



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 2022

No. 57

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 31, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 565

Whereas Donald Edwin Young was born on June 9, 1933, to James Young and Nora (Bucy) Young in Meridian, California;

Whereas Don Young earned an associate degree from Yuba Junior College and a bachelor's degree in teaching from Chico State University;

Whereas Don Young began what would be decades of service to the United States when he served in the Army as part of the 41st Tank Battalion from 1955 to 1957;

Whereas Don Young moved to Alaska in 1959 and found his true home in the village of Fort Yukon, which is located 7 miles above the Arctic Circle;

Whereas Don Young met and married the first love of his life, Lula "Lu" Young, in Fort Yukon;

Whereas Don Young and Lu had 2 wonderful daughters, Dawn and Joni, and later 14 grandchildren;

Whereas Don Young taught fifth grade at a school run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the winter and worked in construction, mining, fishing, and trapping, and as a tugboat captain in the warmer months;

Whereas Don Young was elected mayor of Fort Yukon in 1964 and served in that role until 1967;

Whereas Don Young was elected to and served in the Alaska House of Representatives from 1967 to 1970 and the Alaska State Senate from 1970 to 1973;

Whereas Don Young was elected to the House of Representatives in 1973 in a special election and served 24 additional and consecutive terms;

Whereas Representative Young served as Chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives from 1995 to 2001, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives from 2001 to 2007;

Whereas Representative Young was a champion for Alaska Native peoples, including as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Representative Young fiercely defended Alaska and Alaskans as the sole Representative for the largest State in the United States and devoted himself to fulfilling the immense promise of his home State;

Whereas Representative Young was a leader in strengthening the role of Alaska in providing for the national defense of the United States through his support for the Coast Guard, the Alaskan Command, and the ballistic missile defense and his steadfast commitment to the leadership of the United States in the Arctic;

Whereas Representative Young sponsored at least 85 bills that were enacted into Federal law and sponsored and co-sponsored many more measures that were part of broader legislation;

Whereas legislative achievements by Representative Young span the policy spectrum, from authorizing the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System to important amendments and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

Whereas Representative Young authored and advocated for generational laws, including the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) in 1975, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Public Law 94-265; 90 Stat. 331) in 1976, the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-57; 111 Stat. 1252) in 1997, SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59; 119 Stat. 1144) in 2005, Multinational Species Conservation Funds Reauthorization Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-132; 121 Stat. 1360) in 2007, and the

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58; 135 Stat. 429) in 2021;

Whereas Representative Young formed strong relationships and friendships with members on both sides of the aisle and proudly worked with 10 different presidents;

Whereas Representative Young married his second love, Anne Garland Walton, in 2015, in the United States Capitol;

Whereas, on December 5, 2017, Representative Young became the 45th Dean of the House of Representatives, reflecting his status as its most senior member;

Whereas Representative Young was the longest-serving Republican in the history of Congress; and

Whereas Representative Young ultimately served the 49th State with dedication and distinction for 49 years and 13 days, which is more than ¾ of the period in which Alaska has been a State; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the death of Don Young, congressman for all Alaska and the 45th Dean of the House of Representatives;

(2) honors Representative Young for his lifetime of service to Alaska and the United States, his spirited bipartisanship, and his enduring respect for and devotion to the House of Representatives;

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate—

(A) communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(B) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of the Honorable Don Young; and

(4) at the time that the Senate adjourns or recesses today, the Senate stands adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Don Young.

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

S. 442. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to require the Administrator of General Services to procure the most life-cycle cost effective and energy efficient lighting products and to issue guidance on the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of those products, and for other purposes.

S. 3969. An act to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to explicitly authorize distribution of grant funds to the voting accessibility protection and advocacy system of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4009

Islands and the system serving the American Indian consortium, and the other purposes.

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.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN DON YOUNG

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my political mentors, the dean of the House, Representative Don Young.

I met Don on one of my first days as a Member of the House of Representatives. I walked into this Chamber and took a seat. Minutes later, some old guy starts digging his knuckles into my back. I couldn't believe that was happening. I had no idea what this guy was doing.

You can imagine my confusion as I frustratingly found myself another chair, but you can also be assured that I never sat in that seat again. It wasn't until afterward that I learned that I had sat in his seat. I never made that mistake again.

Knowing him, he has probably already picked out a seat in Heaven, and I pity the fool who tries to sit there.

Don Young is and was a dear friend. At work, he was my mentor, someone whose stalwart belief system and passion for public service inspired me every single day.

Don truly loved the great men and women of Alaska. That was obvious from his fearless advocacy for the Last Frontier up here in Washington and even more obvious on our annual fishing trip, where I got to see firsthand the State he loved so dearly.

I was able to go with him on three separate occasions on that trip. Every one was a great experience. I will miss those annual fishing trips, not just for the sport of it, but for the comradery I felt with the amazing public servants who joined together to learn from one another.

Luckily for Alaska residents and the Young family, Don was a better man and legislator than he was a fisherman.

My prayers and support go out to his wife, Anne, his children, and everyone who was privileged to know this great friend, father, and public servant.

It was an honor to gather and pay tribute to him yesterday. He made every second count and worked hard to

leave this country better than he found it. He was the oldest Member of Congress, and I never let him forget that. I still feel like his time on Earth here was cut short.

Don, your presence, your knowledge, and your leadership will be sorely missed, but they will never be forgotten.

REMEMBERING MABEL JOSEPHINE "JO" MASON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of a woman dedicated to the service of her community, Jo Mason. Throughout her years, Jo remained involved in her community in as many aspects as she could.

After graduating from Glynn Academy, Jo was active in The American Legion Auxiliary for 78 years, where she held several positions in the local, district, and State levels.

The Saint Simons native enjoyed making the lap throws that The American Legion Auxiliary gave out to veterans and their spouses in the local nursing homes in Brunswick. Jo also volunteered at the fire department, helping to man radio station 2 and serving as treasurer for many years.

She was involved with the Golden Isles Emerald Society, Elks Lodge, Golden Isles Retired Firefighters Association, Veterans Council of Golden Isles, and the Coastal Republican Women's Club. She set an example for all of us to follow.

Her memory will be cherished by the many lives that she impacted, including her husband, Bill, who she met on a blind date in December 1965 while he was serving in the Marine Corps.

I am praying for her friends, her family, and her community during this very sad time.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DR. GROVER BELL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of a man dedicated to his community and to the people he served, Dr. Grover Bell of Savannah, Georgia.

Dr. Bell was born in Sardis, Georgia, in 1928 and went to Georgia Teachers College, where he met his beloved wife, Lourdine.

After determining that his calling was to join the ministry, Dr. Bell attended Emory School of Divinity, where he learned to be a shepherd of men.

Throughout his career, he served almost 30 churches of the South Georgia United Methodist Conference, including my home church of Wesley Monumental.

He was loved as a minister by those he served and truly embodied what it means to put others before oneself.

Dr. Bell was also known for his gardening and for his southern, homestyle cooking, two of his passions. His love for daylilies and fried chicken were rivaled only by his love for God and his family.

Leaving behind his wife, four children, eight grandchildren, six great-grandchildren, and countless others to whom he ministered, Dr. Bell has left a

lasting impact on the community that he loved so dearly.

His family and friends remain in my thoughts and prayers after this tremendous loss.

REPEAL THE PINK TAX

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, on the very last day of Women's History Month, I want to draw attention to the fact that there is an insidious form of gender discrimination that goes on in this country from cradle to grave. It is called the pink tax.

It costs more to be a woman. We have seen it happen over and over again, where retailers find it okay to jack up the prices for the same products just because they are being marketed to women.

A New York City Consumer Affairs study compared 800 products and found that they were 13 percent more for those that were virtually identical but provided for women. As I am going to show you today, we see the cost as much as 60 percent more for the same products being focused on women, but basically the same products.

We need to think no further than looking at haircuts, where a woman can't get a haircut for \$26 like former Governor Scott Walker, who mocked one of our colleagues about the cost of her particular haircut.

Let's talk about retail sales. I had my office go online and do some online shopping. On Amazon, you can get this four-pack of Dove deodorant for women for \$19.39, but the male version of this particular product is only \$13.58 for a four-pack. That is a 60 percent cost differential, a 60 percent tax on women.

Here is a pack of probiotics from CVS for a woman. It costs \$32.79. For a man, it costs \$22.79. That is a 68 percent increase and a tax on women for the same product.

Then, we can move on to diapers. Believe it or not, diapers for girls cost more than diapers for boys. In fact, \$37.79 for boys and \$33.99 for girls.

Finally, my favorite is the teddy bears. If you go online and buy a pink teddy bear, you are going to pay a tax. It is \$14.99. A blue teddy bear is only \$12.30.

This is stupid. This is crazy. This is discrimination. It is time for us to deal with it, and there is a way to deal with it.

I have introduced the Pink Tax Repeal Act, which I am hopeful will be heard in the Energy and Commerce Committee. I am hopeful that, once and for all, we can do something about the fact that women pay more for the same goods and the same services.

In California, we have a law that I had passed many years ago that focused on services. The Assembly Office of Research found that women pay \$1,300 more per year for services. It shouldn't be based on gender; it should

be based on the amount of time it takes, whether it is a haircut or dry cleaning a shirt. We have seen over and over again that we pay more for the same service as well.

Colleagues, I hope that on this very last day of Women's History Month, we remember this for the rest of the year, that women pay more for the same goods and services, and that should be against the law.

PROTECT WOMEN'S SPORTS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the strides women have made across all corners of the sports world deserve to be celebrated, not torn to pieces by the far left's radical ideological agenda.

This year officially marks the 50th anniversary of title IX, a law from 1972 that mandates equal opportunities for women in education.

While this anniversary deserves to be recognized, the threat of President Biden's flawed interpretation of this legislation looms larger than ever before. This administration's radical reinterpretation of title IX to include sexual orientation and gender identity has pushed women to the sidelines.

President Biden's decision to allow biological male athletes who identify as transgender to compete in women's sports is an affront to the progress that women have made since 1972.

Title IX was a revolution for women's sports. Since its passage, title IX has spurred women's participation in sports by a considerable margin. Instead of rightfully celebrating these achievements, the left is willing to sacrifice them for the sake of its radical political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be tolerating the left's assault on women. We must ensure that the safety and needs of young girls and women are made a top priority. Erasing sex and gender means, ultimately, erasing women, especially when it comes to sports.

Girls and women at the top of their sport lose a fair chance to compete when a biological male enters the field. How is this any different than keeping women off the field altogether?

We can't let women's sports become collateral damage to the far left's campaign against the traditional, science-based understanding of sex and gender. Allowing women and girls to suffer for the sake of being politically correct is the textbook definition of cowardice.

I am proud of the progress our Nation has made in the past 50 years to uplift and affirm the rights of women. The prospect of those advances being lost today is gut-wrenching. If we allow these fantasies of the radical left to become mainstream, 50 years of progress will be buried completely.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN UKRAINE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak from both the heart and the Constitution.

The privilege of citizenship in the United States gives Americans the freedom to exert and to speak about what is in the depths of their heart while holding the Constitution that indicates: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice"—the Constitution goes on to describe a myriad of justice issues in the Bill of Rights.

In addition to that, we have exhibits, symbols of freedom. I begin first with the Statue of Liberty standing tall in the New York Harbor. What you can see is the throng of humanity, fleeing Ukrainians, who now will probably amount to 6 million internally displaced persons and refugees in totality.

□ 1015

Amongst these individuals are separated families from their husbands, brothers, and cousins and others who are on the fight.

But it is important to describe why we are here: one man, Putin. One man. One man has established this level of intense brutality and violence, insensitivity, rage, and attack.

Mr. Putin's attack is on the babies of Ukraine. I will not give him any credence or respect that he is at war. He is in the midst of destruction and vile actions and attacked a hospital with pregnant women. He separated pregnant women from their babies who were born dead or mothers who gave birth and died and the baby died shortly thereafter.

The new revelation is that babies and women and children have been stolen by Russian soldiers and carted off to Russian territory. That is the vileness of this ludicrous Putin war.

Then we come to find out—which is in the public domain—that he may not be getting the right information, but let us not use that as an excuse.

It didn't matter what revelations he would get. He is a violent actor living in a dream world of reimagining the Soviet Union.

And so it is crucial for those of us who believe in peace that our administration determines the validity of any peace discussions because we would want to be part of ensuring that they are viable.

But, at the same time, to the dismay of many of us, the weapons should be given, the drones should be given, the war has to stop, and there is no end in sight.

And so the murderous attack, the destruction of cities, such as the ocean-based city, that have been destroyed, brought to their knees, individuals lost lives under the pile of rubble, and particularly, the theater where 300 died where children were written on the outside.

Mr. Speaker, we must prepare now for refugees. And may I suggest that we must prepare for refugees coming from South and Central America that will include Haitians and Africans.

We are prepared to take in 125,000. Only 7,000 have been utilized. As some would say, including my late friend and colleague, Elijah Cummings, America is better than this. We know how to do this, and we must find the way to do it.

Standing at podiums and banging on the desk about we don't want these people, then you must not want those who are fleeing the bloody, violent actions of this horrific person.

I believe we should stand united as Americans, to capture the words: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice". . . . I want us to stand with the Ukrainian people, that nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank MARCY KAPTUR for leading the Ukrainian Caucus and all of the Members, Republicans and Democrats.

But as I conclude, let me quickly say in 1 minute one issue that we should not forget in establishing justice: We must have oversight over the United States Supreme Court, and the texts of a spouse, as well, must be addressed, and we will address it.

COVENANT SCHOOL BOYS AND GIRLS CHAMPIONSHIP BASKETBALL TEAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate both the boys and girls high school basketball teams from the Covenant School in Huntington, West Virginia.

The boys high school basketball team took home the national championship in their division and finished their season with an 11-game winning streak.

The girls high school basketball team came in second place in their division nationally.

Athletics play a huge role in ensuring that our next generation is well-rounded, able to work as a team, and are equipped to tackle challenges ahead.

I applaud the Covenant School for instilling these very important values in our student athletes.

West Virginia is so proud of the Covenant School's basketball teams.

GREAT LAKES AUTHORITY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with considerable anticipation as Great Lakes Members introduce legislation to create the Great Lakes Authority.

The Great Lakes Authority is an instrumentality that will unlock our freshwater, industrial heartland's full potential for the century ahead.

The Midwest communities our Members represent are home to people who make, build, and grow that which makes, builds, and grows America.

For decades, however, our region has borne the brunt of job losses associated with disastrous trade policies, underinvestment, and deindustrialization.

Since the passage of NAFTA in 1993, China's entrance into the World Trade Organization in 2001, and CAFTA's passage in 2005, over 91,000 factories have closed across our country.

Nearly 5 million good-paying jobs have been lost, and our region has been very hard hit and is clawing its way back.

But our workers and their families in Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York, in the Great Lakes watershed have suffered enormously as middle class jobs evaporated.

The tragedy does not end there. Local governments have been left to scramble as declining revenues led to the collapse of their budgets and the accrual of crushing bonded indebtedness.

The size and scope of these accumulated economic challenges are too much for any one city or county or, indeed, State to overcome alone. Places like Toledo, Ohio, Lorain, Detroit, Buffalo, Flint, Rochester, all the towns along the old Erie Canal struggle to recover from the outsourcing of manufacturing jobs to penny-wage countries.

Chicago, Cleveland, and Erie, Pennsylvania, alone are limited in their ability to halt climate change and reverse its increasing effects on their shorelines and neighborhoods.

The Great Lakes region needs a boost through accelerated investments and strategic and coordinated support to get back on track.

Last year, President Biden and congressional Democrats accomplished what many had tried but failed to do, and that is pass an historic investment in jobs and infrastructure. That is step one.

This support will help empower our communities to begin planning the necessary steps to rebuilding roads and bridges, improve ports, rail lines and airports, modernize energy and water infrastructure, and protect all of our lakes, the freshwater kingdom on this continent.

But to maximize the impact and turbocharge revitalization, our region really needs a strategic plan to coordinate these resources along, importantly, with private investment to reboot our future.

The Great Lakes region is the only major economic region in our country that lacks a Federal entity dedicated to supporting its long-term coordinated economic development and conserving its natural environment.

The West's water is served by the Bureau of Reclamation, or if you look at the Delta Regional Authority, it helps 10 million people in the Delta Region. And more than 400 counties from Mis-

issippi to West Virginia are served by the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The Great Lakes deserves no less. The Great Lakes Authority Act is long overdue and will create an instrumentality to serve the Great Lakes fresh watershed which will become even more important in the decades to come with each passing day.

The Great Lakes Authority will be a Federal/State instrumentality like the others to spur job creation and world-class worker education, training, and adjustment in communities left behind.

It will foster innovation to build forward the struggling core U.S. manufacturing and industrial base. And it will promote new advances in renewable energy technologies like solar, wind and hydrogen while conserving and stewarding our precious environmental assets.

It will allow us an efficient multimodal transportation shared network with our closest neighbor, Canada, that connects people and goods with where they need to go. Indeed, Canada is our largest trading partner.

For America to compete in this century, we simply need a Great Lakes Authority, and I urge my colleagues to join us in this important effort. Please help us help the Great Lakes region.

AMERICAN BUDGET CRISIS

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a crisis eroding the budgets of hard-working Americans.

Earlier this month, the price of unleaded gasoline rose to the highest level on record, and President Biden's anti-energy policies are directly responsible.

On the campaign trail, Joe Biden promised to end fossil fuels. Since assuming office, President Biden has worked to make good on that promise, imposing 81 individual anti-energy policies.

Coincidentally, the price of gasoline has risen 81 percent since the beginning of his presidency.

Analysts estimate that President Biden's anti-energy agenda will cost American families an additional \$2,000 per year in gasoline costs alone. This is staggering for the 64 percent of Americans who live paycheck to paycheck, thanks to rising costs.

President Biden claims he can't do much right now to reduce gas prices. This simply is not true. President Biden can end the Federal freeze on new oil and gas projects, fast track LNG export permits, expedite approval of all pipeline and energy development, and stop the regulatory barrage on U.S. energy development.

There is so much that can and should be done right now, and this crusade against American energy dominance must end.

RECOGNIZING THE SHERBURNE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary achievement of the Sherburne County Sheriff's Office.

Sheriff Joel Brott, his deputies, and the Sherburne County Jail and clinic staff have earned the prestigious Triple Crown accreditation from the National Sheriffs' Association.

As one of only 50 sheriffs' offices in the country to earn the Triple Crown accreditation, this is a major achievement.

In fact, this accreditation is so rare that, according to the National Sheriffs' Association, fewer than 100 sheriffs' offices have qualified since its establishment in 1993.

The Triple Crown requires simultaneous accreditation by four law enforcement organizations. Achieving one of them is a feat, but gaining all four at once is truly remarkable.

Congratulations, Sheriff Brott. We applaud you and your entire staff for your exceptional work and commitment to excellence in law enforcement.

OWEN LIPINSKI HOCKEY TOURNAMENT

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young hockey player in my district who embodies the spirit of our great sport.

For Minnesotans, hockey is a way of life. Like many young people in our State, Owen Lipinski grew up with a love for the game.

Sadly, when Owen was just 2 years old, he was diagnosed with Marfan syndrome, a connective tissue disorder that makes it difficult for him to play.

One rough hit could cause Owen to lose his eyesight or possibly even threaten his life.

However, this didn't stop him from playing. Owen participated in Minnesota Special Hockey and enjoyed it, but he still wanted more.

Recently, Owen organized a tournament with six teams composed of friends from his neighborhood. He organized the entire event on a pond in his back yard, complete with a public address system and a small concession stand.

As a fellow Minnesotan who loves the game, Owen is an inspiration. I am inspired by Owen and his great work. Congratulations on the tournament, Owen, and I hope you continue to inspire us for years to come.

□ 1030

HONORING REBECCA BOOKER

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of one of my constituents, Ms. Rebecca Booker.

Rebecca has served the Blaine community as a certified fire and life safety educator for the last 20 years. Recently, Rebecca was honored with the 2022 Dr. Anne W. Phillips Award for Leadership in Fire Safety Education by the Congressional Fire Services Institute and the International Fire Service Training Association.

