime, but when corporations and the ultrarich keep getting what they want from a dark money-funded Congress, well, you see that over and over and over again; and Americans' suspicions grow. Their gut tells them the corporations and billionaires are behind the phony ads in an effort to rig our political system.

And Americans' instincts are right. Academic studies show that economic elites and business interests command huge influence in government policy while regular people have statistically little or none. Studies also show that politicians elected to Federal office with the support of dark money are more likely to support legislation aligned with big corporate interests. Regardless of what the American people want, the big donor interests win time after time.

Dark money isn't limited to elections either. I have come to the floor now 18 times to expose a decades-long, right-wing scheme to capture the Federal judiciary and its crown jewel, our Supreme Court. This scheme included a $580 million secretive campaign of dark money and phony front groups to pack the courts with judges selected to green-light donor-friendly policies, running multimillion-dollar ad campaigns to keep the confirmations of those judges and Justices on track.

Now, the result is the Court that dark money built is delivering big for its donor puppeteers. In a matter of days, the FedSoc Six on the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, manufactured new polluter-friendly legal doctrines, and threw out centuries-old gun safety regulations—all things big donors wanted; all things majorities of Americans did not want. What is more, one rightwing donor just dumped $1.6 billion to supercharge the dark money operation that captured the Court and cement that dark money network's hold over the Federal judiciary. And guess what. We wouldn't know who that donor is if someone hadn't tipped off the press—ProPublica and the New York Times. Think about that. We only know this because we get occasional little glimpses of these megadonors' covert schemes. That means this is only the tip of the iceberg. And where that $1.6 billion goes on its way out into our political system will be obscured in dark money channels.

No wonder Americans' trust in the government is cratering. Fifty-eight percent of voters say our government needs major reforms or a complete overhaul. Just a quarter of Americans say they have confidence in the Supreme Court. That is down 11 percent just from last year. Americans know something is deeply amiss in our democracy.

Mr. President, I believe to restore trust in government, we need to flush dark money out of government. Year after year, poll after poll, overwhelming majorities of Americans say: money in politics and wealthy political donors are the root of Washington's dysfunction. Election cycle after election cycle, even during COVID, voters listed political corruption among their most important issues. Americans no longer trust that their voices matter here, not as much as the dark money voices of big corporations and billionaires. And it is time to listen to them. It is time to rid our system of the corrupting influence of unlimited dark money.

Even the Citizens United Justices recognized that unlimited political spending without transparency would corrupt. Even the Justices who opened the floodgates of unlimited political spending knew that if it was not transparent, it would corrupt. They just wouldn't do anything about it.

The DISCLOSE Act hinges on a very simple idea: that Americans deserve to know who is spending to influence their vote. If you agree with that simple idea, vote for the DISCLOSE Act. If you believe that corporations and billionaires shouldn't hide behind phony front groups while spending gobs of money on elections, you should vote for the DISCLOSE Act. If you oppose corruption, you should vote for the DISCLOSE Act. It is time for every Member of this body to go on record about this poison in our system. And with any luck, with 10 Republicans joining us, we can return to a Congress that serves America again, and Americans deserve that.

I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague, Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, when I was in grade school, I had basic civics education. We learned about the fact that the vision of America was based on individuals standing up for their ideas in the public square. They could say: Here is what I think should take us forward, and here are the arguments behind it.

And someone else could say: Not so quick. I don't think that is the right path. We should do something else.

But in the course of this debate, those people gathered in the square could decide which way to go, partly based on whether they admired the thinking and the ideas being presented by the individuals, perhaps also what they knew about the individuals who were making those comments. But this is a basic competition of ideas freely expressed by members of the community and debated openly.

Well, I thought that was a beautiful thing; and it really goes to the notion of freedom of speech and the power that flows up from the people because it is the people gathered and discussing ideas who are making decisions. And in a republic, like our Republic, those decisions also involved whom you vote for because of that set of ideas; and that person is sent to a State legislature or the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate to fight for those ideas. Isn't that a beautiful concept of complete transparent debate?

You know who else agreed with this idea who is no longer with us? Antonin Scalia. Now, I don't know that I have ever quoted Antonin Scalia before, former Supreme Court Justice who passed away a few years ago. He had this to say about disclosure. He said:

> Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.

And then he continued:

> For my part, I do not look forward to a society which, thanks to the Supreme Court, [on which he sat] campaigns anonymously . . . hidden from public scrutiny and protected from the accountability of criticism. This [he said] does not resemble the Home of the Brave.

So here is a very conservative Justice saying that, without transparency, without public accountability, democracy is doomed.

I love the revolutionary idea that flows up from the people or, as Abraham Lincoln put it, that we are of the people, by the people, for the people.

Seven weeks from now, Americans are going to go to the polls, and they are going to cast their vote on initiatives and on individuals running for office based on what they have heard. And here is the challenge. A lot of what they have heard is not about people standing up in public with the courage of their convictions but about secret campaign spending where there is no accountability—the exact kind of influence that Antonin Scalia said dooms our democracy.

Citizens United, the decision in 2010, is something we talk about quite a bit. What it basically said is that if you don't give money directly to a candidate but instead run a campaign on their behalf, you can spend as much as you want. So unlimited spending—unlimited. This created super PACs that can collect unlimited spending from corporations, unlimited spending from individuals, and run unlimited campaigns on behalf of someone—super PACs.

But here is the thing, when they made that decision, the Court thought that perhaps Congress would act to make sure that all of those donations were disclosed. They weren't making a decision that they liked secrecy. After all, Antonin Scalia who voted for Citizens United said:

With secrecy, democracy is doomed.

Well, we haven't acted because we have a triple veto baked into the way the Senate acts that says you need a supermajority to get a bill to the floor, a supermajority to close debate on amendments, and a supermajority to go to a final vote on a bill.

Colleagues across the aisle have said: We wanted to protect that secret money because we think it helps us.

That secret money is all about not government of, by, and for the people; that secret money is about government of, by, and for the powerful. So they are using their veto for the powerful to corrupt our country, to corrupt the core vision of government of, by, and for the people. That is what this DISCLOSE Act is all about, to say that we only thrive if the money is legitimate in campaigns.

Let me explain this. There are two standards that my Republican colleagues have been fighting for: one standard for ordinary people and a completely different standard for the rich and powerful.

For ordinary people, they have supported public disclosure. So for ordinary people in America who spend $200 on a campaign, it is publicly disclosed. Everybody knows who you gave the money to.

But if a billionaire doesn't write a $200 check but writes a $200 million check on behalf of running a campaign for an individual, it is secret. It is secret—secrecy for the rich and powerful, disclosure for ordinary Americans.

This is all about the equivalent of a stadium sound system by the powerful that drowns out the voice of ordinary people. That drowning-out effort, as my colleague just pointed out, has gone higher and higher and higher. The sound system from the stadium has gotten louder and louder and louder, drowning out the voices of people. In 2010, it was some 60 million in dark money. In 2016, collectively over the years they had reached a billion dollars, and, in 2020, over a billion dollars in a single year.

And now we have Barre Seid, who donated his company, $1.6 billion, into the dark money network. This money, spent without accountability, is used to smear candidates.

There is a saying—a saying I heard as a little kid—and that saying was: The lie gets halfway around the world before the truth gets its pants on. But in our social media world, it is more like the lie gets three times around the globe before the truth gets out the front door. The truth is being hammered constantly by the smear campaign from dark money.

So this is what we have: a vote coming up on whether you believe in secret money smear campaigns or you believe in public accountability and preserving the vision of government of, by, and for the people.

This is so important to our future. I wonder what Antonin Scalia, lying in his grave, might be thinking when he sees the outcome of Citizens United, an outcome he did not intend.

You know, I had the experience of being the target of one of these smear campaigns in 2014. The Koch brothers were bragging, and they held a meeting. They said: We are going to put a lot of money—millions of dollars—into an organization called Freedom Partners. And Freedom Partners, along with the network, is going to spend $200 million in the 2014 campaigns.

They came to Oregon, and the press reports said that they were putting $3.6 million into television ads attacking me.

Now, I was in a different position than many targets because the Koch brothers had bragged about this money. So they did not take advantage of the anonymity that they could have. I decided to call them out. I put up an ad and said: Where is this money from? It is out-of-State oil and coal billionaires who have come to our State who want to elect my opponent because they share an agenda, and here is the agenda they have advertised: great investment for them, terrible choice for Oregon.

That was my response. I was able to respond because, in that case, the Koch brothers had chosen to waive the secrecy. They wanted people to know what they were doing. They wanted people to tremble and fear over the fact that they could write a check for $3 million, or $5 million, or $10 million, or $50 million.

This is even more evil when it is secret because then you can't respond about the source and what they are all about.

We have seen some recent examples. The Elections Project—what is that dark money up to? That dark money is up to trying to override article I, section 4 of the Constitution. They want State legislatures, without any influence from Congress or from Governors, to be able to write election rules. That is not what the Constitution says.

In addition, they want State legislators to be able to ignore the vote in their State and reassign electors for President to whomever they want. That is what that dark money group is doing.

How about Heritage Action? Jessica Anderson, the executive director, was caught on video bragging about her organization's role in passing voter suppression laws in Georgia. That is what that dark money is up to. They are trying to stop Americans from voting. How un-American is that? How unpatriotic is that? How ''destroying the freedom and rights of Americans'' is that? That is what Heritage Action is up to in trying to destroy democracy here in the United States of America.

Then we had the dark money groups coming together and saying that they were going to have an under-the-dome-type strategy to stop the DISCLOSE Act. What does ''under the dome'' mean? It is a reference to the dome over the Capitol. ''Under the dome'' is about using the triple veto here in the Senate to stop the DISCLOSE Act.

We twice had 59 votes to try to hold a debate on the DISCLOSE Act, but not 60—1 vote short. Now they are trying to do it again, to use the Republican caucus under the Senate rules—an under-the-dome strategy to support the sleazy, terrible, dark money attacks corrupting elections in America.

I say ''corrupting'' because how can an individual, if they can't see who is donating the money, if they don't know what is true and what isn't, because the highest percentage of these ads are actually putting fake facts forward; they are putting lies forward—that is why I call them a smear campaign. If smear campaigns are inundating the airways, how can citizens make an informed judgment? They can't. That is why Antonin Scalia said this type of secrecy would destroy democracy, and on this, he was right.

Let's pass the DISCLOSE Act. Let's save the vision of government of, by, and for the people.

I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague, and I know that Senator VAN HOLLEN is here as well.

I am going to be brief. I particularly want to thank our colleague from Rhode Island because he has been relentless in terms of making this case day after day. I want to put this in very personal kind of terms because all of us who have the honor of serving in the U.S. Senate can relate to this issue.

Senator WHITEHOUSE has added a reform to his proposal that is very personal to me and I think embodies the accountability and the transparency that Oregonians and people in Minnesota, Michigan, and Maryland are calling for. Here is how I would start it: A number of years ago, I authored legislation that millions of Americans now understand is called Stand By Your Ad. Stand By Your Ad stipulated that as an elected official or a candidate, you would have to actually put your name behind these attack ads where you go after your opponent. And, now, day after day, in these next 50-plus days, we are going to see plenty of these ads.

The law worked well, and it is still on the books today, much to the chagrin of some officials who would like to take a quick hit on their opponent—an official or a candidate—and then scamper off without any accountability.

I do want to make clear, because of the good work of the Senator from Rhode Island, that Stand By Your Ad doesn't mean as much today because we now know the premium is ongoing for these secret, incredibly negative ads on your opponent because the people paying for dark money ads aren't required to put their name behind what they are saying.

That is an extraordinarily strong hit against openness and accountability and transparency in our democracy. Oregonians and people across the country are rightfully disgusted by it. It is extraordinary the lengths that those who are orchestrating these dark money attacks will go in order to make their case when there is no accountability.

I see my seatmate from the Finance Committee. We have worked together for years to change the Medicare statute that barred Medicare from negotiating to hold down the price of medicine. Big Pharma protected this negotiating ban like it was the Holy Grail. My colleague and I would come to the committee day after day and talk about: How is this common sense? Everybody in America negotiates in order to get the best possible deal.

But we looked, particularly in this session, at the start of the debate as a classic study in dark money. Big Pharma, and groups associated with it, spent enormous sums of money attacking me personally in Washington, DC, media. There was scary music, and there were attacks about how anybody who wanted these reforms was like a leech and taking away cures from the American people.

The striking part of all of this, and why what Senator WHITEHOUSE has had to say is so important, is that the ad wasn't even directed at me, because it was in Washington, DC. I am barely a household word in my own household, let alone in Washington, DC.

And what was the point of these extraordinarily large sums attacking me in Washington, DC? The point of it was to scare my colleagues—Senator STABENOW, Senator VAN HOLLEN, all of my colleagues here—because there was so much money at the hands of these extreme groups associated with Big Pharma that wanted to undermine a commonsense reform backed by millions of Americans that Medicare should negotiate.

At one point, someone said: Oh, there is so much opposition to this effort to negotiate.

I said: Are you kidding me? The opponents of negotiating on Medicare must be in a witness protection program because we can't find anybody who thinks you shouldn't negotiate.

Yet Big Pharma was willing to spend huge sums of money—dark money—not really to damage me politically, because my constituents live in Oregon, but to scare other Senators.

So people, of course, are going to get bludgeoned with these dark money ads every time they turn on the television, the radio, or watch a video online. I just don't think that Americans should be forced to guess or wonder what special interest is funding these ads that come from murky groups that have these radical names like the Coalition for Prosperity and Justice. We all know that they are not going to tell you who they really are.

My colleague from Maryland has been very patient. We had some glitches in the schedule, and we want to hear from our friend from Michigan as well.

I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for basically taking the ''Stand By Your Ad'' concept and kind of reconfiguring it in the DISCLOSE legislation. Senator WHITEHOUSE's bill would require the heads of corporations, unions, or other organizations to identify when they are behind political ads, the same way Stand By Your Ad works under the original version of the law that I authored.

And remember—and I want this to be the takeaway about this issue—Senator WHITEHOUSE's proposal and extending ''Stand by Your Ad'' in this kind of fashion treats everybody the same. This is quintessential good government. It is not about going after somebody on the right or somebody on the left. This is about common sense. It is not a radical, leftwing proposal.

The American people ought to know who is trying to influence their votes. By the way, when we authored the original ''Stand by Your Ad'' proposal, it used to be bipartisan. And as my colleague from Rhode Island has mentioned, of late, it has been the Republicans who have been protecting dark money and protecting the basic kind of disclosure that I think our system of government has been all about.

The American people have strong differences of opinion on issues. There is no question about that. But I have had more than 1,020 open-to-all townhall meetings. What nobody disputes is that openness and accountability is what the American system is all about.

So, Senator WHITEHOUSE, our thanks to you for spending years and years at it because you are taking us, in a significant way, back to what I think used to be common sense, used to be accountability, used to be something that transcended the kind of thing that Big Pharma was doing early on where they didn't even pretend—they didn't even pretend—it was about an individual legislator; it was about scaring off all Members of Congress.

We can do better. Senator WHITEHOUSE's proposal moves us in that direction, and I want to thank my colleague from Maryland, who also was trying to deal with the scheduling kind of challenge, and look forward to working with him and my seatmate on the Finance Committee and Senator WHITEHOUSE, another exemplary member of the Finance Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: myself for up to 10 minutes, Senator STABENOW for up to 10 minutes, Senator CANTWELL for up to 5 minutes, and Senator MENENDEZ for up to 5 minutes.

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

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I too want to thank the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE, for his laser focus on the issue of disclosure and transparency. And I want to thank my colleagues here on the floor: Senator WYDEN; Senator STABENOW; and Senator MERKLEY, who was here before; and others within our caucus.

In fact, every member of our Democratic Caucus supports the DISCLOSE Act. We support it because the stakes are so high for the future of our democracy. Billions of dollars that have crept in and now are gushing into our political system to influence our elections pose a grave threat to our Republic and to the future of our democracy.

Make no mistake, these are corporations and very wealthy people who are spending billions of dollars in secret money to influence people's votes so that they can get their way at the expense of the public interest. You have got a very few people with very deep bankrolls who are using their funds to try to shape our democracy and bend our democracy to suit their interests at the expense of everybody else.

And, as President Biden said in his remarks on this earlier this week, even foreign entities—foreign entities that are not allowed to contribute to political campaigns are engaged in these political expenditures—under current law, use dark money, front groups, to try to influence our elections and steer the course of our democracy here in the United States from overseas. That, by itself, should scare the hell out of every Senator and every American.

Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about how we got here. How

did we get to a place where, in the United States of America, for elections, special interests can spend billions of dollars to influence people's votes without telling the voters who they are? And make no mistake, they are not telling voters who they are because they don't want voters to know who is behind these ads.

Well, the story begins with the infamous 5–4 decision in the Supreme Court case of Citizens United. That decision opened the spigots and then floodgates to corporate spending—corporate spending in Federal elections. That is when the Supreme Court said: For spending in elections, we are going to say corporations are people too. Corporations can't go into the ballot box and push the lever, but for purposes of influencing everybody else's vote, we are going to say corporations are people too.

And that unleashed a huge amount of money into politics. The only way to address that part of Citizens United is, of course, either to have a Supreme Court that will reverse the terrible Citizens United decision or through constitutional amendment. I support that, but that is not happening anytime soon. But there is something that we can do right now and which we are going to vote on tomorrow, and that is the issue of secret, dark money because we can change that through our votes tomorrow.

After Citizens United, what you began to see was not just more money, not just a gusher of money from corporations and corporate entities going into elections, but more and more secret money flowing into elections. And you can see the pattern here of, back in 2006, about $5 million a year going into secret money in different ways; in 2020, $1 billion in that year alone. So the trajectory is increasing by the year, and as my colleagues have said, we also have the situation where one individual just contributed $1.6 billion that is going to flow in subterranean ways through our election process—one individual, $1.6 billion.

Now, here is a point I want to emphasize. Even in that really terrible Supreme Court decision, 5–4 decision, in Citizens United, the Justices—eight of the nine Justices in that decision called for more transparency in elections. Here is what Justice Kennedy wrote on behalf of eight of the nine Justices: that the disclosure of political expenditures ''provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters.''

He went on to say that, with disclosure, ''citizens can see whether elected officials are 'in the pocket' of so-called moneyed interests.''

This is Justice Kennedy. He voted for the notorious Citizens United decision, which opened the gushers of money, but he said, as this money flows through our system, we have a public interest in making sure voters know who is spending that money. And he says right here that it is important for citizens to know whether their elected officials are in the pockets of special interests.

So this vote is pretty clear in former Justice Kennedy's terms, which is, if you want dark money, you don't want the public to know who is supporting you in your campaigns, if you support continuing dark money.

So after that Citizens United decision, the alarm bells went off, as they should, and many of us said: We have got to pass a law to require disclosure. All this money is going to flow through the system. My God, at the very least, let's make sure that voters know who is spending the money.

So back in 2010—I served in the House of Representatives at the time—I authored the original DISCLOSE Act. My chief cosponsor was a Republican, Mike Castle from the State of Delaware, at the time. And we passed it. We passed that in the House of Representatives back in 2010. But when it came to the Senate, it hit a brick wall of Republican opposition.

And I must say, given what Republicans had said before the Citizens United decision about disclosure, it was a complete, 180-degree flip-flop and turnaround because the position that the Republican Senate leader Senator MCCONNELL had taken for decades was, We don't need all these regulations to regulate political money, but we should have disclosure; we should have disclosure.

In fact, when he was on ''Meet the Press'' back in the day, in the year 2000, this was a hot issue because of McCain-Feingold. So he was asked why he voted no on one of these campaign finance provisions, and he said the following:

> We need to have real disclosure. And so what we ought to do is broaden the disclosure to include at least labor unions and tax-exempt business associations . . . so you include the major political players in America.

He went on to say—Senator MCCONNELL:

> Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?

Well, I agreed with Senator MCCONNELL in 2000. We want full disclosure and full transparency. But what happened was, as soon as the Citizens United decision came down and a gusher of money started flowing through the system, including through corporations, all of a sudden, all of a sudden: Hey, I didn't mean what I said about disclosure. I can have my cake and eat it too—lots of money and nobody knows where it comes from.

And, in a twist of history, when we passed the DISCLOSE bill out of the House, it came to the Senate, and the Senate version of that bill got 59 out of 100 votes. Every Democrat voted for it. It would have been 60 except for a terrible twist in history, which is Senator KENNEDY passed away. And Senator BROWN took his place, and Senator BROWN voted against cloture on the DISCLOSE Act.

But, my colleagues, here is the fact: 59 out of 100 Senators wanted to move forward there, and but for the anti-democratic filibuster, we wouldn't have secret money in politics today. But here we are, and we have to deal with it in the here and now.

And it is interesting to hear the Republican leader. He said back in 2012, after we tried to move the DISCLOSE Act, on this Senate floor: Dark money is a ''problem that doesn't exist.''

Then, to take things even further, he rallied Republicans, and so, in the Republican national platform in 2012, it read: We ''oppose passage of the DISCLOSE Act,'' by name. We don't want the American people to know who is spending this money. We like dark money in politics.

So that brings us to today because what we saw since that vote in 2010 and then those comments by the Republican leader back in 2012 is this huge gusher of secret money flowing. And, interestingly now, it has also caught the attention of some of our Republican colleagues who have been complaining about secret money in politics, complaining that Democratic political organizations are spending secret money in politics.

As we know, Senator MCCONNELL distributed to reporters an email entitled ''Democrats Let the Dark Money Flow and Like Its Power''—and like its power. And Senator HAWLEY tweeted about dark money from foreign groups, writing:

> But who is funding this overseas dark money group—Big Tech? billionaire activists? foreign governments? We have no idea. Americans deserve to know what foreign interests are attempting to influence American democracy.

This is Senator HAWLEY, the Senator from Missouri. And I don't say this often on the Senate floor, but I agree with Senator HAWLEY's question here. And tomorrow he and every Member of this body will have a chance to vote to say that, yes, we should know about what foreign entities and interests are spending money in our elections, because there is all sorts of money—in fact, about $300 billion a year in foreign money—being laundered through our whole economy, and we don't know how much of that these days is flowing into elections. As President Biden said, we need to pass this to do that.

And if you look at some of the titles of this bill that Senator WHITEHOUSE has put forward, they are pretty simple. There are whole sections of the bill to get at the question of foreign money in our elections. I don't know why anyone is going to oppose that.

Here we are, 12 years later, after that vote in 2010 that got 59 out of 100 votes. It would have had 60, except that Senator Kennedy passed away. And our Republican colleagues, who are now complaining about secret money, have a chance to work with us and vote with us to get rid of it. Whether it is Democratic money, Republican money, somebody else's secret money, get rid

of it. Require transparency. That is what the DISCLOSE Act is all about.

So this is another chance for every Member of the Senate to align themselves with the overwhelming majority of the American people. Eighty percent support transparency disclosure, and they do it because they know how important it is to our democracy. Let's vote for this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first of all, I want to thank Senator VAN HOLLEN for his incredible work over the years and his leadership both in the House and in the Senate. And thank you for taking on this fight and working so hard to expose the bright light of truth and transparency about what is happening around secret money.

And I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his dogged focus on the issue of secret money influencing elections. Thank you for all of your wonderful work, and to all of our colleagues who have joined us on the floor and to all of my Democratic colleagues, all of whom are supporting the DISCLOSE Act.

The Members of this Chamber have a choice to make, and it is really pretty simple: You can be on the side of the American people or you can be on the side of the rich and powerful.

We can pass the DISCLOSE Act, let the public know what is happening, put limits around it, stop all of this; or you can vote against it and vote with the powerful and the wealthy.

The DISCLOSE Act is going to keep our elections in the hands of voters, not the highest bidders. That is really the bottom line. And you don't have to look very far for examples of why we need to pass this legislation.

Colleagues have all been talking today about, stunningly, how a conservative group has received a $1.6 billion donation from a single donor—one man, $1.6 billion; and one mission—one mission—to put his finger on the scale of our democracy.

If you don't think that guy isn't going to have an undue influence on our elections in the coming years, then I have a bridge across the Straits of Mackinac I would like to sell you.

And this very rich man isn't alone, unfortunately. As my colleagues have said, in 2006, there was less than $5 million in dark money spent on our elections—5 million. Then, in 2010, the Supreme Court handed down its Citizens United decision, which opened the floodgates, and it didn't take long for the water to rise. In 2012, more than $300 million was spent in secret money—dark money—in elections, and in 2020, more than $1 billion was spent in dark money in elections. And now we know, in 2022, that we have one person who has already given $1.6 billion to try to influence this election.

If you laid those billion-dollar bills end to end, they would extend around the Earth nearly four times—extend around the Earth four times. That is how much we are talking about here, and we don't even know where all this anonymous spending is coming from.

But we do know this, and Senator WYDEN—Chairman WYDEN—spoke earlier. When we took on Big Pharma to lower prescription drug prices, not one Republican voted yes. When we took on Big Oil to lower energy costs and attack the climate crisis, not one Republican voted yes. When we took on corporations that pay zero in taxes, not one Republican voted yes.

The American people deserve to know why. How much dark money is coming in from those powerful interests to protect their profits?

Dark money could also be coming from foreign actors who wish to harm our country.

What has been reported, though, again, is that dark money is coming in from one really rich guy—one really rich guy who wants to make our Nation a little bit more toward his liking.

American voters deserve to know who is spending huge—huge, huge—sums of money to influence our democracy. And under the DISCLOSE Act, they will know that. It will strengthen the foreign money ban to make sure foreign actors can't influence our elections. It requires corporations and other groups to disclose their donors. Right, left, Democrat, Republican: Disclose your donors.

And it expands disclosure requirements to online ads and other types of ads as well. As for all of those campaign text messages that are blowing up your phone, you deserve to know who is sending them.

These changes are popular. They are common sense, and they are really important. They are really important if we think America deserves to know who is influencing our elections. It is time to make sure our American democracy actually works for the American people.

Again, the Members of this Chamber have a choice to make: We can stand with the American people or we can stand with the rich and powerful. Democrats have made that choice. I have made that choice. We stand with the American people who just want a fair shot to work hard and get ahead. Americans want to know that this is their democracy and that it works for them, not just a few rich people.

I urge my colleagues to support the DISCLOSE Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF ARATI PRABHAKAR

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today to support the nomination of Dr. Arati Prabhakar to be the Director of the Office of Science and Technology. Since 1976, the Office of Science and Technology Policy has worked to ensure that the United States leads in science and technology, to promote STEM education, and to make sure that our science Agencies share the common purpose of benefiting all Americans.

Dr. Prabhakar is very well qualified for this job. As an engineer, physicist, leader, venture capitalist, and pioneer, she has had a trailblazing career, accomplishing a lot in a time period where she was Director of the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency, DARPA, and the first woman to lead the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST.

And under Dr. Prabhakar's leadership, DARPA kick-started the development of a rapid-response mRNA vaccine platform. This platform was the basis for the fast, safe, and effective COVID–19 development.

Under her leadership at NIST, she worked to expand the Manufacturing Extension Partnership to boost the competitiveness of small- and medium-sized American manufacturers.

Just last year, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program helped our domestic manufacturers capture $3.9 billion in new sales. In my State alone, that translated into over $186 million and more than 2,000 jobs created or retained.

Perhaps even more impressive, back in the 1990s, when Dr. Prabhakar was just in her twenties, she helped launch DARPA programs that made essential leaps forward in semiconductor manufacturing technology. Dr. Prabhakar's programs laid the groundwork for five generations of chip manufacturing technologies to help demonstrate leadership right here in the United States.

Dr. Prabhakar is now ready to lead again, and now we are asking for her to lead this important Agency. We have just passed the CHIPS and Science Act, which is a renewed commitment to domestic semiconductor research and manufacturing and U.S. leadership in the next generation chip technology.

Dr. Prabhakar has the exact experience we need to advise the President on semiconductor manufacturing, on bringing the supply chain and security that we need here in the United States, and on continued growth in science and technology jobs that come along with it.

The CHIPS and Science Act directs the National Science Foundation to invest in translational research, including through a new NSF tech directorate.

Before her nomination, Dr. Prabhakar was an important voice in support of this effort of a tech directorate, reaching out to House and Senate colleagues and helping to shape the directorate in its focus on big national and security challenges.

And the CHIPS and Science Act reflects our commitment to diversity in science, to make sure that the engineering, math, and STEM fields are included and that we continue to grow a workforce that is needed.

The important aspect of science is not always thought of in every aspect of growing the next generation. That is why I am so encouraged that Dr.

Prabhakar is very committed to increasing the talent pool that we need in our country.

For the first time in our country's history, the President has elevated the Office of Science and Technology Policy Director to a Cabinet-level post, meaning there will be a scientist in the room for our Nation's most important discussions.

And for the first time in history, with the support of my colleagues here today, Dr. Prabhakar will be the first woman and person of color to serve as the Senate-confirmed OSTP Director.

Dr. Prabhakar will have a lot to do, including developing the whole-of-government science and technology strategies for issues ranging from security to commercial space exploration. And at a time of growing competition, OSTP needs to tell the President and advise our leaders what we need to do to maintain our competitiveness as a nation.

I know, coming from an innovation State, how important the Office of Science and Technology Policy strategies can be in helping our Nation attract and keep the best and brightest and prioritize collaboration between academia and industry. And since Washington has been a STEM leader—in fact, I think we are the most STEM-focused State in the Nation; that is, by number of people involved in STEM——we know that this partnership between the existing workforce and the workforce of tomorrow needs to grow.

I know that, as a former DARPA Director, Dr. Prabhakar will help us with this engine of innovation and growing STEM education in America. Moreover, I know that Dr. Prabhakar will, on many issues, help to improve the participation of women and girls in the issues of STEM.

This is such a big, important issue for us today. But just being at the helm of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, being a woman, being there at the Cabinet level, and advising the President of the United States, I know she will help to deliver a message that young women all across America need to be involved in the sciences to help our Nation in the next phases of innovation. I am so excited that she will be in this position.

I ask my colleagues to support her as a devoted, experienced, and exceptional public servant. These are the kinds of people who we need in government. These are the kinds of people who can make America stronger, safer, and more competitive. I urge my colleagues to support the confirmation of Dr. Prabhakar as the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF AMANDA BENNETT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today in support of Amanda Bennett to be the Chief Executive Officer of the U.S. State Agency for Global Media.

When autocrats around the world have been cracking down on independent media; when regimes silence opposition with repression and fear; when they shut down the internet, as we have seen in countries like Cuba and Iran; when they actively target the United States and like-minded democratic nations with disinformation campaigns, it is critical for the United States to have a champion of democracy and free speech leading the U.S. Agency for Global Media, someone who can meet the challenge posed by the spread of digital authoritarianism around the world.

Ms. Bennett is prepared to take on that task. She has over two decades of experience in journalism, including as the director of Voice of America. For 23 years, she worked at the Wall Street Journal, including as a correspondent in Beijing, where she came face-to-face with China's authoritarianism. She has seen how their state security forces watch and detain journalists to suppress the truth.

As a former director of Voice of America, she understands the importance of the U.S. Agency for Global Media's networks and American public diplomacy efforts.

Over the course of her career, she served on the boards of the Lenfest Institute and Committee to Protect Journalists.

In short, Ms. Bennett is without a doubt the right person for this position. She will be a tireless advocate for the journalists working at USAGM and an effective steward of its operations. She will also be an invaluable ally to USAGM's independent partners, including Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and Radio Free Asia. She will defend the importance of Radio and TV Marti. And she will be accountable to Congress in these efforts.

It has been almost 2 years since the Agency has had a Senate-confirmed CEO at the helm. It is in dire need of steady leadership that supports independent media.

I enthusiastically support Ms. Bennett. I respectfully urge my colleagues to support her confirmation as well.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Madam President, finally, before I yield the floor, I would also like to celebrate the Senate's historic vote today to approve the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

In approving the Kigali Amendment, the Senate took an important step that will have enormous economic and trade benefits for American manufacturing and jobs, but it was also the single most important climate action the Senate and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have taken in more than 30 years. As wildfires ravage the West, hurricanes devastate Puerto Rico, and catastrophic flooding inundates the Midwest, strong action to fight climate change has never been more urgent.

By voting for the Kigali Amendment today, we voted for maintaining a livable planet with clean water to drink. We voted for a stable food supply for all of humanity. We voted, in a strong bipartisan coalition, to keep American innovation and business at the forefront of the transition to clean energy.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude for the support and cooperation of the Foreign Relations Committee's ranking member, the senior Senator from Idaho, Senator RISCH. His partnership and the tireless efforts of his staff were essential in the Senate's success on Kigali.

I want to thank my staff on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Damian Murphy, staff director; Andrew Keller, chief counsel; Josh Klein; Josh Kretman; Julia Greensfelder; and Megan Bartley. They were essential in getting it to the committee and making us successful.

I urge a positive vote.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 1055, Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Ben Ray Luján, Chris Van Hollen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Jeanne Shaheen, Elizabeth Warren, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher A. Coons, Tina Smith, Michael F. Bennet, Jacky Rosen, Edward J. Markey, Angus S. King, Jr.

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 Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 344 Ex.]

YEAS—60

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

NAYS—37

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

NOT VOTING—3

Baldwin	Crapo	Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37, and the motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 1097, Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Charles E. Schumer, Cory A. Booker, Tim Kaine, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Chris Van Hollen, Alex Padilla, Debbie Stabenow, Ben Ray Luján, Christopher Murphy, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Edward J. Markey, Raphael G. Warnock.

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 Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 345 Ex.]

YEAS—58

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

NAYS—38

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

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Crapo
Cramer	Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S. RES. 753

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to say a few words about the state of democracy, both in terms of the upcoming election in Brazil as well as here in the United States.

It is no great secret that, today, democracies around the world are under great threat from rightwing extremism. That obviously includes our own, as we all saw tragically on January 6, 2021, when there was an attack on this very building by those seeking to overturn our Presidential election.

One of the countries where democracy is now under threat is Brazil, the largest nation in Latin America and one of the largest democratic countries in the world. On October 2, less than 2 weeks from now, Brazil will hold its Presidential election. According to many polls, it appears that the two major candidates in that election are President Jair Bolsonaro and former President Lula da Silva. If no candidate in that election receives over 50 percent of the vote, there will be a runoff election between the top two candidates on October 30.

Mr. President, over the past many months, Brazilians from all sectors of society have publicly expressed serious concerns about ongoing efforts in that country to undermine democracy, including close to 1 million Brazilians who signed an open letter released on July 26, 2022, defending the democratic institutions of Brazil and the rule of law.

And there is, in fact, a very good reason as to why the people in Brazil are concerned about their democracy, and that is that the current President and candidate for reelection, Jair Bolsonaro, has made some very provocative statements which suggest that he might not accept the election results if he loses. In other words, Bolsonaro might attempt to destroy Brazilian democracy and remain in power no matter what the people of Brazil determine in a free and democratic election.

Here are just a few examples of what Mr. Bolsonaro has said over the years.

Back in September 2018, before he won his election, Bolsonaro stated:

I will not accept an election result that is not my own victory.

On September 7, 2021, as reported by the Financial Times, Bolsonaro stated:

There are those who think they can take me from the presidency with the mark of a pen. Well, I say to everyone I have only three possible fates: Arrest, death or victory. And tell the bastards I'll never be arrested. Only God can take me from the presidency.

According to Human Rights Watch, previously, President Bolsonaro had claimed, without providing any evidence, that the last two Presidential elections were fraudulent, including his own election, in which he claimed he got more votes than the final tally showed.

But it is not just Bolsonaro's words that should be of concern to those of us who still believe in democracy. According to a recent survey by the Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil is experiencing a 335-percent increase in violence directed against political leaders in 2022 relative to 2019.

Mr. President, it is obviously not the business of the United States to determine who the next President of Brazil is or to get involved in Brazil's Presidential elections in any way. That is a decision to be made solely by the people of Brazil through a fair and free election. But it is the business of the United States to make clear to the people of Brazil that our government will not recognize or support a government that comes to power through a military coup or the undermining of a democratic election. That is our business.

In that regard, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support a resolution

that I have introduced with Senator KAINE, S. Res. 753. And Senator KAINE, of course, is the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, and that is also cosponsored by Senators LEAHY, MERKLEY, BLUMENTHAL, and WARREN.

This resolution is very simple and straightforward. It does not take sides in Brazil's election, obviously, and that would be unacceptable. But what it does do is express the sense of the U.S. Senate that the U.S. Government will make it unequivocally clear that the continuing relationship of the United States and Brazil depends upon the commitment of the government of Brazil to democracy and human rights.

This resolution urges the Biden administration to make clear that the United States will not support any government that comes to power in Brazil through undemocratic means and to ensure U.S. security assistance to Brazil remains compliant with our laws related to the peaceful and democratic transition of power—in other words, no military aid to a military coup in Brazil.

This does not seem to be a complicated or, in my view, controversial piece of legislation. Yet—and I say this with a great deal of sadness, and maybe it tells us the state of democracy in the United States—we have not been able to get one single Republican to cosponsor this very simple, straightforward resolution.

Why is that? And the answer is, I would love for my Republican colleagues to explain to me why they cannot support and add their names to a resolution that simply supports Brazil's democracy and the peaceful transfer of power. Obviously, it would be most effective if this resolution had bipartisan support, and I hope that it will.

Mr. President, in my view, it is imperative that the U.S. Senate make it clear through this resolution that we support democracy in Brazil. It would be unacceptable to the United States to recognize a government that came to power undemocratically; and, if we did that, it would send a horrific message to the entire world. So it is important for the people of Brazil to know that we are on their side.

We are on the side of democracy, and that is what this resolution is about. I ask my colleagues, in a bipartisan way, to support it.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 1056 and 1060; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Roselyn Tso, of Oregon, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, for the term of four years; and Robert A. Wood, of New York, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

DISCLOSE ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the DISCLOSE Act and the need to take action to get secret money out of our elections.

I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on this legislation—and testimony at the Rules Committee hearing I held on it this summer—as well as Leader SCHUMER for holding this vote. Senator WHITEHOUSE has championed this bill since 2012, and I have been proud to support it alongside him in every Congress.

This vote could not come at a more important time, as we are seeing an unprecedented flood of money into our elections. Over $14 billion was spent during the 2020 elections, the most expensive in our country's history.

As we approach the general election in November, with 48 days left, this is already the most expensive midterm election ever. One estimate expects that nearly $10 billion will be spent just on political advertising this election cycle, more than double the $4 billion in the 2018 midterm elections.

As spending on elections increases, the sources of the spending are less accountable than ever before. One investigation found that more than $1 billion was spent on the 2020 elections by groups that do not disclose their donors at all.

Americans know there is way too much money in our elections, and—for our democracy to work—we need to know where this money is coming from. But since the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United opened up the flood of outside money, no significant improvements have been made to our disclosure laws or regulations.

Unlimited, anonymous spending in our elections doesn't encourage free speech; it drowns out the voices of the American people who are seeking to participate. And this unrelenting secret spending will continue unless we take action to address it, which is why we need to pass the DISCLOSE Act.

The DISCLOSE Act would address this tidal wave of secret money by requiring outside groups that spend in our elections to disclose their large donors—those that contribute more than $10,000—to the public.

Importantly, the bill also makes it harder for wealthy special interests to hide their contributions or cloak the identity of donors; and it cracks down on the use of shell companies to conceal donations from foreign nationals.

I held a hearing on the bill in the Rules Committee this summer, where we heard about the effects that secret money is having on our democracy—and why we need to pass this legislation.

Senator WHITEHOUSE testified at that hearing, and he spoke powerfully about the impact that secret money is having on our government—affecting all aspects of our lives, from the makeup of our courts to people's healthcare decisions to addressing climate change.

We also heard from Montana's Commissioner of Political Practices Jeff Mangan, who told us how his State's version of the DISCLOSE Act passed in 2015 with bipartisan support. I couldn't agree more that transparency in our democracy should not be a partisan issue, and regardless of political party, we should know who is spending in our elections.

The American people know what is at stake, so it is no surprise that campaign finance disclosure laws have overwhelming support. One recent poll found that in swing States, 91 percent of likely voters—Republicans and Democrats—support full transparency of campaign contributions and spending in our elections. Another poll from 2019 found that, across America, 83 percent of likely voters support public disclosure of contributions to groups involved in elections.

There is also a long history of bipartisan support for reducing the influence of money in our democracy. In fact, the very first limits on corporate campaign contributions in 1907, the landmark Federal Election Campaign Act in 1972, and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act in 2002—which my friends and former colleagues Senators John McCain and Russ Feingold joined together to champion—were all passed on a bipartisan basis and signed into law by Republican Presidents.

Former Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia—never one to hide his opinions—was also a staunch supporter of campaign finance disclosure. In a 2010 case, Doe v. Reed, he wrote: ''For my part, I do not look forward to a society which, thanks to the Supreme Court, campaigns anonymously . . . hidden from public scrutiny and protected from the accountability of criticism. This does not resemble the Home of the Brave.''

Ensuring the transparency of our elections has been—and should continue to be—a bipartisan value. These issues are at the very heart of our democracy, and this commonsense bill would protect the right of voters to make informed choices and know who has been trying to influence our elections.

While we are here today to vote on legislation to counter the flood of secret money in our elections, there is so much more we must do to safeguard our democracy, and I continue to support this and the other reforms in the Freedom to Vote Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these measures that are so fundamental to our system of government and voting to advance this legislation.

REMEMBERING SCOTT KEITH

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, today I have the distinct honor of welcoming Scott Keith to the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame in the class of 2022. While Scott sadly passed away in 2020, I know he would be pleased that so many people he worked with over the years have honored him with this remarkable posthumous recognition.

Being inducted into the hall of fame is truly one of the highest achievements anyone can meet. It means your peers and colleagues believe you are among the best of the best, you have made the industry better, and during your lifetime, you have set an example for those who wish to follow in your footsteps.

Scott was introduced to the world of agriculture at an early age, having been born in Buffalo and raised on a ranch near Kaycee. It did not take long for him to learn to love and appreciate agriculture in Wyoming and realize that, when he grew up, that is what he wanted to do with his life. In order to help facilitate that dream, Scott enrolled at Casper College and eventually the University of Wyoming, where he earned a bachelor's degree in agriculture business.

Eventually, Scott and his new bride, Brenda, decided to move to Casper to settle down and raise a family. While in Casper, not only did Scott spend time fostering further relationships in the agriculture industry through his work as a loan officer with the Production Credit Association and First Interstate Bank in Casper, he also made sure to leave his mark on the community through numerous volunteer projects in Casper. Scott had served on the Casper Chamber of Commerce Ag Committee, as well as on the Natrona County Conservation District. He was also a very passionate supporter of the Kelly Walsh High School football team and the Casper Swim Club, where he could be found behind the grill at football games and on the pool deck during swim meets. Needless to say, he loved his family and enjoyed supporting his local community any way he could.

In 2002, Scott joined the Wyoming Business Council Agribusiness Division as the forage and co-op development program specialist, which eventually led to a promotion to be the livestock and forage program manager. In that role, Scott was instrumental in promoting the Wyoming hay and forage industry across the United States and abroad. Scott also played a significant role in creating numerous associations related to the promotion of Wyoming Agriculture through the Wyoming Hay and Forage Association and the Future Cattle Producers of Wyoming. His work with the Wyoming Hay and Forage Association led Wyoming hay producers to victory at the World Forage Analysis Superbowl in Madison, WI—twice. I know there are many members of the Pro Football Hall of Fame who have no Super Bowl wins, but Scott was able to claim being a two-time winner of the World Forage Analysis Superbowl.

Scott also took an interest in teaching and promoting agriculture to youth in Wyoming. Being an expert in judging cattle, among other talents, through the Future Cattle Producers of Wyoming program, Scott would encourage high school students to learn how to raise cattle by working with local producers and a donated heifer. This not only gave high school students firsthand experience in learning how to raise cattle, but it also played a vital role in making sure that Wyoming continues to be a worldwide leader in quality beef.

After the passing of his wife Brenda, Scott met Tracy Smith in Casper, and in 2016, he began working as a contractor for Big Iron Auctions. He was quickly promoted to district manager and was able to help those involved in Wyoming agriculture buy and sell their equipment.

In addition to all of his work throughout his career, he still found time to be a part of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, and even was able to serve as the chairman of Wyoming AgXpo. He truly was an amazing person and a role model to all of us in Wyoming.

I wish that Scott had been able to receive this recognition in person. He dedicated his life to the promotion of Wyoming agriculture, and many are benefiting from his hard work. But, I am glad that his legacy will continue to live on through his membership in the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DANA CONNORS

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the career one of Maine's most dedicated, respected leaders: Dana Connors. Dana is part of the fabric of Maine, and it is almost impossible to concisely recognize the impact he has had on our State.

Dana, a proud native of Aroostook County, started his career as a municipal manager in Presque Isle after graduating from the University of Maine. Here, he served as city manager for 16 years, where he built a reputation as an advocate for common sense, a consensus builder, and a good listener. His exceptional ability to put a fine point on issues and present a case for the greater good brought him to State government, where he served as Maine's Commissioner of the Department of Transportation under both a Democratic and Republican Governor—a true testament to his bipartisan values.

In the time I have known him, it has always been clear that Dana served the people, not any party. It is due to this unimpeachable dedication, that people have always trusted him implicitly. I am one of those people, and when I was lucky enough to serve as Governor of the great State of Maine, Dana was my first and only choice to be my transition director. Shortly after in 1994, he became president of the Maine State Chamber of Commerce, where he has served our business community admirably for nearly 30 years.

It is here at the chamber where perhaps he has left his largest legacy. There has never been a greater advocate for Maine's businesses, and his legacy will continue to echo throughout our State for generations. Because of Dana, thousands of Maine businesses have been able to thrive, employ hardworking Maine people, and make our State the greatest in the Nation.

While his retirement will undoubtably leave a large void in the business community, Dana has instilled the same work ethic and understanding of the needs of Maine businesses in his team. They will continue Dana's legacy and ensure the growing success of the State that Dana devoted his career to.

Dana has made the Maine State chamber a shining example of professionalism. His instincts—and his fashion sense—may be a hard act to follow, but his ability to lead always includes a path for others to succeed. Thank you, Dana, for your friendship, your leadership, and your dedication to public service. Maine is better for it.●

RECOGNIZING THE KENTUCKY CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL WASTE AND RECYCLING ASSOCIATION

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Kentucky Chapter of the National Waste and Recycling Association, NWRA.

For 60 years, NWRA has been the Nation's leading voice for the private sector waste and recycling industries, which are essential to maintaining the quality of American life. The daily delivery of waste and recycling services impacts all residential, commercial, and industrial properties.

The NWRA's mission has been to promote the waste and recycling industry

through the strategic application of a results-driven advocacy and vision. The NWRA has created a favorable business climate where members prosper and provide safe, economically sustainable services and jobs that benefit communities throughout America.

With nearly 700 members, no chapter has showcased this shining standard more than Kentucky's NWRA chapter. For example, solid waste in Louisville has a diversion rate that is twice as efficient as comparable sized cities.

Solid waste and recycling collection in Louisville is no easy task. Metro Louisville consists of 83 incorporated cities, numerous homeowners' associations, and the Urban Services District collected by Metro Public Works. Despite these challenges, Kentucky's NWRA chapter continues to meet and exceed all expectations.

I am proud to salute the Kentucky NWRA chapter for their continued service and accomplishments, and I have no doubt they will continue to play an integral role in bettering the Commonwealth.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DOVER ADULT LEARNING CENTER

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to recognize the Dover Adult Learning Center—DALC—on its 50th anniversary. For five decades, the hard-working team at the DALC has supported thousands of adult learners in their quest to reinforce their learning skills and improve their lives through high-quality adult education. I join a grateful community in saluting them for the indispensable service they provide not only to each participant, but also to local partners and businesses who benefit from an educated and engaged workforce.

We all know that an education is the key to unlocking so many doors of opportunity. These doors could lead to a fulfilling new job, a hard-earned promotion at a current place of work, or additional education and training at a community college. No matter the destination, the Dover Adult Learning Center works closely with community members throughout their educational journey to identify personal goals and provide tailored instruction that guides them toward their full potential. The center offers an inviting atmosphere where students of all types—including people with disabilities, people who are homeless or unemployed, teens who might otherwise drop out of high school or immigrants learning English—feel comfortable honing their reading, writing, math, and digital literacy skills. At the Dover Adult Learning Center, a high-quality adult education is always within reach.

Each June, the Dover Adult Learning Center holds a graduation ceremony where participants are able to celebrate the successful completion of their program alongside family, friends, center staff, and volunteer tutors. It is a time to reflect on a period of personal growth and achievement. It is also a chance to look forward with hope. For many graduates, an exciting future with new possibilities is only just beginning. Through their experience at the Dover Adult Learning Center, they are given the tools to venture into this new world with an open mind and a lifelong appreciation for learning.

As a former teacher at the Dover Adult Learning Center, I know from personal experience how hard the center works to provide these programs and accommodate each participant through a variety of learning options, flexible schedules, and access to supportive services like childcare. Its staff and educators are creative in connecting and engaging with each student, and they are always there to offer support and guidance. We should take a moment to thank all of the teachers, staff, and volunteers for the skill, dedication, and passion that they bring to their roles at the center each and every day.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in congratulating the Dover Adult Learning Center on five decades of service and wishing its team all the best as they continue their important work in the coming years.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2490. An act to establish the Blackwell School National Historic Site in Marfa, Texas, 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. 1433. An act to reauthorize the Helen Keller National Center for Youths and Adults Who Are Deaf-Blind.

H.R. 4009. An act to authorize the Georgetown African American Historic Landmark Project and Tour to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4358. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Little Manatee River as a component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6265. An act to require a strategy by the United States Government to disrupt and dismantle the Captagon trade and narcotics networks of Bashar al-Assad in Syria.

H.R. 6846. An act to require a review of sanctions with respect to Russian kleptocrats and human rights abusers.

H.R. 7240. An act to reauthorize the READ Act.

H.R. 7338. An act to require congressional notification prior to payments of Department of State rewards using cryptocurrencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8453. An act to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign persons undermining the Dayton Peace Agreement or threatening the security of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8503. An act to require the development of a strategy to promote the use of secure telecommunications infrastructure worldwide, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8520. An act to establish certain reporting and other requirements relating to telecommunications equipment and services produced or provided by certain entities, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore {Mr. LEAHY) announced that on today, September 21, 2022, he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 8656. An act to designate the clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Mishawaka, Indiana, as the ''Jackie Walorski VA Clinic''.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1433. An act to reauthorize the Helen Keller National Center for Youths and Adults Who Are Deaf-Blind; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 4009. An act to authorize the Georgetown African American Historic Landmark Project and Tour to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4358. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Little Manatee River as a component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6265. An act to require a strategy by the United States Government to disrupt and dismantle the Captagon trade and narcotics networks of Bashar al-Assad in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 6846. An act to require a review of sanctions with respect to Russian kleptocrats and human rights abusers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 7338. An act to require congressional notification prior to payments of Department of State rewards using cryptocurrencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 8453. An act to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign persons undermining the Dayton Peace Agreement or threatening the security of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 8503. An act to require the development of a strategy to promote the use of secure telecommunications infrastructure worldwide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 8520. An act to establish certain reporting and other requirements relating to telecommunications equipment and services produced or provided by certain entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–5141. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of

Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reproductive Health Services'' (RIN2900–AR57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5142. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Principle-based Ethics Framework for Access to and Use of Veteran Data'' (RIN2900–AR52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5143. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Informed Consent and Advance Directives'' (RIN2900–AQ97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5144. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Individuals Using the Department of Veterans Affairs' Information Technology Systems to Access Records Relevant to a Benefit Claim'' (RIN2900–AQ81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5145. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs'' (RIN2900–AP02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5146. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled ''Veterans Benefit Programs Improvement Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5147. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled ''Veterans Health Care Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5148. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled ''Department of Veterans Affairs Miscellaneous Programs Improvement Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5149. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017 Implementation'' (RIN2900–AR19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5150. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled, ''Veterans Memorial Affairs Improvement Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5151. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–5152. A communication from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Annual Fee Calculation'' (RIN3141–AA77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5153. A communication from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Facility License Notification'' (RIN3141–AA76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5154. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Repayment of Candidate Loans'' (Notice 2022–17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2022; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–5155. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Repayment of Candidate Loans'' (Notice 2022–17) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 177. A bill to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Cerro de la Olla Wilderness in the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument and to modify the boundary of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument (Rept. No. 117–151).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1128. A bill to provide for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance to the University of Alaska of certain public land in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–152).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1222. A bill to designate and adjust certain lands in the State of Utah as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–153).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 1321. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–154).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 1631. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land in the State of Arizona to the Arizona Board of Regents, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–155).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1942. A bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–156).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 2438. A bill to modify the boundary of the Cane River Creole National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–157).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3266. A bill to improve recreation opportunities on, and facilitate greater access to, Federal public land, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–158).

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. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 4902. A bill to address the preference for United States industry with respect to patent rights in inventions made with Department of Homeland Security research assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 4903. A bill to reauthorize the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act to promote the protection of the resources of the Northwest Straits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4904. A bill to address the forest health crisis on the National Forest System and public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING:

S. 4905. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide for 3 primary care visits and 3 behavioral health care visits without application of any cost-sharing requirement; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4906. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the National Neurological Conditions Surveillance System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4907. A bill to condition civil and military assistance to the Government of Colombia on certain recurring certifications from the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 4908. A bill to improve the visibility, accountability, and oversight of agency software asset management practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 4909. A bill to increase authorizations for the passenger ferry competitive grant program and the ferry boats and terminal facilities formula grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 4910. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Office of Personnel Management to annually collect data relating to the Federal workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 4911. A bill to provide for noncompetitive appointments in the competitive service for high-performing Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 4912. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to repay a portion of student law default, to make student loan debts dischargeable in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 4913. A bill to establish the duties of the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency regarding open source software security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4914. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to designate certain Mexican drug cartels as foreign terrorist organizations, and to submit a report to Congress justifying such designations in accordance with section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 4915. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 4916. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 787. A resolution recognizing the vital importance of the Mekong River to Southeast Asia and the role of the Mekong-United States Partnership in supporting the prosperity of the region; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 788. A resolution designating the week of September 19 through September 23, 2022, as ''Malnutrition Awareness Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KING, and Mr. DAINES)):

S. Res. 789. A resolution designating October 12, 2022 as ''National Loggers Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSSOFF:

S. Res. 790. A resolution condemning the atrocities that occurred in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1906, in which White supremacist mobs brutalized, terrorized, and killed dozens of Black Americans, and reaffirming the commitment of the Senate to combating hatred, injustice, and White supremacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 844

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employees duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate certain limitations with respect to pre-production plastic pellet pollution, and for other purposes.

S. 1574

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1574, a bill to codify a statutory definition for long-term care pharmacies.

S. 1848

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) were added as cosponsors of S. 1848, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1863, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve access to health care for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2014

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2014, a bill to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for tax returns outside the statute of limitations.

S. 2513

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the application and review process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for clothing allowance claims submitted by veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2609

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2609, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equitable payment for, and preserve Medicare beneficiary access to, diagnostic radiopharmaceuticals under the Medicare hospital outpatient prospective payment system.

S. 3295

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

S. 3347

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3347, a bill to identify and impose sanctions with respect to persons who are responsible for or complicit in abuses toward dissidents on behalf of the Government of Iran.

S. 3389

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3389, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a demonstration project to improve outpatient clinical care for individuals with sickle cell disease.

S. 3508

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3508, a bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley.

S. 3686

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3686, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide education and training on eating disorders for health care providers and communities, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) 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. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4105, a bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 4111

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4111, a bill to support research and State management efforts relating to chronic wasting disease, and for other purposes.

S. 4325

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4325, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 4381

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4381, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to nursing facility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 4416

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) 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. 4449

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4449, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the accuracy of market-based Medicare payment for clinical diagnostic laboratory services, to reduce administrative burdens in the collection of data, and for other purposes.

S. 4500

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4500, a bill to expand youth access to voting, and for other purposes.

S. 4573

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4573, a bill to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the Electoral Count Act, and to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to provide clear guidelines for when and to whom resources are provided by the Administrator of General Services for use in connection with the preparations for the assumption of official duties as President or Vice President.

S. 4602

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4602, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for school meals, and for other purposes.

S. 4702

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4702, a bill to impose limits on excepting competitive service positions from the competitive service, and for other purposes.

S. 4816

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4816, a bill to require the Archivist of the United States to submit to Congress a comprehensive plan for reducing the backlog of requests for records from the National Personnel Records Center, and for other purposes.

S. 4892

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4892, a bill to require elementary and middle schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before changing a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form, allowing a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms.

S.J. RES. 56

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 56, a joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 5500

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5500 intended to be proposed to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Doc. 117–1, amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the ''Kigali Amendment'').