Among her many contributions to fire safety education, Rebecca helped develop the nationally recognized Home Safety Survey, a voluntary home inspection program that looks for potential fire, injury, and crime hazards while offering solutions. Rebecca has completed nearly 4,000 of these surveys herself and trained many colleagues across the country to perform these surveys in their communities.

Ms. Booker also helped establish New America Academy in Minnesota, an organization that provides fire safety education for culturally diverse and immigrant communities.

Rebecca, congratulations on earning this prestigious award and thank you for all you do to increase fire safety education in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING ABBY HONOLD

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Abby Honold, one of the strongest Minnesotans I have ever met and a leader in the fight against sexual assault.

Sexual assault is a life-shattering event, the trauma of which lasts a lifetime but can be compounded in the immediate aftermath by improper care. When Abby, then a student at the University of Minnesota, reported her assault to police in 2014, she worked with a healthcare professional proficient in trauma-informed care to recall important details about her assault to law enforcement and bring the perpetrator to justice.

Survivors like Abby deserve justice, and I was pleased to see that the Abby Honold Act got signed into law earlier this month.

CELEBRATING THE HISTORIC NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great admiration for the strength and grace that Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson has demonstrated throughout her nomination process for the United States Supreme Court.

Last week, people from all over the world watched as she embarked on a journey that only five other women in history have taken. For too long, our judicial system and our government have not reflected the great talent and diversity of our Nation.

Like so many young women, especially our mothers and grandmothers, I had very few female examples to emulate at the beginning of my legal career. When I was at a pivotal age in high school, trying to decide exactly what path to take and what was even possible to achieve, I got to watch the nomination process for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

She was the first woman ever nominated to our Nation's highest Court, and I was deeply moved by her poise

and intelligence under questioning from the much older male Senators. Her confirmation solidified in me a passion for the law and a belief that I could accomplish anything I set my mind to.

I then went on to become a student of the Constitution myself, attending law school, practicing constitutional law, arguing in court, and fighting for justice as an attorney, a State legislator, and now as a proud member of the Judiciary Committee in the United States House of Representatives.

The world has completely transformed since I watched that confirmation hearing in 1981, yet, since that time, only four other women have joined our Nation's highest Court. Each of these Justices brought a unique perspective and inspired young women across the country.

Because of the small number of women who have been appointed, every time a woman is up for the bench, it is necessarily historic. I am ready for it to be less historic.

Although 51 percent of our population is female, of the 115 Justices in American history, 110 of them have been men. And none of them, not one, has been an African-American woman. Mr. Speaker, that needs to change at a faster rate.

Justice Ginsburg was once asked when there will be enough women on the Court. She responded, "When there are nine."

If confirmed, Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson will be the next, and the first African-American woman. I would like to say "when confirmed." Her nomination marks a momentous step forward in the long struggle for a judicial system that truly represents every American and delivers justice, fairness, and equality for all.

I can relate to all the young women out there watching this nomination process, feeling inspired to follow in her footsteps. Don't be deterred or dismayed by the disrespect that she was shown by a handful of Senators. My message to the young women is: You can do this. No matter the challenges or the obstacles, you can achieve your dreams.

Judge Brown Jackson said last week that her nomination is truly a testament to the hope and the promise of this country. She continues to give us new hope, especially to young women lawyers, and her rise to the highest Court of the land holds out the promise of a brighter future for our country.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Brown Jackson is an exceptional, extremely qualified nominee, and I look forward to calling her Justice Brown Jackson.

TROUBLING RECORD OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the troubling record

of President Biden's U.S. Supreme Court nominee, Ketanji Brown Jackson, commonly known as KBJ.

Throughout her legal career, Ketanji Brown Jackson has earned a disturbing record on crime. In advocating for and administering lighter sentences for sex offenders, particularly those preying on and sexually abusing innocent children, KBJ has set an unforgivable pattern that disqualifies her from our country's highest Court.

A prime example of this pattern can be found in the case of U.S. v. Hawkins, where the sentencing guidelines called for up to 10 years in prison for a man, an adult convicted of possessing multiple images of child sex torture. Ketanji Brown Jackson sentenced this predator to just 3 months in jail. Unconscionable.

Mr. Hawkins recently told The Washington Post, "I wasn't very happy that she gave me 3 months, although after reflection when I was in jail, I was hearing from other people who said it was their first time arrested and they got 5 years, 6 years." And he got 3 months.

As crime rates soar in our cities across the country, adding soft-on-crime Justices, especially a Justice who basically ignores the crime of possessing and promoting images of severe child sexual assault, adding a Justice like that to the bench sends an alarming message to communities fearing for their safety.

Additionally, during her confirmation hearing last week, KBJ refused to define what a woman is, excusing her absurdity by claiming she isn't a biologist.

From women's sports to woke corporations like Disney, liberals are pushing an evil agenda that is erasing women and undermining women's accomplishments. As conservatives like myself fight this woke extremism, there will surely be cases considered in the future at the Supreme Court that require Justices to understand and accept the differences between men and women.

If KBJ can't define a woman, how is she to adjudicate Title IX cases? This is a legitimate question that no Democrat wants to answer. This, too, is disqualifying.

While I do not serve in the body that decides this monumental confirmation, I do have a responsibility to tell the American people the truth. And the truth is, a vote to confirm Ketanji Brown Jackson is a vote for lenient sentences for child sexual torture, a vote for the left's woke war on canceling the achievements of real women, and a vote for the liberals' dangerous agenda.

Americans, including Georgians, don't want a Justice on the bench who supports any of this radical garbage. Georgians are watching Senators WARNOCK and OSSOFF. Will they vote for a Supreme Court nominee that is soft on crime, on one of the most heinous crimes of all, child sex torture, or

will they stand up for all of Georgia's family values, protect our children, and be tough on crime by voting "no" on this Supreme Court nominee?

For the sake of our great Nation, the Senate must save the Supreme Court from a lifetime of votes siding with demented pedophiles by voting "no" on Ketanji Brown Jackson's confirmation.

NO VACCINE MANDATES

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring the Federal Government never again abuses its power by ordering employees to receive a vaccine or lose their job.

The COVID-19 pandemic has proven powerful elites will stop at nothing to quench their thirst for power, including President Biden, who issued through OSHA a rule that forced businesses with 100 or more employees to require the COVID-19 vaccine.

Forcing workers out of a job if they refuse to take a jab is a wholly unconstitutional power grab that violates Americans' freedoms, exacerbates labor shortages, and intensifies the supply chain crisis.

Congress occasionally gives our government agencies certain broad authorities, and when those powers are abused, it is our responsibility to claw them back and safeguard the rights of American citizens.

While the U.S. Supreme Court blocked President Biden's OSHA rule, Congress has the authority and the responsibility to prevent any future attempts by the executive branch to subject the American people to unlawful mandates. This is why I proudly introduced H.R. 7281, the Reversing Every Vaccine Emergency Requirement and Stopping Employee OSHA Mandates Act.

My bill, whose short title, is REVERSE OSHA Mandates Act, amends the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to repeal the Secretary's authority to issue emergency temporary standards and is a commonsense and crucial step toward preventing future government overreach by OSHA and defeating their hand in medical tyranny.

It is incumbent upon Congress to prohibit this dangerous abuse of power from further tarnishing our Nation's history and subverting American workers' rights, which is why I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation that reins in OSHA and protects the freedoms of American workers.

PHIL JENKINS' REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the remarkable contributions of Phil Jenkins, who recently finished serving as managing and executive editor at the Free Lance-Star in Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Phil gave his time, his energy, and his dedication to the Free Lance-Star for 24 years.

"Equally wise and unflappable," that is how his colleagues describe him. "A trusted leader, gifted editor, and generous mentor."

When he arrived at the paper in 1998, Phil made sure the paper stayed at the top of its game. As the years went on, his determination guided the paper through difficult stretches and through thousands of local news developments.

He oversaw critical investigations, including those related to the D.C. sniper trial. He managed major transitions, such as shifting from an afternoon to morning production cycle and moving the paper's offices to downtown Fredericksburg.

Under Phil's leadership the Free Lance-Star was nine times judged as Virginia's best midsize daily between 2011 and 2020, winning first place for its writing, design, and photography.

In Fredericksburg, Phil supervised dozens of people, including writers, photographers, designers, editors, web producers, and clerical staff. Those who worked with him over the years said that "few knew a more journalistically savvy, more evenhanded or more calming influence in the newsroom."

When asked to describe Phil's tenure at the paper, a former colleague said that Phil showed "unparalleled leadership" as well as "an uncanny ability to measure and satiate the community's hunger for the news that makes it unique."

Today, Phil's staff and the entire greater Fredericksburg region and the Free Lance-Star readership will greatly miss Phil's hand at the helm of the Free Lance-Star.

One former Free Lance-Star editor said, "Working with such a gifted journalist and wonderful person as Phil Jenkins was one of the highest honors of my life. There is no way to adequately thank him for the contributions he has made to the paper and to the community."

Phil's service to the Fredericksburg area and Virginia overall speaks to the enduring importance of local news, including print journalism. Local news keeps us informed about the day-to-day events in our communities. It allows us to share the triumphs of our neighbors. It holds those in power to account, and it brings to light the challenges we face together, as a community, as a Commonwealth, and as a country.

As another former colleague said, "Nobody gave more to the cause of community journalism than Phil Jenkins."

Today, on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to thank Phil Jenkins for his service to the people of Virginia. We thank him for his devotion to his colleagues, his commitment to accuracy, and his love of a good story founded on the truth.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING BILL SHUGARTS

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Seventh Dis-

trict constituent and U.S. Army veteran Bill Shugarts.

Bill is a Vietnam veteran who served with the 23rd Infantry Division. In Vietnam, Bill planned and ran convoys, and one day, while doing command and control above the Hiep Duc Valley, Bill was in a helicopter crash. Thankfully, he suffered only minimal injuries.

Bill was honorably discharged in 1971 with various commendations and medals, including a Bronze Star with two oak leaf clusters. He began a successful corporate career spanning three different Fortune 500 companies.

But never forgetting his experiences in Vietnam or with his soldiers, Bill has devoted himself to his fellow veterans and our Nation's allies who have stood by our servicemembers.

In service to the community and local veterans, Bill founded the Northern Virginia Military Ministry Outreach, and he cofounded the Fawn Lake Veterans Group. He is a docent at the U.S. Army Museum, and he is a lay leader of the Methodist Wilderness Community Church's military ministry.

In my earliest days in office, and well before the final exit of American forces from Afghanistan, Bill was working to bring attention to the urgent needs of the SIV program. As a founding member of No One Left Behind, Bill focused on increasing the number of visas available, speeding up processing, and bringing refuge to those in danger. Bill worked closely with my office as we strived to make progress, get questions answered, and ultimately get SIVs home to America, their new home.

Now, through their church, Bill and his wife, Margene, continue their tireless work to help Afghan evacuees resettle and build community in their new home in Virginia.

Bill represents the best of Virginia, a Commonwealth made stronger through our ability to keep our promises to our veterans, our military families, and our allies. As the U.S. Representative for Virginia's Seventh District, I thank Bill Shugarts for his advocacy, his compassion, and his deep and abiding sense of service to our country and our Commonwealth.

HONORING DONNA DOSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passage of the Donna Doss Memorial Act.

In February 2019, Border Patrol agent Donna Doss was struck and killed by a vehicle while assisting a State trooper. Donna served more than 15 years in Border Patrol and held several leadership roles within the agency.

Donna was survived by her husband, two sons, parents, brother, and sister.

The House voted yesterday to officially rename the Rocksprings Border

Patrol Station the Donna M. Doss Border Patrol Station. This effort has been underway in Congress since 2020, and I am glad to see it has finally gotten over the finish line.

Our men and women in green put their lives on the line every single day to protect our country, and Americans everywhere are grateful.

CONGRATULATING GREGG POPOVICH

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gregg Popovich, head coach of the San Antonio Spurs, on becoming the winningest head coach in the history of the National Basketball Association.

On March 11, 2020, Pop earned his record-setting 1,336th win as head coach of the San Antonio Spurs when he defeated the Utah Jazz 104–102.

Pop has led the Spurs for over 26 seasons. Pop has won five NBA championships and was named head coach of the year three separate times.

I am honored to introduce my House resolution to congratulate Coach Popovich.

HONORING VETERANS BY EXPANDING CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank every single veteran in New Mexico and nationwide for their service and sacrifices to our country.

But we cannot only thank our veterans for their service. We must honor their service by providing veterans the services they have earned.

In 2018, President Trump's VA began a process under the Asset Infrastructure Review Act to develop a list of recommendations to modernize and realign VA medical facilities.

Two weeks ago, the VA released its recommendations to the Infrastructure Review Commission and proposed the closure of four community-based outpatient clinics in rural areas of my district, closing the Gallup, Las Vegas, Raton, and Espanola clinics.

Combined, these four clinics serve thousands of veterans in predominantly Hispanic and Native American communities. Hispanics and Native Americans serve our country at higher rates. We are incredibly patriotic.

The VA wrongly assumes that these patriotic veterans can receive care from other community providers. They fail to understand that, in our rural areas, there aren't enough healthcare providers. The VA clearly doesn't seem to understand rural America.

The VA's own report listed veterans' statements that they have serious issues driving long distances for care and can't receive critical care and quality care in many areas due to limited community providers. While these were listed in the report, the VA may have listened, but I don't think they heard. But I do hear. I hear my vet-

erans and their stories. I hear their needs.

I heard Harry. Harry is a 75-year-old Cold War veteran who is also a cancer survivor. He is a survivor today because his clinic doctor, Dr. Gomez, ensured Harry received a biopsy, and he received it quickly. It caught his cancer and saved his life. The clinic doctor knew Harry. He knew his history and could respond quickly to Harry's concerns. Harry told me: "It was my pleasure serving this country, but the thing is that they need to take care of us."

Chris, another veteran I spoke to, told me: "Congress is quick to send us to war, but when it comes to healthcare, the government is severely lacking."

Shirley cried as she told me she believes she is alive today because she could drive herself to the clinic where she was immediately triaged, stabilized, and sent to a hospital for the chest pains she was experiencing. Her heart still beats today because of that clinic.

It breaks my heart that after all that these brave veterans have done for us, we are abandoning them just because they live in rural America.

I know how my communities struggle to receive care and the toll it takes on their loved ones to take a full day off work to drive them 6 hours just to draw labs or to have an annual checkup when it could be done in 25 minutes or less in town closer to where they live. Some veterans would be forced to drive those 6 hours round trip for care at the VA hospital in Albuquerque, which is itself overwhelmed, where veterans wait months for appointments.

Do you know what? The VA never spoke to the local Espanola VA clinic. I did. The Espanola clinic doctor told me that other local clinics are not specialized to the unique needs of veterans and don't understand the mental toll that military service has had on our veterans. He asked: "Don't veterans deserve more?"

Veterans do deserve more.

I have traveled to rural parts of my district to meet with veterans and hear what they need. The veterans I spoke to were upset, and rightly so. I am upset, too. They gave years of their lives in service to our country.

It is our Nation's solemn obligation to provide veterans the healthcare, education, housing, and honorable services they have earned, regardless of where they live.

This is about respect. This is about service. This is about saving lives.

I will not stop until we convince the VA and, when it gets to him, President Biden to reject these recommendations.

Instead of closing clinics, we should be expanding care and services to our veterans, meeting their needs wherever they happen to live—in cities, suburbs, or beautiful rural America and rural New Mexico.

That is how we truly thank our veterans.

CONGRATULATING U.S. MEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the United States men's national soccer team on qualifying for the 2022 World Cup this November in Qatar.

Last night, the U.S. men's national soccer team completed their qualifying campaign in Costa Rica. It was a fitting ending to the team's qualifying run, filled with ups and downs and exciting matches, including big wins over Mexico, Panama, Jamaica, and Costa Rica.

After missing out on the 2018 World Cup, the United States team is headed back to the World Cup for the first time in 8 years.

From day one of the 2022 qualifying campaign, Coach Gregg Berhalter and the team set out on one mission and one goal, and that was to qualify. Bolstered by a golden generation of young and exciting talent, including players such as Christian Pulisic, Gio Reyna, Weston McKennie, Tyler Adams, Tim Weah, and many others, the U.S. put together a strong qualifying performance, including an undefeated record against the Mexican national team this past year, which is the first time that has been done in decades.

I am proud that Illinois is home to the United States Soccer Federation, which supports our men's and women's programs at all levels.

I know I join with many in Congress and across the country in congratulating the U.S. men's national soccer team. This qualification is a well-deserved result that is a testament to the hard work put in by all of U.S. soccer and the men's team.

The team has made their country proud, and I look forward to cheering them on at the World Cup in November.

A NEW DAY FOR TRANSIT IN NEW YORK CITY

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing two historic and iconic districts in the 13th Congressional District.

Harlem is the center, the mecca, of the African-American diaspora. It is the center of culture, of music, of literature for the Black community with the Apollo, the Schomburg, and other great historical institutions.

The other neighborhood that I represent, Mr. Speaker, is East Harlem, El Barrio, which is the launching pad for the Latino experience in New York City. It was the home, the cradle, for the Puerto Rican community that opened its doors to Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Colombians, Central and South Americans.

They really are two historic districts within the 13th Congressional District. Today, we mark a new day for those two communities with regard to transit access.

This week, President Biden announced and submitted to Congress a strong and visionary budget. It included \$4.5 billion for the Capital Investment Grant program, which includes \$400 million for the construction of the second phase of the Second Avenue subway extension.

The first phase was completed not too long ago, several years ago, and it went from 96th Street south to 72nd Street, touching some of the most affluent ZIP Codes in the country.

This phase, the second phase, will go north to 125th Street. Some people have categorized it and called it Uptown Grand Central. It would connect East Harlem, El Barrio, and Harlem at 125th Street to the rest of the world.

These stops will connect a transportation desert where over 75 percent of its residents use public transportation to the Lexington Avenue line, which is the most overcrowded subway line in the city, if not the country.

East Harlem, as I said earlier, is currently a transportation desert, and this second phase will change the lives of over 100,000 New Yorkers who will use it on a daily basis.

This phase will extend train services to 96th Street and 125th Street, a 2-mile stretch, and benefit thousands upon thousands of New Yorkers. But it would also connect to Metro-North, a total of 124 stations in seven different counties in upstate New York, suburban New York, as well as Connecticut. As such, it will also connect folks to LaGuardia Airport via bus and future water transportation in the Hudson River and Harlem River.

This is truly a regional project that will connect Harlem and East Harlem, El Barrio, to the rest of the world.

I am happy and proud that President Biden included \$400 million for the second phase of the Second Avenue subway.

The first phase saw 160,000 people benefit on a regular basis, \$842 million in wages, and \$2.87 billion in economic activity in that region.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see this new initiative.

I thank President Biden for bringing the second phase of the Second Avenue Subway to the 13th Congressional District.

□ 1100

SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States takes an oath, promising to faithfully execute the office that he holds. That is a promise to uphold and defend the laws of this country and to protect our Na-

tion's citizens. But President Biden seems determined to violate that oath when it comes to enforcing our immigration and asylum laws.

There is an undeniable crisis at our southern border, and it is a direct result of President Biden's halting of the construction of the border wall, ending the remain-in-Mexico policy and re-implementing catch and release.

Now, instead of taking steps to rectify the situation that he has created, President Biden is preparing to pour fuel on the fire by lifting Title 42. Title 42 is essential to ensuring the immediate expulsion of illegal aliens. And officials within the President's own Department of Homeland Security are sounding the alarm. Officials have said that if this policy is revoked, it would cause a massive run on the border, even worse than we are seeing right now, resulting in upwards of 18,000 illegal crossings a day. That is 6.5 million illegal immigrants crossing every year.

State and local governments, especially school districts across the country, are being overwhelmed. Customs and Border Protection can barely keep up as it is, let alone with that kind of surge. President Biden is failing the American people and his neglect at the border is having catastrophic consequences.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Social Security and its importance to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, everybody is alarmed by the fact that we have been dealing with a global pandemic. That global pandemic, commonly referred to as COVID, has taken close to a million lives in the United States of America. Over 700,000 of those lives are individuals over the age of 65.