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 4916. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, in introducing the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act of 2022. This bill would update and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs, which have provided life-saving services and housing for America's homeless youth for nearly half a century.

Homelessness is affecting youth in truly staggering numbers. According to the National Network for Youth, an estimated 4.2 million young people experience homelessness at some point each year. Some of these youth may be away from home for a few nights, while others have been living on the streets for years. No area of this country is immune from the scourge of homelessness, as it impacts rural and urban communities alike.

Tragically, runaway and homeless youth are at high risk of victimization, abuse, criminal activity, and even death. This population is at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. Many are unable to continue with school and are more likely to enter our juvenile criminal justice system. The reality is that available data likely underestimate the scale and consequences of this problem.

I have met with teachers, social workers, and others from Maine who work directly with young people experiencing homelessness. We talked about the pressure that student homelessness places on teachers, school administrators, and their already strapped resources, and—most important—the homeless students themselves. I have also visited New Beginnings in Lewiston, where I saw firsthand how Runaway and Homeless Youth Act resources are providing essential safety nets for young people in need. The staff at New Beginnings helps young people with case management, provides referrals to State and local agencies, assists with housing needs and access to shelter, and connects individuals to local educational and employment programs.

Several years ago, as the chair of the Senate Transportation and Housing Appropriations Subcommittee, I held a hearing that featured testimony from Brittany Dixon, a former homeless youth from Auburn, ME, who gave powerful testimony on her personal experience with homelessness. After becoming homeless, Brittany was connected with New Beginnings. In her testimony, she said, ''New Beginnings provided many resources I could use to succeed, including assistance with college applications and financial aid. . . . New Beginnings has helped me to develop critical life skills and to become self-sufficient.'' ''Programs that support homeless youth are important to

so many young people like me,'' she added. ''It gives young people the chance to have a safe place to stay while they get their footing and figure out what they want to do in their lives.''

Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs helped make Brittany's success story possible. Sadly, however, there are still many homeless youth who do not have the support they need. We must build on our past efforts because homeless youth should have the same opportunities to succeed as their peers.

The three existing Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs—the Basic Center Program, the Street Outreach Program, and the Transitional Living Program—help community-based organizations reach young people when they need support the most. These programs help runaway and homeless youth avoid the juvenile justice system, and early intervention can help them escape victimization and trafficking.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act would reauthorize and strengthen these programs that help homeless youth meet their immediate needs, and it would help secure long-term residential services for those who cannot be safely reunited with their families. Our legislation would also create a new program—the Prevention Services Program—designed to help prevent youth from running away and becoming homeless in the first place. Moreover, our bill supports wraparound services for victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation.

Mr. President, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act will support those young people who run away, are forced out of their homes, or are disconnected from their families. A caring and safe place to sleep, eat, grow, study, and develop is critical for all young people. The programs reauthorized and modernized through this legislation help extend those basic services to the most vulnerable youth in our communities.

I thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 787—RECOGNIZING THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF THE MEKONG RIVER TO SOUTHEAST ASIA AND THE ROLE OF THE MEKONG-UNITED STATES PARTNERSHIP IN SUPPORTING THE PROSPERITY OF THE REGION

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 787

Whereas the Mekong River supports the livelihoods of approximately 60,000,000 people, making it the most important river in Southeast Asia and one of the most important rivers in the world;

Whereas the Mekong-United States Partnership, comprising the United States, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, and the predecessor of that partnership, the Lower Mekong Initiative, have contributed greatly to the economic, social, and human resources development of the countries in the Mekong River Basin and the protection of the Mekong River;

Whereas the United States has long-standing diplomatic relations with the countries in the Mekong River Basin, including a nearly 200-year-old relationship with treaty ally Thailand;

Whereas the development of the countries in the Mekong River Basin is critical for the unity, economic strength, and institutional development of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, a strategic partner of the United States;

Whereas the Mekong River is increasingly imperiled by the threats of climate change and the construction of upstream dams that have altered the natural flow of the river and vital ecological processes supported by natural flow;

Whereas, since 2019, the flow of water in the Mekong River during the wet season has been abnormally low;

Whereas the Nuozhadu and Xiaowan Dams in China account for more than 50 percent of the water storage of all dams in the Mekong River Basin and can restrict up to 10 percent of the total wet season flow of the Mekong River, exacerbating drought conditions downstream;

Whereas the Mekong River Commission is an integral partner in ensuring the long-term health of the Mekong River;

Whereas the Ayeyawady-Chao Phraya-Mekong Economic Cooperation Strategy can be a leader in supporting river development and protection;

Whereas the Mekong Dam Monitor, funded partly by the Mekong-United States Partnership, has provided essential data and information about the impacts of hydropower dams along the Mekong River to the people and governments of the Mekong River Basin to allow them to prepare for irregular water flows and mitigate the economic and environmental impacts of those flows;

Whereas the Mekong River has become a hub for criminal elements to traffic in drugs, people, and wildlife, undermining the rule of law in the countries in the Mekong River Basin and impacting the world through the proliferation of illegal drugs and fauna that can cause spillover of zoonotic diseases;

Whereas the international community has committed to support the development of countries along the Mekong River through internationally recognized development goals;

Whereas the Friends of the Mekong, which includes the countries in the Mekong River Basin, the United States, Australia, the European Union, Japan, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, the Asian Development Bank, the Mekong River Commission Secretariat, and the World Bank, is committed to supporting the shared principles that have underpinned peace and prosperity across the Indo-Pacific for decades;

Whereas close coordination and collaboration with civil society groups throughout the Mekong River Basin is essential to the protection of the Mekong River;

Whereas, among the countries in the Mekong River Basin, there has been a negative trend toward the detention and detainment of civil society actors and journalists and an increase in violations of human rights;

Whereas the February 1, 2021, military coup in Burma was illegal and unjustified and has resulted in more than 2,000 deaths, more than 1,000,000 people displaced, and tens of thousands of people in detention, and continued violence threatens the stability of the entire region, especially those countries along the borders of Burma; and

Whereas diaspora communities from countries in the Mekong River Basin are a vital part of the United States and help build thriving people-to-people ties between those countries and the United States that lead to strong commercial, civil society, and cultural ties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses sincere concern over the environmental, economic, and humanitarian threats to the Mekong River and the communities of the Mekong River and continued support to counter those threats; and

(2) declares it is the policy of the United States Government to—

(A) through the Mekong-United States Partnership and the Friends of the Mekong, promote the economic and environmental well-being of the people of Mainland Southeast Asia in the 5 countries through which the Mekong River flows, namely, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam;

(B) support a whole-of-government approach in providing and coordinating Federal aid and assistance throughout the Mekong River Basin under the Mekong-United States Partnership, including programmatic support provided by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other Federal agencies;

(C) contribute to the development of quality infrastructure, the development of national electricity markets, cross-border energy trade, the facilitation of cross-border transport, renewable and clean energy acceleration and deployment, the development of micro, small, and medium enterprises, agriculture, transportation, the facilitation of trade and investment, strengthened subregional production linkages and supply chains, digital infrastructure, and the digital economy in the Mekong River Basin;

(D) promote engagement and buy-in of the United States private sector to support the long-term inclusive economic growth, resilience, global health, education, and sustainable development of the region;

(E) leverage the expertise of the United States, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Australia, and other partners in high-quality infrastructure to support the economic development needs of the countries in the Mekong River Basin;

(F) support the development of quality infrastructure, including through projects financed by the United States International Development Finance Corporation, in the countries in the Mekong River Basin;

(G) encourage all members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to view the environmental, humanitarian, and economic threats to the Mekong River as a danger to the entire region;

(H) promote sustainable water use, natural resources management, and environmental conservation and protection, including—

(i) through support for a technically sound, well-coordinated, and consensus-based approach to managing the shared resources of the Mekong River Basin;

(ii) through support for environmental conservation, protection, and resilience in the Mekong subregion; and

(iii) by enhancing the capacity of countries in the Mekong River Basin in the sustainable conservation and management of natural resources, including fishery resources, for sustainable food security;

(I) continue the important work that provides vital data and monitoring to the people and governments of the Mekong River;

(J) support the development of the capacity of the region to respond to a variety of threats, including countering transnational crime such as trafficking of drugs, wildlife, timber, and persons, and criminal activity associated with illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, and to improve health security, including emergency preparedness and response for pandemics and epidemics, cybersecurity, and disaster response and preparedness and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief;

(K) promote the development of human capital through education, medical and laboratory research and development, vocational training, youth empowerment, women's economic empowerment, gender equality, university cooperation, and educational and professional exchanges;

(L) work together with countries in the Mekong River Basin to combat the impacts of climate change and support the resiliency of those countries;

(M) encourage all countries in the Mekong River Basin to provide timely early warning for natural and unnatural operations of the river;

(N) support freedom of expression in the countries in the Mekong River Basin through promoting independent journalism and the freedom to access information;

(O) continue to call for the cessation of violence in Burma and support the return of Burma to a path of inclusive democracy, so that it can fully contribute to regional development;

(P) prioritize the strengthening of people-to-people ties through United States exchange programs such as the Fulbright Program, the Peace Corps, the International Visitors Leadership Program, and the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative Program, including the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative Academy at Fulbright University Vietnam; and

(Q) recognize that strong democratic institutions, the protection of human rights, independent civil society, and free and fair elections are central to implementing the shared vision of a Mekong River region, and an Indo-Pacific region, that is free, open, secure, prosperous, and sustainable.

SENATE RESOLUTION 788—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 19 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 23, 2022, AS ''MALNUTRITION AWARENESS WEEK''

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 788

Whereas malnutrition is the condition that occurs when an individual does not get enough protein, calories, or nutrients;

Whereas malnutrition is a significant problem in the United States and around the world, crossing all age, racial, class, gender, and geographic lines;

Whereas malnutrition can be driven by social determinants of health, including poverty or economic instability, access to affordable healthcare, and low health literacy;

Whereas there are inextricable and cyclical links between poverty and malnutrition;

Whereas communities of color, across all age groups, are disproportionately likely to experience both food insecurity and malnutrition;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture defines food insecurity as when an individual or household does not have regular, reliable access to the foods needed for good health;

Whereas Black children are almost 3 times more likely to live in a food-insecure household than White children;

Whereas infants, older adults, individuals with chronic diseases, and other vulnerable populations are particularly at risk for malnutrition;

Whereas the American Academy of Pediatrics has found that failure to provide key nutrients during early childhood may result in lifelong deficits in brain function;

Whereas disease-associated malnutrition affects between 30 and 50 percent of patients admitted to hospitals, and the medical costs of hospitalized patients with malnutrition can be 300 percent more than the medical costs of properly nourished patients;

Whereas, according to the ''National Blueprint: Achieving Quality Malnutrition Care for Older Adults, 2020 Update'', as many as ½ of older adults living in the United States are malnourished or at risk for malnutrition;

Whereas, according to recent Aging Network surveys, 76 percent of older adults receiving meals at senior centers and other congregate facilities report improved health outcomes, and 84 percent of older adults receiving home-delivered meals indicate the same;

Whereas disease-associated malnutrition in older adults alone costs the United States more than $51,300,000,000 each year; and

Whereas the American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition established Malnutrition Awareness Week to raise awareness about, and promote the prevention of, malnutrition across the lifespan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 19 through September 23, 2022, as ''Malnutrition Awareness Week'';

(2) recognizes registered dietitian nutritionists and other nutrition professionals, health care providers, school foodservice workers, social workers, advocates, caregivers, and other professionals and agencies for their efforts to advance awareness about, treatments for, and the prevention of malnutrition;

(3) recognizes the importance of existing Federal nutrition programs, such as the nutrition programs under title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) and Federal child nutrition programs, for their role in combating malnutrition;

(4) supports increased funding for the critical programs described in paragraph (3);

(5) recognizes—

(A) the importance of medical nutrition therapy under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); and

(B) the need for vulnerable populations to have access to nutrition counseling;

(6) recognizes the importance of the innovative research conducted by the National Institutes of Health on—

(A) nutrition, dietary patterns, and the human gastrointestinal microbiome; and

(B) how those factors influence the prevention or development of chronic disease throughout the lifespan;

(7) supports access to malnutrition screening and assessment for all patients;

(8) encourages the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to evaluate the implementation of newly-approved malnutrition electronic clinical quality measures; and

(9) acknowledges—

(A) the importance of access to healthy food for children, especially in child care settings and schools; and

(B) the benefits of evidence-based nutrition standards.

SENATE RESOLUTION 789—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 12, 2022 AS ''NATIONAL LOGGERS DAY''

Mr. DURBIN (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KING, and Mr. DAINES)) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 789

Whereas the logging industry has served as an economic driver and cultural tradition in the United States for centuries;

Whereas the logging industry creates rural jobs and provides revenue for local and State governments and National Forests;

Whereas loggers provide renewable material for products used by people in the United States every day;

Whereas loggers are the first link in the $300,000,000,000 domestic forest products supply chain;

Whereas loggers are the means by which healthy forest management plans are accomplished;

Whereas logging provides for healthy forests that maintain vital animal habitats;

Whereas logging provides for healthy forests which—

(1) protect watersheds;

(2) sequester carbon;

(3) provide public recreational opportunities; and

(4) reduce loss of life and property from wildfires; and

Whereas logging provides for healthy forests through regeneration, including planting 2,500,000,000 trees annually: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 12, 2022, as ''National Loggers Day''; and

(2) encourages the President to officially designate October 12th as ''National Loggers Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 790—CONDEMNING THE ATROCITIES THAT OCCURRED IN ATLANTA, GEORGIA, IN 1906, IN WHICH WHITE SUPREMACIST MOBS BRUTALIZED, TERRORIZED, AND KILLED DOZENS OF BLACK AMERICANS, AND REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE SENATE TO COMBATING HATRED, INJUSTICE, AND WHITE SUPREMACY

Mr. OSSOFF submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 790

Whereas the horrific act of lynching impacted race relations in the United States and shaped the geographic, political, social, and economic conditions of Black people in ways that are still relevant today;

Whereas more than 4,400 Black people were lynched across 20 States between 1877 and 1950, 594 of whom were Black victims in Georgia and 36 of those documented victims were killed in Fulton County;

Whereas, until 1906, Atlanta, Georgia, was home to more than 50,000 Black residents, many of whom owned homes and businesses in the city;

Whereas, on September 22, 1906, at 9 p.m., 10,000 White men and boys gathered at the corner of Pryor and Decatur Streets, an area known as Five Points in downtown Atlanta;

Whereas the mob was motivated by the media's false coverage of Black men brutalizing White women;

Whereas city officials, which included Mayor James G. Woodward, attempted to calm the crowds but failed to do so;

Whereas, going through Decatur Street, Pryor Street, Central Avenue, and throughout the central business district, assaulting hundreds of Black people, the mob of White men and boys continued to hunt and kill Atlanta's Black residents into the night;

Whereas, in an attempt to control the mob, Mayor Woodward called the fire department out to disperse the mob using large streams of water, but the mob quickly regathered and continued to shoot and stone Atlanta's Black residents;

Whereas, by Monday, September 24, 1906, what is now known as Downtown Atlanta, was under military rule;

Whereas the massacre continued, with plans to move outside of the city and into Brownsville, a Black community south of downtown with about 1,500 residents;

Whereas the community gathered to prepare and fight back, and with great fear of a counterattack they were disarmed by State Troops, and more than 250 African American men were arrested;

Whereas, through the duration of the massacre, armed Black residents defended their neighborhoods, both in Brownsville and in Dark Town;

Whereas at least 25 Black residents were murdered, 2 White men were killed, hundreds of Black residents were wounded, and thousands of Black businesses and homes were burned or destroyed;

Whereas the story of the Atlanta race massacre is only 1 of many such atrocities and horrific incidents, and shows the lasting impact of White supremacy in the United States; and

Whereas the theft of property from Black landowners as well as the displacement caused by the terrorizing of the Black community in Atlanta, Georgia, shows how historic racism and injustice have significantly contributed to persistent wealth inequality between Black and White Americans in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the actions of the White supremacist mobs that drove out Black residents of Atlanta, Georgia;

(2) honors the memory of the victims and acknowledges the lasting impact that this incident has had on the Black community of Atlanta, Georgia;

(3) expresses support for the designation of a national day of remembrance for the victims of forced migrations of Black Americans throughout United States history; and

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the Federal Government to combat White supremacy and seek reconciliation for racial injustice.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5518. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Doc. 117–1, Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the ''Kigali Amendment'').

SA 5519. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5520. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5521. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H .R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5522. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H .R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5523. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5524. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5525. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5526. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5527. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5528. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5529. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5530. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5531. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5532. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5533. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5534. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5535. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5536. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5537. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5538. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5539. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5540. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5541. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5542. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5543. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5544. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5545. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5546. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5547. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED

(for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5548. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5549. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5550. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5551. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5552. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5553. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5554. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5555. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5556. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5557. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5558. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5559. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5560. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5561. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5562. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5563. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5564. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COTTON, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5565. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5566. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5567. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5568. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5569. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5570. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5518. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Doc. 117–1, Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the ''Kigali Amendment''); as follows:

In section 1, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS AND A CONDITION**''.

In section 1, strike ''declaration of section 2'' and insert ''declarations of section 2 and the condition of section 3''.

In section 2, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS**''.

In section 2, strike ''following declaration'' and all that follows through the period at the end and insert the following: ''following declarations:

(1) The Kigali amendment is not self-executing.

(2) The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following condition: Prior to the Thirty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer a proposal to amend Decision I/12E, ''Clarification of terms and definitions: developing countries,'' made at the First Meeting of the Parties, to remove the People's Republic of China.

SA 5519. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10____. ZERO-EMISSION VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE AT GSA FACILITIES OR CAMPUSES.

(a) ANNUAL GOALS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'') shall develop—

(1) annual goals for the deployment of zero-emission vehicle infrastructure, including electric vehicle supply equipment, at facilities or campuses of the General Services Administration (referred to in this section as ''GSA facilities or campuses'') such that by December 31, 2030, not less than 90 percent of GSA facilities or campuses with 200 or more daily employees and visitors offer zero-emission vehicle charging or fueling infrastructure; and

(2) guidance to ensure progress towards the annual goals developed under paragraph (1).

(b) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall prepare a detailed plan—

(1) to achieve the goals developed under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) that—

(A) identifies particular GSA facilities or campuses as priority facilities or campuses, as applicable, at which to achieve those goals, including by considering—

(i) demand for zero-emission vehicle charging and fueling;

(ii) locations of zero-emission vehicle fleets of the General Services Administration and tenant Federal agencies;

(iii) locations relevant to State zero-emission vehicle charging and fueling needs;

(iv) geographical gaps in zero-emission vehicle charging infrastructure;

(v) availability of incentives; and

(vi) other factors, as determined by the Administrator; and

(B) includes a requirement that all applicable electric vehicle supply equipment at GSA facilities or campuses is certified under the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a).

(c) INCLUSION IN PROJECTS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall ensure that appropriate zero-emission

vehicle infrastructure, including electric vehicle supply equipment and zero-emission vehicle fueling infrastructure, is included in, with respect to a GSA facility or campus—

(1) any prospectus for a construction, alteration, or lease project;

(2) any prospectus for an alteration of a leased building;

(3) any contract for parking lot paving or repaving; and

(4) any other appropriate project, as determined by the Administrator.

(d) FUNDING.—The Administrator may use amounts made available under section 60504 of Public Law 117–169 (commonly known as the ''Inflation Reduction Act'')—

(1) to achieve the zero-emission vehicle infrastructure goals developed under subsection (a)(1), including through carrying out projects in support of those goals; and

(2) for the cost of any additional employees, contractors, and training needed to support those goals.

SA 5520. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10___. TREATMENT OF PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM LOAN FORGIVENESS OF PAYROLL COSTS UNDER HIGHWAY AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROJECT COST-REIMBURSEMENT CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 31.201–5 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), for the purposes of any cost-reimbursement contract awarded in accordance with section 112 of title 23, United States Code, or section 5325 of title 49, United States Code, or any subcontract under such a contract, no cost reduction or cash refund (including through a reduced indirect cost rate) shall be due to the Department of Transportation or to a State transportation department, transit agency, or other recipient of assistance under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, or chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, on the basis of forgiveness of the payroll costs of a covered loan (as those terms are defined in section 7A(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636m(a))) issued under the paycheck protection program under section 7(a)(36) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)).

(b) SAVING PROVISION.—Nothing in this section amends or exempts the prohibitions and liabilities under section 3729 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) TERMINATION.—This section ceases to be effective on June 30, 2025.

SA 5521. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PROHIBITION ON SMOKING IN FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1715 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1715. Prohibition on smoking in facilities of the Veterans Health Administration

''(a) PROHIBITION.—No person (including any veteran, patient, resident, employee of the Department, contractor, or visitor) may smoke on the premises of any facility of the Veterans Health Administration.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'facility of the Veterans Health Administration' means any land or building (including any medical center, nursing home, domiciliary facility, outpatient clinic, or center that provides readjustment counseling) that is—

''(A) under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

''(B) under the control of the Veterans Health Administration; and

''(C) not under the control of the General Services Administration.

''(2) The term 'smoke' includes—

''(A) the use of cigarettes, cigars, pipes, and any other combustion or heating of tobacco; and

''(B) the use of any electronic nicotine delivery system, including electronic or e-cigarettes, vape pens, and e-cigars.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 17 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1715 and inserting the following new item:

''1715. Prohibition on smoking in facilities of the Veterans Health Administration.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 526 of the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–585; 38 U.S.C. 1715 note) is repealed.

SA 5522. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. INVESTMENT, TRADE, AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish a comprehensive United States strategy for public and private investment, trade, and development in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean.

(2) FOCUS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall focus on increasing exports of United States goods and services to Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean by 200 percent in real dollar value by the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the President shall consult with—

(A) Congress;

(B) each agency that is a member of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;

(C) the relevant multilateral development banks, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the respective United States Executive Directors of such banks;

(D) each agency that participates in the Trade Policy Staff Committee;

(E) the President's Export Council;

(F) each of the development agencies;

(G) any other Federal agencies with responsibility for export promotion or financing and development; and

(H) the private sector, including businesses, nongovernmental organizations, and African and Latin American and Caribbean diaspora groups.

(4) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(A) STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress the strategy required by paragraph (1).

(B) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the strategy required by paragraph (1).

(b) SPECIAL AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EXPORT STRATEGY COORDINATORS.—The President shall designate an individual to serve as Special Africa Export Strategy Coordinator and an individual to serve as Special Latin America and the Caribbean Export Strategy Coordinator—

(1) to oversee the development and implementation of the strategy required by subsection (a); and

(2) to coordinate developing and implementing the strategy with—

(A) the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;

(B) the Assistant United States Trade Representative for African Affairs or the Assistant United States Trade Representative for the Western Hemisphere, as appropriate;

(C) the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs or the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, as appropriate;

(D) the Export-Import Bank of the United States;

(E) the United States International Development Finance Corporation; and

(F) the development agencies.

(c) TRADE MISSIONS TO AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—It is the sense of Congress that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce and other high-level officials of the United States Government with responsibility for export promotion, financing, and development should conduct a joint trade missions to Africa and to Latin America and the Caribbean.

(d) TRAINING.—The President shall develop a plan—

(1) to standardize the training received by United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers, economic officers of the Department of State, and economic officers of the United States Agency for International Development with respect to the programs and procedures of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the Small Business Administration, and the United States Trade and Development Agency; and

(2) to ensure that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) all United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers that are stationed overseas receive the training described in paragraph (1); and

(B) in the case of a country to which no United States and Foreign Commercial Service officer is assigned, any economic officer of the Department of State stationed in that country receives that training.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.—The term ''development agencies'' means the United States Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the United States Trade and Development Agency, the United States Department of Agriculture, and relevant multilateral development banks.

(2) MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS.—The term ''multilateral development banks'' has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c)(4) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(4)) and includes the African Development Foundation.

(3) TRADE POLICY STAFF COMMITTEE.—The term ''Trade Policy Staff Committee'' means the Trade Policy Staff Committee established pursuant to section 2002.2 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—The term ''Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee'' means the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee established under section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727).

(5) UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.—The term ''United States and Foreign Commercial Service'' means the United States and Foreign Commercial Service established by section 2301 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721).

SA 5523. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1052. TERMINATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.

(a) FUTURE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.—Any authorization for the use of military force or declaration of war enacted into law after the date of enactment of this Act shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of such authorization or declaration.

(b) EXISTING AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.—Any authorization for the use of military force or declaration of war enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act shall terminate on the date that is 6 months after the date of such enactment.

SA 5524. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Baltic Defense and Deterrence

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Baltic Defense and Deterrence Act''.

SEC. 1282. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) supporting and strengthening the security of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (referred to in this Act as the ''Baltic countries'') is in the national security interests of the United States;

(2) continuing to strengthen and update the United States-Baltics security cooperation roadmap is critical to achieving strategic security priorities as the Baltic countries face ongoing belligerence and threats from the Russian Federation, including amid the Russian Federation's illegal and unprovoked war in Ukraine that began on February 24, 2022;

(3) the United States should encourage advancement of the Three Seas Initiative to strengthen transport, energy, and digital infrastructures among Eastern European countries, including the Baltic countries; and

(4) improved economic ties between the United States and the Baltic countries, including to counter economic pressure by the People's Republic of China, offer an opportunity to strengthen the United States-Baltic strategic partnership.

SEC. 1283. BALTIC SECURITY AND ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State shall establish and implement an initiative, to be known as the ''Baltic Security and Economic Enhancement Initiative'', for the purpose of increasing security and economic ties with the Baltic countries.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Baltic Security and Economic Enhancement Initiative shall be—

(1) to ensure timely delivery of security assistance to the Baltic countries, prioritizing assistance to bolster defenses against hybrid warfare and improve interoperability with the military forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(2) to mitigate the impact on the Baltic countries of economic coercion by the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China;

(3) to identify new opportunities for foreign direct investment and United States business ties; and

(4) to bolster United States support for the economic and energy security needs of the Baltic countries, including by convening an annual trade forum with the Baltic countries and the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State, $60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out the initiative authorized under subsection (a).

SEC. 1284. BALTIC SECURITY INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement an initiative, to be known as the ''Baltic Security Initiative'', for the purpose of deepening security cooperation with the Baltic countries.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Baltic Security Initiative shall be—

(1) to achieve United States national security objectives, including deterring aggression by the Russian Federation and bolstering the long-term security of North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies;

(2) to enhance regional planning and cooperation among the Baltic countries, particularly with respect to long-term regional capability projects, including—

(A) long-range precision fire systems and capabilities;

(B) integrated air and missile defense;

(C) maritime domain awareness;

(D) land forces development, including stockpiling large caliber ammunition;

(E) command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;

(F) special operations forces development; and

(G) coordination with and security enhancements for Poland, which is a neighboring North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally; and

(3) to improve the Baltic countries' cyber defenses and resilience to hybrid threats.

(c) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the Department of Defense to achieve the objectives described in subsection (b).

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include a consideration of—

(A) security assistance programs for the Baltic countries managed by the Department of State;

(B) the ongoing security threats to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's eastern flank posed by Russian aggression, including as a result of the Russian Federation's 2022 invasion of Ukraine with support from Belarus; and

(C) rising tensions with, and presence in the Baltic countries of, the People's Republic of China, including economic bullying of the Baltic countries by the People's Republic of China.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense, $250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out the initiative authorized under subsection (a).

SA 5525. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 144. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF C–40 AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2023 for the Air Force may be obligated to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status any C–40 aircraft.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to an individual C–40 aircraft that the Secretary of the Air Force determines, on a case-by-case basis, to be no longer mission capable because of a Class A mishap.

(2) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that an aircraft is no longer mission capable, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a certification that the status of such aircraft is due to a Class A mishap and not due to lack of maintenance or repairs or other reasons.

SA 5526. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1035. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO OPERATE THE DETENTION FACILITY AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, AFTER SEPTEMBER 30, 2024.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to operate the detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, after September 30, 2024.

SEC. 1036. REPEAL OF PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Section 1035 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 132 Stat. 1954), as most recently amended by section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81; 135 Stat. 1901), is repealed.

(b) USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES.—Section 1033 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 132 Stat. 1953), as most recently amended by section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81; 135 Stat. 1901), is repealed.

(c) USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.—Section 1034 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 132 Stat. 1954), as most recently amended by section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81; 135 Stat. 1901), is repealed.

SEC. 1037. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATIONS AND NOTIFICATIONS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND OTHER FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 969; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is repealed.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Section 308 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–87; 125 Stat. 1883; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is repealed.

SEC. 1038. REPEAL OF CHAPTER 47A OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapters I through VI and subchapter VIII of chapter 47A of title 10, United States Code, are repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SUBCHAPTER VII.—Subchapter VII of chapter 47A of such title is amended—

(1) in section 950d(a)(3), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023)'' after ''of this title'';

(2) in section 950f—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023)'' after ''of this title''; and

(ii) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking ''section 949b(b)(4) of this title'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) No appellate military judge on the United States Court of Military Commission Review may be reassigned to other duties, except under circumstances as follows:

''(A) The appellate military judge voluntarily requests to be reassigned to other duties and the Secretary of Defense, or the designee of the Secretary, in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which the appellate military judge is a member, approves such reassignment.

''(B) The appellate military judge retires or otherwise separates from the armed forces.

''(C) The appellate military judge is reassigned to other duties by the Secretary of Defense, or the designee of the Secretary, in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which the appellate military judge is a member, based on military necessity and such reassignment is consistent with service rotation regulations (to the extent such regulations are applicable).

''(D) The appellate military judge is withdrawn by the Secretary of Defense, or the designee of the Secretary, in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which the appellate military judge is a member, for good cause consistent with applicable procedures under chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).'';

(3) in section 950h(c), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023)'' after ''of this title''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 950k. Definition

''In this subchapter, the term 'military commission under this chapter' means a military commission under this chapter as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters at the beginning of chapter 47A of such title is amended by striking the items relating to subchapters I through VI and subchapter VIII.

SA 5527. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET, strike the amount in the Senate Authorized column and insert ''756,865''.

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Total Aircraft Procurement, Navy, strike the amount in the Senate Authorized column and insert ''19,125,814''.

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Total Procurement, strike the amount in the Senate Authorized column and insert ''158,585,016''.

SA 5528. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXTREMIST ACTIVITY BY A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES: TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COUNSELING; NOTATION IN SERVICE RECORD.

(a) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COUNSELING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(20) In the case of a member who has violated Department of Defense Instruction 1325.06 (or successor instruction) by participating in extremist activity, in-person counseling, developed by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, that includes—

''(A) efforts to deradicalize the member;

''(B) information regarding why extremist activity is inconsistent with service in the armed forces and with national security;

''(C) information regarding the dangers associated with involvement with an extremist group; and

''(D) methods for the member to recognize and avoid disinformation.''.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall complete development of counseling provided under paragraph (20) of such subsection, as added by paragraph (1), not later than the day that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary concerned shall ensure that such counseling is carried out on and after that day.

(b) SERVICE RECORD.—In the case of a member of the Armed Forces who has violated Department of Defense Instruction 1325.06 (or successor instruction) by participating in extremist activity, the Secretary concerned shall ensure that the commanding officer of the member notes the violation in the service record of the member.

(c) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Secretary concerned'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 5529. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION E—DREAM ACT

TITLE LI—DREAM ACT

SEC. 5101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Dream Act''.

SEC. 5102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, any term used in this title that is used in the immigration laws shall have the meaning given such term in the immigration laws.

(2) DACA.—The term ''DACA'' means deferred action granted to an alien pursuant to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program announced by President Obama on June 15, 2012.

(3) DISABILITY.—The term ''disability'' has the meaning given such term in section 3(1) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(1)).

(4) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The term ''early childhood education program'' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003).

(5) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; HIGH SCHOOL; SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The terms ''elementary school'', ''high school'', and ''secondary school'' have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(6) IMMIGRATION LAWS.—The term ''immigration laws'' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)).

(7) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education''—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002); and

(B) does not include an institution of higher education outside of the United States.

(8) PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS.—The term ''permanent resident status on a conditional basis'' means status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis under this title.

(9) POVERTY LINE.—The term ''poverty line'' has the meaning given such term in section 673 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902).

(10) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(11) UNIFORMED SERVICES.—The term ''Uniformed Services'' has the meaning given the term ''uniformed services'' in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 5103. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.

(a) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this section, to have obtained such status on a conditional basis subject to the provisions under this title.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis, an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States or is in temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a), if—

(A) the alien has been continuously physically present in the United States since the date that is 4 years before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) the alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien initially entered the United States;

(C) subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the alien—

(i) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), (10)(A), (10)(C), or (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

(ii) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(iii) has not been convicted of—

(I) any offense under Federal or State law, other than a State offense for which an essential element is the alien's immigration status, that is punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 1 year; or

(II) 3 or more offenses under Federal or State law, other than State offenses for which an essential element is the alien's immigration status, for which the alien was convicted on different dates for each of the 3 offenses and imprisoned for an aggregate of 90 days or more; and

(D) the alien—

(i) has been admitted to an institution of higher education;

(ii) has earned a high school diploma or a commensurate alternative award from a public or private high school, or has obtained a general education development certificate recognized under State law or a high school equivalency diploma in the United States; or

(iii) is enrolled in secondary school or in an education program assisting students in—

(I) obtaining a regular high school diploma or its recognized equivalent under State law; or

(II) in passing a general educational development exam, a high school equivalence diploma examination, or other similar State-authorized exam.

(2) WAIVER.—With respect to any benefit under this title, the Secretary may waive the grounds of inadmissibility under paragraph (2), (6)(E), (6)(G), or (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) for humanitarian purposes or family unity or if the waiver is otherwise in the public interest.

(3) TREATMENT OF EXPUNGED CONVICTIONS.—An expunged conviction shall not automatically be treated as an offense under paragraph (1). The Secretary shall evaluate expunged convictions on a case-by-case basis according to the nature and severity of the offense to determine whether, under the particular circumstances, the Secretary determines that the alien should be eligible for cancellation of removal, adjustment to permanent resident status on a conditional basis, or other adjustment of status.

(4) DACA RECIPIENTS.—Secretary shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis, an alien who was granted DACA unless the alien has engaged in conduct since the alien was granted DACA that would make the alien ineligible for DACA.

(5) APPLICATION FEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may require an alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.

(B) EXEMPTION.—An applicant may be exempted from paying the fee required under subparagraph (A) if the alien—

(i)(I) is younger than 18 years of age;

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; and

(III) is in foster care or otherwise lacking any parental or other familial support;

(ii) is younger than 18 years of age and is homeless;

(iii)(I) cannot care for himself or herself because of a serious, chronic disability; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; or

(iv)(I) during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, accumulated $10,000 or more in debt as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses incurred by the alien or an immediate family member of the alien; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line.

(6) SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.—The Secretary may not grant an alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for aliens who are unable to provide such biometric or biographic data because of a physical impairment.

(7) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall utilize biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate—

(i) to conduct security and law enforcement background checks of an alien seeking permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section; and

(ii) to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for such status.

(B) COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The security and law enforcement background checks of an alien required under subparagraph (A) shall be completed, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, before the date on which the Secretary grants such alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section.

(8) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—An alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional

basis under this section shall undergo a medical examination.

(B) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall prescribe policies and procedures for the nature and timing of the examination required under subparagraph (A).

(9) MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE.—An alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section shall establish that the alien has registered under the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.), if the alien is subject to registration under such Act.

(c) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.—

(1) TERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PERIOD.—Any period of continuous physical presence in the United States of an alien who applies for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section shall not terminate when the alien is served a notice to appear under section 239(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(a)).

(2) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAKS IN PRESENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), an alien shall be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States under subsection (b)(1)(A) if the alien has departed from the United States for any period exceeding 90 days or for any periods, in the aggregate, exceeding 180 days.

(B) EXTENSIONS FOR EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may extend the time periods described in subparagraph (A) for an alien who demonstrates that the failure to timely return to the United States was due to extenuating circumstances beyond the alien's control, including the serious illness of the alien, or death or serious illness of a parent, grandparent, sibling, or child of the alien.

(C) TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY.—Any period of travel outside of the United States by an alien that was authorized by the Secretary may not be counted toward any period of departure from the United States under subparagraph (A).

(d) LIMITATION ON REMOVAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Attorney General may not remove an alien who appears prima facie eligible for relief under this section.

(2) ALIENS SUBJECT TO REMOVAL.—The Secretary shall provide a reasonable opportunity to apply for relief under this section to any alien who requests such an opportunity or who appears prima facie eligible for relief under this section if the alien is in removal proceedings, is the subject of a final removal order, or is the subject of a voluntary departure order.

(3) CERTAIN ALIENS ENROLLED IN ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOL.—

(A) STAY OF REMOVAL.—The Attorney General shall stay the removal proceedings of an alien who—

(i) meets all the requirements under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(1), subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of such subsection;

(ii) is at least 5 years of age; and

(iii) is enrolled in an elementary school, a secondary school, or an early childhood education program.

(B) COMMENCEMENT OF REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—The Secretary may not commence removal proceedings for an alien described in subparagraph (A).

(C) EMPLOYMENT.—An alien whose removal is stayed pursuant to subparagraph (A) or who may not be placed in removal proceedings pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall, upon application to the Secretary, be granted an employment authorization document.

(D) LIFT OF STAY.—The Secretary or Attorney General may not lift the stay granted to an alien under subparagraph (A) unless the alien ceases to meet the requirements under such subparagraph.

(e) EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section or in any other law may be construed to apply a numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this title.

SEC. 5104. TERMS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS.

(a) PERIOD OF STATUS.—Permanent resident status on a conditional basis is—

(1) valid for a period of 8 years, unless such period is extended by the Secretary; and

(2) subject to termination under subsection (c).

(b) NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.—At the time an alien obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis, the Secretary shall provide notice to the alien regarding the provisions of this title and the requirements to have the conditional basis of such status removed.

(c) TERMINATION OF STATUS.—The Secretary may terminate the permanent resident status on a conditional basis of an alien only if the Secretary—

(1) determines that the alien ceases to meet the requirements under paragraph (1)(C) of section 5103(b), subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of that section; and

(2) prior to the termination, provides the alien—

(A) notice of the proposed termination; and

(B) the opportunity for a hearing to provide evidence that the alien meets such requirements or otherwise contest the termination.

(d) RETURN TO PREVIOUS IMMIGRATION STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under subsection (a)(1) or is terminated under subsection (c) or whose application for such status is denied shall return to the immigration status that the alien had immediately before receiving permanent resident status on a conditional basis or applying for such status, as appropriate.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.—An alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under subsection (a)(1) or is terminated under subsection (c) or whose application for such status is denied and who had temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a) immediately before receiving or applying for such permanent resident status on a conditional basis, as appropriate, may not return to such temporary protected status if—

(A) the relevant designation under section 244(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(b)) has been terminated; or

(B) the Secretary determines that the reason for terminating the permanent resident status on a conditional basis renders the alien ineligible for such temporary protected status.

SEC. 5105. REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status granted under this title and grant the alien status as all alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(A) is described in paragraph (1)(C) of section 5103(b), subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of that section;

(B) has not abandoned the alien's residence in the United States; and

(C)(i) has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education or has completed at least 2 years, in good standing, in a program for a bachelor's degree or higher degree in the United States;

(ii) has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge; or

(iii) has been employed for periods totaling at least 3 years and at least 75 percent of the time that the alien has had a valid employment authorization, except that any period during which the alien is not employed while having a valid employment authorization and is enrolled in an institution of higher education, a secondary school, or an education program described in section 5103(b)(1)(D)(iii), shall not count toward the time requirements under this clause.

(2) HARDSHIP EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status and grant the alien status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(A) satisfies the requirements under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1);

(B) demonstrates compelling circumstances for the inability to satisfy the requirements under subparagraph (C) of such paragraph; and

(C) demonstrates that—

(i) the alien has a disability;

(ii) the alien is a full-time caregiver of a minor child; or

(iii) the removal of the alien from the United States would result in extreme hardship to the alien or the alien's spouse, parent, or child who is a national of the United States or is lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(3) CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status granted under this title may not be removed unless the alien demonstrates that the alien satisfies the requirements under section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)).

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an alien who is unable to meet the requirements under such section 312(a) due to disability.

(4) APPLICATION FEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may require aliens applying for lawful permanent resident status under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.

(B) EXEMPTION.—An applicant may be exempted from paying the fee required under subparagraph (A) if the alien—

(i)(I) is younger than 18 years of age;

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; and

(III) is in foster care or otherwise lacking any parental or other familial support;

(ii) is younger than 18 years of age and is homeless;

(iii)(I) cannot care for himself or herself because of a serious, chronic disability; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; or

(iv)(I) during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, the alien accumulated $10,000 or more in debt as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses incurred by the alien or an immediate family member of the alien; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line.

(5) SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.—The Secretary may not remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for applicants who are unable to provide such biometric data because of a physical impairment.

(6) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall utilize biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate—

(i) to conduct security and law enforcement background checks of an alien applying for removal of the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status; and

(ii) to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for removal of such conditional basis

(B) COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The security and law enforcement background checks of an alien required under subparagraph (A) shall be completed, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, before the date on which the Secretary removes the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status.

(b) TREATMENT FOR PURPOSES OF NATURALIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), an alien granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis shall be considered to have been admitted to the United States, and be present in the United States, as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION FOR NATURALIZATION.—An alien may not apply for naturalization while the alien is in permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

SEC. 5106. DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING IDENTITY.—An alien's application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis may include, as proof of identity—

(1) a passport or national identity document from the alien's country of origin that includes the alien's name and the alien's photograph or fingerprint;

(2) the alien's birth certificate and an identity card that includes the alien's name and photograph;

(3) a school identification card that includes the alien's name and photograph, and school records showing the alien's name and that the alien is or was enrolled at the school;

(4) a Uniformed Services identification card issued by the Department of Defense;

(5) any immigration or other document issued by the United States Government bearing the alien's name and photograph; or

(6) a State-issued identification card bearing the alien's name and photograph.

(b) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL PRESENCE IN THE UNITED STATES.—To establish that an alien has been continuously physically present in the United States, as required under section 5103(b)(1)(A), or to establish that an alien has not abandoned residence in the United States, as required under section 5105(a)(1)(B), the alien may submit documents to the Secretary, including—

(1) employment records that include the employer's name and contact information;

(2) records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States;

(3) records of service from the Uniformed Services;

(4) official records from a religious entity confirming the alien's participation in a religious ceremony;

(5) passport entries;

(6) a birth certificate for a child who was born in the United States;

(7) automobile license receipts or registration;

(8) deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts;

(9) tax receipts;

(10) insurance policies;

(11) remittance records;

(12) rent receipts or utility bills bearing the alien's name or the name of an immediate family member of the alien, and the alien's address;

(13) copies of money order receipts for money sent in or out of the United States;

(14) dated bank transactions; or

(15) 2 or more sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien who have direct knowledge of the alien's continuous physical presence in the United States, that contain—

(A) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(B) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(c) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING INITIAL ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES.—To establish under section 5103(b)(1)(B) that an alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien initially entered the United States, an alien may submit documents to the Secretary, including—

(1) an admission stamp on the alien's passport;

(2) records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States;

(3) any document from the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security stating the alien's date of entry into the United States;

(4) hospital or medical records showing medical treatment or hospitalization, the name of the medical facility or physician, and the date of the treatment or hospitalization;

(5) rent receipts or utility bills bearing the alien's name or the name of an immediate family member of the alien, and the alien's address;

(6) employment records that include the employer's name and contact information;

(7) official records from a religious entity confirming the alien's participation in a religious ceremony;

(8) a birth certificate for a child who was born in the United States;

(9) automobile license receipts or registration;

(10) deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts;

(11) tax receipts;

(12) travel records;

(13) copies of money order receipts sent in or out of the country;

(14) dated bank transactions;

(15) remittance records; or

(16) insurance policies.

(d) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ADMISSION TO AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—To establish that an alien has been admitted to an institution of higher education, the alien shall submit to the Secretary a document from the institution of higher education certifying that the alien—

(1) has been admitted to the institution; or

(2) is currently enrolled in the institution as a student.

(e) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF A DEGREE FROM AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—To establish that an alien has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education in the United States, the alien shall submit to the Secretary a diploma or other document from the institution stating that the alien has received such a degree.

(f) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA, GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE, OR A RECOGNIZED EQUIVALENT.—To establish that an alien has earned a high school diploma or a commensurate alternative award from a public or private high school, or has obtained a general educational development certificate recognized under State law or a high school equivalency diploma in the United States, the alien shall submit to the Secretary—

(1) a high school diploma, certificate of completion, or other alternate award;

(2) a high school equivalency diploma or certificate recognized under State law; or

(3) evidence that the alien passed a State-authorized exam, including the general educational development exam, in the United States.

(g) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ENROLLMENT IN AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.—To establish that an alien is enrolled in any school or education program described in section 5103(b)(1)(D)(iii), 5103(d)(3)(A)(iii), or 5105(a)(1)(C), the alien shall submit school records from the United States school that the alien is currently attending that include—

(1) the name of the school; and

(2) the alien's name, periods of attendance, and current grade or educational level.

(h) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EXEMPTION FROM APPLICATION FEES.—To establish that an alien is exempt from an application fee under section 5103(b)(5)(B) or 5105(a)(4)(B), the alien shall submit to the Secretary the following relevant documents:

(1) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH AGE.—To establish that an alien meets an age requirement, the alien shall provide proof of identity, as described in subsection (a), that establishes that the alien is younger than 18 years of age.

(2) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH INCOME.—To establish the alien's income, the alien shall provide—

(A) employment records that have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency;

(B) bank records; or

(C) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien's work and income that contain—

(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(3) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH FOSTER CARE, LACK OF FAMILIAL SUPPORT, HOMELESSNESS, OR SERIOUS, CHRONIC DISABILITY.—To establish that the alien was in foster care, lacks parental or familial support, is homeless, or has a serious, chronic disability, the alien shall provide at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the circumstances that contain—

(A) a statement that the alien is in foster care, otherwise lacks any parental or other familiar support, is homeless, or has a serious, chronic disability, as appropriate;

(B) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(C) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(4) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH UNPAID MEDICAL EXPENSE.—To establish that the alien has debt as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses, the alien shall provide receipts or

other documentation from a medical provider that—

(A) bear the provider's name and address;

(B) bear the name of the individual receiving treatment; and

(C) document that the alien has accumulated $10,000 or more in debt in the past 12 months as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses incurred by the alien or an immediate family member of the alien.

(i) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING QUALIFICATION FOR HARDSHIP EXEMPTION.—To establish that an alien satisfies one of the criteria for the hardship exemption set forth in section 5105(a)(2)(C), the alien shall submit to the Secretary at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the circumstances that warrant the exemption, that contain—

(1) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(2) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(j) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING SERVICES IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.—To establish that an alien has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge, the alien shall submit to the Secretary—

(1) a Department of Defense form DD–214;

(2) a National Guard Report of Separation and Record of Service form 22;

(3) personnel records for such service from the appropriate Uniformed Service; or

(4) health records from the appropriate Uniformed Service.

(k) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EMPLOYMENT.—

IN GENERAL.—An alien may satisfy the employment requirement under section 5105(a)(1)(C)(iii) by submitting records that—

(A) establish compliance with such employment requirement; and

(B) have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency.

(2) OTHER DOCUMENTS.—An alien who is unable to submit the records described in paragraph (1) may satisfy the employment requirement by submitting at least 2 types of reliable documents that provide evidence of employment, including—

(A) bank records;

(B) business records;

(C) employer records;

(D) records of a labor union, day labor center, or organization that assists workers in employment;

(E) sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien's work, that contain—

(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and

(F) remittance records.

(l) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—If the Secretary determines, after publication in the Federal Register and an opportunity for public comment, that any document or class of documents does not reliably establish identity or that permanent resident status on a conditional basis is being obtained fraudulently to an unacceptable degree, the Secretary may prohibit or restrict the use of such document or class of documents.

SEC. 5107. RULEMAKING.

(a) INITIAL PUBLICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish regulations implementing this title in the Federal Register. Such regulations shall allow eligible individuals to immediately apply affirmatively for the relief available under section 5103 without being placed in removal proceedings.

(b) INTERIM REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the regulations published pursuant to subsection (a) shall be effective, on an interim basis, immediately upon publication in the Federal Register, but may be subject to change and revision after public notice and opportunity for a period of public comment.

(c) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which interim regulations are published under this section, the Secretary shall publish final regulations implementing this title.

(d) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—The requirements under chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act''), shall not apply to any action to implement this title.

SEC. 5108. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not disclose or use information provided in applications filed under this title or in requests for DACA for the purpose of immigration enforcement.

(b) REFERRALS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not refer any individual who has been granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis or who was granted DACA to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or any designee of either such entity.

(c) LIMITED EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), information provided in an application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis or a request for DACA may be shared with Federal security and law enforcement agencies—

(1) for assistance in the consideration of an application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis;

(2) to identify or prevent fraudulent claims;

(3) for national security purposes; or

(4) for the investigation or prosecution of any felony not related to immigration status.

(d) PENALTY.—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000.

SEC. 5109. RESTORATION OF STATE OPTION TO DETERMINE RESIDENCY FOR PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1623) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal under subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the original enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–546).

SA 5530. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. ACCESS TO PAY AND BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE COMPONENTS WHILE REQUESTS FOR RELIGIOUS AND HEALTH ACCOMMODATIONS ARE PENDING.

A member of the National Guard or another reserve component of the Armed Forces shall maintain access to pay and benefits while a request of the member for a religious or health accommodation is pending.

SA 5531. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 589. LIMITATION ON INVOLUNTARY SEPARATION OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES BASED ON COVID–19 VACCINATION STATUS.

A member of an active or reserve component of the Armed Forces may not be involuntarily separated from the Armed Forces based solely on the vaccination status of the member with respect to COVID–19 until the Armed Forces have achieved the end strengths authorized under section 401.

SA 5532. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 1254. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCREASING PORT AND AIRFIELD CAPACITY OF COUNTRIES IN INDO-PACIFIC REGION.

It is the sense of Congress that, as the People's Republic of China continues to grow in influence through infrastructure (specifically infrastructure that can easily be shifted from economic to military uses), the United States International Development Finance Corporation should prioritize providing alternative financing opportunities that increase port and air field capacity of countries throughout the Indo-Pacific region that—

(1) are targets of the predatory infrastructure development scheme of the People's Republic of China; and

(2) are eligible for support provided by the Corporation under title II of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (22 U.S.C. 9621 et seq.).

SA 5533. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. RECOGNITION OF SERVICE OF THE USS OKLAHOMA CITY AND CREW.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The USS Oklahoma City is a nuclear-powered fast attack submarine named after Oklahoma City, the capital and most populous city in Oklahoma, and is the second ship in the history of the Navy to bear that name.

(2) The motto of the USS Oklahoma City is ''The Sooner, The Better'', which is a testament to both the spirit of the people of Oklahoma City and the readiness of the 140-person crew of the USS Oklahoma City.

(3) The USS Oklahoma City was christened and launched on November 2, 1985, sponsored by Linda M. Nickles, and was commissioned for service on July 9, 1988, with Commander Kevin John Reardon as the first commanding officer of the submarine.

(4) Since the commissioning of the USS Oklahoma City, the USS Oklahoma City has traveled around the globe multiple times and has served in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, the Pacific, and, most recently, Apra Harbor, Guam.

(5) In the aftermath of the April 19, 1995, bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, the crew of the USS Oklahoma City donated blood in support of the victims of the deadliest act of homegrown terrorism in the history of the United States, which resulted in the deaths of 168 individuals.

(6) The USS Oklahoma City was the first Navy submarine to transition from navigation using paper charts to an all-electronic navigation suite.

(7) On Friday, May 20, 2022, the inactivation ceremony for the USS Oklahoma City was held in Puget Sound Naval Shipyard to honor nearly 34 years of service.

(8) Throughout the career of the USS Oklahoma City, the USS Oklahoma City supported a range of missions, including anti-surface warfare, anti-submarine warfare, targeted strike missions, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions.

(b) RECOGNITION OF SERVICE.—Congress recognizes the service of the Los Angeles-class attack submarine the USS Oklahoma City and the crew of the USS Oklahoma City, who served the United States with valor and bravery.

SA 5534. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 589. PROHIBITED EXTREMIST ACTIVITIES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall amend Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1325.06 to provide that military personnel may not actively engage in, threaten, or advocate—

(1) conduct that promotes illegal discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, religion, ethnicity, or national origin; or

(2) conduct that threatens or advocate the use of force, violence, or criminal activity to achieve political or ideological objectives.

SA 5535. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. ENSURING RELIABLE SUPPLY OF RARE EARTH MINERALS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The People's Republic of China is the global leader in mining, refining, and component manufacturing of rare earth elements, producing approximately 85 percent of the world's supply between 2011 and 2017.

(2) In 2019, the United States imported an estimated 80 percent of its rare earth compounds from the People's Republic of China.

(3) On March 26, 2014, the World Trade Organization ruled that the People's Republic of China's export restraints on rare earth minerals violated its obligations under its protocol of accession to the World Trade Organization, thereby harming United States manufacturers and workers.

(4) The Chinese Communist Party has threatened to leverage the People's Republic of China's dominant position in the rare earth market to ''strike back'' at the United States.

(5) The Quadrilateral Security Dialogue is an effective partnership for reliable multilateral financing, development, and distribution of goods for global consumption, as evidenced by the Quad Vaccine Partnership announced on March 12, 2021.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the People's Republic of China's dominant share of the global rare earth mining market is a threat to the economic stability, well being, and competitiveness of key industries in the United States;

(2) the United States should reduce reliance on the People's Republic of China for rare earth minerals through—

(A) strategic investments in development projects, production technologies, and refining facilities in the United States; or

(B) in partnership with strategic allies of the United States that are reliable trading partners, including members of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue; and

(3) the United States Trade Representative should initiate multilateral talks among the countries of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue to promote shared investment and development of rare earth minerals.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the officials specified in paragraph (3), shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the work of the Trade Representative to address the national security threat posed by the People's Republic of China's control of nearly ⅔ of the global supply of rare earth minerals.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a description of the extent of the engagement of the United States with the other countries of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue to promote shared investment and development of rare earth minerals during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date of the report; and

(B) a description of the plans of the President to leverage the partnership of the countries of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue to produce a more reliable and secure global supply chain of rare earth minerals.

(3) OFFICIALS SPECIFIED.—The official specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Secretary of State.

(B) the Secretary of Commerce.

(C) The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

(4) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SA 5536. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 220 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 220. STUDY ON FACILITATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE BATTERY TECHNOLOGIES FOR WARFIGHTERS.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry conduct study to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing support to domestic battery producers, particularly those producing lithium-ion cells and battery packs—

(1) to facilitate the research and development of safe and secure battery technologies for existing as well as new or novel battery chemistry configurations;

(2) to assess existing commercial battery offerings within the marketplace for viability and utility for warfighter applications; and

(3) to transition such technologies, including technologies developed from pilot programs, prototype projects, or other research and development programs, from the prototyping phase to production.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) collect, analyze, and retain data;

(2) develop and share best practices relating to matters described in subsection (a);

(3) identify any policy or regulatory impediments inhibiting the facilitation described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) or the transition described in paragraph (3) of such subsection; and

(4) share results from the study across the Department, and with elements of the Federal Government, including the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall administer the study.

SA 5537. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5___. LIMITATION ON DISCHARGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO CHOOSE NOT TO RECEIVE A VACCINE FOR COVID–19.

The Secretary of Defense may not discharge any member of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable solely because such member chooses not to receive a vaccine for COVID–19.

SA 5538. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. GUIDANCE CLARITY.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Each agency, as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, shall include a guidance clarity statement as described in subsection (b) on any guidance issued by that agency under section 553(b)(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code, on and after the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget issues the guidance required under subsection (c).

(b) GUIDANCE CLARITY STATEMENT.—A guidance clarity statement required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) be displayed prominently on the first page of the document; and

(2) include the following: ''The contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and do not, of themselves, bind the public or the agency. This document is intended only to provide clarity to the public regarding existing requirements under the law or agency policies.''.

(c) OMB GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance to implement this section.

SA 5539. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. GOLDEN VISA TRANSPARENCY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED CONTRIBUTION.—The term ''covered contribution'' means—

(A) a monetary donation to, investment in, or any other form of direct or indirect capital transfer, including through the purchase or rental of real estate, to—

(i) the government of a foreign country; or

(ii) any person, business, or entity in such a foreign country; and

(B) a donation to, or endowment of, any activity contributing to the public good in such a foreign country.