The COVID pandemic has also turned the economy upside down and has led to a period of inflation. And during that period, the group that is impacted the most as well as seniors in America. It is people that are on fixed incomes that need our help directly.

There are more than 10,000 baby boomers a day who become eligible for Social Security. And for about 40 percent of senior beneficiaries, Social Security provides the majority of their income. And for one in six Americans, it provides more than 90 percent of their income. And yet, shamefully, the United States Congress has not taken action on this in more than 50 years.

Today, and every day, you can hear Members come to the floor and talk about their concern for our constitu-

ents; most notably, the elderly and even more poignantly, the veterans. More veterans rely on Social Security disability than they do on the VA. And yet, Congress has not addressed this issue in more than 50 years. The last time Congress addressed this issue, milk was 72 cents a gallon. Everybody knows that those prices have become so high today that it causes seniors to have to put food back on the grocery shelves because they can't afford it. This is especially true for people of color.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our former leader, John Lewis, who pointed out and said that Social Security is the next Civil Rights Movement because of the discrimination that is taking place within Social Security. And because also, people have come to rely on it because it is a guarantee.

We don't have to go back to 1929 and the great crash. We only have to go back as far as 2008 and 2009 to look at what happened in that recession and find out that people's 401(k) became a 101(k). And yet, during that same time period, Social Security never missed a payment—not a pension payment, not a spousal payment, not a dependent coverage payment, and not a disability payment.

This is not something the President can do by executive order, nor is it anything that the Supreme Court is going to adjudicate. This is the responsibility of the United States Congress, and help is on the way. People are going to have an opportunity to vote on Social Security 2100, bringing Social Security into this century and then also rectifying the discrimination that has taken place.

Recent polls show this: That 64 percent of Black adults say securing Social Security should be the top priority for the President and Congress to address this year. Martin Luther King had a better way of saying it. He called it the "fierce urgency of now."

In the midst of this pandemic, remember this, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: These are your brothers and sisters. These are your parents. These are your aunts and uncles. These are your co-workers. These are people you worship with.

Over 5 million Americans get below-poverty level checks from Social Security. Why? Because Congress hasn't taken on its responsibility and stepped up to the plate and done what is expected of them.

I commend JIM CLYBURN, our leader here, who has come out strongly in favor of making sure that we address this inequality.

RECOGNIZING ODESSA AND MIDLAND CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Odessa and Midland Chambers of Commerce during

their fly-in to Washington, D.C., this week. It was incredible to host nearly 70 business and community leaders, elected officials, students, teachers, and staff from all throughout the Permian Basin, including the University of Texas of the Permian Basin, engaging with lawmakers, advocating for their community and advocating for energy independence. Thank you to the Odessa Chamber president, Renee Earls, the Midland Chamber president, Bobby Burns, and all the fantastic staff, leaders, and volunteers who helped make this fly-in successful.

TITLE 42 RESCISSION

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration's handling of the border crisis is not humane. It is heart-breaking.

Yesterday, the White House confirmed their intention to rescind Title 42, one of the only policies in place that is helping quell the border crisis.

This decision will have disastrous consequences on the already several million illegal immigrants who have flooded into this country. Human trafficking and smuggling across our border have reached historic highs, and our border States are paying the price. In fact, every State is a border State.

Texas is suffering from record-high levels of fentanyl and drugs pouring across the border, increased crime, high-speed chases, and more.

DHS already lacks the capacity to process, retain, and apprehend illegal immigrants along the border. Rescinding Title 42 will only double down on the amount of people that are illegally crossing the border, making it that much more difficult for those in the Border Patrol and Customs, and other agencies, who are trying to do their job to keep this country safe.

The small communities along the border are already overwhelmed and they cannot withstand a surge of hundreds of thousands of illegal migrants reportedly waiting on the other side of the border to get in once Title 42 is rescinded.

Migrants will pour into this country in a flood as our communities experience the catastrophic results. Patrol facilities and local communities will once again be forced to absorb at least double the current number. Title 42 is the only policy that is helping.

The administration has abandoned Texas, has abandoned other border States, and has abandoned its duty to secure our country. Making any changes to this policy will have disastrous consequences.

And get this straight, I remind everyone in this House that we still have a mask mandate on board aircrafts in this country to keep us safe from COVID. Yet, we are rescinding Title 42, also in place because of the pandemic. Think about that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stand with us and to help come up with a reasonable solution. Title 42 rescission is not that solution. President Biden must not rescind Title 42.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH ANN MAFFORD

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a staple in the Odessa, Texas, community, Ms. Elizabeth Ann Mafford, also known as "Ms. Ann".

Ms. Ann recently celebrated her 10th work anniversary at Chick-fil-A in Odessa, Texas. And while this was a special occasion in and of itself, it comes on the heels of Ms. Ann also celebrating her 90th birthday.

Ms. Ann is a constant in Odessa, Texas, bringing joy and light to everyone she encounters. From working the drive-through and the front counter and just greeting customers on the way in, she continuously spreads light throughout the entire community.

In a testament to Ms. Ann's life, her celebration of her 10th anniversary on the job was recognized community-wide. Folks posted online in recognition of Ms. Ann's kindness and love, and I would like to personally thank her for living the American Dream, for showing everyone throughout this country that even at 90 years young that she can still work and be a productive member of our community, bringing so much light and joy throughout Odessa, the Permian Basin, and Texas.

Ms. Ann, thank you for what you do for our community and the joy you spread.

OIL AND GAS REBATES

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Orange County families are feeling the squeeze of higher gas prices. As a single working mom, I share their concern when I fill up my minivan. We can provide relief by holding oil companies accountable.

These corporations are making record profits, the highest they have been in over 7 years, even as Americans are struggling. And as the price of crude oil falls, oil and gas companies have refused to pass on savings to customers. Especially as Big Oil engages in profiteering, they should not get our taxpayer dollars to line their pockets. Each year, the industry receives roughly \$650 billion in direct and indirect subsidies, financed by taxpayers.

This week, I am leading an effort to bring legislation to the House floor that ends these giveaways to a profitable industry and instead puts these dollars toward helping families make ends meet.

Last week, I introduced the End Oil and Gas Tax Subsidies Act, which would eliminate nearly a dozen longstanding egregious tax breaks to the oil and gas industry. Healthy capitalism requires a level-playing field. For far too long, Big Oil has manipulated the market in its favor by lobbying Congress for sweetheart deals. Then, they raise prices while simultaneously rewarding their executives with huge bonuses.

Their record profits are proof that they can do without market-distorting government subsidies.

Eliminating these tax breaks would provide approximately \$60 billion in help to families feeling the squeeze. If my colleagues have the political courage to stand up to Big Oil, we can quickly relieve the pain that Americans feel at the pump. I am ready.

□ 1115

CRACKING DOWN ON PORCH PIRATES

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, porch pirates steal packages and make our communities less safe. Over 1 in 3 Americans, myself included, have been a victim of this theft, which costs us billions of dollars each year.

I joined Democrats and Republicans to introduce the Porch Pirates Act, which will crack down on this crime. This bipartisan bill expands Federal protections for mail and parcels to cover deliveries from private carriers.

Porch pirates are committing crimes of opportunity, and online shopping—especially during the pandemic—has dramatically increased these opportunities. I recently met with the Irvine police chief who described to me how sophisticated these bad actors have become.

Our Porch Pirates Act modernizes Federal law and helps keep families safe.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS A PROMISE

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is a promise. It is a promise that we make to older adults and disabled Americans, people who count on our support.

One of Social Security's most important features—one not found in traditional pensions—is that benefits automatically adjust for inflation each year. The current level of adjustment isn't working. As corporate profiteers drive inflation to new highs, people on Social Security are not even treading water, they are sinking.

Democrats have a solution. The Social Security 2100 Act fixes the inflation adjustment. It would put more money in the pocket of older Americans and people with disabilities so they can afford higher healthcare costs and other expenses.

It would also eliminate waiting periods for people with disabilities, reducing disabled poverty. More than 200 Members of Congress support this bill, and I am proud to be among them. By passing the Social Security 2100 Act, we honor our promise to older Americans and disabled Americans.

AMERICA'S ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, when the Biden administration learned Iran was just weeks away from enriching enough uranium for a weapon, this administration's response was to rush to a deal to

slow but not stop Iran's nuclear ambitions. This is so.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, no deal will include concrete guarantees that Iran will not develop nuclear weapons. Yet, in pursuit of a deal, the Biden administration is offering concessions that will enrich our adversaries, endanger our allies, and cost America dearly.

The whole new deal now hinges on delisting the Islamic Revolutionary Guard—yes, that terrorist organization—even as the IRGC supported attacks against U.S. troops recently in the UAE.

Mr. Speaker, sanctions relief will give Iran access to over \$100 billion in frozen assets. That is over \$100 billion in frozen assets to the center of terrorism in the world. Nuclear trade, in addition, with Russia and China will only strengthen this unholy alliance.

What can our allies expect from an Iran enriched from energy sales and free from sanctions? Even worse, President Biden is seeking to buy oil from Iran instead of ramping up U.S. production. This disastrous decision, irrational decision, will fill their coffers even more.

We have wrecked our U.S. national and economic security, Mr. Speaker, by forfeiting our energy over the last 15 months and our independence. We are now subject to the fluctuations from the randomness of the geopolitical events rather than relying upon American workers and American energy.

We have cost our Nation thousands of jobs and empowered our enemies. We are seeing this firsthand with the leverage we have ceded to Russia because this administration seeks to decimate U.S. energy production.

The Department of Energy is taking trips and seeking oil purchases from Venezuela. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen Department of Energy representatives in Pennsylvania to see how the great reserves in the Marcellus Shale can support our country's energy needs.

Is the Biden administration choosing Venezuela over Pennsylvania? Are they choosing Tehran over Texas? And as my good friend, Representative AUGUST PFLUGER, branded not too long ago: Are they choosing Moscow over Midland?

This is the product of disastrous domestic policies weakening our hand in diplomacy and the Biden administration rushing to negotiate from a position of weakness. It is why our allies are urging us to walk away and keep sanctions in place on Iran.

This deal was misguided 7 years ago. It is downright dangerous today. We need Democrats and Republicans in this House to stand up for America and against this erroneous, misguided, senseless Iran nuke deal.

HONORING MAJOR NHIA LONG VANG

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by taking a moment to remember one of my constituents who lived an extraordinary life, Major Nhia Long Vang, who recently passed away.

Major Vang was a longtime leader in the Fresno Hmong community and bravely served alongside American soldiers in Laos during the Vietnam war. This conflict also is known as the secret war in Laos. Major Vang was recruited at the age of 19 by the Central Intelligence Agency to serve in the Special Guerilla Unit, otherwise known as the SGU, during the secret war to help the U.S. fight against the North Vietnamese Communist Army and the Pathet Lao Communist troops.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Major Vang led intelligence missions on the Ho Chi Minh Trail to gather surveillance on the Communist forces. He also oversaw missions that rescued American pilots during the Vietnam war when their planes were shot down.

By 1980, Major Vang's family received asylum to come to the United States, where he would settle in Fresno in 1983. Once in the United States, Major Vang worked tirelessly to support the families of soldiers whom the secret war in Laos impacted.

Major Vang was a leader and advisor to organizations like the Lao Veterans of America and the Special Guerilla Units Veterans and Families. Major Vang was also instrumental and a partner in helping my efforts to secure burial rights in national cemeteries and other benefits for Special Guerilla Unit veterans who fought alongside with American soldiers.

It has been an honor in my career to get to know a hero like Major Vang and work with him as an advocate for the SGU veterans and get them the recognition they so deserve.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to recognize Women's History Month. While it is the end of March now, we so honor always the contributions that women make in our country and in our valley. Across the world they make a difference every day, as we know.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize just some of the so many talented and incredible women that I interact with and I get a chance to work with:

Dora Westerlund is president and CEO of the Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation. Dora has changed the lives of more than 15,000 Hispanic and non-Hispanic-owned businesses to become economically self-sufficient and add to the vibrancy of our economy in the San Joaquin Valley.

Sara Bosse serves as the public health director for Madera County. During this pandemic she has been incredibly responsive and led the county's response to combat COVID-19 by expanding testing, vaccinations, and managing the outbreaks in Madera County.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize Gammeloh Mohammed of Merced who

founded the Merced County Freedom Coalition, which fosters collaboration between law enforcement, government agencies, and other community partners in the fight against human trafficking. As co-chair of the Victims Rights Caucus, I know her efforts are very important. She has provided essential resources to support survivors and victims of crime.

AMERICA'S SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to an important issue that is affecting our economy, and that is the supply chain issue. Congress can take effective action by cracking down on foreign-owned shipping companies that have monopolized the industry and that are creating inflationary pressures.

My bill, the Ocean Shipping Antitrust Enforcement Act, subjects foreign-owned ocean shipping carriers to American antitrust law, as they should be. This builds on provisions in the Ocean Shipping Reform Act that Representative GARAMENDI and I and others are supporting that has already passed the House.

Together, these pieces of legislation protect American exporters from unfair trade practices like container rate increases, sudden change in shipping schedules, unreasonable fees by shipping companies, and ships leaving ports with empty containers after they have offloaded their goods here in America.

Agricultural producers in California are suffering. A University of California study found that in the fall of 2021, an empty container leaving California ports hit almost 80 percent, pre-pandemic it was about 30 percent. This is an unfair trade practice.

President Biden said in this very Chamber during the State of the Union—on the topic of ocean shipping reform—that capitalism without competition is exploitation. It is. We must answer the President's call to get this meaningful ocean shipping reform legislation to his desk.

GOD BLESS UKRAINE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying, God bless the people of Ukraine and the suffering during this horrific war taken on by the pariah Putin, who is a war criminal and must be punished for it. God bless them.

TRIBUTE TO DON YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for 5 minutes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give tribute to Congressman Don Young.

For almost 50 years, Congressman Don Young proudly represented all Alaska. The dean of the House, as he was affectionately known, was the ninth-longest tenured Member of Congress. His passing last week leaves a huge void for his constituents, for this body, and certainly for so many of us who had the honor of personally knowing Don. For me, personally, I thought

he was a mentor for many of the issues that we shared together.

Our paths first crossed when I was 20 years old and I was elected among a group of fellow young Republicans to meet Congressman Young when he visited the island to discuss its future political status. It was in that moment when I was able to witness firsthand his loyalty to the causes he deeply cared about, including Puerto Rico's quest for statehood.

Little did I know at that time that I would have the fortune and honor to serve alongside him in the U.S. House of Representatives, and to sit on the two committees he ever served on and chaired, the Natural Resources and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees.

Congressman Don Young had a unique perspective when it came to Puerto Rico's fight for statehood and full equality as American citizens. He could relate because he moved to Alaska shortly after it was admitted into the Union as the 49th State.

As Alaska's sole Representative in the House, he understood better than anyone else the inequities under the territorial status and the opportunities that statehood brings. He knew what kind of fight we would be in for, and he was with us every step of the way.

He understood the difficulties of representing a non-contiguous district here in this body, and because of this, Puerto Rico found in him an immediate ally. He frequently visited the island and even served as an election observer in one of our most recent referendums, demonstrating once again his longstanding commitment to ensuring the island's 3.2 million American citizens had their voice heard.

When former Speaker Paul Ryan was giving a tribute to Congressman Don Young when he became the dean of the House, he said: You always knew where he stood, but more importantly, you always knew where you stood with him. And that is because he made no secret of his politics or his opinion.

He was a staunch supporter of utilizing domestic energy and mineral production and infrastructure development to spur economic growth. He also fiercely defended Alaska Natives' rights and worked tirelessly to ensure they were enabled to improve their lives and economic status. He was a loyal friend to organized labor and to his fellow veterans.

Congressman Don Young was a legislative force of nature. He was the primary sponsor of 123 bills that were enacted into law, including legislation for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline in his first year in Congress. More often than not, he crossed the aisle on bills such as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, women's rights, such as the Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009, and the Magnuson-Stevens Act, otherwise known as the Young-Studds bill, which revolutionized Federal fisheries management and preserved the commercial fishing industry in Alaska and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Don Young's legacy will live on in every Alaskan, every Member who has served with him, and every staffer who has been fortunate to learn from him.

His passing leaves a big void. He touched our lives deeply in so many ways, and this House will never be the same without Don.

I pray for his wife, Anne; Congressman Young's two daughters; and his grandchildren.

Godspeed, Don Young, and gracias.

□ 1130

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and I can't let this month pass without highlighting two barrier-breaking public servants.

So many women have contributed greatly to Louisiana, but today, I want to take a few moments to celebrate two: Councilwoman Dorothy Mae Taylor and Congresswoman Lindy Claiborne Boggs.

A New Orleans teacher and activist, Dorothy led a fight for equality within the segregated school systems while serving as a PTA president. Under her leadership, the city's Black and White schools finally achieved equal funding.

While I didn't know it at the time, my educational experience as a boy growing up in New Orleans in the sixties and seventies would improve thanks to the work of Mrs. Taylor. During the civil rights movement, she successfully fought to desegregate New Orleans recreational facilities and register African-American voters.

She was a woman of many firsts: the first woman of color to be elected to the Louisiana House of Representatives; the first African-American woman to hold the head of a State department; and the first Black woman and one of the first two women to serve on the New Orleans City Council, in 1986.

Councilwoman Taylor worked issues like criminal justice reform before they were popular. After a century of segregation, she was the first councilmember to move on a proposal to ban discrimination in Mardi Gras krewe membership, a move that paved the way for their eventual desegregation.

I was elected to the New Orleans City Council in 1994, the year that Councilwoman Taylor retired, but I am so grateful to have known her and to have had an opportunity to learn from her many pearls of wisdom.

Though she passed in the year 2000, she left a lasting mark on New Orleans, Louisiana, and our country.

Congresswoman Lindy Boggs lived a life of service and warmth, unafraid to break the glass ceiling while overcoming great personal loss.

Her husband, the Honorable Hale Boggs, served in Congress for decades

until his tragic death in a plane crash. Following his passing, Lindy Boggs replaced him as Congresswoman Boggs and became the first woman ever elected to Congress from the State of Louisiana.

It takes a lot of inner strength to do that, strength we also see today from our current colleague serving as a Member of Congress from Louisiana, Congresswoman JULIA LETLOW.

In this very Chamber, Congresswoman Boggs fought tirelessly for equal rights for women and minorities. She also fought to make the House of Representatives more welcoming to women, successfully advocating for a women's-only space in a governing body that was more than 96 percent male. That room still exists today and is appropriately named the Lindy Claiborne Boggs Congressional Women's Reading Room.

Throughout her life, Congresswoman Boggs famously opened her home, her kitchen, and her heart to the people of Louisiana and the community she loved so much.

She passed in 2013, but we all uplift the memory of Congresswoman Boggs and Councilwoman Dorothy Mae Taylor for advancing issues that they had committed their entire lives to protecting and advancing voting rights, fighting against discrimination, providing healthcare to underserved members of our community, and fighting for humanity for people everywhere.

In the spirit of the Honorable Lindy Boggs and the Honorable Dorothy Mae Taylor, we say thank you for your incredible service, and we will continue the drumbeat of these issues here in Congress.

ENERGY COSTS AFFECTING U.S. FARMERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about energy and energy costs in this country and, of course, in my home State of California, where you can easily find fuel over 6 bucks a gallon. Let me translate this conversation into what it means for farmers and what farmers mean for food supply.

Now, we know the United States farmer provides the best, the cleanest, the most efficient process, more grown per acre per unit than anywhere else in the world. So, it is amazing to me that, just a few days ago, President Biden announced that we are going to have food shortages in the world and even here. We are already seeing the empty shelves. We are already seeing the high prices—supply and demand for everything.

In the United States of America, food shortages make me ask: What are our priorities as a country and as a government here or in my home State, the government of California?

We are looking at energy costs. Everything requires energy when we have a product that goes from a field, from a mine, or from a manufacturer to your home, Mr. Speaker. The fuel costs to operate a tractor, a combine, the trucks that bring you fertilizer and that bring you seed, the trucks that take away the grown product to the processor, to the mill, and finally bringing it to your store shelf or even if you have it delivered to your house, Mr. Speaker. All those energy costs ripple through everything we do and have as citizens of this country.

What is being done about energy costs? Well, I just saw a blurb a minute ago that the President wants to tap into our energy reserve, the stored oil that we have someplace that always seems to be a political football around here to solve some problem when it is really supposed to be a reserve for very acute times of danger for our country. Now, they are using it as an economic flattener or what have you.

We have reserves in the ground in this country that we are not tapping, but our tone-deaf government here and our State of California won't do anything about that. Instead, let's export it from Venezuela, and let's export it from the Middle East. Maybe we will do something about Russia. We will see if that takes effect.

We are not doing anything to help our own people with the energy crisis and energy costs here. We are dancing around that collectively as a government in this administration. Why? What is their priority? When John Kerry says he hopes this thing Putin is doing in Ukraine doesn't stop our ability to reach our climate change goals, how tone-deaf are these people? Are you kidding me?

We are going to continue to enjoy even emptier shelves for our food, tires, and everything else because of high energy costs and a government in Washington and in Sacramento unwilling to do anything about it other than half measures or zero measures.

What does this do to our food supply, as we talked about? My colleagues in the State legislature proposed a sales tax holiday, a fuel tax holiday, which would knock about 51 cents off of a gallon of fuel. It is not the be-all or fix-all, but it can do something temporarily to help while we get our energy going again, supposedly. It would help. They turned that down. Instead, they proposed a tax increase on production of fuel in California. Unbelievable. Damn, who are you guys working for? Amazing.

In my home State, as we try to produce food, tens of millions of acre-feet of water and snow fall upon our State each year. We hear drought, drought, drought, record drought. Yes, it is lower than normal, but we are not capturing the water we can.

We could raise Shasta Dam, a Federal project, which Federal dollars were put toward. We could build Sites Reservoir in northern California and

add 1.5 million-acre feet of stored water.

But no. They are letting the water get away out through the delta for salinity and for fish populations that don't even exist. The delta smelt is gone.

The Klamath Basin up in the north, zero allocation for agriculture last year and this year. Statewide, we are looking at probably 70 percent of irrigated acres by the time it is all added up. They are going to be idle this year.

What does that mean to the American people? That is California's problem; you guys don't know what you are doing out there anyway. Well, tomato production is going to be down quite a bit, so that means less tomato sauce for New York, less olives and olive oil for New York.

This is what we are doing to our food production. Fertilizer costs are going to drive costs even more, and we will not be farming in California much longer.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S BUDGET DISREGARDS FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, President Biden's own words: Show me your budget, and I will show you your priorities.

President Biden's budget is not only a reflection of his priorities; it is a mirror into the soul of the Democrat Party. Biden's budget exposes Democrat leadership's complete disregard for fiscal responsibility, adding trillions of dollars in new spending and sending us hurtling toward an incalculable national debt of \$45 trillion by 2032.

The budget proposal includes a staggering \$2.5 trillion in tax hikes that would weaken our global competitiveness, stifle wage growth, and send prices skyrocketing even higher than the current 40-year high inflation. The result would be devastating for American investment, innovation, and jobs.

The deficit spending in Biden's proposal will leave our children steeped in debt and at risk of an economic crisis they cannot borrow their way out of. His budget doubles down on the radical socialist policies, including the Green New Deal and its extreme environmental policies and a whole-of-government assault on oil and gas, which is undermining our energy independence and making us weaker and more vulnerable, like our friends in Europe. It also includes tax hikes that will make America less competitive, raising taxes higher than Communist China, and hiring tens of thousands of new IRS agents to harass hardworking Americans.

This is his vision for a stronger and more prosperous America.

While the President's expansion of nondefense domestic spending is on

pace to double over the next several years, his budget effectively cuts spending for the Defense Department by 4 percent. If our adversaries weren't already emboldened by the disaster at the southern border, the debacle in Afghanistan, the weak negotiations with Iran, or the slow and feckless response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, they certainly will be now.

The President's budget is not only a failure in the area of readiness; it is more advertisement of weakness in an increasingly dangerous world.

Lastly, the President's budget uses an outrageous budget gimmick to prevent his massive, multitrillion-dollar Build Back Better from affecting the budget score.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people did that—that off-balance, Enron-like accounting scheme—they would go to prison. This is not just intellectually dishonest; it is downright deceitful.

From the top-line numbers to tax hikes, from partisan policies to bureaucratic bloat, President Biden's budget highlights the Democratic Party's real priorities: the largest expansion and most radical reimagining of the Federal Government in the lives of its people.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 44 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 (Mr. LIEU) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Gracious God, take this day into Your keeping. Let no minute pass that we fail to realize that You have ordained its stewardship, guided our footsteps, and allowed our enjoyment of it.

For You only had to speak, and the heavens were created. You breathed Your words, and the stars were born. You assigned the sea its boundaries and locked the oceans in vast reservoirs.

Holy God, we marvel at Your handiwork and stand in awe of Your power. So may we realize that You are at work in us this day.

In reverence to You, may we display the beauty of Your creation in us. May we be true to the purposes for which You have placed us in this time, in this place.

From our mouths, may there come forth words that reflect both Your

truth and Your compassion. May our attitudes reveal the care and concern You have for all those You have made in your image.

Let our lives ever flow with the love You have shown us that all may come to rejoice in Your loving kindness.

In Your merciful name, we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMALFA 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.

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE DONALD E. YOUNG

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the legacy of my good friend and colleague, Congressman Don Young from Alaska, who sadly passed away the evening of March 18.

Don was an inspirational man who served the people of Alaska in the House of Representatives for nearly half a century and did so with a giant heart and tremendous passion.

Don cherished this institution. He was a strong proponent of bipartisan-ship and civility, and he consistently sought to find common ground. It is something I always admired about him.

There is something I want the country and the world to know: He was also a champion for the disability community, and I was proud to work closely with Don as co-chairs of the Bipartisan Disabilities Caucus.

Together, we worked across the aisle to break down barriers and provide opportunities for Americans with disabilities and to raise awareness of disability issues for our colleagues.

Don was a problem solver. He was a dedicated public servant. And, in many ways, he was larger than life. I was devastated to learn of his passing, and I am really going to miss him. He made a difference.

His wife, Anne, and his children, Dawn and Joni, are in my prayers, as well as his entire family.

Rest in peace.

AMERICA'S EXTREME ECONOMIC CRISIS

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a tree is known by its fruits. Every policy that Biden and the Democrats have created is demonstrably an America last policy.

They call it Build Back Better, but the truth is, their agenda is Americans last, build back broke policies.

Americans are facing an extreme economic crisis as a result of Democrat policies that President Biden and Speaker PELOSI have put into place.

Skyrocketing prices at the store and the pump are causing Americans pain in their pocketbook. Biden's outrageous budget is fuel on the inflation fire.

President Biden and the Democrats in the House are deliberately bankrupting Americans and taking away their economic opportunities. What are we leaving behind for our children and grandchildren?

Americans cannot afford the America last policies the Democrats have created that have made crisis upon crisis.

RELIANCE ON FOREIGN OIL

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

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York). Mr. Speaker, U.S. reliance on foreign oil threatens our national security, pollutes our environment, and unnecessarily burdens our families with high and fluctuating gas prices.

Americans want to make the leap to electric vehicles which are cleaner, quicker, and quieter. But the lack of supply and changing infrastructure is holding people back.

China ranks number 1 in the world, controlling 80 percent of the market of producing raw materials in lithium ion batteries, the United States ranks 15. If we don't move quickly, we will fall further behind.

I support efforts to invoke the Defense Production Act so President Biden can help domestic manufacturers expand the production and supply of critical materials and goods.

This is a bold and necessary move that will accelerate the availability of electric vehicles and put Americans back to work.

ENERGY COSTS AFFECT FARMERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, President Biden has been promising recently

empty shelves, food shortages in the United States of America.

American farmers are the most efficient and the best in the world at what they do, but they can't do it very well with these high energy costs.

Fertilizer takes energy to produce. It takes oil to produce. When you see the cost increasing 51 percent, this isn't just going to hit the farmers; it is going to hit all consumers.

Energy costs ripple through everything: planting, harvesting, delivering, everything. So what are we doing? What is our focus going to be?

In my home State of California, water is being taken away from agriculture. We need the Bureau of Reclamation and our own State water resources to be focused on producing food for people.

In Ukraine, those farmers are trying to plant amidst bombs from Putin and Russia. In our own country, in my own home State, the bombs are being dropped by the government on farmers, having their water taken away, having their energy costs go through the roof.

We have to focus on producing energy and food for Americans that is affordable instead of this direction that the Federal and my own State government are doing to the people and not for them.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF RETIRED MAJOR GENERAL NORBERT RAPPL

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an American patriot and a prominent fixture in my community, retired Major General Norbert Rappl, who passed away earlier this month.

General Rappl was a courageous veteran who dedicated his life to serving our great Nation in the United States Army.

A Korean war veteran, he rose through the ranks, retiring as Commander of the 98th Training Division of the United States Army Reserves. We are deeply grateful for his service.

Upon returning home, General Rappl turned his dedication to his community, and my hometown of Irondequoit, becoming a charter member and past president of the Irondequoit Rotary Club chapter.

His never-ending devotion to serving others was his life's calling and is a key piece of his legacy that will never be forgotten. May he rest in peace.

VIETNAM VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday was Vietnam Veterans Day. The day was a reminder that our freedom is not free.

We stand together to thank and honor Vietnam veterans and their families for their service and their sacrifice. Across the country, we paused and remembered the service and sacrifices made.

Tuesday, in Indiana County, in the Pennsylvania 15th Congressional District, the Historical and Genealogical Society hosted their second annual program featuring guest speakers, music from the era, and an historical display relating to the Vietnam Memorial in Washington, D.C., called "The Wall that Heals."

Vietnam Veterans Day and the programs are dedicated to honor the veterans who served Active Duty in the United States Armed Forces from November 1, 1955, to May 15, 1975, the time period in which the U.S. had soldiers deployed.

In addition to a pinning ceremony for Vietnam veterans in attendance, wreaths will be placed remembering Indiana County residents who were killed in the line of duty or named as missing in action during the war.

Mr. Speaker, events like the program in Indiana County are a great way for our younger generation to learn and our older generations to be remembered. It is important we always find time to thank and honor our veterans for their service to our great Nation.

To my friends who are Vietnam veterans, welcome home.

REMEMBERING UKRAINE

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 weeks since Vladimir Putin launched his assault on Ukraine and its people; a relentless churn of cruelty, of war crimes, crimes against humanity.

More than 4 million people have fled Ukraine, but tragically, not everyone has found refuge. More than 1,000 civilians have been murdered, and that number grows.

On Monday, there were more than 40 shellings by Russian troops in and around Kyiv, destroying homes, and in one case, killing a child in his own bed.

The children. There have been 145 children known dead, a likely horrifying undercount. Innocent children, unarmed civilians. The horror continues.

We must continue to support Ukraine and provide all necessary aid. We must not lose sight of the people.

Pennsylvania is home to more than 122,000 Ukrainians, the second most of any State, and my district is home to a dynamic Ukrainian-American community, many with family in Ukraine.

I think of them. I think of Ukraine every day. The world must stand united to end this series of war crimes.

"Glory to Ukraine." "Slava Ukraini."

"Glory to the heroes." "Slava heroyam."

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY, MARINA METEVELIS

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

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, a very special friend and constituent of mine turned 100 years old last week. Her name is Marina Metevelis, but back home, she is better known as Tulsa's "Rosie the Riveter."

Marina took the iconic red bandana for the first time and wrapped it around her head when she was 16 years old in 1941, when she reported to work on the B-17 Flying Fortress bombers in the aftermath of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Marina joined the "Rosie the Riveter" sisterhood that day and stood shoulder to shoulder with an army of extraordinary women who became the most formidable munition and war supply manufacturers in modern history.

They played an integral role in World War II, for which the entire world is grateful.

Marina still wears the red bandana to this day. She hasn't slowed down for one second, working to forge a better community for Tulsa and continuing her lifelong mission to support our veterans by raising funds for numerous veteran organizations.

Happy birthday, Marina. Thank you for your service to our Nation, and may God bless you.

CAPPING THE PRICE OF INSULIN

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of something every single Member of this body should be able to get behind, capping the price of insulin at \$35 a month.

In my home State of Massachusetts, over half a million people rely on their lifesaving insulin prescription. But being forced to pay anywhere from \$100 to \$1,600 a month for it simply isn't doable for so many families.

Far too many diabetics are being forced to ration their doses, and some are even skipping them altogether because they can't afford the medicine they need.

Let's be clear about what that means. Hardworking folks are risking their lives each day because big pharmaceutical companies are putting profits first.

We have the ability to change that with the legislation before us today, Mr. Speaker. And shame on us if we stand by and do nothing while people we have the honor to represent die waiting for Congress to act.

I plead with my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. Our constituents are depending on us.

□ 1215

PREPARING OUR COUNTRY FOR THE FUTURE

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

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today the House will take a historic step toward restoring American manufacturing leadership by voting to go to conference on the COMPETES Act.

This bold bill makes much-needed investments in research, innovation, and manufacturing that will ensure America can outcompete any nation in the world now and for decades to come.

The package will accelerate domestic production of semiconductor chips, the key component of everything from cars and computers to communications and clean energy systems. It will strengthen the supply chain to make more goods in America. It will create jobs and support new skill-building apprenticeship programs, and it will support strong labor and environmental standards.

What's more, the bill and its provisions have received bipartisan support, both here in the House and over in the Senate. You heard that right, Congress is delivering investments that will prepare our country for the next generation of success.

CONGRATULATING APR SUPPLY COMPANY ON 100 YEARS IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate APR Supply Company on the occasion of their company's 100th year in business, which is a milestone that not many companies achieve.

APR Supply Company is a third-generation-owned-and-operated full-service distributor of plumbing, HVAC, and hydronic supplies, supporting countless companies through their 38 locations in my district and in other areas of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

In America, the entrepreneurial spirit it has led many to pursue founding a business. Over the years some may succeed, some may fail, but to celebrate 100 years is a milestone that few achieve, as I mentioned. This achievement signals that an organization is relentlessly pursuing their values and supporting their customers.

I recently enjoyed visiting one of their facilities with third-generation president and CEO Scott Weaver to learn about their innovative inventory management system and their operations.

Again, congratulations to the team at APR Supply and to Scott on celebrating 100 years in business. Best wishes on their continued success.

COMMENDING BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS

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

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize the Boys and Girls Clubs of Broward County and Palm Beach County for over 100 years of combined service to their communities.

Over the past half a century, both clubs have grown and now serve more than 10,000 youth in 17 cities across Palm Beach County and over 12,500 youth at 12 locations across Broward County. Their work is critical for the success of the kids who need them most in our communities.

Each young person who walks through their doors can access programs that support their academic success, physical health, social-emotional well-being, and leadership development.

Most importantly, it is a safe place for kids to have fun, make lifelong friends, and to help build resiliency and the confidence that will serve them for the rest of their lives.

The Boys and Girls Clubs Movement challenges each and every one of us to fulfill our full potential. For more than 50 years, the Palm Beach County and Broward County clubs have done just that. I commend both organizations as they continue their essential work helping young people reach their full potential as productive, caring, and responsible citizens.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3617, MARIJUANA OPPORTUNITY REINVESTMENT AND EXPUNGEMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6833, AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1017 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1017

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3617) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-37, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without inter-

vening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-38, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 900, agreed to February 2, 2022), is amended by striking "April 1, 2022" each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) "April 29, 2022".

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), 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. PERLMUTTER. Mr. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1017, providing for consideration of two bills. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3617, the MORE Act, under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman NADLER, provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, makes three amendments in order, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, under a closed rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman DELAURO, provides 1 hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule extends recess instructions, suspension authority, and same-day authority through April 29, 2022.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are here today to provide for consideration of Chairman NADLER's MORE Act, which would end decades of failed and unjust marijuana policy.

Today, 18 States, two territories, and the District of Columbia have laws legalizing and regulating commercial cannabis, and a total of 37 States, three territories, and the District of Columbia have laws allowing cannabis for medical purposes. An additional 11 States have low-THC medical cannabis laws.

This means a total of 47 States, four territories, and the District of Columbia have laws allowing some use of cannabis; 97.7 percent of the U.S. population live in these States and territories. It is clear Prohibition is over.

Today we have an opportunity to chart a new path forward on Federal cannabis policy that actually makes sense. The MORE Act is about justice, safety, equity, and States' rights. The bill would decriminalize cannabis at the Federal level by removing the substance from the Controlled Substances Act, but the bill does not force a State to legalize any form of cannabis. It is still up to the States to set their own policy.

The bill also contains provisions on resentencing and the expungement of criminal records. There is no reason why people should still be in prison for low-level, nonviolent cannabis convictions, or have their future predetermined by a cannabis conviction. The war on drugs has torn many families and communities apart and has had a disproportionate impact on people of color. The MORE Act would allow communities to start the healing process.

By removing cannabis from the Controlled Substances Act, the bill also addresses the cannabis banking problem that I have been working on for nearly

10 years in the form of the SAFE Banking Act. Under current law, banks and credit unions providing services to State-licensed cannabis businesses are subject to criminal prosecution and regulatory penalties under Federal law. Therefore, businesses which legally grow, market, or sell cannabis in States where it is legal are generally locked out of the banking system, making it difficult for them to maintain a checking account, access credit, accept credit and debit cards, meet payroll, or pay tax revenue.

This has created a significant public safety risk, as these businesses are forced to operate as cash-only businesses in an industry with billions and billions of dollars in transactions. These high-volume cash businesses are being targeted by violent criminals and putting our communities at risk.

I want to share a few examples of how bad the public safety issue has become.

In November 2021, over the course of one week in Oakland, California, more than 25 cannabis businesses had their stores vandalized and robbed and lost upwards of \$5 million.

A Colorado dispensary chain saw 15 burglaries during a 90-day period in mid-2021, with criminals driving vehicles into their buildings, cutting holes through rooftops and walls, and attacking the stores with pry bars and sledgehammers.

Washington State is averaging more than a robbery per day at dispensaries. In fact, recently in *The Seattle Times*, it was reported that there were three deaths related to robberies of dispensaries—the robber, a policeman, and owner of a store. This is just last week.

This is an untenable situation for these businesses, their employees, and their customers. If Congress fails to align Federal and State law, crimes targeting dispensaries will only get worse. The cannabis industry remains one of the fastest-growing industries and now supports more than 428,000 jobs, with nearly \$25 billion in State-legal cannabis sales per year. The time to pass the MORE Act and right the injustices in our community is now.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, to address skyrocketing insulin costs. Over 37 million Americans have been diagnosed with diabetes, and in Colorado there are over 300,000. The Affordable Insulin Now Act will require Medicare Part D and health insurance plans to cover insulin and cap out-of-pocket cost-sharing at \$35 per month.

Prescription drugs like insulin force Coloradans to make difficult financial decisions. In a 2020 report from the Colorado Attorney General, approximately 40 percent of all survey respondents reportedly using insulin are forced to ration their use of this lifesaving product at least once a year.

□ 1230

I am proud of the steps Colorado has taken to ensure individuals have great

er access to insulin. In 2021, Colorado became the second State in the country to limit insulin prices by enacting an insulin affordability program.

No one should have to pay more than \$35 a month for insulin. The passage of this legislation will lower costs for insulin users and save money for hard-working Americans. I commend Representative ANGIE CRAIG and all of my colleagues for their work on this bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative from Colorado for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we are here to consider House Resolution 1017, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6833 and H.R. 3617. This rule makes in order no Republican amendments, completely ignoring the flaws of each underlying bill and the thoughtful concerns raised by my colleagues. Not only do my colleagues not want to debate these issues, but they also don't appear to even want to acknowledge them.

First, I want to address H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, which would require health insurers to cover selected insulin products without applying any deductible or imposing any cost-sharing in excess of \$35.

This bill is just a partisan exercise that will only reshuffle the decks for how patients pay for insulin. It is not a serious attempt to address rising prices. The price controls in this legislation would be an expansive intervention into the free market and will most likely lead to an increase in premiums for everyone.