(3) GOLDEN VISA PROGRAM.—The term ''golden visa program'' means an immigration, investment, or other program of a foreign country that, in exchange for a covered contribution authorizes the individual making the covered contribution to acquire citizenship in such country or receive any other immigration benefit in the foreign country, including temporary or permanent residence that may serve as the basis for subsequent naturalization.

(4) VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.—The term ''visa waiver program'' means the program authorized under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187).

(b) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VISA WAIVER PROGRAM PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES THAT OPERATE GOLDEN VISA PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of continued participation in the visa waiver program, each foreign country participating in the visa waiver program that operates a golden visa program shall—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide to the Secretary of Homeland Security a description of the laws, regulations, and policies governing the golden visa program of the country, including, as applicable, such laws, regulations, and policies relating to—

(i) the physical presence of the golden visa program applicant in the country;

(ii) residence requirements;

(iii) covered contribution requirements;

(iv) security and background check procedures for applicants and intermediaries;

(v) risk management practices or measures, control systems, and oversight mechanisms;

(vi) information sharing with other foreign countries regarding application rejections;

(vii) anti-money laundering measures; and

(viii) information sharing with the tax residence of the applicant; and

(B) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide notice to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State of the name of each individual to whom the foreign country has ever provided citizenship, residence, or any other immigration benefit through such golden visa program before the date of the first such notice;

(C) promptly provide notice to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State of the name of each individual to whom the foreign country provides citizenship, residence, or any other immigration benefit through such golden visa program after the date of the first such notice; and

(D) with respect to each such individual, details regarding—

(i) any identity assumed by the individual before the individual applied for such golden visa program; and

(ii) any identity the individual has assumed since receiving such immigration benefit.

(2) EFFECT OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland shall suspend from participation in the visa waiver program any foreign country described in paragraph (1) that does not comply with such paragraph.

(3) PROCEDURES TO ENSURE SANCTIONED INDIVIDUALS ARE NOT ADMITTED OR PAROLED INTO THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall develop procedures to ensure that an individual whose entry into the United States has been prohibited pursuant to sanctions imposed by the United States Government and who has received an immigration benefit through a foreign country's golden visa program is not admitted or paroled into the United States as a national of such foreign country.

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at the beginning of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

(i) with respect to each visa waiver program participant country that operates a golden visa program, describes the laws, regulations, and policies governing the golden visa program including, as applicable, such laws, regulations, and policies with respect to—

(I) the physical presence of the golden visa program applicant in the country;

(II) residence requirements;

(III) covered contribution requirements;

(IV) security and background check procedures for applicants and intermediaries;

(V) risk management practices or measures, control systems, and oversight mechanisms;

(VI) information sharing with other foreign countries regarding application rejections;

(VII) anti-money laundering measures; and

(VIII) information sharing with the tax residence of an applicant;

(ii) includes the number of individuals whose entry into the United States has been prohibited pursuant to sanctions imposed by the United States Government and who have received an immigration benefit pursuant to

a golden visa program of a visa waiver program country, disaggregated by country that granted such benefit;

(iii) with respect to each such individual, a description of the specific type of sanction to which the individual is subject;

(iv) describes the procedures developed and implemented pursuant to paragraph (3); and

(v) includes an intelligence assessment of national security and criminal threats posed by the use of golden visa programs by foreign nationals and by United States citizens.

(B) FORM.—Each report required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.—Section 217(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(H) OPERATION OF GOLDEN VISA PROGRAM.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023, no country that operates a golden visa program may be designated as a program country unless the country submits, as a condition of its participation, the information described in section 1077(b)(1) of such Act.'';

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) in subclause (IV), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subclause (V) as subclause (VI); and

(iii) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following:

''(V) shall evaluate whether the program country operates a golden visa program and, as applicable, whether the program country has complied with the requirements of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023; and'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

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

''(C) TERMINATIONS RELATING TO GOLDEN VISA PROGRAMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall immediately terminate the designation of a program country if the country—

''(I) establishes a golden visa program (or in the case of a program country with an existing golden visa program, modifies the golden visa program or the terms and conditions of the golden visa program) without providing to the Secretary the information described in section 1077(b)(1) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023;

''(II) refuses to provide such information; or

''(III) provides such information but the information is of insufficient quality, as determined by the Secretary.

''(ii) REDESIGNATION.—With respect to a country the designation of which has been terminated under this subparagraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security may redesignate the country as a program country, without regard to subsection (f) or paragraph (2) or (3), if the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that—

''(I) the country—

''(aa) has resumed sharing the information described in section 1077(b)(1) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023; and

''(bb) has shared such information that was withheld before the date of termination and such information that has accumulated since that date; and

''(II) the quality of such information is sufficient, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.''; and

(D) in subparagraph (D)(i), as redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (A) or (B)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A), (B), or (C)''; and

(3) in paragraph (11)(C)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) with respect to a subject country that operates a golden visa program—

''(I) an assessment of any threat posed by the golden visa program;

''(II) recommendations to mitigate any such threat; and

''(III) an assessment of the quality of the subject country's information sharing relating to the golden visa program.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) DEFINITION OF GOLDEN VISA PROGRAM.—In this subsection, the term 'golden visa program' has the meaning given such term in section 1077(a) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.''.

SA 5540. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REQUIREMENT TO POST A 100 WORD SUMMARY TO REGULATIONS.GOV.

Section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) the Internet address of a summary of not more than 100 words in length of the proposed rule, in plain language, that shall be posted on the Internet website under section 206(d) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note) (commonly known as regulations.gov).''.

SA 5541. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 322. PRODUCTION AND USE OF NATURAL GAS AT MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 352), the Secretary of the Army may—

(A) produce any natural gas located within land under the geographic footprint of the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant (referred to in this Act as ''MCAAP''); and

(B) treat, manage, and use the natural gas produced pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—To carry out any authority described in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Army may enter into a contract with an entity determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) ROYALTIES TO THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA.—

(1) VALUE OF ROYALTIES.—Beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the Secretary of the Army, for natural gas produced at MCAAP pursuant to subsection (a) during that calendar year, information on the amount of royalty payments that the State of Oklahoma would have received under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) if the natural gas had been produced pursuant to a lease issued under that Act.

(2) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—On request of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army shall promptly provide all information, documents, and other materials the Secretary of the Interior considers necessary to calculate the amount of royalty payments under paragraph (1).

(3) PAYMENTS; DISBURSEMENTS.—

(A) PAYMENTS TO TREASURY.—On receipt of the information from the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph (1) each calendar year, the Secretary of the Army shall deposit in the Treasury of the United States an amount equal to the amount of the royalty payments calculated under that paragraph.

(B) DISBURSEMENTS TO OKLAHOMA.—The Secretary of the Interior shall disburse to the State of Oklahoma an amount equal to the amount deposited in the Treasury of the United States by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to subparagraph (A) as though the amounts were being disbursed to the State under section 6 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 355).

(4) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—On receipt of written notice from the Governor of Oklahoma consenting to the waiver of any of the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (3), the Secretary of the Interior may waive that requirement.

(c) OWNERSHIP OF FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army may take ownership of any gas production and treatment equipment and facilities and associated infrastructure from an entity with which the Secretary has entered into a contract under subsection (a)(2) in accordance with the terms of such contract.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY.—With respect to a natural gas well installed on MCAAP and subject to this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall have no responsibility for—

(A) the plugging, abandonment, or reclamation of such well; or

(B) any environmental damage caused by or associated with the production of such well.

(d) LIMITATION ON USES.—Natural gas produced pursuant to subsection (a) may be used only to support activities and operations at MCAAP.

(e) SAFETY STANDARDS FOR GAS WELLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A natural gas well installed on MCAAP and subject to this Act shall meet the same technical installation and operating standards required for a natural gas well installed under a lease issued pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), including—

(A) the gas measurement requirements under the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(B) the operational standards required by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to part 3160 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(2) COMPLIANCE.—With respect to a natural gas well installed on MCAAP and subject to this Act—

(A) the Bureau of Land Management shall—

(i) ensure compliance by the Secretary of the Army with the standards described in paragraph (1); and

(ii) report any violations of the standards to the Secretary of the Army; and

(B) the Secretary of the Army shall take such actions as are necessary to bring the well into compliance with such standards.

SA 5542. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CRITERIA FOR GRANTING DIRECT-HIRE AUTHORITY TO AGENCIES.

Section 3304(a)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''shortage of candidates'' and all that follows through ''highly qualified candidates)'' and inserting ''shortage of highly qualified candidates''.

SA 5543. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. APPOINTMENT OF MILITARY SPOUSES.

Section 3330d of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) The term 'remote work' refers to a work flexibility arrangement under which an employee—

''(A) is not expected to physically report to the location from which the employee would otherwise work, considering the position of the employee; and

''(B) performs the duties and responsibilities of such employee's position, and other authorized activities, from an approved worksite—

''(i) other than the location from which the employee would otherwise work;

''(ii) that may be inside or outside the local commuting area of the location from which the employee would otherwise work; and

''(iii) that is typically the residence of the employee.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is on active duty, or a spouse of a disabled or deceased member of the Armed Forces, to a position in which that spouse will engage in remote work.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''subsection (a)(3)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(4)''.

SA 5544. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES FOR TRAVEL FOR MEDICAL CARE.

Section 453 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) TRAVEL AWAY FROM DUTY STATION FOR MEDICAL CARE.—A member of the uniformed services, or a family member of such a member, who travels to obtain medical care not provided at the duty station of the member may be provided travel and transportation allowances to the extent provided in regulations prescribed under section 464 of this title.''.

SA 5545. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. SECURITY COOPERATION ACTIVITIES AT COUNTER-UAS TRAINING ACADEMY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) supports the Department of Defense's decision to establish the Counter-UAS Training Academy at Fort Sill, Oklahoma (in this section referred to as the ''C-UAS Academy'');

(2) believes the C-UAS Academy will play an important role in synchronizing training on counter-drone tactics across the military services;

(3) recognizes the important role of the C-UAS Academy in the military education and training of foreign partners on counter-unmanned aircraft systems operations; and

(4) encourages the Department of Defense to utilize the C-UAS Academy to expand such efforts.

(b) BRIEFING ON SECURITY COOPERATION EFFORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall brief the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on how the Department of Defense intends to bolster security cooperation activities with allies and partners at the C-UAS Academy, including an identification of any shortfalls in resourcing or gaps in authorities that could inhibit these security cooperation efforts.

SA 5546. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1115. LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO CERTAIN POSITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3326 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**CERTAIN**'' before ''**POSITIONS**''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''appointed'' and all that follows through ''Defense'' and inserting ''appointed to a position in the excepted or competitive service classified at or above GS–14 of the General Schedule (or equivalent) in or under the Department of Defense''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''for the purpose'' and all that follows through ''Management''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 33 of such title is amended in the item relating to section 3326 by inserting ''certain'' before ''positions''.

SA 5547. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. SOCIOECONOMIC LABOR THRESHOLD FOR THE SERVICE CONTRACT ACT.

(a) SOCIOECONOMIC LABOR THRESHOLD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the socioeconomic labor threshold is—

(A) for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on October

1 following such date of enactment, the amount determined by the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (2)(A); and

(B) for each 1-year period beginning on October 1 following such date of enactment, the amount determined by the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (2)(B).

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.—

(A) INITIAL PERIOD.—The amount determined under this paragraph for the period described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be $2,500 as—

(i) increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, comparing—

(I) such Consumer Price Index for October of 1965; and

(II) such Consumer Price Index for the most recent month as of the date of enactment of this Act for which such Consumer Price Index is available; and

(ii) (if applicable), rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

(B) SUBSEQUENT PERIODS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this subparagraph for the applicable period described in paragraph (1)(B) shall be the amount in effect on the date of such determination as—

(I) increased (if applicable) from such amount by the annual percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from the preceding year as calculated in accordance with clause (ii); and

(II) (if applicable) rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

(ii) CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.—In making the determination under clause (i) and calculating the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers under clause (i)(I), the Secretary of Labor shall compare the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for June of the calendar year in which such determination is made with the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for June of the preceding calendar year.

(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—With respect to a determination under clause (i) of the amount in effect under this paragraph for an applicable period under paragraph (1)(B), if there is not an annual percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average) from the preceding year as described in clause (i)(I), the amount in effect under this paragraph for such applicable period shall be the amount in effect under paragraph (1) on the date of such determination.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE MCNAMARA-O'HARA SERVICE CONTRACT ACT.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 6701 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) SOCIOECONOMIC LABOR THRESHOLD.—The term 'socioeconomic labor threshold' means the socioeconomic labor threshold established under section 1077(a) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.''.

(2) APPLICABILITY THRESHOLD.—Section 6702(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) involves an amount exceeding—

''(A) for contracts and bid specifications made prior to the date of enactment of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023, $2,500; and

''(B) for contracts and bid specifications made on or after such date of enactment, the socioeconomic labor threshold.''.

SA 5548. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. FLEXIBILITY FOR TEMPORARY AND TERM APPOINTMENTS.

(a) TEMPORARY AND TERM APPOINTMENTS.—Subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 3117. Temporary and term appointments

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

''(2) TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT.—The term 'temporary appointment' means an appointment in the competitive service for a period of not more than 1 year.

''(3) TERM APPOINTMENT.—The term 'term appointment' means an appointment in the competitive service for a period of more than 1 year and not more than 5 years.

''(b) APPOINTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an Executive agency may make a temporary appointment or term appointment to a position in the competitive service when the need for the services of an employee in the position is not permanent.

''(2) EXTENSION.—Under conditions prescribed by the Director, the head of an Executive agency may—

''(A) extend a temporary appointment made under paragraph (1) in increments of not more than 1 year each, up to a maximum of 3 total years of service; and

''(B) extend a term appointment made under paragraph (1) in increments determined appropriate by the head of the Executive agency, up to a maximum of 6 total years of service.

''(c) APPOINTMENTS FOR CRITICAL HIRING NEEDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions prescribed by the Director, the head of an Executive agency may make a noncompetitive temporary appointment, or a noncompetitive term appointment for a period of not more than 18 months, to a position in the competitive service for which a critical hiring need exists, as determined under section 3304, without regard to the requirements of sections 3327 and 3330.

''(2) NO EXTENSIONS.—An appointment made under paragraph (1) may not be extended.

''(d) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director may prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

''(2) APPLICATION.—Any regulations prescribed by the Director for the administration of this section shall not apply to the Secretary of Defense in the exercise of the authorities granted under section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2447).

''(e) SPECIAL PROVISION REGARDING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary of Defense from making temporary and term appointments in the competitive service pursuant to section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2447).

''(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect the authorities granted under section 3109.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3116 the following:

''3117. Temporary and term appointments.''.

SA 5549. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2867.

SA 5550. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.

(a) EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES.—Section 3115(e)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''15 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''.

(b) EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY FOR POSTSECONDARY STUDENTS.—Section 3116(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''15 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''.

SA 5551. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 564. REPORT ON STATUS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the training for all components of the Armed Forces required by Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1300.17, entitled ''Religious Liberty in the Military Services'' and issued on September 1, 2020.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A copy of the educational materials for each military service.

(2) A description, disaggregated by military service, of—

(A) the number of trainings that have been conducted pursuant to DoDI 1300.17;

(B) the number of members of the Armed Forces who have received the training; and

(C) the number of members of the Armed Forces who have yet to complete the training.

SA 5552. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NONCOMPETITIVE ELIGIBILITY FOR HIGH-PERFORMING CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''competitive service'' has the meaning given the term in section 2102 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''Executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Under such regulations as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue, an Executive agency may noncompetitively appoint, for other than temporary employment, to a position in the competitive service any individual who—

(1) is certified by the Director as having been a high-performing employee in a former position in the competitive service;

(2) has been separated from the former position described in paragraph (1) for less than 6 years; and

(3) is qualified for the new position in the competitive service, as determined by the head of the Executive agency making the noncompetitive appointment.

(c) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—An individual may not be appointed to a position under subsection (b) more than once.

(d) DESIGNATION OF HIGH-PERFORMING EMPLOYEES.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall, in the regulations issued under subsection (b), set forth the criteria for certifying an individual as a ''high-performing employee'' in a former position, which shall be based on—

(1) the final performance appraisal of the individual in that former position; and

(2) a recommendation by the immediate or other supervisor of the individual in that former position.

SA 5553. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 389. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO MAINTAIN OR ESTABLISH COMPUTER NETWORKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND VICTIM ASSISTANCE.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, adjudication, or other activity relating to law enforcement or victim assistance.

SA 5554. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1052. PORT MAINTENANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 411(o) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211(o)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) PORT MAINTENANCE.—

''(A) PROCEDURES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Commissioner, in consultation with the Administrator of the General Services Administration—

''(I) shall establish procedures by which U.S. Customs and Border Protection may conduct maintenance and repair projects costing not more than $300,000 at any Federal Government-owned port of entry where the Office of Field Operations performs any of the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of subsection (g)(3); and

''(II) is authorized to perform such maintenance and repair projects, subject to the procedures described in clause (ii).

''(ii) PROCEDURES DESCRIBED.—The procedures established pursuant to clause (i) shall include—

''(I) a description of the types of projects that may be carried out pursuant to clause (i); and

''(II) the procedures for identifying and addressing any impacts on other tenants of facilities where such projects will be carried out.

''(iii) PUBLICATION OF PROCEDURES.—All of the procedures established pursuant to clause (i) shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

''(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The publication of procedures under clause (iii) shall not impact the authority of the Commissioner to update such procedures, in consultation with the Administrator, as appropriate.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall only be available for maintenance and repair projects involving existing infrastructure, property, and capital at any port of entry described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS.—The Commissioner shall annually adjust the amount described in subparagraph (A) by the percentage (if any) by which the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the month of June preceding the date on which such adjustment takes effect exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the same month of the preceding calendar year.

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to affect the availability of funding from—

''(i) the Federal Buildings Fund established under section 592 of title 40, United States Code;

''(ii) the Donation Acceptance Program established under section 482; or

''(iii) any other statutory authority or appropriation for projects described in subparagraph (A).''.

(b) REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes the elements described in paragraph (2).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a summary of all maintenance projects conducted pursuant to section 411(o)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a) during the prior fiscal year;

(B) the cost of each project referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) the account that funded each such project, if applicable; and

(D) any budgetary transfers, if applicable, that funded each such project.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 422(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 232(a)) is amended by inserting ''section 411(o)(3) of this Act and'' after ''Administrator under''.

SA 5555. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XI, insert the following:

SEC. _____. MAKING PERMANENT THE DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY FOR DOMESTIC DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE FACILITIES, THE MAJOR RANGE AND TEST FACILITIES BASE, AND THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.

(a) CODIFICATION OF SECTION 1125 OF FY 2017 NDAA.—Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end a new section consisting of—

(1) a heading as follows:

"§ 1599j. Direct hire authority for domestic defense industrial base facilities, the Major Range and Test Facilities Base, and the Office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation"; and

(2) a text consisting of the text of section 1125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (10 U.S.C. 1580 note prec.).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH CODIFICATION.—Section 1599j of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''During each of fiscal years 2017 through 2025, the Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''United States Code,''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''During fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''United States Code,''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1599j. Direct hire authority for domestic defense industrial base facilities, the Major Range and Test Facilities Base, and the Office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation.''.

(d) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 1125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (10 U.S.C. 1580 note prec.) is repealed.

SA 5556. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 829. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAFFICKING IN CONTRACTING PROVISIONS.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO REFER VIOLATIONS TO AGENCY SUSPENSION AND DEBARMENT OFFICIAL.—Section 1704(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 22 U.S.C. 7104b(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''refer the matter to the agency suspension and debarment official and'' before ''consider taking one of the following actions''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (G).

(b) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAFFICKING IN CONTRACTING PROVISIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on implementation of title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2092).

SA 5557. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PROTECTION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN VESSEL MANIFESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 431(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1431(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2)(A) The information listed in paragraph (1) shall not be available for public disclosure if—

''(i) the Secretary of the Treasury makes an affirmative finding on a shipment-by-shipment basis that disclosure is likely to pose a threat of personal injury or property damage; or

''(ii) the information is exempt under the provisions of section 552(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) The Secretary shall ensure that any personally identifiable information, including Social Security numbers and passport numbers, is removed from any manifest signed, produced, delivered, or electronically transmitted under this section before access to the manifest is provided to the public.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 5558. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5____. OPPORTUNITY TO COMPLETE 20 YEARS OF SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO HAVE NOT RECEIVED A VACCINE FOR COVID–19.

The Secretary of Defense shall permit any member of the Armed Forces who has reached or exceeded 18 years of satisfactory service in the Armed Forces the opportunity to complete 20 years of satisfactory service if—

(1) the member has not received a vaccine for COVID–19; and

(2) the Secretary is unable to provide clear and convincing evidence that there is a reason not to permit the member to complete such service other than the fact that member has not received such vaccine.

SA 5559. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. _____. USE OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION IN RULEMAKING.

Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) To the extent that an agency makes a decision based on science when issuing a rule under this section, the agency shall use scientific information, technical procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models, employed in a manner consistent with the best available science, and shall consider as applicable—

''(1) the extent to which the scientific information, technical procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models employed to generate the information are reasonable for and consistent with the intended use of the information;

''(2) the extent to which the information is relevant for use by the head of the agency in making a decision related to issuing the rule;

''(3) the degree of clarity and completeness with which the data, assumptions, methods, quality assurance, and analyses employed to generate the information are documented;

''(4) the extent to which the variability and uncertainty in the information, or in the procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models, are evaluated and characterized; and

''(5) the extent of independent verification or peer review of the information or of the procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models.

''(g) An agency shall make a decision described in subsection (f) based on the weight of the scientific evidence.

''(h) Each agency shall make available to the public—

''(1) all notices, determinations, findings, rules, consent agreements, and orders of the head of the agency in connection with a rule;

''(2) a nontechnical summary of each risk evaluation conducted in connection with a rule; and

''(3) a list of the studies considered by the agency in carrying out each risk evaluation described in paragraph (2), along with a description of the results of those studies.''.

SA 5560. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Belt and Road Initiative Oversight

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Belt and Road Oversight Act''.

SEC. 1282. COUNTRY CHINA OFFICER.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall direct all Chiefs of Mission to designate not fewer than 1 Foreign Service Officer in a United States embassy or other diplomatic post in each country with whom the United States has diplomatic relations as the Country China Officer.

(b) DUTIES.—Each Country China Officer shall monitor and report on the activity of the People's Republic of China in his or her country of responsibility, including capital investment in critical infrastructure and other projects associated with the Belt and Road Initiative.

SEC. 1283. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE PROJECTS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall direct all United States embassies to prepare a report that details equity and assets within their country of operation that are controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Each such report shall be prepared by a Country China Officer designated pursuant to section 1282(a) and shall include the information described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the respective country's overall debt obligations to the People's Republic of China;

(2) a list of known infrastructure projects in the respective country that are financed from capital provided by—

(A) the banking system of the People's Republic of China, including—

(i) policy banks, including—

(I) the China Development Bank;

(II) the Export-Import Bank of China; and

(III) the Agricultural Development Bank of China;

(ii) state-owned commercial banks, including—

(I) the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China;

(II) the Agricultural Bank of China;

(III) the China Construction Bank;

(IV) the Bank of Communications Limited; and

(V) the Bank of China;

(iii) sovereign wealth funds, including—

(I) the China Investment Corporation;

(II) China Life Insurance Company;

(III) the China National Social Security Fund; and

(IV) the Silk Road Fund;

(iv) urban commercial banks; and

(v) rural financial institutions; and

(B) international financing institutions, including—

(i) the World Bank Group;

(ii) the Asian Development Bank;

(iii) the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank; and

(iv) the New Development Bank; and

(C) any other financial institution or entity the China Country Officer deems appropriate;

(3) the identification of the infrastructure projects referred to in paragraph (2) that are projects under the Belt and Road Initiative;

(4) any domestic vulnerabilities that the debts referred to in paragraph (1) could exacerbate in the respective country;

(5) a list of the known or speculated collateral listed by the respective country for the debts incurred by Belt and Road Initiative projects referred to in paragraph (2); and

(6) a list of the known or speculated assets owned by People's Republic of China entities, including telecommunications and critical infrastructure.

(c) SUBMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT.—

(1) INITIAL SUBMISSION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary of State issues the directive described in subsection (a), the Chief of Mission in each country shall submit the report required under subsection (a) to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

(2) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall prepare and distribute a report that includes all of the information from the individual country reports received pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

(A) the heads of other Bureaus and agencies of the Department of State, as appropriate;

(B) the United States International Development Finance Corporation;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(E) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(G) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(H) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(I) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(J) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1284. NOTIFICATION OF FUTURE BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE PROJECTS.

After the reports required under section 1283 have been prepared and submitted, the Secretary of State shall require that each Country China Officer notify the Chief of Mission of the respective Embassy and the China Desk at the Department of State of any project described in section 1283(b)(2) not later than 30 days after the date on which the Country China Officer is made aware of such project.

SEC. 1285. ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REPORT OF BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the reports required under section 1283 and the notifications required under section 1284, each Country China Officer shall submit an annual report to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, through the Chief of Mission that contains all of findings relating to Belt and Road Initiative projects described in section 1283(b)(2) in the respective country during the 12-month reporting period.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall prepare and distribute an annual report containing all of the information from the reports received pursuant to subsection (a) to the recipients described in section 1283(c)(2).

SEC. 1286. ANNUAL STRATEGY TO COUNTER THE INFLUENCE OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Country China Officer at each respective embassy, in consultation with the Chief of Mission for the respective country, shall develop a comprehensive, country-specific strategy to counter the influence of the People's Republic of China within their country of responsibility.

(b) USE OF STRATEGY.—The strategy developed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be used to equip all personnel across all embassies, consulates, and other diplomatic posts in the respective country of responsibility to effectively counter the influence of the People's Republic of China in their respective context and country of responsibility.

(c) SUBMISSION.—The Chief of Mission shall submit an annual report to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs that—

(1) describes the implementation of the strategy developed pursuant to subsection (a) during the reporting period; and

(2) assesses specific challenges and opportunities relating to the People's Republic of China in the respective country of responsibility.

(d) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall submit an annual report that summarizes the information contained in the reports received pursuant to subsection (c) to the heads of the Bureaus of the Department of State, as appropriate.

SEC. 1287. PROCUREMENT PROJECTIONS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Country China Officer at each respective embassy, in consultation with other embassy personnel, shall submit an annual report to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs that—

(1) describes the procurement and infrastructure needs of their respective country of responsibility; and

(2) assesses specific challenges and opportunities relating to potential financing by the People's Republic of China for procurement and infrastructure projects to meet such needs.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall submit an annual report that summarizes the information contained in the reports received pursuant to subsection (a) to—

(1) the heads of the Bureaus of the Department of State, as appropriate; and

(2) the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

SEC. 1288. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DEVELOPMENT FINANCE.

It is the sense of Congress that, as the People's Republic of China's influence grows through infrastructure (particularly infrastructure that can easily be shifted from economic to military uses), the United States International Development Finance Corporation should prioritize providing alternative financing opportunities that increase port and air field capacity of countries that—

(1) meet the investment criteria set forth in the BUILD Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115–254); and

(2) are targets of the predatory infrastructure development scheme of the People's Republic of China commonly known as the Belt and Road Initiative.

SA 5561. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. BLENDED FEDERAL WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1103(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

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

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) The Office of Personnel Management shall collect from Executive agencies, other than elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C.

3003(4))), on at least an annual basis the following:

''(I) The total number of persons employed directly by the Executive agency.

''(II) The total number of prime contractor employees and subcontractor employees, as those terms are defined in section 8701 of title 41, issued credentials allowing access to Executive agency property or computer systems.

''(III) The total number of employees of Federal grant and cooperative agreement recipients, as those legal instruments are described in sections 6304 and 6305 of title 31, respectively, who are issued credentials allowing access to Executive agency property or computer systems.

''(IV) A total count of the workforce of the Executive agency, including employees, prime contractor employees, subcontractor employees, grantee employees, and cooperative agreement employees.

''(ii) The Office of Personnel Management shall compile the data collected under clause (i) and issue, and post on its website, an annual report containing the data.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF THE BLENDED FEDERAL WORKFORCE.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''Executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) The implementation of Federal laws and the competent administration of Federal programs require skilled and capable personnel.

(B) Executive agencies depend on a blended workforce that includes Federal employees, employees of prime contractors and subcontractors performing services to Executive agencies, and employees of State or local governments, nonprofit organizations, or institutions of higher education performing services to Executive agencies under the terms of grants and cooperative agreements (in this subsection referred to as ''grantees''), all of whom make essential contributions to achieving the missions of the Government in service to the people of the United States.