Let's not forget, one of the reasons drug prices are rising is because of Washington and the majority's runaway spending leading to the greatest deficits in American history. Instead of admitting that their wildly expensive spending bills have caused inflation, my colleagues claim that companies have suddenly decided now is the time to raise prices arbitrarily.

Congress cannot keep dumping money into the economy and then blaming American companies for the problems it creates. We need to be focusing on getting our debt under control and stop the war on American industry so that we can reduce prices not just on drugs but on everything.

Furthermore, addressing only insulin establishes a problematic precedent and fails to take into account the high prices associated with countless other necessary drugs, like those for cancer, heart disease, and a slew of other conditions.

A sincere attempt by Congress to solve this problem would be to focus on ways to reduce pricing through market-based forces. For example, Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee have offered several proposals which would improve price transparency so that Americans could

see the real cost of their drugs and make choices accordingly.

Instead of working with Republicans to advance these solutions, the majority has yet again elected a go-it-alone approach that has yet to achieve any results for the American people.

Next is H.R. 3617, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, a broad bill that would remove pot from the list of scheduled substances under the Controlled Substances Act and eliminate criminal penalties for individuals who manufacture, distribute, or possess marijuana. This rule makes no Republican amendments in order, which is proof that the Democrats just want to push this bill as a messaging bill.

That said, there are several concerns with this bill. First, it fails to set any standards to prevent marijuana use by those most vulnerable to abuse: minors. In fact, back in September, when Mr. FITZGERALD offered an amendment to alter the definition of the term "minor" to align with other provisions of U.S. Code, the majority voted against it.

Without this amendment, crucial protections for our youth are left out of this bill. In committee, I even offered a motion to consider an amendment that would maintain existing penalties for selling pot to minors. It was defeated along party lines, a stunning position for Democrats to take.

But not only does this bill legalize pot; it creates a new government program to assist people in opening pot stores. Let me repeat that: This bill creates a government program to help people open pot stores.

This bill also ignores the issue of driving under the influence, even though driving under the influence of marijuana can have deadly consequences, something law enforcement officers across America have warned about.

Additionally, what happens if an illegal immigrant is arrested for driving under the influence of marijuana? This is not addressed.

Republicans on the committee sought to ensure that this bill would not impede the deportation of illegal immigrants who have been arrested for driving under the influence. That was also rejected along party lines.

There are so many issues our constituents are facing today. Yet, we are here, spending time considering legislation to legalize pot that is not only flawed, but it is also dangerous.

We could be working on lowering gas prices, tackling the snowballing Federal debt, or addressing the inflation affecting every American today. But instead, I guess the majority wants us to get as high as today's gas prices and spend tax dollars on pot stores.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill. I ask Members to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I remind my friend from Minnesota who was talking about party-line votes, we want to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, whether it is insulin or across the board, which we have done in the Build Back Better bill that is sitting in the Senate, and I can say I think virtually every single Republican voted against negotiating prescription drug prices.

If you want to talk about a free market, then you ought to be able to negotiate prescription drug prices so that Americans across the board get the best possible prices for their drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), a prominent and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished and, by his own admission, highly caffeinated gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my Rules Committee colleague and great friend, for yielding me time.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. In particular, I would like to say a few words about the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Over the past two decades, the costs of prescription diabetes drugs like insulin have artificially skyrocketed by more than tenfold.

A few years ago, I was proud to commission a report by the House Committee on Oversight and Reform to determine the extent of this price gouging and how it is affecting communities across the country, including my own in Rochester, New York, and the impact it is having on patients, especially older adults, and our uninsured population. The results of that review were staggering.

In communities across the country, out-of-pocket costs have risen by 400 percent for the Medicare program and beneficiaries over the last decade. The average price for a standard unit of insulin in the United States was more than 10 times the average price in a sampling of 32 other countries.

These excessively inflated prices have real consequences on how patients manage this chronic disease. I have talked with many patients and families in my own district that have had to ration their dose or stop taking this life-saving and life-sustaining medication altogether.

For the richest and most powerful nation in the world to allow this to continue is nothing less than shameful.

In passing this bill, we are taking the first step of many to rein in these inflated costs and protecting patients to ensure the best possible health outcomes.

I am so proud to deliver for my constituents back home, and I look forward to voting for this rule and getting one step closer toward seeing the bill passed into law.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amend-

ment to the rule to provide for consideration of Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS and Congressman WESTERMAN's American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, while the majority is continuing to prioritize things like legalizing marijuana, constituents in my district continue to send me photos of their energy bills and the prices they are paying at the gas pumps.

Since President Biden took office, gasoline prices are up by more than 50 percent, natural gas is up more than 25 percent, and diesel fuel is up more than 47 percent. These price increases are on top of crippling, record-high inflation that is a tax on the American people of every stripe, class, and creed.

When adjusted for these factors, wages and salaries are below prepandemic levels. My constituents are pleading with Congress to focus on this issue and are being ignored by the out-of-touch majority.

Mr. Speaker, to speak further on the previous question, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858.

This administration has sent desperate requests for oil from oppressive regimes like Iran and Venezuela. It is past time the Biden administration start making those frantic calls to Oklahoma instead of OPEC or even my friends in Texas instead of Tehran. Until that happens, gas prices will continue to soar, and hardworking Americans will suffer.

While Putin continues to wage war on Ukraine, exposing our dependence on Russian energy, Biden continues to wage war on our domestic oil and gas industry that provides sustainable, reliable energy to the American people.

This week, Biden doubled down his attack by releasing a budget that includes an astonishing \$45 billion in tax hikes on American energy producers.

Seventy percent of goods in America are moved by trucks. An increase in gas prices will continue to be passed down on the food and products that all Americans buy. Let me be clear: Biden's energy policy is hurting all Americans and not just at the pump.

Whether you like it or not, traditional energy powers our country. Oil and gas are essential to power our homes and, yes, provide the energy to power electric vehicles.

Biden's war on energy poses a threat to all of us. It is imperative that the Federal Government stop villainizing the industry that powers our world.

Global energy markets are complicated, but one thing is certain: If policymakers continue to impose barriers on domestic energy production, prices will continue to rise. Therefore, we need to instill confidence in the industry that plays such a crucial role in our economy by restoring stability and consistency with policies that prioritize American energy production.

Investors and business leaders make their decisions based not only on the policies debated and voted on in D.C. but also on the rhetoric from public officials. What happens in this Chamber impacts businesses, but also what we go out and say on cable TV.

Trust me, I was a business leader for 35 years. Today's political climate will directly influence future investment decisions, especially in heavily regulated industries like energy.

The Biden administration has been sending mixed messages. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they are concerned about the high prices reflected by the weak oil and gas supply, but their actions tell a different story. They aggressively push a plan to crush oil and gas production entirely.

Their video simply doesn't match their audio, which is why the American people have lost faith in Democratic leadership.

We must restore sanity and pursue energy dominance once again on the world stage.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple points in response.

One, we are trying to bring down the price of insulin—that is one of the bills here that we are talking about—from the outrageous amounts that are required for this lifesaving drug down to \$35. Yet, my Republican colleagues oppose reducing that.

They worry about inflation at the pump, which we all do, but it is Putin's price hike. We know where this came from, this increase, and the President is working to release millions of barrels of oil from our underground storage, and he wants to place a price on leases that aren't being used. We have 12 million acres that are under lease and are not being used. That will bring down the price at the pump. But we have to defeat Putin. It is his price hike.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has made a truly exceptional contribution to this institution and to the work that goes on here, the amazing Peggy Fields.

Peggy has served in the Clerk's Office since 2008, first as assistant bill clerk and now as bill clerk, where she oversees an amazing team that works late

nights and long hours to literally keep the House of Representatives running.

I can spend hours talking about how incredible everyone in the Clerk's Office is:

How they have an incredible eye for detail and never drop the ball;

How they seamlessly process the hundreds of daily submissions into the hopper;

How they rose to the challenge of keeping this body running during a pandemic—implementing proxy voting and the e-hopper so our work could go on, even when it wasn't safe for all of us to be here;

And, of course, how much they believe in this institution and all that it represents.

But I only have a few minutes, so let me just say to everyone in the Clerk's Office that your work does not go unnoticed. It is recognized by so many of us here in the congressional community and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, Peggy Fields started her journey to Capitol Hill 33 years ago when she went to work for former Congressman "Bud" Cramer, who was then the district attorney of Madison County, Alabama.

Congressman Cramer told me that when he was sworn into Congress in January 1991, the first employee in his Washington office was Peggy Fields. Peggy helped run that office for 18 years, and unsurprisingly, she was beloved by everyone. In the Congressman's office, Peggy proudly represented her hometown of Huntsville, Alabama.

He told me that Peggy and her family are renowned in Huntsville, and that she is and always has been devoted to the people of Huntsville, as well as her friends and family back home.

In 2008, she joined the Office of the Clerk as an assistant bill clerk. And her dedication and exceptional work ethic earned her the promotion to bill clerk in July of 2021.

As if all this were not enough, Peggy will soon graduate from Wesley Theological Seminary with a doctorate of ministry degree in church leadership. And I want to congratulate her on that incredible achievement.

Peggy and her team have the daunting task of processing every single bill and cosponsor form for the House.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the bill clerks work especially closely with the Parliamentarian's office, because the Parliamentarian is responsible for referring all bills on the day that they are introduced. And the bill clerks process those referrals on the same day as well.

Now, sometimes that means that the bill clerks and Parliamentarians share late nights together and they get to know each other quite well. I want to read a note sent over to me by the Parliamentarian's office about Peggy.

"Peggy is always such a welcoming presence to us, both on the floor and in

our offices. However, Peggy is so welcoming and kind that there is always a noticeable uptick in bill introduction whenever she is stationed on the floor. That is why we came to know her by the nickname 'The Bill Magnet,' we know that our workload increases whenever she is on the floor.

"However, always thinking of others, Peggy would make up for this increased bill count by singing a cappella renditions of popular songs in our office while we finished up our referrals. She is one of a kind, the consummate public servant, and truly irreplaceable to this institution."

Mr. Speaker, at a time when there are a lot of challenges and uncertainties in the world, here is someone who is doing everything she can to make everyone's day a little bit brighter and to give back to her community and to her country; someone who, through her dogged willpower, incredible knowledge, and decades of experience, tackles every challenge she faces with poise, talent, and a great sense of humor.

Even on her team's busiest days, during their longest hours, and on their latest nights, and during the historic and often unprecedented times that we are living through, Peggy is a beacon of light, bringing camaraderie and positivity to everything she does.

She has served this institution, and the people it represents, with integrity, with honor, and with skill for the past 33 years.

Mr. Speaker, Peggy Fields is an inspiration, and her career in public service has been nothing short of remarkable. She set out to make a difference, and what a difference she has made.

On behalf of all of my colleagues and staff on both sides of the aisle, past and present, and the countless people in whose lives Peggy has made an immeasurable difference, I would like to extend this institution's deepest and most sincere thanks to Peggy and wish her all the best as she begins this new chapter.

Thank you, Peggy.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Massachusetts and the entire body in congratulating Ms. Fields on her retirement and thank her for her service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

As Congress debates legalizing marijuana, Americans in the real world are facing an energy crisis that we in Congress cannot afford to continue to ignore.

In my hometown of Altoona, Pennsylvania, the cost of gasoline is now \$4.28 a gallon; over 50 percent higher than it was just one year ago.

In rural communities, these skyrocketing prices are forcing families to make hard choices about what they can afford and what they cannot afford. Instead of working to support the needs of these Pennsylvanian families, President Biden and his administration have continued to work against American energy producers.

On day one of his Presidency, President Biden made good on a longtime liberal wish list item. He canceled the Keystone XL pipeline. Now, in his budget, President Biden has chosen to put solar panels ahead of natural gas. He has chosen to put windmills ahead of coal. He has chosen the Green New Deal ahead of Pennsylvanians.

Now, the President has decided to recklessly release oil from our strategic reserves without a concrete plan to refill them. This stopgap measure does not support our national security and it will do little to help lower the cost of fuel for American families.

It is time to invest in American energy. It is time to return to American energy dominance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, we are here about reducing prices on insulin, something that so many Americans need. Yet, my colleagues want to talk about a bill that is not even before the House of Representatives today. We ought to be talking about reducing the price of prescription drugs, like insulin, for Americans who need it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my friend, and another prominent member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PERLMUTTER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's rule. The two bills in the rule provide for important, long overdue reforms that most Americans are in favor of. The MORE Act will reform our Federal drug laws to bring Federal laws in line with the majority of States which are now legally and responsibly regulating cannabis.

Mr. Speaker, 37 States, including the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, have successfully legalized medicinal cannabis, creating a thriving, safe, and legal market for cannabis, creating thousands of jobs and billions in new tax revenue. This is a rare win-win scenario for everyone—government, businesses, patients, and consumers.

However, the ongoing conflict between our State and Federal laws creates daily legal issues for businesses, banks, doctors, and consumers. The MORE Act will address these problems by removing cannabis from the Controlled Substances Act. This will allow veterans to use medicinal cannabis without losing their VA benefits.

It will allow legal businesses to access financial services. It will allow scientists and government agencies to research cannabis, and it will not prevent States from regulating or even criminalizing misuse of cannabis.

More importantly, the MORE Act includes a comprehensive package of criminal justice reforms to give a second chance to those whose lives have been upended by the excesses of the war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule also includes the Affordable Insulin Now Act, which will cap insulin costs at \$35. This is a much-needed reform that will provide financial relief to the millions of Americans who rely on insulin to manage their diabetes. While I am glad that we are able to find compromise on capping insulin costs, Americans are demanding that we pass comprehensive legislation to lower prescription drug costs for all Americans. And we continue to invite our Republican colleagues to help us to do that.

Prescription drug prices are way too high. Insulin is ten times more expensive in the U.S. than in other countries. Across the board, Americans pay more for their drugs than people in other countries pay for the exact same drugs. There is no justification for this difference.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, the prescription drug market is broken, and insulin is just one example of how bad the problem is. We urgently need prescription drug price reform so all Americans can afford the medications they need to manage their health.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for today's rule and the underlying bills when they are considered on the floor.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can immediately consider the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

Gas prices are at \$5 and even \$6 a gallon. The average household is now spending \$2,000 more a year because of increased gas costs on Biden's watch. Biden and the Democrats think that now is the time to add \$45 billion in new taxes on the oil and gas industry. Many Americans have been and are being regulated into poverty in an unnecessary sacrifice at the altar of climate change.

Instead of unleashing our domestic oil and gas industry, Biden is "simp" to radical environmentalists and not-in-my-backyard extremists, and literally begged OPEC to drill more oil instead of relying on the hardworking American roughneck.

On day one, he canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, killing 11,000 good-paying American energy jobs. But that didn't stop the big guy from approving the Nord Stream 2 pipeline and benefitting our enemies.

Because of Biden's fake ban on Russian oil and gas, that won't even go into effect for 22 more days and is littered with waivers to keep Russian energy flowing, the U.S. continues to import 100,000 barrels of Russian oil and send them roughly \$10 million each day. We folks are funding the Kremlin.

Why does Biden favor foreign energy over domestic energy? We know that American natural gas is 42 percent cleaner than Russian gas, so it is not for environmental reasons. But maybe there is another reason we don't know about. Perhaps there is 10 percent in this tucked away for the big guy.

How about this: Instead of funding both sides of the war and playing Biden and Pelosi's con games, we should restart construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, overturn Biden's energy leasing moratorium, and expedite permits for pipelines and natural gas exports.

We need the American Energy Independence from Russia Act and stop playing Biden's energy-from-anywhere-but-America game.

Mr. Speaker, America should not only have affordable energy for our own use, but we should be exporting it abroad. We can literally export strength and freedom to our allies.

In short, the solution is very simple. Drill, baby, drill.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. In the richest country in the world, we cannot allow healthcare to become wealth care; available to those who can afford it.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I support H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, because diabetes can kill, and insulin can save lives, if you can get it.

Some things bear repeating. Insulin saves lives if you can get it. Mr. Speaker, this bill will ensure that millions who need it will be able to get it. In the richest country in the world, Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow healthcare to be wealth care.

□ 1300

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

Just 1 year ago, our country was comfortably meeting our energy needs, and we were a net exporter of energy for the first time in 50 years. However, under the Biden administration, we have seen a continued assault on American energy that has killed jobs, increased our dependency on foreign energy sources, and most recently jeopardized our national security.

The administration continues to block new oil and gas lease sales from moving forward, all while placing undue regulatory burdens on American energy development. Just this week, President Biden proposed \$45 billion worth of tax increases on fossil fuels in his budget to further weaken America's ability to power our country.

These proposed tax increases are just another example of the administration doubling down on the anti-American-produced energy policies that have sent prices skyrocketing here at home. The administration's energy agenda has not only undermined our country's energy security, but has also forced our European allies to become even more dependent on Russia to meet their energy needs.

Instead of turning to America's own energy sector to meet our energy needs, this administration is asking countries like Iran and Venezuela to compensate for the ban on Russian imports and ignoring American energy producers. In doing so, they are prioritizing oil produced by dictators over American energy producers who support jobs and businesses here at home.

The administration must reverse course and stop depending on foreign dictators to ship oil to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to flip the switch and reduce our dependence on foreign energy by unleashing American energy. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 10 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Minnesota has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act and the underlying rule.

It is unconscionable that in the richest country the planet has ever seen, millions of Americans, our neighbors, are forced to choose between buying medicine and paying their gas bill. Americans pay more than 10 times the price of insulin compared to other similar countries; 10 times.

In fact, one in four of our neighbors who rely on insulin have rationed or skipped doses due to costs. I want folks to think about that. A quarter of the people prescribed insulin for their medical condition have risked their life to be able to afford another month's worth of insulin. This is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6833 caps out-of-pocket costs for insulin at no more than \$35 per month in Medicare and commercial health insurance. This cap will be a lifesaver for millions of our neighbors who currently pay 10 times more the price of insulin compared to similar wealthy nations.

How can these companies sell the exact same drug here for 10 times the

price of other nations? Because corporate greed and price gouging are not just permitted in our country, but encouraged. The bill is not the complete fix, Mr. Speaker, and we must do more to help our uninsured. So many are hurt and getting sicker and even dying because of corporate greed and monopolies of Big Pharma.

This bill is the beginning in reining in corporate greed and putting people over profits. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

I am a proud cosponsor of this bill that will strengthen our energy security, bolster our economy, and position ourselves to counter Russian aggression in Ukraine.

This morning, gas near my district office in Ogden, Utah, is \$4.30. For the average family driving the average vehicle in Utah, this means that each fill-up will cost over \$110. For Utah's hard-working agricultural industry, this means thousands of dollars more will be spent on fuel so they can feed the rest of America.

These skyrocketing prices are unacceptable. I share my constituents' outrage over how the Biden administration's policies have contributed to this painful situation. This is a self-imposed tax on all Americans. For those of us who come from energy producing States, we know we can do better.

It is past time we get back to what we were doing in 2019 when the United States was a net exporter of energy. It is better for our economy and our environment when we produce domestically. In Utah, we understand this because we do this.

Instead of allowing Americans to do their jobs, the Biden administration has shut down new oil and gas leasing. Instead of helping our communities grow, he has asked the oil cartels in the Middle East to pump more oil. Instead of investing in America, he has made us more dependent on energy imports from Russia and other foreign adversaries. We can do better.

Passing the America Energy Independence from Russia Act today will put us on a path toward energy independence. I encourage my colleagues to join me in rejecting the previous question so we can lower prices for all.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill's relief for Mary in Austin whose grandson, like so many others, will be able to get some relief. They are paying up to \$300 per month for insulin, and now they would pay \$35 per month.

But 5½ million Texans and 28 million Americans are uninsured. This bill of-

fers them no help whatsoever. In our upside-down healthcare system, those who have the least continually get asked to pay the most for essential pharmaceuticals. Sixty-eight percent of those without health insurance are forced to pay full monopoly prices for their essential insulin. They are being denied any relief today, despite the fact that I and 12 of my colleagues offered a simple amendment that could have provided that assistance.