(C) Approximately 2,000,000 Federal employees help to execute the laws of the United States, supplemented by an unknown number, estimated to exceed 5,000,000, of employees of prime contractors, subcontractors, and grantees providing services to Executive agencies.

(D) Policymakers, Executive agencies, and observers have often focused on individual components of the blended workforce, such as employees, without considering all components or considering the entire blended workforce and how all 3 components can work most effectively together.

(E) Executive agencies inhibit their own workforce planning and risk making decisions that may reduce the overall efficiency and cost effectiveness of the blended workforce by focusing on only 1 component in isolation.

(F) Establishing artificial limits on headcounts or full-time equivalent positions for Federal employees, administrators, and managerial employees of Executive agencies may discourage the employment of interns or entry-level employees to build a balanced employment pipeline and may inadvertently encourage managers to shift work to contractors and grantees for the purpose of complying with such numerical limits, even if those decisions are not justified by an approach to improve the efficiency or cost effectiveness of the Executive agency's work.

(G) The Government Accountability Office has identified strategic human capital management as a high-risk area for the Federal Government, adding that critical skills gaps ''impede the government from cost-effectively serving the public and achieving results''.

(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Executive agencies should—

(A) manage the entire Federal blended workforce, including employees, contractors, and grantees, using a comprehensive and holistic approach to advance their missions as effectively and cost efficiently as possible, within appropriated budgets and without using artificial numerical limits on headcounts or full-time-equivalent positions; and

(B) conduct a holistic review of their blended workforce and develop a comprehensive plan to ensure an efficient and cost-effective blended workforce.

SA 5562. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 753. CONSCIENCE PROTECTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHO PROVIDE OR ASSIST WITH PROVISION OF HEALTH CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall not take any adverse action against a member of the Armed Forces who provides or assists in the provision of health care for the Department of Defense (including as a behavioral, mental, or physical health professional) on the basis that such member declines to perform, assist, refer for, or otherwise participate in a particular medical procedure, counseling activity, or course of treatment because of a sincere religious belief or moral conviction of such member or because the particular medical procedure, counseling activity, or course of treatment would, in the professional medical judgment of such member, be harmful to the patient.

(b) NO IMPACT ON CARE.—The Secretary shall ensure that no patient is unduly delayed in receiving any medically indicated care they are otherwise eligible to receive, including preventative, emergency, and routine care, because of compliance by the Secretary with subsection (a).

(c) ADVERSE ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''adverse action'' includes any adverse personnel action, discrimination, or denial of promotion, schooling, training, or assignment.

SA 5563. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1262. REPORT ON UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA COUNTERNARCOTICS PARTNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the counternarcotics partnership between the United States and Colombia.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A strategy for the Department to enhance coordination with and support for the Comandos Jungla Antinarcoticos, including through training with United States Special Forces, also known as the Green Berets.

(2) An evaluation of the success, as of the date on which the report is submitted, of the support provided by the Department for the efforts of the Policia National de Colombia to conduct counternarcotics operations, eradicate and seize cocaine and coca base, and train police in rural security positions.

SA 5564. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COTTON, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1214. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT TRAINING PIPELINE BETWEEN UNITED STATES NAVY AND ROYAL AUSTRALIAN NAVY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the AUKUS partnership between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States presents a significant opportunity to enhance security cooperation in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) parties to the AUKUS partnership should work expeditiously to implement a strategic roadmap to successfully deliver capabilities outlined in the agreement;

(3) the United States should engage with industry partners to develop a comprehensive understanding of the requirements needed to increase capacity and capability;

(4) Australia should continue to expand its industrial base to support production and delivery of future capabilities;

(5) the delivery of a nuclear-powered submarine to the Government of Australia would require the appropriate training and development of future commanding officers to operate such submarines for the Royal Australian Navy; and

(6) in order to uphold the stewardship of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, the Secretary of Defense should work to coordinate an exchange program to integrate and train Australian sailors for the operation and maintenance of nuclear-powered submarines.

(b) EXCHANGE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall carry out an exchange program for Australian submarine officers during 2023 and each subsequent year. Under the

program, each year, two Australian submarine officers shall be selected to participate in the program. Each such participant shall—

(1) receive training in the Navy Nuclear Propulsion School;

(2) following such training and by not later than July 1 of the year of participation, enroll in the Submarine Office Basic Course; and

(3) following completion of such course, be assigned to duty on an operational United States submarine at sea.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on a notional exchange program for Australian submarine officers that includes initial, follow-on, and recurring training that could be provided to Australian submarine officers in order to prepare such officers for command of nuclear-powered Australian submarines.

SA 5565. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LOW POWER TV STATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission;

(2) the term ''Designated Market Area'' means—

(A) a Designated Market Area determined by Nielsen Media Research or any successor entity; or

(B) a Designated Market Area under a system of dividing television broadcast station licensees into local markets using a system that the Commission determines is equivalent to the system established by Nielsen Media Research; and

(3) the term ''low power TV station'' has the meaning given the term ''digital low power TV station'' in section 74.701 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide low power TV stations with a limited window of opportunity to apply for the opportunity to be accorded primary status as Class A television licensees.

(c) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking to issue a rule that contains the requirements described in this subsection.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The rule with respect to which the Commission is required to issue notice under paragraph (1) shall provide that, during the 1-year period beginning on the date on which that rule takes effect, a low power TV station may apply to the Commission to be accorded primary status as a Class A television licensee under section 73.6001 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Commission may approve an application submitted under subparagraph (A) if the low power TV station submitting the application—

(i) satisfies—

(I) section 336(f)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 336(f)(2)) and the rules issued under that section, including the requirements under such section 336(f)(2) with respect to locally produced programming, except that, for the purposes of this subclause, the period described in the matter preceding subclause (I) of subparagraph (A)(i) of such section 336(f)(2) shall be construed to be the 90-day period preceding the date of enactment of this Act; and

(II) paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of 73.6001 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation;

(ii) demonstrates to the Commission that the Class A station for which the license is sought will not cause any interference described in section 336(f)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 336(f)(7)); and

(iii) as of the date of enactment of this Act, operates in a Designated Market Area with not more than 95,000 television households.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF LICENSE.—A license that accords primary status as a Class A television licensee to a low power TV station as a result of the rule with respect to which the Commission is required to issue notice under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be subject to the same license terms and renewal standards as a license for a full power television broadcast station, except as otherwise expressly provided in this subsection; and

(B) require the low power TV station to remain in compliance with paragraph (2)(B) during the term of the license.

(d) REPORTING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report regarding the implementation of this section, which shall include—

(1) a list of the current, as of the date on which the report is submitted, licensees that have been accorded primary status as Class A television licensees; and

(2) of the licensees described in paragraph (1), an identification of each such licensee that has been accorded the status described in that paragraph because of the implementation of this section.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect a decision of the Commission relating to completion of the transition, relocation, or reimbursement of entities as a result of the systems of competitive bidding conducted pursuant to title VI of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), and the amendments made by that title, that are collectively commonly referred to as the ''Television Broadcast Incentive Auction''.

SA 5566. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. MODIFICATIONS TO SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1262 the following:

''SEC. 1262A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

''It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish and regularize information sharing and sanctions-related decision making with like-minded governments possessing human rights and anti-corruption sanctions programs similar in nature to those authorized under this subtitle.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2(b) and in title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) are each amended by inserting after the items relating to section 1262 the following:

''Sec. 1262A. Sense of Congress.''.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1263(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10102) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) through (4) and inserting the following:

''(2) is a current or former government official, or a person acting for or on behalf of such an official, who is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in—

''(A) corruption, including—

''(i) the misappropriation of state assets;

''(ii) the expropriation of private assets for personal gain;

''(iii) corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources; or

''(iv) bribery; or

''(B) the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption;

''(3) is or has been a leader or official of—

''(A) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, any of the activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) related to the tenure of the leader or official; or

''(B) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section as a result of activities related to the tenure of the leader or official;

''(4) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of—

''(A) an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) that is conducted by a foreign person;

''(B) a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

''(C) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) conducted by a foreign person; or

''(5) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or been purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section.''.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by inserting ''corruption and'' after ''monitor''.

(3) REQUESTS BY CONGRESS.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A request under paragraph (1) with respect to whether a foreign person has engaged in an activity described in subsection (a) shall be submitted to the President in writing jointly by the chairperson and ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees.''.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 1264(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10103(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) a description of additional steps taken by the President through diplomacy, international engagement, and assistance to foreign or security sectors to address persistent underlying causes of conduct giving rise to the imposition of sanctions under this section, as amended on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, in each country in which foreign persons with respect to which such sanctions have been imposed are located; and

''(8) a description of additional steps taken by the President to ensure the pursuit of judicial accountability in appropriate jurisdictions with respect to foreign persons subject to sanctions under this section.''.

SA 5567. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Combating Global Corruption

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Combating Global Corruption Act of 2022''.

SEC. 1282. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) CORRUPT ACTOR.—The term ''corrupt actor'' means—

(A) any foreign person or entity that is a government official or government entity responsible for, or complicit in, an act of corruption; and

(B) any company, in which a person or entity described in subparagraph (A) has a significant stake, which is responsible for, or complicit in, an act of corruption.

(2) CORRUPTION.—The term ''corruption'' means the unlawful exercise of entrusted public power for private gain, including by bribery, nepotism, fraud, or embezzlement.

(3) SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION.—The term ''significant corruption'' means corruption committed at a high level of government that has some or all of the following characteristics:

(A) Illegitimately distorts major decision-making, such as policy or resource determinations, or other fundamental functions of governance.

(B) Involves economically or socially large-scale government activities.

SEC. 1283. PUBLICATION OF TIERED RANKING LIST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall annually publish, on a publicly accessible website, a tiered ranking of all foreign countries.

(b) TIER 1 COUNTRIES.—A country shall be ranked as a tier 1 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is complying with the minimum standards set forth in section 1284.

(c) TIER 2 COUNTRIES.—A country shall be ranked as a tier 2 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is making efforts to comply with the minimum standards set forth in section 1284, but is not achieving the requisite level of compliance to be ranked as a tier 1 country.

(d) TIER 3 COUNTRIES.—A country shall be ranked as a tier 3 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is making de minimis or no efforts to comply with the minimum standards set forth in section 1284.

SEC. 1284. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF CORRUPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The government of a country is complying with the minimum standards for the elimination of corruption if the government—

(1) has enacted and implemented laws and established government structures, policies, and practices that prohibit corruption, including significant corruption;

(2) enforces the laws described in paragraph (1) by punishing any person who is found, through a fair judicial process, to have violated such laws;

(3) prescribes punishment for significant corruption that is commensurate with the punishment prescribed for serious crimes; and

(4) is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, including through prevention.

(b) FACTORS FOR ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION.—In determining whether a government is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, the Secretary of State shall consider, to the extent relevant or appropriate, factors such as—

(1) whether the government of the country has criminalized corruption, investigates and prosecutes acts of corruption, and convicts and sentences persons responsible for such acts over which it has jurisdiction, including, as appropriate, incarcerating individuals convicted of such acts;

(2) whether the government of the country vigorously investigates, prosecutes, convicts, and sentences public officials who participate in or facilitate corruption, including nationals of the country who are deployed in foreign military assignments, trade delegations abroad, or other similar missions, who engage in or facilitate significant corruption;

(3) whether the government of the country has adopted measures to prevent corruption, such as measures to inform and educate the public, including potential victims, about the causes and consequences of corruption;

(4) what steps the government of the country has taken to prohibit government officials from participating in, facilitating, or condoning corruption, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of such officials;

(5) the extent to which the country provides access, or, as appropriate, makes adequate resources available, to civil society organizations and other institutions to combat corruption, including reporting, investigating, and monitoring;

(6) whether an independent judiciary or judicial body in the country is responsible for, and effectively capable of, deciding corruption cases impartially, on the basis of facts and in accordance with the law, without any improper restrictions, influences, inducements, pressures, threats, or interferences (direct or indirect);

(7) whether the government of the country is assisting in international investigations of transnational corruption networks and in other cooperative efforts to combat significant corruption, including, as appropriate, cooperating with the governments of other countries to extradite corrupt actors;

(8) whether the government of the country recognizes the rights of victims of corruption, ensures their access to justice, and takes steps to prevent victims from being further victimized or persecuted by corrupt actors, government officials, or others;

(9) whether the government of the country protects victims of corruption or whistleblowers from reprisal due to such persons having assisted in exposing corruption, and refrains from other discriminatory treatment of such persons;

(10) whether the government of the country is willing and able to recover and, as appropriate, return the proceeds of corruption;

(11) whether the government of the country is taking steps to implement financial transparency measures in line with the Financial Action Task Force recommendations, including due diligence and beneficial ownership transparency requirements;

(12) whether the government of the country is facilitating corruption in other countries in connection with state-directed investment, loans or grants for major infrastructure, or other initiatives; and

(13) such other information relating to corruption as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

(c) ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION IN RELATION TO RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS.—In determining whether a government is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, the Secretary of State shall consider the government of a country's compliance with the following, as relevant:

(1) The Inter-American Convention against Corruption of the Organization of American States, done at Caracas March 29, 1996.

(2) The Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, done at Paris December 21, 1997 (commonly referred to as the ''Anti-Bribery Convention'').

(3) The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, done at New York November 15, 2000.

(4) The United Nations Convention against Corruption, done at New York October 31, 2003.

(5) Such other treaties, agreements, and international standards as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

SEC. 1285. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS UNDER GLOBAL MAGNITSKY HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, should evaluate whether there are foreign persons engaged in significant corruption for the purposes of potential imposition of sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note)—

(1) in all countries identified as tier 3 countries under section 1283; or

(2) in relation to the planning or construction or any operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after publishing the list required by section 1283(a) and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the committees specified in subsection (f) a report that includes—

(1) a list of foreign persons with respect to which the President imposed sanctions pursuant to the evaluation under subsection (a);

(2) the dates on which such sanctions were imposed;

(3) the reasons for imposing such sanctions; and

(4) a list of all foreign persons found to have been engaged in significant corruption in relation to the planning, construction, or operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) BRIEFING IN LIEU OF REPORT.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, may (except with respect to the list required by subsection (b)(4)) provide a briefing to the committees specified in subsection (f) instead of submitting a written report required under subsection (b), if doing so would better serve existing United States anti-corruption efforts or the national interests of the United States.

(e) TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO NORD STREAM 2.—The requirements under subsections (a)(2) and (b)(4) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1286. DESIGNATION OF EMBASSY ANTI-CORRUPTION POINTS OF CONTACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall annually designate an anti-corruption point of contact at the United States diplomatic post to each country identified as tier 2 or tier 3 under section 1283, or which the Secretary otherwise determines is in need of such a point of contact. The point of contact shall be the chief of mission or the chief of mission's designee.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each anti-corruption point of contact designated under subsection (a) shall be responsible for enhancing coordination and promoting the implementation of a whole-of-government approach among the relevant Federal departments and agencies undertaking efforts to—

(1) promote good governance in foreign countries; and

(2) enhance the ability of such countries—

(A) to combat public corruption; and

(B) to develop and implement corruption risk assessment tools and mitigation strategies.

(c) TRAINING.—The Secretary of State shall implement appropriate training for anti-corruption points of contact designated under subsection (a).

SA 5568. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS ON SENATE-CONFIRMED OFFICIALS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the executive branch have recognized the importance of preventing and mitigating the potential for conflicts of interest following government service, including with respect to senior United States officials working on behalf of foreign governments; and

(2) Congress and the executive branch should jointly evaluate the status and scope of post-employment restrictions.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) EXTENDED POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS FOR CERTAIN SENATE-CONFIRMED OFFICIALS.—

''(1) SECRETARY OF STATE AND DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE.—With respect to a person serving as the Secretary of State or Deputy Secretary of State, the restrictions described in section 207(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a foreign governmental entity before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States at any time after the termination of that person's service as Secretary or Deputy Secretary.

''(2) UNDER SECRETARIES, ASSISTANT SECRETARIES, AND AMBASSADORS.—With respect to a person serving as an Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, or Ambassador at the Department of State or the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, the restrictions described in section 207(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a foreign governmental entity before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States for 3 years after the termination of that person's service in a position described in this paragraph, or the duration of the term or terms of the President who appointed that person to their position, whichever is longer.

''(3) ENHANCED RESTRICTIONS FOR POST-EMPLOYMENT WORK ON BEHALF OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES OF CONCERN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to all former officials listed in this subsection, the restrictions described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a country of concern described in subparagraph (B) before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States at any time after the termination of that person's service in a position described in paragraph (1) or (2).

''(B) COUNTRIES SPECIFIED.—In this paragraph, the term 'country of concern' means—

''(i) the People's Republic of China;

''(ii) the Russian Federation;

''(iii) the Islamic Republic of Iran;

''(iv) the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

''(v) the Republic of Cuba; and

''(vi) the Syrian Arab Republic.

''(4) PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIONS.—Any violations of the restrictions in paragraphs (1) or (2) shall be subject to the penalties and injunctions provided for under section 216 of title 18, United States Code.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) FOREIGN GOVERNMENT ENTITY.—The term 'foreign governmental entity' includes—

''(i) any person employed by—

''(I) any department, agency, or other entity of a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level;

''(II) any governing party or coalition of a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level; or

''(III) any entity majority-owned or majority-controlled by a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level; and

''(ii) in the case of a country described in paragraph (3)(B), any company, economic project, cultural organization, exchange program, or nongovernmental organization that is more than 33 percent owned or controlled by the government of such country.

''(B) REPRESENTATION.—The term 'representation' does not include representation by an attorney, who is duly licensed and authorized to provide legal advice in a United States jurisdiction, of a person or entity in a legal capacity or for the purposes of rendering legal advice.

''(6) NOTICE OF RESTRICTIONS.—Any person subject to the restrictions of this subsection shall be provided notice of these restrictions by the Department of State upon appointment by the President, and subsequently upon termination of service with the Department of State.

''(7) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The restrictions under this subsection shall apply only to persons who are appointed by the President to the positions referenced in this subsection on or after 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(8) SUNSET.—The enhanced restrictions under paragraph (3) shall expire on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

SA 5569. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Masih Alinejad HUNT Act of 2022

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Masih Alinejad Harassment and Unlawful Targeting Act of 2022'' or the ''Masih Alinejad HUNT Act of 2022''.

SEC. 1282. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran surveils, harasses, terrorizes, tortures, abducts, and murders individuals who peacefully defend human rights and freedoms in Iran, and innocent entities and individuals considered by the Government of Iran to be enemies of that regime, including United States citizens on United States soil, and takes foreign nationals hostage, including in the following instances:

(1) In 2021, Iranian intelligence agents were indicted for plotting to kidnap United States citizen, women's rights activist, and journalist Masih Alinejad, from her home in New York City, in retaliation for exercising her rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Iranian agents allegedly spent at least approximately half a million dollars to capture the outspoken critic of the authoritarianism of the Government of Iran, and studied evacuating her by military-style speedboats to Venezuela before rendition to Iran.

(2) Prior to the New York kidnapping plot, Ms. Alinejad's family in Iran was instructed by authorities to lure Ms. Alinejad to Turkey. In an attempt to intimidate her into silence, the Government of Iran arrested 3 of Ms. Alinejad's family members in 2019, and sentenced her brother to 8 years in prison for refusing to denounce her.

(3) According to Federal prosecutors, the same Iranian intelligence network that allegedly plotted to kidnap Ms. Alinejad is also targeting critics of the Government of Iran who live in Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United Arab Emirates.

(4) In 2021, an Iranian diplomat was convicted in Belgium of attempting to carry out a 2018 bombing of a dissident rally in France.

(5) In 2021, a Danish high court found a Norwegian citizen of Iranian descent guilty of illegal espionage and complicity in a failed plot to kill an Iranian Arab dissident figure in Denmark.

(6) In 2021, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) appealed to the United Nations to protect BBC Persian employees in London who suffer regular harassment and threats of kidnapping by Iranian government agents.

(7) In 2021, 15 militants allegedly working on behalf of the Government of Iran were arrested in Ethiopia for plotting to attack citizens of Israel, the United States, and the United Arab Emirates, according to United States officials.

(8) In 2020, Iranian agents allegedly kidnapped United States resident and Iranian-German journalist Jamshid Sharmahd, while he was traveling to India through Dubai. Iranian authorities announced they had seized Mr. Sharmahd in ''a complex operation'', and paraded him blindfolded on state television. Mr. Sharmahd is arbitrarily detained in Iran, allegedly facing the death penalty. In 2009, Mr. Sharmahd was the target of an alleged Iran-directed assassination plot in Glendora, California.

(9) In 2020, the Government of Turkey released counterterrorism files exposing how Iranian authorities allegedly collaborated with drug gangs to kidnap Habib Chabi, an Iranian-Swedish activist for Iran's Arab minority. In 2020, the Government of Iran allegedly lured Mr. Chabi to Istanbul through a female agent posing as a potential lover. Mr. Chabi was then allegedly kidnapped from Istanbul, and smuggled into Iran where he faces execution, following a sham trial.

(10) In 2020, a United States-Iranian citizen and an Iranian resident of California pleaded guilty to charges of acting as illegal agents of the Government of Iran by surveilling Jewish student facilities, including the Hillel Center and Rohr Chabad Center at the University of Chicago, in addition to surveilling and collecting identifying information about United States citizens and nationals who are critical of the Iranian regime.

(11) In 2019, 2 Iranian intelligence officers at the Iranian consulate in Turkey allegedly orchestrated the assassination of Iranian dissident journalist Masoud Molavi Vardanjani, who was shot while walking with a friend in Istanbul. Unbeknownst to Mr. Molavi, his ''friend'' was in fact an undercover Iranian agent and the leader of the killing squad, according to a Turkish police report.

(12) In 2019, around 1,500 people were allegedly killed amid a less than 2 week crackdown by security forces on anti-government protests across Iran, including at least an alleged 23 children and 400 women.

(13) In 2019, Iranian operatives allegedly lured Paris-based Iranian journalist Ruhollah Zam to Iraq, where he was abducted, and hanged in Iran for sedition.

(14) In 2019, a Kurdistan regional court convicted an Iranian female for trying to lure Voice of America reporter Ali Javanmardi to a hotel room in Irbil, as part of a foiled Iranian intelligence plot to kidnap and extradite Mr. Javanmardi, a critic of the Government of Iran.

(15) In 2019, Federal Bureau of Investigation agents visited the rural Connecticut home of Iran-born United States author and poet Roya Hakakian to warn her that she was the target of an assassination plot orchestrated by the Government of Iran.

(16) In 2019, the Government of Denmark accused the Government of Iran of directing the assassination of Iranian Arab activist Ahmad Mola Nissi, in The Hague, and the assassination of another opposition figure, Reza Kolahi Samadi, who was murdered near Amsterdam in 2015.

(17) In 2018, German security forces searched for 10 alleged spies who were working for Iran's al-Quds Force to collect information on targets related to the local Jewish community, including kindergartens.

(18) In 2017, Germany convicted a Pakistani man for working as an Iranian agent to spy on targets including a former German lawmaker and a French-Israeli economics professor.

(19) In 2012, an Iranian American pleaded guilty to conspiring with members of the Iranian military to bomb a popular Washington, DC, restaurant with the aim of assassinating the ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the United States.

(20) In 1996, agents of the Government of Iran allegedly assassinated 5 Iranian dissident exiles across Turkey, Pakistan, and Baghdad, over a 5-month period that year.

(21) In 1992, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom expelled 2 Iranians employed at the Iranian Embassy in London and a third Iranian on a student visa amid allegations they were plotting to kill Indian-born British American novelist Salman Rushdie, pursuant to the fatwa issued by then supreme leader of Iran, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini.

(22) In 1992, 4 Iranian Kurdish dissidents were assassinated at a restaurant in Berlin, Germany, allegedly by Iranian agents.

(23) In 1992, singer, actor, poet, and gay Iranian dissident Fereydoun Farrokhzad was found dead with multiple stab wounds in his apartment in Germany. His death is allegedly the work of Iran-directed agents.

(24) In 1980, Ali Akbar Tabatabaei, a leading critic of Iran and then president of the Iran Freedom Foundation, was murdered in front of his Bethesda, Maryland, home by an assassin disguised as a postal courier. The Federal Bureau of Investigation had identified the ''mailman'' as Dawud Salahuddin, born David Theodore Belfield. Mr. Salahuddin was working as a security guard at an Iranian interest office in Washington, DC, when he claims he accepted the assignment and payment of $5,000 from the Government of Iran to kill Mr. Tabatabaei.

(25) Other exiled Iranian dissidents alleged to have been victims of the Government of Iran's murderous extraterritorial campaign include Shahriar Shafiq, Shapour Bakhtiar, and Gholam Ali Oveissi.

(26) Iranian Americans face an ongoing campaign of intimidation both in the virtual and physical world by agents and affiliates of the Government of Iran, which aims to stifle freedom of expression and eliminate the threat Iranian authorities believe democracy, justice, and gender equality pose to their rule.

SEC. 1283. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms ''admission'', ''admitted'', and ''alien'' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(3) CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ''correspondent account'' and ''payable-through account'' have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

(4) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''foreign financial institution'' has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(i)).

(5) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means any individual or entity that is not a United States person.

(6) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 1284. REPORT AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN ABUSES TOWARD DISSIDENTS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Attorney General, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) includes a detailed description and assessment of—

(i) the state of human rights and the rule of law inside Iran, including the rights and well-being of women, religious and ethnic minorities, and the LGBTQ community in Iran;

(ii) actions taken by the Government of Iran during the year preceding submission of the report to target and silence dissidents both inside and outside of Iran who advocate for human rights inside Iran;

(iii) the methods used by the Government of Iran to target and silence dissidents both inside and outside of Iran; and

(iv) the means through which the Government of Iran finances efforts to target and silence dissidents both inside and outside of Iran;

(B) identifies foreign persons working as part of the Government of Iran or acting on behalf of that Government (including members of paramilitary organizations such as Ansar-e-Hezbollah and Basij-e Mostaz'afin), that the Secretary of State determines, based on credible evidence, are knowingly responsible for, complicit in or involved in ordering, conspiring, planning or implementing the surveillance, harassment, kidnapping, illegal extradition, imprisonment, torture, killing, or assassination of citizens of Iran (including citizens of Iran of dual nationality) or citizens of the United States inside or outside Iran who seek—

(i) to expose illegal or corrupt activity carried out by officials of the Government of Iran;

(ii) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote internationally recognized human rights and freedoms, such as the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections, in Iran; or

(iii) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote the rights and well-being of women, religious

and ethnic minorities, and the LGBTQ community in Iran; and

(C) includes, for each foreign person identified subparagraph (B), a clear explanation for why the foreign person was so identified.

(2) UPDATES OF REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be updated, and the updated version submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, during the 10-year period following the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) not less frequently than annually; and

(B) with respect to matters relating to the identification of foreign persons under paragraph (1)(B), on an ongoing basis as new information becomes available.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by paragraph (1) and each update required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of State shall post the unclassified portion of each report required by paragraph (1) and each update required by paragraph (2) on a publicly available internet website of the Department of State.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—In the case of a foreign person identified under paragraph (1)(B) of subsection (a) in the most recent report or update submitted under that subsection, the President shall—

(1) if the foreign person meets the criteria for the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) of section 1263 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10102), impose sanctions under subsection (b) of that section; and

(2) if the foreign person does not meet such criteria, impose the sanctions described in subsection (c).

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed under this subsection with respect to a foreign person are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1)(B) is—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The visa or other entry documentation of an alien described in subsection (a)(1)(B) shall be revoked, regardless of when such visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(II) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under subclause (I) shall—

(aa) take effect immediately; and

(bb) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(d) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 15 days before the termination of the sanctions that—

(1) credible information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed; or

(3) the person has—

(A) credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior;

(B) has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed; and

(C) has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a) in the future.

SEC. 1285. REPORT AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS CONDUCTING SIGNIFICANT TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN ABUSES TOWARD DISSIDENTS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not earlier than 30 days and not later than 60 days after the Secretary of State submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report required by section 1284(a), the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies any foreign financial institution that knowingly conducts a significant transaction with a foreign person identified in the report submitted under section 1284(a).

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall post the unclassified portion of each report required by paragraph (1) on a publicly available internet website of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may prohibit the opening, or prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution identified under subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 1286. EXCEPTIONS; WAIVERS; IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND NATIONAL SECURITY ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under sections 1284 and 1285 shall not apply to any authorized intelligence, law enforcement, or national security activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under section 1284(c)(2) shall not apply with respect to the admission of an alien to the United States if the admission of the alien is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under section 1284 with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the waiver and the reasons for the waiver.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this Act.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of section 1284(b)(1) or 1285(b) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out either such section shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 1287. EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the authorities and requirements to impose sanctions under this title shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(b) GOOD DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''good'' means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

SA 5570. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PATUXENT RESEARCH REFUGE EXPANSION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 105 acres of Goddard Space Flight Center land under the jurisdiction of the Administrator known as ''Area 400''.

(3) RESEARCH REFUGE.—The term ''Research Refuge'' means the Patuxent Research Refuge established by Executive Order 7514 of December 16, 1936.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(b) RESEARCH REFUGE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—The acquisition boundary of the Research Refuge is expanded to include the land depicted as ''Area 400'' on the map entitled ''Patuxent Research Refuge Acquisition Boundary Expansion'' and dated July 28, 2022.

(c) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT CENTER LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a joint determination by the Administrator and the Secretary that the Federal land has been remediated and restored to the satisfaction of the Administrator and the Secretary, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3), the Administrator shall transfer to the Secretary, at no cost, administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land for inclusion in the Research Refuge.

(2) REMEDIATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall prepare an updated environmental evaluation of the Federal land, which shall include—

(i) a sampling and analysis of the soil;

(ii) a sampling and analysis of the groundwater; and

(iii) an assessment of the onsite septic system.

(B) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall consult with, and incorporate input from, the Secretary relating to the environmental evaluation prepared under subparagraph (A), including for purposes of—

(i) developing the sampling design;

(ii) conducting the data review and analysis; and

(iii) developing recommendations for the remediation of the Federal land.

(C) REMEDIATION.—Any necessary remediation identified in the environmental evaluation prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be conducted and funded by the Administrator.

(D) MONITORING.—Based on the findings of the environmental evaluation prepared under subparagraph (A), the Administrator and the Secretary shall jointly design and agree to an ongoing monitoring plan for the Federal land, which shall be conducted and funded by the Administrator.

(3) RESTORATION.—Before the transfer of the Federal land under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall restore the Federal land, which shall include—

(A) the demolition of any—

(i) aboveground structures;

(ii) concrete sidewalks;

(iii) underground storage tanks;

(iv) seismic isolation pads; and

(v) abandoned in-place monitoring wells;

(B) the decommissioning of the septic system;

(C) the demolition of the perimeter fence and gate;

(D) the decommissioning of electrical, sewer, and water connections;

(E) the removal of associated debris from the Federal land; and

(F) the stabilization of exposed soil.

(4) FUTURE LIABILITY.—The Administrator shall retain post-transfer responsibility, including for any ongoing monitoring required under paragraph (2)(D), for any hazardous substances that may be present on the Federal land as a result of activities by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have nine requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPREUNERSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

RUSSIA AND BELARUS SDR EXCHANGE PROHIBITION ACT OF 2022

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 452, H.R. 6899.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6899) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from engaging in transactions involving the exchange of Special Drawing Rights issued by the International Monetary Fund that are held by the Russian Federation or Belarus.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table.

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

The bill (H.R. 6899) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, September 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 484, S. 4822, with the provisions of the previous order in effect; further, that if cloture is not invoked, the Senate proceed to executive session to vote on confirmation of the Bennett nomination; that upon disposition of the Bennett nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Prabhakar nomination and at 1:45 p.m. vote on confirmation of the nomination; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. SANDERS. For the information of the Senate, there will be two rollcall votes at 11:30 a.m. and one rollcall vote at 1:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 21, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROSELYN TSO, OF OREGON, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT A. WOOD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING KEVIN AND SOURIYNO CHEN AS IOWANS OF THE WEEK

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing brothers Souriyno Chen and Kevin Chen as Iowans of the Week. Young entrepreneurs Souriyno and Kevin co-own Lucky Lotus, a successful, Southeast Asian eatery in Des Moines. Since opening their doors in October 2019, the Chens have leveraged their restaurant to serve up more than just delicious local eats. While working through significant challenges as new restaurant owners throughout the COVID–19 pandemic, they've consistently stepped up during difficult times to further causes they care about.

Souriyno and Kevin were no strangers to the restaurant business prior to opening Lucky Lotus. As the sons of refugees Seng and Dala Chen, who owned and operated Café Fuzion on Des Moines' east side for 15 years, they grew up in the industry. The two brothers saw an opportunity to share their family's passion for good food with greater Des Moines, a place they saw as full of possibilities. They wanted to be part of this growing community as it moved in a positive direction and contribute to its momentum.

With so much heart in its premise, it's no surprise that Lucky Lotus has been an engine for charitable giving since its inception. As Souriyno and Kevin saw the growing success of their restaurant, it was important to them to leverage this new platform and build on the community. They began engaging in efforts like raising funds for certain causes and doing food drives, always looking for different opportunities to affect positive change where and when they could.

Through Lucky Lotus, the Chen brothers donated a percentage of their proceeds to the Des Moines Chapter of the NAACP during the height of the Black Lives Matter movement to help eliminate race-based discrimination in our state. As hostility and hate crimes against Asian Americans were on the rise, they used the trending #StopAsianHate outcry to not only call for an end to racism and xenophobia in Iowa, but also donated a large share of their proceeds for a week to the Iowa Asian Alliance. They raised funds to create the Lucky Lotus Scholarship in partnership with the Iowa Asian Alliance, which was awarded to several local students for the first time last year. It was originally meant to be one award for one student, but the brothers raised enough funds to offer three scholarships instead. The Chens have found a way to make the Lucky Lotus Scholarship an annual award that will now go to three young Iowans of Asian descent and help them pay for higher education.

The more Souriyno and Kevin learned about the growing conflict in Ukraine in recent weeks, they jumped into action. Lucky Lotus publicly announced earlier this week that they are donating proceeds of various dishes to World Central Kitchen, an organization working on the frontlines in Ukraine to provide hot meals to Ukrainian refugees and neighboring countries. Iowans interested in learning about how they can help the crisis in Ukraine can visit the U.S. Department of State's ''United with Ukraine'' website for more information.

Souriyno and Kevin understand how powerful food can be. It's a necessary thing for our survival and basic comfort, but regardless of our different backgrounds or experiences, food offers a way to stay better connected and to show our care for one another. The Chen brothers are telling a story through Southeast Asian food, sharing the love of what they grew up eating, and making a positive impact on issues that matter in the process. They'll tell you Lucky Lotus would not exist without all the love and support of the people across the Des Moines metro, and I am inspired by how they've leveraged that support to give back in Iowa and beyond. Souriyno and Kevin are working every day to make the community a better place, whether by donating to causes supporting folks from all walks of life or by bringing people together over a shared meal. I am proud to name them our Iowans of the Week.

OPPOSING H.R. 8520, THE COUNTERING UNTRUSTED TELECOMMUNICATIONS ABROAD ACT

HON. PATRICK T. McHENRY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I rise, along with Republican Members of the Financial Services Committee, Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets—Rep. BILL HUIZENGA, Rep. FRENCH HILL, Rep. TOM EMMER, Rep. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY, Rep. WARREN DAVIDSON, Rep. TREY HOLLINGSWORTH, Rep. ANTHONY GONZALEZ, Rep. BRYAN STEIL and Rep. VAN TAYLOR, to express our serious concerns with H.R. 8520, the Countering Untrusted Telecommunications Abroad Act. Although this bill was referred to the Financial Services Committee, the referral was waived without understanding the bill's impact on U.S. capital markets.

We believe that H.R. 8520 implicates securities disclosure obligations in a way that runs counter to our existing principles-based disclosure framework. As such, H.R. 8520 risks setting a precedent in support of policies that run counter to our free-market principles and are harmful to the competitiveness of U.S. capital markets.

In particular, we are concerned that H.R. 8520 requires publicly traded companies to make certain disclosures to the Securities and Exchange Commission to advance foreign policy and national security objectives. As we have stated on several previous occasions this is ineffective. Sanctioning is the most effective way to achieve foreign policy and national security objectives—not our securities laws.

Hijacking U.S. investment disclosure rules to accomplish extraneous policy goals compromises the strength of American capital markets, disincentivizes companies from going or remaining public by increasing compliance costs and reduces investment opportunities for retail investors and retirement savers. Moreover, the SEC is not the appropriate entity for advancing our Nation's national security or foreign policy agenda. Such issues should be handled by agencies with expertise in overseeing more effective tools like sanctions and export controls.

Similarly, H.R. 8520 inappropriately considers all information of a certain kind ''material,'' in this case information related to contracts for—or usage of—telecommunications equipment or services from certain providers. Currently, under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, public companies are required to file annual reports with the SEC that are made public to disclose company information that investors would find material to making investment decisions. It is not Congress' job to tell public companies what information is and is not material. Instead, it is up to the individual company to make that determination on its own. Otherwise, companies will be forced to increase costs and regulatory risks to comply with disclosure obligations that do not materially influence investment decisions.

Moreover, this bill is mandating compliance with a disclosure regime that requires disclosing information that is likely unknowable. Specifically, the bill requires that publicly traded companies disclose if they or ''any affiliate'' used or entered into contracts to use covered telecommunications equipment or services. Inexplicably, the bill does not define ''any affiliate.'' Still, in many instances, it will be impossible for many companies to know whether their affiliates contracted for or used such services. To make matters worse, when companies attempt to disclose this impossible-to-discern information in a manner that later turns out to be mistaken, they would be liable for securities fraud.

The flawed approach set forth in this bill sets a dangerous precedent. H.R. 8520 should have been marked up in the Financial Services Committee prior to floor consideration in order to fully debate the policy implications. Ultimately, this bill will limit choices for everyday investors, encourage public companies to go private, and weaken the health of U.S. public markets.

For these reasons, we oppose H.R. 8520.

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING TOYS FOR TOTS DAY IN MISSOURI

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. LONG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Toys for Tots program and their chapters in Southwest Missouri.

First established in 1947, Toys for Tots is celebrating their 75th Anniversary in 2022. They have lived up to their mission of providing toys to the less fortunate ever since then, providing over 627 million toys to more than 281 million less fortunate children nationwide. This is done with the help of local communities during the annual holiday campaign lasting from October to Christmas.

Southwest Missouri has three Toys for Tots Campaigns, in Joplin serving Jasper County, in Newton serving Newton and McDonald Counties, and in Springfield serving Barry, Barton, Camden, Cedar, Christian, Dade, Dallas, Greene, Hickory, Lawrence, Polk, St. Clair, Vernon and Webster Counties. These three local Campaigns have done phenomenal work in bringing the joy of Christmas to those in need.

Missouri Governor Mike Parson has proclaimed October 1, 2022, to be Toys for Tots Day across the State of Missouri. I join Governor Parson and the Missouri General Assembly in congratulating Toys for Tots on their 75th Anniversary and wish them continued success for the next 75 years.

HONORING COOPER WERNER LOWE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Cooper Werner Lowe. Cooper is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 410, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Cooper has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Cooper has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned 23 merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Cooper has served 2 terms as Patrol Leader and also served as Troop Chaplain. Cooper has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Cooper coordinated and led the construction of a 12 x 16 storage shed behind a church that the Lowes attended.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Cooper Werner Lowe for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CELEBRATING 75 YEARS OF THE PHOENIX INDIAN CENTER

HON. RUBEN GALLEGO

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Phoenix Indian Center, which celebrates its 75th anniversary this year.

Founded in 1947, the Phoenix Indian Center is the oldest American Indian non-profit organization of its kind in the United States. Originally established to help Native Americans who traveled to downtown Phoenix to sell arts and crafts to support their families, the nonprofit has successfully expanded its services to offer exemplary employment, education, cultural enrichment, and community engagement services for urban Native Americans. Additionally, the Phoenix Indian Center has continuously achieved its goal to ''keep families intact and help them maneuver through difficult situations they may encounter.''

By implementing their core values of integrity, accountability, adaptability, and respect, the Phoenix Indian Center has established resources such as job preparedness workshops, youth services, housing assistance, scholarships, and many others that have positive impacts throughout the Native American community. For 75 transformative years, I thank the Phoenix Indian Center, and I look forward to seeing what they accomplish next for our community.

STANDING UP FOR DOWNWINDERS UNDER THE RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION ACT (RECA)

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in continued support of the reauthorization of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA). I first learned about RECA through my constituents over 10 years ago, and since then I have been determined to get justice for the victims of reckless federal government policies that injured thousands.

From 1945 to 1962, the United States government, through its military, conducted nearly 200 atmospheric weapons development tests as part of our nation's Cold War security strategy during an era when other nations were also engaged in nuclear weapons testing and proliferation. These tests exposed millions of innocent Americans to potentially cancer-causing ionized radiation from nuclear fallout. It is hard to believe today, but for over a decade the military was blasting tons of radioactive material into our skies. And this was the military that was supposed to protect Americans.

One report, from the University of Kansas, explained that ''enormous clouds, pinkish-gray in color, rose up into the air, spreading out and reaching over nearby communities. At the time, not much information about these tests was available to the public, but the radioactive dust that fell from the clouds—gathering on people's homes, their cars, their clothes lines, and their vegetable gardens—caused serious and harmful long-term medical issues.''

The report further documents just one person's experience with the radiation delivered over their farm in Utah:

''Not till the 1960s were we really aware of the danger of those fallout materials. Mom and Dad were told that there was nothing to worry about, it wasn't going to harm anybody. And then people started getting sick! And passing away! And thyroid cancer was a big one, it was huge . . . and then our family lost that sweet little baby. Dad still thinks that it's the milk Mom drank, and then Mom later on got colon cancer, and none of that has ever shown up in her family. There's no sign of colon cancer anywhere in the family. And Mom died with colon cancer, and Dad and Warren were plagued with skin cancer, and I've had a bit of skin cancer myself. It's always a worry because, the people realized that the government were lying to them! Literally lying to them. And it just was sad, it was a sad situation.''

When the injuries were discovered, Congress subsequently provided an apology on behalf of the nation and passed the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990, or RECA, to establish a trust fund for partial restitution to individuals—commonly referred to as ''Downwinders''—who have contracted certain cancers and other serious diseases that can be directly attributed to the radiation exposure from the nuclear weapons testing.

The spread of radioactive material was not limited to Arizona, Utah and Nevada. It went essentially nationwide. The University of Kansas states, ''While the areas surrounding test sites in the southwestern states are some of the most heavily affected, air currents carried the radioactive particles all over the country, and even beyond the borders of the U.S.'' This information came from the National Cancer Institute.

RECA was and is an effort to provide some very minimal compensation for the radiation victims. RECA is all we have now, even though it was too little and too late for many.

I have long led legislation that would reauthorize RECA and expand eligibility for Downwinders compensation by including qualified individuals who were exposed in any part of Clark County, Nevada, or Mohave County, Arizona—immediately downwind jurisdictions from the testing site that have been excluded from compensation for decades due to a drafting error. The exclusion of my constituents in Mohave County, Arizona is an egregious injustice. It's clear that the original legislative intent was to include all of Mohave County and that the partial exclusion is a drafting error in the statutory text: In 1990, RECA was passed with Mohave County included. Then in 2000, S. 1515 amended RECA expanding qualification to additional counties. The expansion of compensation to additional counties did not seek to exclude any jurisdiction. It only sought to ''increase'' Downwinders compensation to additional counties. In amending the Act, the House of Representatives stated in the House Report that Congress's goal in amending the Act was to ''increase'' the existing Downwinder areas to ''include'' additional areas. The House report makes clear that the drafters sought to increase the area that had been covered under the prior version and to add new counties. In reality, Congress added new counties to the affected area but also mistakenly eliminated a large portion of Mohave County. In short, legal malpractice in drafting

the statute cut out more than half of Mohave County, one of the most impacted counties in the U.S.

The statutory text is at odds with the stated goals of House Report 106–697 which states ''S. 1515 would increase the Downwinder ''affected area'' to include . . . the counties of Coconino, Yavapai, Navajo, Apache, and Gila in Arizona.'' It says nothing about excluding any county. This drafting error has had a direct impact on people's health and safety and has cost many of my constituents the compensation they deserve. I call for immediate rectification of RECA to clarify that the original text and later amendments never sought to exclude my constituents in Mohave County, Arizona from qualifying for Downwinders compensation.

But Madam Speaker, there is more. As the maps demonstrate, radioactive fallout was documented across the United States. It is not just Mohave County that should be included under RECA, but all contiguous 48 states. There is evidence of fallout in every state. Only the furthest west areas, such as L.A. escaped radiation. But Eastern California was exposed. For that reason, I am urging an amendment to RECA as we reauthorize it: RECA should allow claims from any person who lived in a documented radiation zone during the test years that later developed a cancer related to radiation exposure.

The government sacrificed its people to test the bombs. Moralists can argue if that was the right thing to do at the time. But today, 70 years later, the moral debate is irrelevant. The people have been hurt. Families devasted. They were unwittingly sacrificed as foot soldiers in a war they did not sign up for. At a minimum, the federal government today has the moral obligation to recognize their sacrifice and compensate the victims.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 2022

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3895, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) Reauthorization Act. This bipartisan legislation reauthorizes USCIRF through 2024 and demonstrates strong congressional support for its mission of promoting religious freedom as a core objective of U.S. foreign policy.

As the daughter of immigrants who fled religious persecution abroad, I believe the U.S. has a responsibility to stand up for the rights of religious minorities around the world. That's why I'm proud to have joined Congressman CHRIS SMITH in introducing H.R. 7829, the House companion of S. 3895. I'm grateful to Rep. SMITH for partnering with me on this legislation and for his unwavering commitment to ensuring that all people can practice the religion of their choice without fear of persecution.

In 1998, Congress established USCIRF, an independent commission dedicated to promoting religious freedom through U.S. foreign policy. In the years since its founding, the Commission has lived up to its mandate by issuing incisive reports about religious freedom conditions abroad, advising Congress and Executive Branch officials, and sounding the alarm when religious persecution occurs. Importantly, the Commission is independent from the State Department, ensuring that its assessments of religious freedom conditions abroad are not influenced by, or perceived to be influenced by, other U.S. foreign policy interests.

We live in an era in which religious freedom is threatened in much of the world. The Chinese government is perpetrating genocide against Uyghur Muslims; Christians in Iraq and Syria have been subjected to ethnic strife and the ravages of war; and the Burmese junta continues its horrific genocidal campaign against the Rohingya minority. It's clear that USCIRF's work is as important today as ever before.

By reauthorizing USCIRF on a bipartisan basis, Congress will demonstrate strong support for the Commission and its critical work to promote religious freedom abroad. I urge my colleagues to stand with the persecuted religious minorities of the world by supporting this legislation.

RECOGNIZING BIOHIVE UTAH

HON. BURGESS OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, on December 2, 1982, the medical team from the University of Utah successfully implanted the first permanent artificial heart in the world.

Forty years later, Utah remains a trailblazer in healthcare innovation.

Over the past two years, I had the pleasure of visiting many Utah businesses at the forefront of the healthcare industry. I would like to highlight the impressive work a few of our homegrown companies are accomplishing in the healthcare space.

The team at Ortho Development Corporation works to restore mobility by perfecting the design, manufacturing, and distribution of surgical instruments used for total knee and hip replacements.

Xenter specializes in developing new wireless medical device technologies and digital health tools to address the latest challenges in medicine while helping Utahns manage their health information.

Canyon Labs is an accredited laboratory providing testing, scientific and technical consulting, and clinical research services for medical devices, pharmaceuticals, over the counter drugs, and biologics.

Ultradent is a global dental manufacturing company improving oral health throughout the world and ranked No. 9 best workplace by Fortune magazine.

My state's pro-innovation regulatory environment, advanced medical infrastructure, and highly skilled workforce work in tandem to cement Utah's invaluable role in the life sciences community.

Biohive, a collaboration of more than 1,100 companies representing Utah's life science and healthcare innovation ecosystem, is the driving force behind the beehive state's success. The collective effort of local government, the private sector, and other stakeholders facilitated by the Biohive initiative has delivered remarkable results.

Utah is ranked No. 6 in the Nation for medical device development, and No. 5 for diagnostics development. Utah also serves as the epicenter for lifesaving catheter technologies and is a rising force in bio-pharma.

Additionally, the Bioscience industry in Utah supports 130,000 local jobs, accounts for 8 percent of GDP, and produces hundreds of patents for lifesaving medical devices.

Behind these extraordinary accomplishments are the pioneering spirit, grit, and kindness of Utahns. I am proud to represent the beautiful state of Utah, and I hope Utah's success story serves as the blueprint for other states to emulate.

HONORING THE COURAGEOUS LIFE AND SERVICE OF ROBERT C. SHAW

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert C. Shaw, for his courageous service in the United States Navy.

Robert Shaw was born in 1924 in Saratoga County, New York. At the age of 19, Bob joined the United States Navy as a torpedo man's mate on the USS *Tigrone*. Bob and the USS *Tigrone* began their war patrol at Pearl Harbor and then set off for Guam for engine repairs. The fleet then made their way to the South China Sea to help identify and intercept Japanese shipping boats. Beginning in April 1945, Bob and his fleet performed lifeguard duties off the coast of Hainan until Japan surrendered in August of 1945.

Bob was discharged from the Navy on December 21, 1945 at the rank of Seaman First Class. For his brave and selfless service, he was awarded the Victory Medal, the American Campaign Medal, and the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal.

Following his time in the Navy, Bob continued to lead a life full of service to country and community. After being discharged, Bob bought and lived on two farms, where he organized a 4-H Club for local youth to mentor and educate them on proper farm practices. Bob was also an active member of Optimist International, a worldwide volunteer organization, and the Freemasons.

In addition to his volunteer work, Bob contributed to the local community in a variety of ways. Bob owned and operated several local businesses including the Stage Coach Inn, the Crossroads, the General Store in Wilton, and Shaw Fuel, which is still in operation today.

Throughout his life, Bob showed exceptional dedication to serving his country and his local community. I am proud to honor Bob with the Saratoga County Veterans Association as part of the monthly Honor our Deceased Veterans Ceremony. On behalf of the 21st District of New York, I would like to thank Bob Shaw and his family for their service to the country and community.

CELEBRATING THE UNVEILING OF THE FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN VETERANS MONUMENT IN BUFFALO, NEW YORK

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, today I join the Western New York community in celebrating and honoring the service of African American veterans throughout the history of the United States military. For decades, our country ignored the unjust conditions in which African Americans had served in our armed forces. When others returned home from war, they were heralded as heroes. When African Americans returned home from war, our nation denied their humanity and their equal rights. Thankfully, a committee in Buffalo, New York has dedicated its time and energy into recognizing this reality. Now, the African American Veterans Monument will stand on the Buffalo waterfront as a constant reminder to all its citizens of the immense sacrifices that have been made.

From the Revolutionary War to the present day, millions of African Americans have served this country with valor. There are currently more than 360,000 African American soldiers in our military. We have an additional 2.1 million African American veterans. Over 200,000 African Americans served in the Union Army during the Civil War and over 1 million African Americans served in WWII. In total, 89 African Americans have been awarded the Medal of Honor, the most prestigious military decoration awarded to U.S. service members. This type of unquestionable loyalty and service cannot go unrecognized. Leaders in the Western New York community, led by New York State Assembly Majority Leader Crystal Peoples-Stokes, were not about to let that happen.

This monument will honor our African American veterans in the same way they served our country: with integrity, strength, and resilience. The first of its kind, this monument will be unveiled on September 24, 2022, at Buffalo and Erie County Naval & Military Park. The date commemorates the anniversary of the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation Act, the law that first allowed African Americans to join the armed forces. Every aspect of this monument was carefully constructed. It will feature twelve black concrete pillars to symbolize all twelve major campaigns that African Americans have fought in. The top of each pillar is illuminated to represent the candles that families would put in windows to guide their soldiers to safety. These lights will continuously glow to remind us that service does not end when a soldier comes home; it is a commitment that can never be properly repaid.

Nevertheless, I trust that the African American Veterans Monument can be the first of many steps to thoroughly appreciate our brave and selfless veterans in the African American community. I am so proud to represent countless African American veterans and those who recognized the necessity of this monument. This is long overdue.

HONORING 70 YEARS OF THE MISSOURI AND ASSOCIATED RIVERS COALITION (MOARC)

HON. SHARICE DAVIDS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 70th anniversary of the Missouri and Associated Rivers Coalition (MOARC). Since its inception, MOARC and its members have tirelessly served the greater Kansas City region.

MOARC was formed in 1952, following a flood, with the goal of implementing better water management. Membership today consists of organizations, associations, companies, governmental units, and individuals, all of whom are interested in establishing better flood control programs and supporting conservation of land-water resources.

Since its creation, MOARC's members have fiercely advocated for the Kansas Third District and the rest of the region, advocating for projects like the Bush Creek Basin. Without their efforts, it might not be recognized as the cultural corridor of Kansas City. And thanks to their work advocating for projects like the St. Joseph Levee and Line Creek Watershed, the region is better positioned to take action on important infrastructure needs.

I've also had the pleasure of supporting MOARC's work while in Congress. Last year, I joined local officials to tour the Upper Turkey Creek levee project, for which I secured funding and MOARC supported.

I look forward to continuing my strong relationship with MOARC, their exceptional members, and their local land-water conservation efforts. Here's to many more years of responsible waterway stewardship in the greater Kansas City region.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF REVEREND MICHAEL RUSSO

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Reverend Michael Russo.

Throughout his life, Michael demonstrated his dedication to his faith and his passion for education. He earned his bachelor's in communications and later his Master of Divinity from Seton Hall University. Michael became an ordained minister in 1971 and was known from that point on as Father Mike. Father Mike was especially interested in political communications and American journalism. He earned a Ph.D. in American Social and Political History from New York University (NYU). His doctoral dissertation, which focused on CBS News's impact on American politics, received the 1983 Bayrd Still Award in Historical Writing.

Father Mike was eager to share his knowledge and passion for U.S. history with future generations. He began his career as an educator teaching Religion and Communication Studies at Seton Hall. He later served as chair of Seton Hall's Religious Studies Department. He began teaching Political Communication at Saint Mary's College in the early 1980s and was later appointed as chair of the Academic Senate and chair of the Communication Department. Father Mike was adored among the Saint Mary's community and has touched countless students' lives.

Father Mike worked closely with CBS News for many years, offering his expert analysis on papal happenings. His partnership with CBS began when Mike was still in college, serving as Walter Cronkite's desk assistant. Father Mike was later asked by CBS to cover events surrounding the Pope where he provided his expertise to a global audience. Father Mike had the honor of travelling with Pope John Paul II on "Shepard One" when His Holiness visited Northern California in 1987.

Sadly, Mike passed away on August 10, 2022. He is survived by his brother Joseph and his wife Anita, his sister Marian, his nieces and nephews, Leah, AJ, Philip, Bettina, Tim, William, Josephine, and Julian, and many other loving family members, friends, colleagues, and parishioners. Father Mike will be remembered for his wisdom, compassion, and commitment to his faith. He will be deeply missed. Please join us in honoring Reverend Michael Russo for his many contributions to our community and to our Nation.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RED ARROW DINER

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 100th Anniversary of the Red Arrow Diner in Manchester, New Hampshire. As one of the most popular diners on the East Coast, the Red Arrow Diner enjoys a special place in the folklore of our state and remains a popular destination for locals, celebrities, politicians, and tourists alike.

Dating back to the diner's opening in October of 1922, the Red Arrow cemented its legacy in downtown Manchester as a quaint, family-friendly locale with a knack for home-cooked meals guaranteed to please even the most skeptical palate. This tiny little diner on Lowell Street flourished into a major chain that today employs one hundred and seventy-five people and has expanded operations to Concord, Londonderry, and Nashua. Despite this massive growth, the Red Arrow remains committed to the values of its founders: serving customers with a smile and delivering consistent, quality home cooked meals.

The Red Arrow Diner's success can be attributed in large part to the efforts of Carol Lawrence, her father George Lawrence, and Amanda Wihby. Their vision for this diner has made the Red Arrow a must-visit destination for visitors from out of state, and their dedication to the state of New Hampshire will ensure that the Red Arrow remains a vital part of our state culture for another 100 years. On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I thank the Red Arrow Diner and its management for 100 years of outstanding contributions to our state.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FERRY SERVICE EXPANSION ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the ''Ferry Service Expansion Act'' with U.S. Senator PATTY MURRAY (D–WA). I want to thank my House colleagues for their support as original cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation.