Nor does this bill represent the slightest progress toward preventing prescription price gouging. It is so true, as many have said, that many Americans are paying 10 times the price for insulin as do consumers in other countries. This bill does not do anything, however, to lower it to nine times. Indeed, this bill does not lower the price of insulin by one penny, it just shifts the burden of paying for the insulin off the shoulders of insured insulin users, and shifts it on to the rest of us who are paying insurance premiums, and will pay higher premiums because of this, and \$11 billion more in costs to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I assume Big Pharma supports this bill because it is not facing any additional duty to lower its prices for this lifesaving product. Some day this Congress will break free of the shackles of Big Pharma, which fills these halls with more lobbyists than there are Members of Congress.

Some day we will provide genuine relief to all Americans burdened by soaring drug prices, but that day, sadly, is not today.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the America Energy Independence from Russia Act. That would not only strengthen our security and independence, it would lower gas prices by approving the Keystone pipeline, removing restrictions on LNG exports, restarting production on Federal lands and waters, and overall encouraging more American energy development.

In the midst of skyrocketing inflation and surging prices at the pump, along with the geopolitical context where Europe is dependent on Russian oil and gas, you would think the Biden administration would abandon their whole-of-government approach to targeting American energy production. Since Biden took office, he has used every tool at his disposal to undermine the oil and gas industry and our energy independence along with it.

In addition to the onslaught of his unilateral attacks, his first Presidential budget was released and called for \$35 billion in punitive tax increases on the oil and gas industry. His administration has weaponized and abused their regulatory authority to attack the industry at every turn; SEC reports for permitting on the directives, and EPA radical regulations.

What is more astonishing is Biden's latest budget, which is \$4 trillion in taxes, and includes \$45 billion in taxes on oil and gas. These are the same provisions that his own party rejected and had to abandon their build back broke proposal.

Just like he has done with the regulatory regime, it appears our President is weaponizing the tax code to cancel an entire sector of our economy, one that is paramount to our prosperity and security. As events around the world constrain supply, he seems hell-bent to ensure that anyone but American energy producers, the most efficient, the cleanest producers in the world, are positioned to supply the United States and our people and our allies around the world.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I remind my friend, Mr. ARRINGTON, that there are 12 million acres of non-producing Federal land with 9,000 unused but already approved permits for production.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to wish Mr. ARRINGTON a happy birthday.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 6833, and I acknowledge Ms. CRAIG and Mrs. MCBATH. I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle that we can walk and chew gum at the same time, but right now people are dying because they are apportioning or putting in proportion their insulin that they need—not taking the full amount, but doing it proportionately. That is a death sentence.

Let me indicate: Native Americans, 14.7 percent diabetic; Hispanic, 12.5 percent; Black Americans, 11.7 percent. Many of them are on Medicare and many of them are on Medicaid. We can do both. I do rise to support this legislation—\$35 in 2023, regardless of whether a beneficiary has reached the annual out-of-pocket spending; \$35 beginning in 2024.

It is well-known that those who had diabetes suffered more with COVID-19. This is an important step. In the 18th Congressional District uninsured residents paid 23 times more for the brand of insulin, and we must begin to work on that. I join with my colleagues in making that the next step. I rise for this.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to support the new response to marijuana, and to insist that we pass the MORE Act that came out of my subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee.

Public support for legalization of marijuana has surged in the past two decades. A total of 47 States have reformed their laws. We must reform the banking aspect of it. We need to open the door to research, therapeutic treatment for veterans, better banking and tax laws, and we need to help fuel the economic growth within the industry.

We need to do this by sending dollars out to help our respective communities bring down the cost of crime, be able to

help those who are in business. We must do this and spend Federal resources to end criminalization, build the economic engine, and to ensure that we are in step with 47 of our States.

Thousands of men and women have suffered needlessly from the Federal criminalization of marijuana with mandatory minimums, particularly Black and Brown. All these persons incarcerated need to be able to be constructive, but they are in there on the false war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I support both the insulin bill and the MORE Act, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the Rule governing House consideration of H.R. 3617, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2021,” or the “MORE Act of 2021.”

The Rule that is being considered is carefully crafted and provides Members of the House an opportunity to address the existing conflict between federal and state laws regarding marijuana, or cannabis, and to provide reasonable solutions to resolve this conflict.

The bill is straightforward and responds to the need to leave the question of the legality of cannabis to the individual states while attempting to restore and reinvest in communities that have been ravaged by the War on Drugs.

Specifically, the bill decriminalizes cannabis on the federal level, provides a taxation structure for the sale of cannabis that will support a community reinvestment trust fund, and provides for expungement of convictions and arrests for federal cannabis offenses.

The Rule provides for debate and full consideration of the solutions and opportunities for cannabis reform offered by H.R. 3617 by the Congress.

The subject of the bill is public knowledge and well known by members of this body.

I have worked to provide sensible reforms to our criminal justice system.

Our outdated federal laws and policies unwisely require the expenditure of scarce law enforcement resources on cannabis offenses while conflicting with many states’ laws regarding cannabis.

Cannabis does not fit the definition of a Schedule One drug and federal law must be updated to reflect this reality—just as most states have already begun to do.

Thirty-seven states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have adopted laws allowing medical use of cannabis.

Eighteen states, the District of Columbia, and the Northern Mariana Islands have adopted laws for legalizing cannabis for adult recreational use.

As public support for the legalization of marijuana has surged in the past two decades, a total of 47 States have reformed their laws in one form or another pertaining to cannabis, despite its federal criminalization.

We need to open the door to research, therapeutic treatment for veterans, better banking and tax laws, and we need to help fuel economic growth within the industry.

We need to do this without continuing to spend federal resources on criminalization and unjust incarceration for marijuana offenses.

Thousands of men and women have suffered needlessly from the federal criminaliza-

tion of marijuana, particularly in black and brown communities.

These individuals have borne the burden of collateral consequences that have damaged our society across generations—such as the denial of affordable housing, educational opportunities, employment, and the right to vote.

Meanwhile, the laws enacted for the purpose of perpetuating the “War on Drugs” have led America to imprison more people than any other country.

The Rule allows the House to address these historical wrongs by voting on H.R. 3617.

I thank the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I serve, for the work it has done to bring H.R. 3617 to the floor for a vote.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of the Rule and the underlying bill H.R. 3617.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also to speak in strong support of the Rule governing House consideration of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

The Rule that is being considered is well crafted and provides Members of the House an opportunity to address an urgent need of constituents who require life saving insulin.

The bill is simple and gets to the urgent need to limit cost-sharing for insulin under private health insurance and the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Specifically, the bill caps cost-sharing under private health insurance for a month’s supply of selected insulin products at \$35 or 25 percent of a plan’s negotiated price (after any price concessions), whichever is less, beginning in 2023.

The bill caps cost-sharing under the Medicare prescription drug benefit for insulin products at: \$35 in 2023 regardless of whether a beneficiary has reached the annual out-of-pocket spending threshold, and \$35 beginning in 2024 for those who have not yet reached this threshold.

The Rule provides for debate and full consideration of the benefits offered by H.R. 6833 by the Congress.

The subject of the bill is public knowledge and well known by members of this body.

I have worked closely with the healthcare community that serve Houstonians to ensure that programs are receiving the appropriate level of federal support.

One of the most difficult challenges are the hurdles to healthcare created by lack of health insurance such as a lack of access to necessary medications due to the high costs of many prescription drugs.

Diabetes is a life-threatening disease that disproportionately affects communities of color.

Diabetes is associated with serious health problems, including heart disease and stroke, kidney failure, and blindness.

There are 15,000 Medicare beneficiaries in the Eighteenth Congressional District who have been diagnosed with diabetes.

These individuals are my constituents and I know that on average, each of them pays 4.8 times the cost of similar medication in Australia, 3.6 times the cost in the United Kingdom, and 2.6 times the cost in Canada.

Additionally, in the Eighteenth Congressional District, 26.7 percent of residents are uninsured.

For example, an uninsured resident of this congressional district pays 23 times more for this brand of insulin than their counterparts in

Australia, 15 times more than they would in the United Kingdom, and 13 times more than they would in Canada.

The consequences of these staggering costs are not benign.

Many patients often speak of having to make heart-wrenching decisions about what to buy with the commonly fixed incomes attendant to seniors.

Many medical professionals indicate that the high prices for prescription drugs are a function of a lack of competition, and authorizing Medicare to create a program to negotiate drug prices may be an estimable way to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

All told this reflects a disturbing trend: in our country, the cost of branded drugs tends to go up, whereas in other countries, the costs tend to go down.

Before insulin the prognosis for diabetics was bleak.

Over the past two decades, manufacturers have systematically and dramatically raised the prices of their insulin products by more than tenfold—often in lockstep.

In 2017, diabetes contributed to the death of 277,000 Americans—and was the primary death for 85,000 of those individuals.

That same year diagnosed diabetes cost the United States an estimated \$327 billion—including \$237 billion in direct medical costs and \$90 billion in productivity losses.

Diabetes drugs, including insulin and oral medications that regulate blood sugar levels, play a critical role in helping people with diabetes manage their condition and reduce the risk of diabetes-related health complications.

Although insulin is the most well-known diabetes medication, diabetes patients are often prescribed other oral drugs to use in place of or alongside insulin.

Many of these non-insulin products used to regulate blood sugar levels are brand drugs that lack generic alternatives.

In recent years, the high prices of diabetes drugs have placed a tremendous strain on diabetes patients as well as the federal government, which provides diabetes medications to more than 43 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Because Medicare lacks the authority to negotiate directly with drug manufacturers, Medicare beneficiaries pay significantly more for their drugs than patients abroad.

Patients who are uninsured or underinsured and must pay for their drugs out of pocket bear an even greater cost burden.

The Rule allows the House to address this urgent need by voting on H.R. 6833.

I thank the committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor for the work they have done to bring H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act to the floor for a vote.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of the Rule and the underlying bill H.R. 6833.

Thank you.

□ 1315

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, the American people should be asking—no, they should be demanding—that this body address energy independence. But the majority refuses to hear or even discuss the Republican solution that we have been talking about. Instead, we do have before us today a bill to legalize pot.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIF-FANY).

Mr. TIF-FANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the MORE legislation both for what it does and what it does not do.

For starters, the bill authorizes the collection of detailed demographic information on marijuana-sector employees, including their race and ethnicity, for a massive, publicly accessible government database. This is another attempt by Democrats to promote their destructive identity politics agenda and lay the groundwork for a rigid quota system that picks winners and losers based on skin color.

The database will also put more sensitive personal data at risk and open the door to mischief by Federal bureaucrats who have repeatedly weaponized access to Americans' private information to promote a partisan political agenda. Hello IRS.

I am also disappointed that the majority refused to allow votes on two commonsense amendments I proposed. The first would have required child-resistant packaging and a Surgeon General's warning label detailing the dangers these products pose to pregnant women and their unborn babies. Investigative reports have revealed multiple instances of pot shop clerks recommending marijuana to expectant mothers as safe, despite well-documented risks. Few, if any, of these retail clerks have any medical training and should stick to dispensing pot, not prenatal advice.

The second would have banned the use of ingredients or flavor additives in marijuana-infused products such as fruit, chocolate, vanilla, or candy. For years, we have been told by many on the other side that such flavors appeal to children and should be banned from tobacco products. If this standard is good enough for JUUL and Puff Bar, shouldn't it also apply to Cheech and Chong?

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will make an already complicated situation worse. I ask for a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I just remind my friend from Wisconsin that 47 States, every territory, and the District of Columbia now allow for some level of marijuana use, and this Congress is going to have to catch up to what the States are doing.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in his outstanding State of the Union Address earlier this month, President Joe Biden presented Democrats' visionary agenda to build a better America with lower healthcare costs for American families, and with justice in all that we do.

House Democrats have long led the charge to lower the costs of prescrip-

tion drugs. So it is with great pride that the Democratic House today will advance one of the pillars of this vision: capping the cost of insulin at \$35 a month. In doing so, we take another important step in the fight to bring down drug prices across the board for every American family.

I thank the lead sponsors of this legislation who have been relentless, dissatisfied, and persistent in this fight: Congresswoman ANGIE CRAIG, Congressman DAN KILDEE, and Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH of Georgia.

I salute the chairs of the committees of jurisdiction for helping steer this vital legislation to the floor: Chairman FRANK PALLONE of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Chairman RICHIE NEAL of the Committee on Ways and Means, and Chairman BOBBY SCOTT of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Everyone knows that the cost of insulin—a lifesaving drug that has been around for a century—is outrageous and out of control. That cost is outrageous and out of control. On average, Americans pay more than 10 times for insulin compared to what consumers around the world pay. Here in the United States the price of insulin skyrocketed by 54 percent from 2014 to 2019. Meanwhile, Big Pharma is reaping record-breaking profits; producing insulin at about \$10 a vial, while charging families up to 30 times that amount.

This affordability crisis is taking a severe human toll. One in four Americans who rely on insulin have been forced to ration or skip their dose—a practice that can be dangerous and even deadly. And working parents with a family member on insulin are reporting higher levels of stress and anxiety and are often forced to choose between paying their bills and protecting the health of a loved one.

Indeed, across the country, as I have said on this floor before, I have seen grown men cry about how they cannot meet their family's needs when it comes to prescription drugs. This crisis is a kitchen-table issue for millions of families, and it is a medical, economic, and moral imperative that Congress take action.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act not only requires Medicare and commercial users to cover lifesaving insulin on their plans, but also caps the out-of-pocket costs for families at \$35 per month. In doing so, we put more money back in the pockets of hardworking families and vulnerable seniors. This is crucial right now, as so many Americans struggle to keep up with the burdensome, everyday costs. Of course, this has even been exacerbated with COVID which has, in many instances, spread diabetes more.

House Democrats proudly passed a cap on insulin's cost in the Build Back Better legislation last year. We already did this last year. Today, we, again, take this strong step toward lower health costs for the people. To be clear,

comprehensive reform is urgently needed to lift the crushing burden of prescription drug prices weighing on our families.

Democrats will never ever relent, Mr. Speaker, until we realize our long-standing goal of lowering drug prices across the board. And we are continuing our fight to empower Medicare to negotiate lower drug prices—we have been working on that for decades—and make these lower prices available to Americans with private insurance, too.

We do so in honor of the late Chairman Elijah Cummings, the North Star in Congress and a relentless warrior for lower drug prices, with the Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this rule applies not just to lowering the cost of insulin but also to the very important MORE Act.

I also rise today in support of this urgent legislation that will help pave the path toward racial and economic justice.

I thank Chairman JERRY NADLER for his steadfast voice for equity and opportunity for all at the helm of the Judiciary Committee.

I salute Congressman ED PERLMUTTER for his tireless and long-standing leadership on this issue, a relentless persistence to satisfy, as the gentleman says. Thank heaven, we are passing it today.

I also want to commend Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER for their persistence as well.

For far too long, Mr. Speaker, failed Federal drug policies have torn apart families and devastated communities of color. People of color are four times more likely to be arrested on cannabis charges and are often targeted for longer prison terms than others. Tragically, the communities most harmed by criminalization are benefiting the least from the legal cannabis marketplace as prior cannabis convictions are barring too many of them from entering the industry. As a result, only one-fifth of cannabis businesses are minority owned, and only 4 percent of owners are Black. Meanwhile, more than 600,000 Americans are still arrested each year on cannabis charges, threatening to perpetuate this vicious cycle.

With the MORE Act, which the Democratic House proudly passed last Congress, we take strong actions to correct these injustices.

This landmark legislation is one of the most important criminal justice reform bills in recent history: delivering justice for those harmed by the brutal and unfair consequences of criminalization; opening the doors of opportunity for all to participate in this rapidly growing industry; and decriminalizing cannabis at the Federal level so we do not repeat the grave mistakes of our past.

Those of us from California take pride in our State's long leadership in this justice effort, and in recent years,

46 more States have reformed cannabis laws. As the distinguished gentleman from Colorado mentioned in his remarks, 47 States have taken this act. Now it is time for the Federal Government to follow suit.

Both of the bills that the House will pass today that are covered by this rule, the insulin bill and the MORE Act, are overwhelmingly popular with the American people, and they represent strong steps toward building a brighter and fairer future for our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong, bipartisan “yes” votes on both bills and on the rule.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, as a law enforcement officer for over 23 years, I have had to make the devastating visit to unsuspecting family members to tell them that their loved one has died because a driver was driving under the influence. We can all sit here and pretend that marijuana is a harmless drug, but it is not. It clouds your judgment and inhibits your reaction time.

The unfortunate reality is if we take steps to legalize marijuana, we will, without question, increase the number of people who will drive under the influence of marijuana on our roads. As we know all too well, there are many angel families in this country who have lost their sons and daughters to people who are unlawfully in this country and drove under the influence.

My amendment would have ensured the MORE Act does not prohibit the deportation of illegal immigrants who are convicted of driving under the influence of marijuana. Unfortunately, Democrats blocked my commonsense and potentially lifesaving amendment.

Mr. Speaker, shouldn't we, at a minimum, ensure this legislation is not weaponized and used as a tool to get criminals who are in this country illegally out of trouble and out of deportation proceedings?

It seems to me that the safety of the American people continues to be a low priority for this Democrat majority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend from Minnesota if she has any other speakers.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. No, I do not, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be disappointed in the priorities of my colleagues. They have chosen to spend precious time that could be spent addressing the national debt, inflation, gas prices, or any number of serious issues facing Americans today. Instead, they chose to talk about legalizing marijuana and spending tax dollars on pot stores—which does not take into consideration important elements like

how to protect minors or how to address laws surrounding driving under the influence—and an insincere attempt to address the rising cost of insulin.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and the underlying bills, I ask Members to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for joining me here today to speak on the rule, the MORE Act, and the Affordable Insulin Now Act. I especially want to thank Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER with respect to the MORE Act.

Data is clear that patients in the United States pay more than 10 times for their insulin than what patients in other countries pay for this lifesaving drug. There are reports of people paying up to \$1,000 a month just to keep themselves alive. Nobody should face these kinds of difficult decisions about affording their medication and keeping themselves healthy or putting food on the table.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act puts a reasonable cap of \$35 a month on this important drug, and I hope we can advance this bipartisan idea this week.

□ 1330

On marijuana, we are long past due for the reforms in the MORE Act. The MORE Act is about justice, safety, equity, and States' rights. We must decriminalize marijuana at the Federal level and take meaningful steps to address the effects the war on drugs has had, particularly in minority and disadvantaged communities.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle who claim this isn't an important issue to American families, I encourage them to talk to individuals who can't pass a background check to get a job, visit with people who spent time in prison for a low-level marijuana conviction whose lives have been changed forever, talk to a State-legal business owner or employee who faces armed robberies or threats of violence due to all the cash they have since the business can't access the banking system.

The House is acting again this week to urge the Senate to finally pass meaningful cannabis reform legislation. As this body knows, my SAFE Banking Act has passed the House six times now without any Senate action, with big bipartisan numbers. The House will pass the MORE Act this week. It is clear Congress needs to reform our broken cannabis laws to better respond to the 37 States across the country that have some level of legal marijuana use.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1017

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6858) to strengthen United States energy security, encourage domestic production of crude oil, petroleum products, and natural gas, 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 Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6858.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I encourage a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

Mr. 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.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 202, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—219

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

Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Manning
 Matsui
 McBath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mfume
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newman
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peters

NAYS—202

Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bentz
 Bergman
 Bice (OK)
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NC)
 Boebert
 Bost
 Brooks
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Cammack
 Carey
 Carl
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cawthorn
 Chabot
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyde
 Cole
 Comer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 Davidson
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donalds
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Ellzey
 Emmer
 Estes
 Fallon
 Feenstra
 Ferguson
 Fischbach
 Fitzgerald
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Foxx
 Franklin, C.
 Scott
 Fulcher
 Gallagher
 Garbarino
 Garcia (CA)

Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Ross
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger

Spier
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Suozzi
 Swalwell
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Walorski
 Waltz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Armstrong
 Brady
 Bustos
 Cheney

Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (SC)

Wittman
 Womack
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10
 Davis, Rodney
 Fortenberry
 Hartzler
 Kinzinger
 Moore (WI)
 Tonko

□ 1406

Messrs. JACOBS of New York, STEWART, COLE, NEWHOUSE, LAM-BORN, WILSON of South Carolina, and SMITH of Missouri changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”
 Mr. MCEACHIN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”
 So the previous question was ordered.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
 Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I was un-avoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 98.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Joyce (OH)	Scott, David
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)	(Garbarino)	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Sessions (Babin)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi	Sires (Pallone)
Comer	(Beyer)	Soto (Wasserman)
(Fleischmann)	Lawson (FL)	Schultz)
Crist	(Wasserman)	Steel (Oberholte)
(Schultz)	Schultz)	Strickland
Mace (Rice (SC))	Manning (Beyer)	Suozzi (Beyer)
Cuellar (Pappas)	McClain	Taylor (Carter
Curtis (Stewart)	(Fitzgerald)	(TX))
DeGette (Blunt	Newman (Beyer)	Thompson (MS)
Rochester)	Owens (Stewart)	(Evans)
Espallat	Roybal-Allard	Trone (Beyer)
(Correa)	Harder (CA)	Waltz (Mast)
Gomez)	Schultz)	Wilson (FL)
Jayapal (Gomez)	Salazar	(Jeffries)
Johnson (TX)	(Gimenez)	
(Jeffries)	Sánchez (Gomez)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 202, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]
 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
 Butterfield
 Carbajal

Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Golden
 Gomez
 Gonzalez, Vicente
 Gotthelmer
 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

NAYS—202

Duncan
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bentz
 Bergman
 Bice (OK)
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NC)
 Boebert
 Bost
 Brooks
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Cammack
 Carey
 Carl
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cawthorn
 Chabot
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyde
 Cole
 Comer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donalds

Rush
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spier
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Suozzi
 Swalwell
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Ross
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger

Moore (AL)	Rosendale	Tenney
Moore (UT)	Rouzer	Thompson (PA)
Mullin	Roy	Tiffany
Murphy (NC)	Rutherford	Timmons
Nehls	Salazar	Turner
Newhouse	Scalise	Upton
Norman	Schweikert	Valadao
Obornolte	Scott, Austin	Van Drew
Owens	Sessions	Van Dwayne
Palazzo	Simpson	Wagner
Palmer	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Pence	Smith (NE)	Walorski
Perry	Smith (NJ)	Waltz
Pfluger	Smucker	Weber (TX)
Posey	Spartz	Webster (FL)
Reed	Stauber	Wenstrup
Reschenthaler	Steel	Westerman
Rice (SC)	Stefanik	Williams (TX)
Rodgers (WA)	Steil	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Womack
Rose	Taylor	

NOT VOTING—10

Armstrong	Fortenberry	Tonko
Brady	Hartzler	Zeldin
Bustos	Hollingsworth	
Cheney	Kinzinger	

□ 1417

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I was detained by legislative business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 98 and "yea" on rollcall No. 99.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Joyce (OH)	Scott, David
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)	(Garbarino)	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Sessions (Babin)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi (Beyer)	Sires (Pallone)
Comer (Fleischmann)	Lawson (FL)	Soto (Wasserman)
Crist (Wasserman)	(Wasserman)	Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)	Schultz)	Steel (Obornolte)
Curtis (Stewart)	Mace (Rice (SC))	Strickland (Takano)
DeGette (Blunt)	Manning (Beyer)	Suozi (Beyer)
Rochester)	McClain	Taylor (Carter (TX))
Esparillat (Correa)	(Fitzgerald)	Thompson (MS) (Evans)
Harder (CA)	Newman (Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
(Gomez)	Owens (Stewart)	Waltz (Mast)
Jayapal (Gomez)	Roybal-Allard (Wasserman)	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (TX)	Schultz)	(Jeffries)
(Jeffries)	Salazar (Gimenez)	
	Sánchez (Gomez)	

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, 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 (Ms. PORTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-38, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 117-285, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 6833

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 "Affordable Insulin Now Act".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR INSULIN PRODUCTS.

(a) PHSA.—Part D of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-111 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2799A-11. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage shall provide coverage of selected insulin products and, with respect to such products, shall not—

- "(1) apply any deductible; or
- "(2) impose any cost-sharing in excess of the lesser of, per 30-day supply—

"(A) \$35; or

"(B) the amount equal to 25 percent of the negotiated price of the selected insulin product net of all price concessions received by or on behalf of the plan or coverage, including price concessions received by or on behalf of third-party entities providing services to the plan or coverage, such as pharmacy benefit management services.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) SELECTED INSULIN PRODUCTS.—The term 'selected insulin products' means at least one of each dosage form (such as vial, pump, or inhaler dosage forms) of each different type (such as rapid-acting, short-acting, intermediate-acting, long-acting, ultra long-acting, and premixed) of insulin (as defined below), when available, as selected by the group health plan or health insurance issuer.

"(2) INSULIN DEFINED.—The term 'insulin' means insulin that is licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 and continues to be marketed under such section, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351(a) pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and continues to be marketed pursuant to such licensure.

"(c) OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDERS.—Nothing in this section requires a plan or issuer that has a network of providers to provide benefits for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider, or precludes a plan or issuer that has a network of providers from imposing higher cost-sharing than the levels specified in subsection (a) for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider.

"(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to require coverage of, or prevent a group health plan or health insurance coverage from imposing cost-sharing other than the levels specified in subsection (a) on, insulin products that are not selected insulin products, to the extent that such coverage is not otherwise required and such cost-sharing is otherwise permitted under Federal and applicable State law.

"(e) APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING TOWARDS DEDUCTIBLES AND OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS.—Any cost-sharing payments made pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall be counted toward any deductible or out-of-pocket maximum that applies under the plan or coverage."

(b) IRC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 9826. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, a group health plan

shall provide coverage of selected insulin products and, with respect to such products, shall not—

- "(1) apply any deductible; or
- "(2) impose any cost-sharing in excess of the lesser of, per 30-day supply—

"(A) \$35; or

"(B) the amount equal to 25 percent of the negotiated price of the selected insulin product net of all price concessions received by or on behalf of the plan, including price concessions received by or on behalf of third-party entities providing services to the plan, such as pharmacy benefit management services.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) SELECTED INSULIN PRODUCTS.—The term 'selected insulin products' means at least one of each dosage form (such as vial, pump, or inhaler dosage forms) of each different type (such as rapid-acting, short-acting, intermediate-acting, long-acting, ultra long-acting, and premixed) of insulin (as defined below), when available, as selected by the group health plan.

"(2) INSULIN DEFINED.—The term 'insulin' means insulin that is licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and continues to be marketed under such section, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351(a) of such Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and continues to be marketed pursuant to such licensure.

"(c) OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDERS.—Nothing in this section requires a plan that has a network of providers to provide benefits for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider, or precludes a plan that has a network of providers from imposing higher cost-sharing than the levels specified in subsection (a) for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider.

"(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to require coverage of, or prevent a group health plan from imposing cost-sharing other than the levels specified in subsection (a) on, insulin products that are not selected insulin products, to the extent that such coverage is not otherwise required and such cost-sharing is otherwise permitted under Federal and applicable State law.

"(e) APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING TOWARDS DEDUCTIBLES AND OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS.—Any cost-sharing payments made pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall be counted toward any deductible or out-of-pocket maximum that applies under the plan."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 9826. Requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products."

(c) ERISA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1185 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 726. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage shall provide coverage of selected insulin products and, with respect to such products, shall not—

- "(1) apply any deductible; or
- "(2) impose any cost-sharing in excess of the lesser of, per 30-day supply—

"(A) \$35; or

"(B) the amount equal to 25 percent of the negotiated price of the selected insulin product net of all price concessions received by or on behalf

of the plan or coverage, including price concessions received by or on behalf of third-party entities providing services to the plan or coverage, such as pharmacy benefit management services.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) **SELECTED INSULIN PRODUCTS.**—The term ‘selected insulin products’ means at least one of each dosage form (such as vial, pump, or inhaler dosage forms) of each different type (such as rapid-acting, short-acting, intermediate-acting, long-acting, ultra long-acting, and premixed) of insulin (as defined below), when available, as selected by the group health plan or health insurance issuer.

“(2) **INSULIN DEFINED.**—The term ‘insulin’ means insulin that is licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and continues to be marketed under such section, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351(a) of such Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and continues to be marketed pursuant to such licensure.

“(c) **OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDERS.**—Nothing in this section requires a plan or issuer that has a network of providers to provide benefits for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider, or precludes a plan or issuer that has a network of providers from imposing higher cost-sharing than the levels specified in subsection (a) for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider.

“(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to require coverage of, or prevent a group health plan or health insurance coverage from imposing cost-sharing other than the levels specified in subsection (a) on, insulin products that are not selected insulin products, to the extent that such coverage is not otherwise required and such cost-sharing is otherwise permitted under Federal and applicable State law.

“(e) **APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING TOWARDS DEDUCTIBLES AND OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS.**—Any cost-sharing payments made pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall be counted toward any deductible or out-of-pocket maximum that applies under the plan or coverage.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 725 the following:

“Sec. 726. Requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products.”

(d) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER COST-SHARING.**—Section 1302(d)(2) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO INSULIN COVERAGE.**—The exemption of coverage of selected insulin products (as defined in section 2799A-11(b) of the Public Health Service Act) from the application of any deductible pursuant to section 2799A-11(a)(1) of such Act, section 726(a)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, or section 9826(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not be considered when determining the actuarial value of a qualified health plan under this subsection.”

(e) **COVERAGE OF CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS UNDER CATASTROPHIC PLANS.**—Section 1302(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **COVERAGE OF CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B)(i), a health plan described in paragraph (1) shall provide coverage of selected insulin products, in accordance with section 2799A-11 of the Public Health Service Act, before an enrolled individual has incurred, during a

plan year, cost-sharing expenses in an amount equal to the annual limitation in effect under subsection (c)(1) for the plan year.

“(B) **TERMINOLOGY.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the term ‘selected insulin products’ has the meaning given such term in section 2799A-11(b) of the Public Health Service Act; and

“(ii) the requirements of section 2799A-11 of such Act shall be applied by deeming each reference in such section to ‘individual health insurance coverage’ to be a reference to a plan described in paragraph (1).”

(f) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of the Treasury may implement the provisions of, including the amendments made by, this section through sub-regulatory guidance, program instruction, or otherwise.

SEC. 3. APPROPRIATE COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS UNDER MEDICARE PART D.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1860D-2 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “The coverage” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (8), the coverage”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and (D)” and inserting “and (D) and paragraph (8)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and (D)” and inserting “and (D) and paragraph (8)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (8)”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D)(i), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (8)”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “and (4)” and inserting “(4), and (8)”;

(D) in paragraph (4)(A)(i), by striking “The coverage” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (8), the coverage”;

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) **TREATMENT OF COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, with respect to an individual, the following shall apply with respect to any insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B)) that is covered under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled:

“(i) **NO APPLICATION OF DEDUCTIBLE.**—The deductible under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to such insulin product.

“(ii) **APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The coverage provides benefits for such insulin product, regardless of whether an individual has reached the initial coverage limit under paragraph (3) or the out-of-pocket threshold under paragraph (4), with cost-sharing for a one-month supply that is equal to the applicable copayment amount.

“(II) **APPLICABLE COPAYMENT AMOUNT.**—For purposes of this clause, the term ‘applicable copayment amount’ means, with respect to an insulin product under a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, an amount that is not more than \$35.

“(B) **INSULIN PRODUCT.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘insulin product’ means a covered part D drug that is an insulin product that is approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and marketed pursuant to such approval or licensure, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and marketed pursuant to such section.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) **TREATMENT OF COST-SHARING FOR INSULIN PRODUCTS.**—The coverage is provided in accordance with subsection (b)(8).”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO COST-SHARING FOR LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS.**—Section 1860D-14(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(iii), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the copayment amount applicable under the preceding sentence for a one-month supply of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual may not exceed the applicable copayment amount (as defined in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) of such section) for the product under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E), by inserting the following before the period at the end “or under section 1860D-2(b)(8) in the case of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of such section)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the annual deductible applicable under such section, including as reduced under the preceding sentence, shall not apply with respect to an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual.”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the amount of the coinsurance applicable under the preceding sentence for a one-month supply of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual may not exceed the applicable copayment amount (as defined in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) of such section) for the product under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (E), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the amount of the copayment or coinsurance applicable under the preceding sentence for a one-month supply of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual may not exceed the applicable copayment amount (as defined in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) of such section) for the product under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled.”

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall implement this section for plan years 2023 and 2024 by program instruction or otherwise.

SEC. 4. ONE YEAR-EXTENSION ON MORATORIUM ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RULE RELATING TO ELIMINATING THE ANTI-KICKBACK STATUTE SAFE HARBOR PROTECTION FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG REBATES.

Section 9006 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (P.L. 117-58) is amended by striking “January 1, 2026” and inserting “January 1, 2027”.

SEC. 5. MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)), as amended by section 313 of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022, is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$9,046,500,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and

ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. 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. 6833.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act, which is critical to protecting more than 7 million American patients who rely on insulin.

Today, one in four Americans who need insulin report either having cut back or skipped doses because the cost is simply too high. That is heart-breaking and unacceptable. No one should have to ration their insulin to help reduce costs, risking their health and, in some tragic cases, actually costing them their lives.

This bill will make insulin more affordable by capping the out-of-pocket cost for consumers in both Medicare and the private insurance market at \$35 a month. This will address the vast disparities between what people pay for insulin in other countries as compared to the United States.

Right now, Americans are paying more than 10 times the price for insulin as people in other high-income countries. That is simply not fair.

Right now, one out of every five Americans who depend on insulin have out-of-pocket costs of significantly more than \$35 per month. That is unconscionable considering that insulin has been in use for over a century.

I have heard my Republican colleagues contend that prices for insulin are coming down but, in reality, prices are going up for the consumer. The list prices set by the manufacturer, which patient cost-sharing is based off of, keep going up. In fact, reports note that the average retail price for insulin rose 54 percent—more than double—from 2014 to 2019.

Now, Madam Speaker, I continue to strongly support comprehensive efforts to rein in the soaring costs of prescription drugs and empowering Medicare to negotiate fair prices, but we cannot afford to wait any longer to address the price of insulin.

I commend Representatives CRAIG, KILDEE, and MCBATH for their leadership and hard work in bringing this important legislation to the House floor.

I urge my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to support this lifesaving legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all share the goal of reducing the cost of insulin. This bill, however, is not the right answer. This is an attempt to revive Speaker PELOSI's proposed government drug-pricing scheme, part of a socialized medicine approach that would lead to fewer cures.

It is the largest expansion of the Federal Government's role in private health insurance design since ObamaCare. It will cost more than \$11 billion over the next 10 years through higher subsidies for higher premiums.

Just this morning, Axios reported: "But legislation like a House bill from Representative ANGIE CRAIG . . . that will be debated on the floor today wouldn't address the core problem of rising prices for insulin. It would instead shift more of the cost onto health insurers and employers and result in higher premiums, according to experts."

That means people who can't afford day-to-day life because of inflation and spending will face higher costs somewhere else.

Today, it is the government fixing the price on insulin. What is next? Gas? Food?

History tells us that price-fixing doesn't work. It shifts the problem somewhere else so the powerful have the excuse for more subsidies, more spending, and more control.

This bill does nothing to address the real reasons insulin prices are going up. One of those is the pharmacy benefit managers and other middlemen who negotiate for high list prices and then hide the lower costs from the patients. This bill gives the middlemen who are making the money a pass because again, in this bill, the Democrats delay the rebate rule that would ensure that the real savings go into the pockets of the patients.

Madam Speaker, we have a solution. We have a bill that we have been working on for several Congresses. It enjoys bipartisan support. It is H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act.

It would lower the costs of all prescription drugs, including insulin. It caps seniors' out-of-pocket insulin costs at \$50 per month through Medicare. It also allows high-deductible plans to cover insulin before the deductible kicks in. It increases low-cost options with more generic and biosimilar competition. There is exciting innovation on the way being built right now. And it creates more price transparency.

We should be lowering the costs without going down the road of price con-

trols that destroy the hope of so many people in this country for lifesaving cures.

I urge us to reject H.R. 6833. Let's work on a solution for all diseases. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, who, along with the rest of the leadership, continues this effort to address affordability.

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

First of all, this is not price control. It is limiting the purchaser on a price, but the companies are still going to charge what they are going to charge, and somebody is going to have to pay, and Medicare is going to have to pay. So, it does increase the cost. But it is not price control on the pharmaceuticals. And I want to say that we have a bill, of course, that will allow negotiation in Medicare, just as the VA does.

□ 1430

Negotiation is not price control. Negotiation is saying, I am going to buy a lot of your product, and I want a better price.

A lot of us do that. We call it Sam's Club, or some other club that we go to. And we buy large volumes and get a cheaper price than our poorer friends who just buy it one at a time. So I am for this bill. It is a good bill.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representatives CRAIG, KILDEE, and MCBATH for their leadership on this bill. They have long been champions of making healthcare and prescription medications accessible and affordable for all Americans.

More than one in three Americans are at high risk of developing diabetes, and over 37 million Americans already have it. A lot of those folks can't do without insulin. They don't have an option. And insulin has been on the market for decades and is not protected under patent, and the development prices have ages ago been amortized.

Madam Speaker, to treat their condition, the people who have diabetes must rely on insulin injections to regulate their blood sugar levels. Now, if you have no option of not buying a product, those who sell that product can put the price wherever, if it means your life. A lack of insulin can lead to insulin shock, diabetic coma, kidney failure, and death.

It is unacceptable that this lifesaving medication is priced out of reach for many who need it because it costs so little to produce.

This is not a mechanism that has to charge these prices because it took so much to produce it. It costs only \$10 to manufacture a month's supply. Yet, a month's supply can cost hundreds of dollars. However, with out-of-pocket costs as high as over \$600 for a 40-day supply—now, if you extrapolate 40 days, that is 10 days more than a

month, so that is a third more. So let's say it costs \$13 to produce. \$600. Why? Because if they don't have it, they die.

So all we are saying is, let's make sure this is affordable so people can sustain their lives and their health.

Many Americans have resorted to rationing by skipping doses of their insulin because they can't afford it. The legislation before us would cap the out-of-pocket price of insulin at \$35 a month.

Let me again remind you, that is 35 percent of the cost of producing it. This would ease the burden of skyrocketing prices and impossible choices.

Americans should not have to choose between paying the rent or for food, whatever, or paying for their insulin. As a matter of fact, they can't make that choice. They need both. They need to eat, and they need to live. And insulin is so often the way they assure that outcome. The prices will continue to rise unless we choose to act today.

Madam Speaker, House Democrats already voted for this measure once, and Republicans already voted against it. So I guess we don't have any surprise of what's going to happen here.

The Republicans are going to say to those who are using insulin: You are on your own. You are on your own. We are not going to worry about it.

And we are going to say: We are here to help. We are here to make sure you don't get ripped off. We are here to make sure that you have the medicine that you absolutely need to survive.

We voted for this measure as part of the Build Back Better Act in November. We made a promise to the American people that we would address the cost of prescription drugs, and we honored that promise.

Republicans said no. They said once again: Consumer, you need insulin, you are on your own. They voted for higher drug prices. They voted for the status quo where many Americans have to choose between lifesaving insulin and putting food on the table.

Today, my fellow colleagues, is an opportunity to vote to save lives and to provide a lifeline for millions of Americans with diabetes.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, do not say to the American people: You are on your own.

Tell them: We are here to help. Vote to help them. Vote to ensure that they will be able to afford a drug they need to protect themselves from death.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting to bring prices down across our economy and our healthcare system. Join me in protecting Americans' ability to access lifesaving medication that prevents needless suffering, extends life, and provides a higher quality of living.

Join me in voting for the Affordable Insulin for All Act. Again, I thank Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCBATH, the chairman of this committee, and all

those who brought this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues, don't say, You are on your own.

Say, We are by your side, and we are here to help.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I would just remind the body that the measure that the majority leader referred to failed in the Committee on Energy and Commerce with opposition from Democrats and Republicans because the proposed capping, price-fixing of drugs that the Democrats are promoting, would jeopardize cures; cures for people with Alzheimer's, cancers, diabetes.