Ferries are among the most climate-resilient modes of public transportation, capable of reaching areas where it is infeasible or imprudent to build new bridges or causeways. Historically, Congress has underfunded public ferry service compared to other transit and roadway projects. Our ''Ferry Service Expansion Act'' would correct this by increasing funding for both the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) formula and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) competitive grant programs to the levels requested by the Public Ferry Coalition, which represents public ferry operators across the country.

In the Bay Area, the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) is working to expand ferry service for commuters and visitors alike. WETA is also retrofitting its existing diesel-powered ferries to reduce emissions of particulates and greenhouse gases, WETA is pursuing new, zero-emissions ferries to eventually replace its entire vessel fleet. The ''Ferry Service Expansion Act'' would provide federal support for this important work, while also holding federal grantees to the high standards for ''Buy American'' requirements and prevailing wages under the Davis-Bacon Act that already apply to other federal funding for ferries.

Under current law, States may use their federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) for public or private ferry projects. In December 2020, the Bay Area Council released a feasibility study for employing hovercraft to provide ferry service in the South Bay. Hovercrafts can provide ferry service in environmentally sensitive areas that cannot be dredged to sufficient depth for vessels. Section 4 of the ''Ferry Service Expansion Act'' would simply clarify that States could use their STBG for hovercraft ferries, provided the project is otherwise eligible under the program as providing ferry service to the public. On July 1, 2021, the House passed this same provision as my amendment to Chairman PETER A. DEFAZIO's (D–OR) ''Investing in a New Vision for the Environment and Surface Transportation (INVEST) in America Act.''

Lastly, our bicameral, bipartisan legislation would also support private operators of passenger ferries by allowing them to register Capital Construction Funds with the Maritime Administration (MARAD). Capital Construction Funds allow vessel operators to forgo paying federal business taxes on such vessels provided all that forgone tax payment is reinvested in constructing new U.S.-flagged vessels in American shipyards. Under current law, only cargo vessels and commercial fishing boats are eligible for this special tax exemption. However, some car ferry operators successfully registered Capital Construction Funds with MARAD, arguing that the cars are ''cargo'' and therefore their vessels are a ''cargo vessel'' and not a ''ferry.'' The ''Ferry Service Expansion Act'' corrects this discrepancy by ensuring that passenger ferries are also clearly eligible. On March 29, 2022, the House passed this same provision from my H.R. 6882 as part of the ''Don Young Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2022'' (H.R. 6865).

As a senior member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I continue working to secure additional federal funding to complement the state, county, and local investments to improve ferry service across the Bay Area. I plan to work with Senator MURRAY to make this legislation a priority. Madam Speaker, I encourage all members of the House to join us in cosponsoring the ''Ferry Service Expansion Act.''

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 22, 2022 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 27

4 p.m.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Business meeting to consider S. 4573, to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the Electoral Count Act, and to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to provide clear guidelines for when and to whom resources are provided by the Administrator of General Services for use in connection with the preparations for the assumption of official duties as President or Vice President.

SR–301

SEPTEMBER 28

Time to be announced

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Karla Ann Gilbride, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Jessica Looman, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, Moshe Z. Marvit, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and other pending calendar business.

TBA

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine stakeholder views on the Brownfields Program reauthorization.

SD–406

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine keeping the pressure on Russia and its enablers, focusing on the reach of and next steps for U.S. sanctions.

SD–419

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity from Nuremberg to Ukraine.

SD–226

11 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 4828, to provide consistent leadership, purpose, and administrative support for the primary governmentwide executive councils, S. 4894, to provide for the perpetuation, administration, and funding of Federal Executive Boards, S. 4893, to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require certain disclosures by registrants regarding exemptions under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, S. 4882, to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, S. 4528, to establish a Government-wide approach to improving digital identity, S. 4816 and H.R. 7337, bills to require the Archivist of the United States to submit a plan to Congress to eliminate the records backlog at the National Personnel Records Center, S. 4328, to modify the fire management assistance cost share, S. 4399, to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government, S. 4668, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 400 North Main Street in Belen, New Mexico, as the ''U.S. Senator Dennis Chavez Post Office'', H.R. 7777, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to establish an industrial control systems cybersecurity training initiative, H.R. 5689, to improve the provision of Federal resources to help build capacity and fund risk-reducing, cost-effective mitigation projects for eligible State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and certain private nonprofit organizations, H.R. 6824, to authorize the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security to hold an annual cybersecurity competition relating to offensive and defensive cybersecurity disciplines, H.R. 7211, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, review a final rule of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, H.R. 3544, to require the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain surplus computers and technology equipment to nonprofit computer refurbishers for repair, distribution, and return, H.R. 4209, to support remediation of illicit cross-border tunnels, H.R. 6873, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office for

Bombing Prevention to address terrorist explosive threats, H.R. 228, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2141 Ferry Street in Anderson, California, as the ''Norma Comnick Post Office Building'', H.R. 1095, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 South Willowbrook Avenue in Compton, California, as the ''PFC James Anderson, Jr., Post Office Building'', H.R. 5659, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1961 North C Street in Oxnard, California, as the ''John R. Hatcher III Post Office Building'', an original bill entitled, ''Federal Contracting for Peace and Security Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Strengthening Agency Management and Oversight of Software Assets Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Department of Homeland Security Seal Protection Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Securing Open Source Software Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Invent Here, Make Here for Homeland Security Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Protecting the Border from Unmanned Aircraft Systems Act'', an original bill entitled, ''National Climate Adaptation and Resilience Strategy Act'', and the nominations of Colleen Joy Shogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, Vijay Shanker, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and Laura E. Crane, Leslie A. Meek, Veronica M. Sanchez, Errol Rajesh Arthur, Kendra Davis Briggs, and Carl Ezekiel Ross, each to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD–342

3:15 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on the Constitution

To hold hearings to examine S. 2298, to amend section 1977 of the Revised Statutes to protect equal rights under law.

SD–226

SEPTEMBER 29

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water

To hold a joint hearing to examine S. 3571, to promote remediation of abandoned hardrock mines.

SD–406

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert Harley Shriver III, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and Richard L. Revesz, of New York, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

SD–342

2 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed briefing on the Russian Invasion of Ukraine.

SVC–217

OCTOBER 12

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine putting the Bipartisan Infrastructure law to work, focusing on the private sector perspective.

SD–406

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the resolution of Advise and Consent to Ratification to the amendment to the Montreal Protocol ("Kigali Amendment"), as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4879–S4940

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4902–4916, and S. Res. 787–790. **Pages S4912–13**

Measures Reported:

S. 177, to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Cerro de la Olla Wilderness in the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument and to modify the boundary of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 117–151)

S. 1128, to provide for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance to the University of Alaska of certain public land in the State of Alaska, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 117–152)

S. 1222, to designate and adjust certain lands in the State of Utah as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System. (S. Rept. No. 117–153)

S. 1321, to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 117–154)

S. 1631, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land in the State of Arizona to the Arizona Board of Regents, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 117–155)

S. 1942, to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 117–156)

S. 2438, to modify the boundary of the Cane River Creole National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 117–157)

S. 3266, to improve recreation opportunities on, and facilitate greater access to, Federal public land, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 117–158) **Page S4912**

Measures Passed:

Russia and Belarus SDR Exchange Prohibition Act: Senate passed H.R. 6899, to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from engaging in transactions involving the exchange of Special Drawing Rights issued by the International Monetary Fund that are held by the Russian Federation or Belarus.

Page S4940

House Messages:

Advanced Air Mobility Coordination and Leadership Act: Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to S. 516, to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system.

Page S4887

Disclose Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4822, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, be at 11:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 22, 2022; that if cloture is not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, Senate continue consideration of the nomination of Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, and vote on confirmation thereon; and that upon disposition of the nomination, Senate continue consideration of the nomination of Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and vote on confirmation thereon at 1:45 p.m. **Page S4940**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday,

September 22, 2022, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4940**

Treaty Approved:

Amendment to Montreal Protocol ("Kigali Amendment"): By 69 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. EX. 343), two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the resolution of Advise and Consent to Ratification, as amended, to Treaty Document 117–1, the amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the ''Kigali Amendment''), with 1 declaration, after having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4879–87, S4887–98**

Adopted:

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. EX. 342), Sullivan/Lee Amendment No. 5518, to ensure that the People's Republic of China is not treated as a developing country. **Pages S4896–98**

Withdrawn:

Schumer Amendment No. 5503, to add an effective date. **Page S4879**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make grammatical, technical changes to the resolution of ratification with respect to the treaty, in order to reflect the addition of material. **Page S4902**

Bennett Nomination: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media. **Pages S4898–S4908**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 60 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. EX. 344), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S4907–08**

Prabhakar Nomination: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy. **Page S4908**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 58 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 345), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4908**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Robert A. Wood, of New York, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations.

Roselyn Tso, of Oregon, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, for the term of four years. **Page S4940**

Messages from the House: **Page S4911**

Measures Referred: **Page S4911**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4911–12**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4913–14**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4914–17**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4910–11**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4917–40**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4940**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—345) **Pages S4897–98, S4907–08.**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:33 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, September 22, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page 4940.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

VA ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD MODERNIZATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine the VA's electronic health record modernization, focusing on rollout, cost, and schedule, after receiving testimony from Donald M. Remy, Deputy Secretary, Terry Adirim, Program Executive Director, Electronic Health Record Modernization Integration Office, Shereef Elnahal, Under Secretary for Health, Veterans Health Administration, Jon J. Rychalski, Assistant Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, and David Case, Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Mike Sicilia, Oracle, Austin, Texas; and Brian Rieksts, Institute for Defense Analyses, Alexandria, Virginia.

RECRUITING AND RETENTION EFFORTS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine the status of military recruiting and retention efforts across the Department of Defense, after receiving testimony from Stephanie P. Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Military Personnel Policy, Lieutenant General Douglas F. Stitt, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–1, United States Army, Vice Admiral Rick J. Cheeseman, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations Personnel, Manpower and Training, N1, United States Navy, Lieutenant General Caroline M. Miller, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel, and Services, United States Air Force, and Michael R. Strobl, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, United States Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 305, to establish the Springfield Race Riot National Monument in the State of Illinois, S. 1211, to establish the Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historic Park in Collinsville, Illinois, Monroe, Madison, and St. Clair Counties, Illinois, and St. Louis City County, Missouri, S. 3447, to authorize the National Service Animals Monument Corporation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, S. 3579, to authorize the Embassy of France in Washington, DC, to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor the extraordinary contributions of Jean Monnet to restoring peace between European nations and establishing the European Union, S. 3873, to designate the outdoor amphitheater at the Blue Ridge Music Center in Galax, Virginia, as the ''Rock Boucher Amphitheater'', S. 4122, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Housatonic River in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 4168, to amend title 54, United States Code, to reauthorize the National Park Foundation, S. 4222, to establish the St. Croix National Heritage Area, S. 4371, to establish the Cesar E. Chavez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park in the States of California and Arizona, S. 4377 and H.R. 4380, bills to designate the El Paso Community Healing Garden National Memorial, S. 4464 and H.R. 1908, bills to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Ka'ena Point National Heritage Area, S. 4693, to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails and designate the American Discovery Trail, S. 4784, to modify the boundary of the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument in the State of Maine, to improve public access to the National Monument, and S.J. Res. 57, redesignating the Robert E. Lee Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery as the ''Arlington House National Historic Site'', after receiving testimony from Senator Padilla; Michael A. Caldwell, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities, and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Will Shafroth, National Park Foundation, Washington, D.C.; and Steve Richardson, Friends of Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument, Patten, Maine.

BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE LAW

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine putting the Bipartisan Infrastructure law to work, focusing on state and local perspectives, after receiving testimony from Nicole Majeski, Delaware Department of Transportation Secretary, Dover; Jimmy D. Wriston, West Virginia Department of Transportation Secretary, and Commissioner of the Division of Highways, Charleston; Mayor Regina Romero, Tucson, Arizona; and Jim Tymon, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.

WOMEN LEADERS COUNTERING AUTHORITARIANISM

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine women leaders countering authoritarianism, after receiving testimony from Rosa Maria Paya, Cuba Decide, Miami, Florida; Jewher Ilham, Worker Rights Consortium, Arlington, Virginia; and Roya Hakakian, New Haven, Connecticut.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Colleen Joy Shogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Archivist of the United States, who was introduced by Senator Capito, Vijay Shanker, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and Laura E. Crane, Leslie A. Meek, and Veronica M. Sanchez, each to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

TRIBAL ACCESS TO SPECTRUM

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine promoting and supporting tribal access to spectrum and related benefits in Native communities, after receiving testimony from Heidi

Todacheene, Senior Advisor to the Secretary, Department of the Interior; Umair Javed, Chief Counsel, and Priscilla Delgado Argeris, Chief Legal Advisor, both of the Office of the Chairwoman, Federal Communications Commission; Anna Maria Ortiz, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, and Sally Moino, Assistant Director, Physical Infrastructure, both of the Government Accountability Office; Tyler Iokepa Gomes, Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, Kapolei; Melanie Benjamin, and Keith Modglin, both of the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe, Onamia, Minnesota; and Chris Cropley, Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes, Juneau, Alaska.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Maria Araujo Kahn, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Blumenthal, Julie Rikelman, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Markey, Margaret R. Guzman, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, who was introduced by Senators Warren and Markey, Araceli Martinez-Olguin, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, who was introduced by Senators Feinstein and Padilla, Jamar K. Walker, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, who was introduced by Senators Warner and Kaine, and Jamal N. Whitehead, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, who was introduced by Senator Murray, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

SBA STATE TRADE EXPANSION PROGRAM OVERSIGHT

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the SBA's State Trade Expansion Program, after receiving testimony from Gabriel J. Esparza, Associate Administrator, Office of International Trade, Small Business Administration; Shaun Akhavan, Allied International Corp., Glen Burnie, Maryland; and Grace Preston, Geophysical Survey Systems, Inc., Nashua, New Hampshire.

VETERANS' ACCESS TO CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine ensuring veterans' timely access to care in VA and the community, after receiving testimony from Denis McDonough, Secretary, and Darin Selnick, former Senior Advisor to the Secretary, both of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Carrie M. Farmer, RAND Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Joy J. Ilem, Disabled American Veterans, Washington, D.C.

PROTECTING AMERICAN INNOVATION

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting American innovation, focusing on industry, academia, and the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, after receiving testimony from William R. Evanina, The Evanina Group, Alexandria, Virginia; Michelle Van Cleave, Jack Kemp Foundation, and Robert Sheldon, CrowdStrike, both of Washington, D.C.; and Kevin R. Gamache, Texas A and M University System, College Station.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 8930–8948; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 97–98; and H. Res. 1378–1382, were introduced. **Pages H8064–65**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H8066–67**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 82. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions (H. Rept. 117–482); and

H. Res. 1377, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4118) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5768) to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program to establish, create, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6448) to direct the Director of the Office of Community

Oriented Policing Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8542) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–483). **Page H8064**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H8013**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:56 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H8019**

Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act: The House passed S. 1098, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans, by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 448. Consideration began yesterday, September 20th.

Pages H8030–31

Rejected the Foxx motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor, by a yea-and-nay vote of 202 yeas to 228 nays, Roll No. 447.

Pages H8030–31

H. Res. 1361, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1098) was agreed to yesterday, September 20th.

Authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present the statue of Harry S. Truman from the people of Missouri: The House agreed to take from the Speaker table and agree to S. Con. Res. 44, authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present the statue of Harry S. Truman from the people of Missouri.

Page H8032

Authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Black Americans in Congress, 1870–1989": The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 82, authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Black Americans in Congress, 1870–1989".

Page H8032

Presidential Election Reform Act: The House passed H.R. 8873, to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the process for the counting of electoral votes, by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 203 nays, Roll No. 449. **Pages H8032–48**

H. Res. 1372, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8873) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 446, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 445.

Pages H8022–30

Senate Referrals: S. 3884 was held at the desk. S. 4552 was held at the desk. S. 4553 was held at the desk. S. 4899 was held at the desk. S. 4900 was held at the desk. **Page H8022**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H8022.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8029, H8029–30, H8030–31, H8031, and H8047–48.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

Committee Meetings

UPDATE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW COMMISSION ON SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRIAL COUNSELS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled "Update on the Implementation of Recommendations of the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military and the Establishment of the Office of Special Trial Counsels". Testimony was heard from Gilbert R. Cisneros, Jr., Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense; Gabe Camarillo, Under Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army; Erik Raven, Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy; and Gina Ortiz Jones, Under Secretary of the Air Force, Department of the Air Force.

EXAMINING THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled "Examining the Administration of the Unemployment Insurance System". Testimony was heard from Thomas Costa, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Team, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3655, the "Vaccine Injury Compensation Modernization Act of 2021"; H.R. 5141, the "Maximizing Outcomes through Better Investments in Lifesaving Equipment for (MOBILE) Health Care Act"; H.R. 8163, the "Improving Trauma Systems and Emergency Care Act"; H.R. 6737, the "Flint Registry Reauthorization Act"; H.R. 6965, the "Visit America Act"; H.R. 5441, the "Prevent All Soring Tactics Act of 2021"; H. Res. 1355, of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to ivermectin; H. Res. 1244, of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to any COVID–19 vaccine; H. Res. 1258, of inquiry directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide certain documentation to the House of Representatives relating to the calculation of certain expenditure limitations applicable to Federal funding of the Medicaid program in Puerto Rico; H. Res. 1263, of inquiry directing the President to provide certain documents in the President's possession to the House of Representatives relating to COVID–19 funding; H. Res. 1267, of inquiry directing the President to provide certain documents in the President's possession to the House of Representatives relating to the oversight of the Wuhan Institute of Virology laboratory by the Director of the National Institutes of Health; H. Res. 1268, of inquiry directing the President to provide certain documents in the President's possession to the House of Representatives relating to actions taken by the Secretary of Health and Human Services related to the COVID–19 pandemic response; H. Res. 1274, of inquiry directing the President to provide certain documents in the President's possession to the House of Representatives relating to communications by or among any of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the White House, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Justice related to the executive branch's recommendations for a long-term, consensus approach to reduce the supply and availability of illicitly manufactured fentanyl-related substances in the United States; H. Res. 1275, of inquiry directing the President to provide certain documents in the President's possession to the House of Representatives relating to communications by staff of the White House regarding the implications of revoking the public health orders commonly referred to as "title 42"; H. Res. 1284, of inquiry directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide certain documentation to the House of Representatives relating to the negotiation of prices for prescription drugs under the Medicare prescription drug program; H. Res. 1287, of inquiry directing the President to provide certain documents in the President's possession to the House of Representatives relating to the recall of infant formula manufactured by Abbott Laboratories and potential impacts on the infant formula supply chain; H. Res. 1265, of inquiry requesting the President to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to plans to exploit the energy crisis to pursue a radical climate agenda; H. Res. 1272, of inquiry requesting the President to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to plans to declare a "climate emergency" in order to invoke emergency authorities to impose regulations on industrial activity, or the supply and delivery of energy or electric power, in the United States; H. Res. 1260, of inquiry requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Energy, to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relating to plans to draw down and sell petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and plans to refill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; H. Res. 1326, of inquiry requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Energy, to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relating to plans to protect baseload bulk power system generation and transmission to maintain bulk power system reliability; H. Res. 1264, of inquiry requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives certain documents relating to misinformation and the preservation of free speech; H. Res. 1271, of inquiry requesting the President transmit to the House of Representatives certain documents relating to activities of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration relating to broadband service; H. Res. 1237, of inquiry requesting the President to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to online censorship of political speech; and H. Res. 1261, of inquiry requesting the President to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to communications and directives with the Federal Trade Commission. H.R. 8163, and H.R. 6965 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 3655, H.R. 5141, H.R. 6737, H.R. 5441, H. Res. 1355, H. Res. 1244, H. Res. 1258, H. Res. 1263, H. Res. 1267, H. Res. 1268, H. Res. 1274, H. Res. 1275, H. Res. 1284, H. Res. 1287, H. Res. 1265, H. Res. 1272, H. Res. 1260, H. Res. 1326, H. Res. 1264, H. Res. 1271, H. Res. 1237, and H. Res. 1261 were ordered reported, without amendment.

HOLDING MEGABANKS ACCOUNTABLE: OVERSIGHT OF AMERICA'S LARGEST CONSUMER FACING BANKS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Holding Megabanks Accountable: Oversight of America's Largest Consumer Facing Banks". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE U.S. INTEREST IN REGIONAL SECURITY COOPERATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA: OPPORTUNITIES, OBSTACLES, AND OBJECTIVES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism held a hearing entitled "Examining the U.S. Interest in Regional Security Cooperation in the Middle East and North Africa: Opportunities, Obstacles, and Objectives". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ATROCITY CRIMES COMMITTED BY RUSSIA IN UKRAINE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment, and Cyber held a hearing entitled "Accountability for Atrocity Crimes Committed by Russia in Ukraine". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PREPAREDNESS AND RESILIENCE: A FOCUS ON WATER

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Critical Infrastructure Preparedness and Resilience: A Focus on Water". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5455, the "Terry Technical Correction Act"; H.R. 2864, the "Clean Slate Act of 2021"; H.R. 5651, the "Fresh Start Act of 2021"; H.R. 8770, the "Expanding the VOTE Act"; H. Res. 1343, of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to unaccompanied alien children; and H. Res. 1356, of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to Ray Epps. H.R. 5455, H.R. 5651, H.R. 2864, H.R. 8770, H. Res. 1343, and H. Res. 1356 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee continued a markup on H. Res. 1247, of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the 2023–2028 five-year program for offshore oil and gas leasing; H. Res. 1248, of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the compliance with the obligations of the Mineral Leasing Act; H. Res. 1251, of inquiry directing the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the mineral withdrawal within the Superior National Forest; H. Res. 1252, of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the mineral withdrawal within the Superior National Forest; and H. Res. 1253, of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the actions of the Department of the Interior's Departmental Ethics Office; and H.R. 4690, the "Sustaining America's Fisheries for the Future Act of 2021".

PUTIN'S PROXIES: EXAMINING RUSSIA'S USE OF PRIVATE MILITARY COMPANIES

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled "Putin's Proxies: Examining Russia's Use of Private Military Companies". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING LONG-TERM CARE IN AMERICA: THE IMPACT OF THE CORONAVIRUS IN NURSING HOMES

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a hearing entitled "Examining Long-Term Care in America: The Impact of the Coronavirus in Nursing Homes". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RIGHT TO REPAIR: LEGISLATIVE AND BUDGETARY SOLUTIONS TO UNFAIR RESTRICTIONS ON REPAIR

Committee on Rules: Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process held a hearing entitled "Right to Repair: Legislative and Budgetary Solutions to Unfair Restrictions on Repair"[Original Jurisdiction Hearing]. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MENTAL HEALTH JUSTICE ACT OF 2022; BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE ACT; VICTIM ACT OF 2022; INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 8542, the ''Mental Health Justice Act of 2022''; H.R. 4118, the ''Break the Cycle of Violence Act''; H.R. 5768, the ''VICTIM Act of 2022''; and H.R. 6448, the ''Invest to Protect Act of 2022''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 7–4, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4118, the ''Break the Cycle of Violence Act'', H.R. 5768, the ''VICTIM Act of 2022'', H.R. 6448, the ''Invest to Protect Act of 2022'', and H.R. 8542, the ''Mental Health Justice Act of 2022''. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4118, the ''Break the Cycle of Violence Act'', under a closed rule. The rule provides 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5768, the ''VICTIM Act of 2022'', under a closed rule. The rule provides 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–62, modified by the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6448, the ''Invest to Protect Act of 2022'', under a closed rule. The rule provides 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–65 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8542, the ''Mental Health Justice Act of 2022'', under a closed rule. The rule provides 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Representatives Jackson Lee and Tiffany.

LOOKING BACK TO PREDICT THE FUTURE: THE NEXT GENERATION OF WEATHER SATELLITES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics; and Subcommittee on Environment held a joint hearing entitled ''Looking Back to Predict the Future: The Next Generation of Weather Satellites''. Testimony was heard from Stephen Volz, Assistant Administrator, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; John Gagosian, Joint Agency Satellite Division Director, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Fred Meny, Assistant Inspector General for Audit and Evaluation, Office of Inspector General, Department of Commerce.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 1298, of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the role of the Department of the Treasury in the Paycheck Protection Program of the Small Business Administration; and H.R. 8844, the ''STEP Improvement Act of 2022''. H. Res. 1298 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 8844 was ordered reported, without amendment.

BUSINESS MEETING; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a business meeting on legislation on VA Facility Naming Bills; and a markup on H.R. 6273, the ''VA Zero Suicide Demonstration Project Act of 2021''; H.R. 3793, the ''Support Families of the Fallen Act''; legislation on the Food Security for All Veterans Act; H.R. 8852, the ''End Veteran Hunger Act of 2022''; legislation on the Expanding Home Loans for Guard and Reservists Act; H.R. 2800, the ''WINGMAN Act''; H.R. 8510, the ''Strengthening Whistleblower Protections at the Department of Veterans Affairs Act''; H.R. 5918, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs repays members of the Armed Forces for certain contributions made by such members of towards Post-9/11 Educational Assistance; H.R. 1957, the ''Veterans Infertility Treatment Act

of 2021''; H.R. 4601, the ''Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act''; H.R. 3304, the ''CARS for Vets Act''; H.R. 2521, the ''DOULA for VA Act of 2021''; and H.R. 7589, the ''REMOVE Copays Act''.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 8876, the ''Jackie Walorski Maternal and Child Home Visiting Reauthorization Act of 2022''; and a business meeting on legislation on Improvements to Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Mental Health Services; legislation on Improvements to the Medicare Program Related to Physician Services and Education; legislation on Requiring Coverage of Forensic Medical Exams with No Cost Sharing; legislation on Improved Information in Provider Directories, Plan Definitions, and Crisis Services for Private Insurance Plans; and legislation on Improved Information for Network Coverage and Plan Documents in Private Insurance Plans. H.R. 8876 was ordered reported, as amended. Legislation on Improvements to Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Mental Health Services; legislation on Improvements to the Medicare Program Related to Physician Services and Education; legislation on Requiring Coverage of Forensic Medical Exams with No Cost Sharing; legislation on Improved Information in Provider Directories, Plan Definitions, and Crisis Services for Private Insurance Plans; and legislation on Improved Information for Network Coverage and Plan Documents in Private Insurance Plans were agreed to, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jose Emilio Esteban, of California, to be Under Secretary for Food Safety, and Alexis Taylor, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs, both of the Department of Agriculture, and Vincent Garfield Logan, of New York, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the nation's largest banks, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine opportunities and challenges in deploying innovative battery and non-battery technologies for energy storage, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 673, to provide a temporary safe harbor for publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which content may be distributed, and the nominations of Cindy K. Chung, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Tamika R. Montgomery-Reeves, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Kelley Brisbon Hodge, John Frank Murphy, Mia Roberts Perez, and Kai N. Scott, each to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and Thomas E. Brown, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Georgia, and Kirk M. Taylor, to be United States Marshal for the District of Colorado, both of the Department of Justice, 9 a.m., SD–106.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine stopping senior scams, focusing on empowering communities to fight fraud, 10 a.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance, hearing entitled ''State of Emergency: Examining the Impact of Growing Wildfire Risk on the Insurance Market'', 9 a.m., 2128 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability, hearing entitled ''Federal Building Security: Examining the Risk Assessment Process'', 10 a.m., 310 Cannon and Webex.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, hearing entitled ''Power and Profiteering: How Certain Industries Hiked Prices, Fleeced Consumers, and Drove Inflation'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Zoom.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10 a.m., Thursday, September 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business, Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4822, DISCLOSE Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 11:30 a.m.

If cloture is not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4822, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, and vote on confirmation thereon.

Following disposition of the nomination of Amanda Bennett, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and vote on confirmation thereon at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Thursday, September 22

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 4118—Break the Cycle of Violence Act. Consideration of H.R. 5768—VICTIM Act of 2022. Consideration of H.R. 6448—Invest to Protect Act of 2022. Consideration of H.R. 8542—Mental Health Justice Act of 2022.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Axne, Cynthia, Iowa, E959
Davids, Sharice, Kans., E962
DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E962
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E961
Gallego, Ruben, Ariz., E960
Garamendi, John, Calif., E963
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E960
Graves, Sam, Mo., E960
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E962
Long, Billy, Mo., E960
McHenry, Patrick T., N.C., E959
Owens, Burgess, Utah, E961
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E962
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E961

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.