This bill does not bring down the cost. It only shifts the cost. And in fact, their definition of negotiation would allow the government to impose a 95 percent tax on the innovators.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), leader on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be here today. I worked with my colleague, DIANA DEGETTE. We had hearings on the cost of diabetes and on the supply chain, and we said this is something we can work on together. And we did work on it together. And most of those provisions are in a bipartisan H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act.

Madam Speaker, I am fighting for my constituents to have lower insulin costs. But I think, more importantly, I am fighting for my constituents to deliver a cure for diabetes. Our experts say it is not impossible to have a cure for diabetes in the next decade. And we need to continue to push policies that promote innovation, not slow it down. So the Lower Costs, More Cures Act will help patients, including seniors, afford monthly insulin prescriptions without discouraging future investments in breakthrough medications.

I encourage the majority to come back with H.R. 19, Lower Costs, More Cures Act, and let's work together, instead of the rhetoric that we just heard from our respected leader. Let's work together and do it in a bipartisan way, the way we tried to do it in the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), the prime sponsor of the bill, who is constantly working to address affordability issues for Americans.

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for yielding.

Madam Speaker, diabetes does not care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. This disease is an absolute torrential disease inside working families across our country. This bill has been mischaracterized by the other side. This would lead to a \$35 cost for Americans, for Minnesotans, for part D Medicare beneficiaries and commercial plan beneficiaries.

For the vast majority of working families, the price of insulin is simply unsustainable. Many Americans are forced to risk their own lives by rationing doses or skipping treatments entirely. Today, we have an opportunity to save American families thousands of their hard-earned dollars.

Madam Speaker, my bill, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, would cap it at \$35 a month. Certainly, our work to lower drug costs and expand access to healthcare across this Nation is not done. But this is a major step forward in the right direction and a chance to make good on our promises to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a great member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, we all share the same goal of lowering the cost of prescription drugs, especially insulin. But H.R. 6833 doesn't get to the actual factors that drive the pricing.

The bill before us today is just another attempt by Democrats in Washington to pass a political solution and set Federal price controls. And once they open that door, what happens when they don't stop with insulin? What happens when they decide to move on past healthcare, set price controls on other sectors of our economy?

Why not cap what you can sell your house for in order to get the cost of housing down? Congress can't be for government price controls, as that is a slippery slope.

Now, some of my colleagues may bring up the fact that Republicans' bipartisan alternative, H.R. 19, also caps seniors' out-of-pocket costs. But let me point out the distinction, it is Medicare part D.

H.R. 6833 caps Medicare part D and private health plans. That is a direct, government price control on private companies.

Madam Speaker, I am a doctor. I am also the co-chair of the House Kidney Caucus. I have an acute understanding of how expensive prescription drugs are and the need for Congress to act. However, I also understand that it is a structural issue and simply slapping price controls on it would not actually solve the problem. This will only raise premiums and shift the costs to patients with other diseases.

Thankfully, there is a better way. H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act is a truly bipartisan solution to lower costs of all prescription drugs, including insulin. The bill caps out-of-pocket costs on prescription drugs in Medicare part D for seniors, allows high deductible health plans to cover insulin before the deductible kicks in, increases low-cost options by bringing more generic and biosimilar competition to the marketplace, and increases drug price transparency for patients. And the best part: Every provision is bipartisan.

So let's get back to working together on bipartisan solutions that actually lower drug prices rather than resort to government price controls and a march towards government-run healthcare.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Energy and Commerce to consider my amendment to H.R. 6833, which is H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2022.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the table of contents of this amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of this legislation. Seated here on the floor, listening to our Republican friends—price controls, socialists, killing innovation. I am not going to use all of my time using their language.

How about this? Diabetes kills. Diabetics need insulin. They have to be able to afford it. They have paid their taxes all of their lives, hardworking people.

So the cost for this? Sign me up for it. Sign me up for it to help people, to invest in our own people.

This is absurd, the prices in our country, when it costs \$15 to manufacture.

So today, we stand with your constituents as well as ours to lower the price of insulin for those that need it so that they can go on with their lives.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Americans pay 10 times as much for insulin as do any other consumers in countries around the world. The exact same drug. You know, we actually have the names of people who have died because they could not afford their insulin and started to cut back on their prescribed amount. And that is just unacceptable.

Big Pharma has been gouging consumers for a long time, even for life-saving drugs, and it is time to stop it. The Affordable Insulin Now Act will make insulin \$35 a month for millions of Americans, and it will save life after life after life. This is only the start. We have to make sure that all Americans have access, including those who have no insurance.

□ 1445

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act. The bill before us today will finally deliver the financial relief Oregonians whose lives depend on insulin so desperately need.

By capping the costs to no more than \$35 a month in Medicare part D and commercial insurance, Congress is making it clear that no one should have to cut back, ration, or skip doses of lifesaving medication.

I am proud that this policy is a central tenet of my own drug pricing bill that I have worked on with leadership, secured in the House, and passed in the Build Back Better bill. We need to rein in all drug price prescriptions. That is why it is important to negotiate drug prices without stifling innovation, like we do in our bill. Limit the price increases of everyday drugs to the price of inflation, and perhaps more importantly, limit out-of-pocket costs to seniors to \$2,000 or less.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), a member of Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act, critical legislation to cap out-of-pocket costs for insulin at \$35 per month.

I consistently hear from Granite State families about how the rising cost of insulin is forcing them to put their health at risk by cutting back on doses or skipping them all together because it is just too expensive.

We cannot continue to force American families to make impossible decisions between their medication and their well-being. At the end of the day, the work that we do is about our constituents, and I can say right here, right now that I care more about the well-being of my constituents and their health than I do about the profits of certain companies that seem to be protected on the other side of the aisle.

No one should pay more than \$35 a month for their insulin, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Washington has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER), a

member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that today we will be voting to pass the Affordable Insulin Now Act. This is personal for me. I have type 1 diabetes and insulin keeps me alive. This tiny 2 teaspoon bottle that used to cost \$40 now retails for over \$300. Most of us need more than one bottle a month to survive.

No one should have to ration their insulin—taking just enough to stay alive but not enough to stay healthy. That is a dangerous and sometimes deadly tightrope to walk, which is why this bill to cap insulin at \$35 a month is so critical for my patients, as a pediatrician, and for people like me.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), an outstanding member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, for over 30 years I was the one who was on the other side of the counter who had to tell the patient how much their insulin costs. I was the one who watched the senior citizens trying to decide whether they were going to buy insulin or buy groceries. I was the one who watched a mother cry because she couldn't afford the medication for her child.

I was the one who watched all this happen, and now I am finally getting the opportunity to address this issue on the House floor. I am saddened that it will do nothing to protect those mothers from the pain of not being able to afford lifesaving medications.

Make no mistake about this. We all agree on the same thing, Madam Speaker. We want lower prices for drugs, particularly for insulin. But instead of fixing a broken system, this bill aims to control it. This Socialist plan of requiring every private insurance company across the country to offer certain insulins, not all but certain, at a mandated price will have disastrous consequences on seniors and the 217 million Americans who rely on private insurance.

We all know that insurance agencies will shift these costs to patients with other diseases. Don't kid yourself. This is like squeezing a balloon, it is going to go somewhere else. We aren't talking about the bipartisan solutions that currently exist, like the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2021, H.R. 19. That is what we ought to be talking about.

Why aren't we talking about the PBMs, the middlemen? The Berkeley Institute came out with a study last week, Madam Speaker, that said that 37 percent of the price of a drug goes to the pharmaceutical manufacturer and the rest goes to the middleman, the PBM. The solution is right there before us. This is not going to fix it. This is going to control it, but it is not going to fix it.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this. We all have the same common goal, but this is not the solution.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. BOURDEAUX).

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Before his death, my father paid \$300 for a 10 milliliter vial of insulin that cost about \$25 in Canada. Far too many Americans, like my father, are forced to choose between paying for their medication or buying food for their families. No one should have to make that choice.

Georgia has one of the highest diabetes rates in the country, and this measure would provide my constituents with meaningful relief. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 6833 and lower the cost of insulin.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for giving me this opportunity because I wanted my colleagues on the other side to see what an insulin patient looks like. You are looking at him.

I need insulin in order to stay alive. The boot that I am wearing is not a fashion decision, it is because I have a diabetic ulcer on my foot, the fourth one I have had in 7 years.

I have left my insulin in New Jersey, gone to the drugstore when I arrived down here in Washington, and said: I need insulin. They said: Well, Mr. PAYNE, your insurance isn't ready to cover it. I said: Well, that is all right. I am doing okay in life, I will pay for it. She goes back, she gets the bag and hands it to me and says: \$348. What happens to the people that are not at the level of a Member of Congress? Think about that. It is \$12 in Canada.

We are asking for it to be three times higher than it is in Canada. Think about that. I live it every single day.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I hear the Democrats talking about this helping all Americans. This does nothing to help those without insurance. Let me repeat this. If you do not have insurance, this does not lower your cost, it may actually increase the price of your insulin.

Increasing competition to lower prices, as we do in H.R. 19 is the way, not dictating a price cap. We have break-through biosimilars right now. We had two approved last year; biosimilars that would help bring down the costs; costs savings within all markets so that patients would have access to lower-cost insulin.

The problem is getting those savings to the patients. The PBMs are the ones pocketing the money. Net prices have come down because of innovation. We can lower costs without shifting them.

Let's go to work. Republicans and Democrats, we all want to lower the price of insulin and we can do it without government price controls and we can do it by working together and actually solving the problem.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman NEAL for his leadership on the Ways and Means Committee in helping to bring this important legislation to the floor.

Right now, families and seniors that I represent in Michigan, and all across the country, are paying too much for prescription drugs, in particular, for insulin. That is why Congresswoman CRAIG and Congresswoman McBATH and I have introduced the Affordable Insulin Now Act to make insulin more accessible and more affordable.

This legislation would lower out-of-pocket costs for Americans with diabetes by ensuring that insurers and Medicare can't charge more than \$35 a month out-of-pocket for this medication.

Insulin was discovered over 100 years ago. Since then, little about this life-saving medication has changed, but the price of insulin in the United States has absolutely skyrocketed. As a result, Americans pay 10 times more for insulin than patients in other developed countries, and one in four Americans who rely on insulin have cut back or skipped their doses due to costs.

No one should have to choose between taking their medication as prescribed and putting food on the table or a roof over their head. People must make that choice because of Big Pharma's unfair pricing practices. This is something I know a little bit about.

As a father of a type 1 diabetic, I have seen firsthand how the high price of prescription drugs like insulin can harm patients and harm families. When my daughter turned 26 and got her own health insurance, there are months where she spends a third of her take-home pay, because she is diabetic, on staying alive. She has her mom and I to back her, but not everybody has that advantage. Either way, it doesn't make it okay.

In Michigan, it is estimated that 1 in 10 people have some form of diabetes. The average sticker price for a month's supply of insulin is \$375, but for some it can be as high as \$1,000 a month, just because they need to take more insulin. That is just not right.

Jill Verdier, a type 1 diabetic from my district, was my virtual guest at the State of the Union this year. She told me that insulin is like air to people with diabetes, they need it to survive.

□ 1500

At a time when Big Pharma is making record profits, Congress has to do more to lower costs, out-of-pocket costs. And that is why I fought to bring this bill to the floor with my colleagues, Representative CRAIG and Representative MCBATH. I urge my colleagues to vote to pass our legislation to lower costs. This is important legislation. I know we need to invest in cures. Obviously we would like to see the total price of insulin come down. But it is difficult to hear my colleagues on the other side who oppose the legislation to bring down the cost will also oppose this legislation to keep Americans from having to spend more out of their pocket. I think this is legislation that makes sense. It would help people. It would save lives.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this issue is so important I don't think we should automatically accept a partisan proposal that doesn't even get to the heart of the problem.

Today we actually could be voting on H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act, a bipartisan bill that would not only address the root causes of the high insulin prices, but lower costs for all patients.

Instead, and I might say, very sadly, we are voting on a partisan messaging bill to give Washington a greater say in Americans' medical decisions while raising premiums on seniors and the millions of Americans with private health insurance.

This is nothing more than an attempt by my colleagues on the other side to pass just piece by piece their cures-killing Socialist takeover of the entire innovation sector. And worse, despite the misleading title of this current bill, it does nothing to lower the actual price of insulin. Instead, it uses budget games and regulations to disguise the actual cost of insulin for all consumers.

This is just another instance of misguided health and economic policies coming at a time when more than half of Americans are worried about rising prices and the economy. And, of course, like the President's budget released this week, this bill, too, is only "paid for" with gimmicks, adding to our deficit and the core causes of inflation.

We can and should do more for the American people who are struggling. The American people expect us to work together. We could be doing that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who is my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. As a type 2 diabetic myself for the last 30 years, I

know firsthand the high cost of this prescription. There is nothing in my district more prevalent as a disease entity than diabetes. I strongly support it. It is an idea whose time not only has come but has passed.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who is also a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, to assure a stable supply of insulin and better health at \$35 instead of \$300 monthly, I fully support this bill for Yolanda, a retired Texas teacher, and one-quarter of insulin-dependent patients forced to ration their insulin because of predatory pricing.

Yet, instead of addressing pharmaceutical price gouging, this bill really only shifts how Big Pharma is rewarded. Since this bill does not reduce any insulin prices by one penny, all of us who are insured will ultimately pay through our premiums while taxpayers are on the hook for \$11 billion. For Americans who rely on other types of lifesaving drugs, there is also no relief. Big Pharma remains immune from any restraint on its monopoly prices from a Congress that is simply unable to hold it accountable.

My further concern is that this bill widens the coverage gap for nearly 5.5 million Texans and 28 million Americans who are uninsured, wrongly excluded from any benefit, and who do not receive any benefit today. While the uninsured population represents 17 percent of the insulin-dependent population, they constitute 80 percent of the people who pay full, monopoly prices. So, help for some—which is important—but there is a need to do more for the many who are not covered today.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from numerous groups representing and reflecting the views of millions of Americans.

AMAC ACTION,
Leesburg, FL, March 30, 2022.

Hon. STEVE SCALISE,
House Republican Whip,
Washington, DC.

DEAR WHIP SCALISE: On behalf of the 2.3 million members of AMAC—Association of Mature American Citizens, I write to express our concern with H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Not too long ago, former President Trump made significant gains in lowering insulin costs for Americans. He initiated the Part D Senior Savings Model a voluntary program which allows beneficiaries to choose enhanced Part D plan options that offer lower out-of-pocket costs for insulin. He also signed an Executive Order that delivered inexpensive insulin and epinephrine to lower income patients. Unfortunately, President Biden delayed this Executive Order the day after he took office in 2021 before rescinding it later that year.

Now, the Democrats are considering H.R. 6833 which is an unserious attempt to lower the price of insulin. This bill would exert price controls on private market insulin to

cap the costs paid by patients. H.R. 6833 takes us closer to further pharmaceutical price-fixing, a policy contained the Build Back Better plan. Price-fixing drugs leads to rationing and shortages as evidenced in other countries who have employed this policy. The Democrats' bill is estimated to increase spending by about \$11 billion, and the bill is paid for by delaying the rebate rule for one year. This Trump-era rule compels pharmacy benefit managers to share the rebates they receive from drug manufacturers with Part D beneficiaries to lower their out-of-pocket expenses.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act is an election year messaging act on the part of Democrats. If they were serious about lowering the cost of insulin, they would work with Republicans on innovative programs like the Part D Senior Savings Model, a program that is expanding with robust participation by plan sponsors and offers predictable insulin costs that do not exceed \$35/month.

As an organization comprised of Americans who are age 55-plus, controlling drug costs, especially insulin costs, is paramount to maintaining a good quality of life for AMAC members. H.R. 6833 is a step in the wrong direction for lowering insulin prices and opens the door for further government price-fixing and regulation.

Sincerely,

BOB CARLSTROM,
President, AMAC Action,

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS
AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
March 30, 2022,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: You will soon be considering H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act. On behalf of the more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I urge you to oppose H.R. 6833 and any other measure to institute price controls in the medical marketplace.

In addition to imposing price controls, H.R. 6833 also increases funding for the Medicare Improvement Fund by \$9 billion and adds \$1.5 million to the budget for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Historically, price controls like those contained in the Affordable Insulin Now Act increase costs and lead to shortages and rationing. H.R. 6833 will lead to increased premiums for seniors and the 217 million Americans who rely on private health insurance. The government has no business setting prices on any good or service, especially not healthcare. Price controls inherently distort the medical marketplace and leave Americans worse off by significantly decreasing future research and development.

Americans are already suffering under the highest inflation in 40 years, and H.R. 6833 will increase this financial hardship. The cost of medicines should be addressed without instituting price controls or threatening future innovation. I again urge you to oppose this legislation. All votes on H.R. 6833 may be among those considered in CCAGW's 2022 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHATZ.

NFIB,
Washington, DC, March 30, 2022.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of NFIB, the nation's leading

small business advocacy organization, I write to express concern regarding H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

This legislation has a laudable goal of attempting to make insulin more affordable and accessible to Americans on private and public health plans. Unfortunately, it will have unintended consequences for small businesses and employees by necessitating increased premiums while failing to address the underlying issues that make insulin unaffordable in the first place.

As studies have shown, a limited number of manufacturers, patent evergreening, practices of pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs), and other issues contribute to the high price of insulin. H.R. 6833 does not address any of these problems and instead seeks to solve consumer affordability by pushing significant, additional costs onto employers and health plans by limiting participant cost sharing.

For over 30 years, NFIB members have identified the cost of health insurance as the number one small business problem with 50 percent ranking it as a critical problem. Rising health insurance premiums result in fewer small businesses offering health insurance benefits. Since 2000, the average costs of an employer-sponsored single coverage plan and an employer-sponsored family plan have increased 149 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Unsurprisingly, facing these cost pressures, the number of small businesses with fewer than 50 employees offering coverage has declined from 47.2 percent in 2000 to 31 percent in 2020. Many small employers that are providing insurance have been forced to increase participant cost-sharing and deductibles as the only means to counter unsustainable premium increases and continue to offer coverage. To that end, solutions to affordability that limit cost-sharing without corresponding reforms will only serve to increase premiums and further exacerbate the small business affordability problem.

NFIB continues to advocate for affordable health insurance for small businesses and all Americans. However, if the system of employer sponsored health insurance is to endure in the long-term, Congress must work together to address the underlying cost drivers of the American healthcare system, rather than shift additional cost burdens onto employers seeking to offer health insurance to their employees.

Sincerely,

KEVIN KUHLMAN,
Vice President,
Federal Government Relations.

PARTNERSHIP FOR
EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE,
March 30, 2022.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The Partnership for Employer-Sponsored coverage (P4ESC) writes to share our strong concerns regarding H.R. 6833 the "Affordable Insulin Now Act." Although P4ESC shares the goal of lowering the cost of insulin, we believe this bill will simply shift costs back to employers and employees, including those who are insulin dependent. A better and more direct solution that addresses excessive profit taking by pharmaceutical manufacturers and others, including pharmacy benefit managers, in the pharmaceutical supply chain would be preferable.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently found that H.R. 6833 would increase the federal deficit by as much as \$11 billion over ten years and increase health insurance

premiums for all Americans. Indeed, there will not be any curb on future insulin price increases paid by employers and insurers. Every dollar of cost increase will be reflected in ever higher health insurance premiums paid by all Americans, whether privately insured or covered through Medicare. Better approaches that increase competition among insulin manufacturers, address regulatory problems and streamline the supply chain will help reduce the cost of all prescription drugs, including insulin.

The Partnership for Employer-Sponsored Coverage is an advocacy alliance of employment-based organizations and trade associations representing businesses of all sizes and the more than 181 million American employees and their families who rely on employer-sponsored coverage every day. We are committed to working to ensure that employer-sponsored coverage is strengthened and remains a viable, affordable option for decades to come. We look forward to working with you to ensure employer-sponsored coverage continues to thrive.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues with you or your staffs.

Sincerely,

PARTNERSHIP FOR EMPLOYER-
SPONSORED
COVERAGE (P4ESC).

THE ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2022.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As the House prepares to vote on the “Affordable Insulin Now Act” (H.R. 6833), The ERISA Industry Committee (ERIC) writes to share opposition to this legislation and urges members to vote “NO” when the bill is called for a vote.

ERIC is a national nonprofit organization exclusively representing the largest employers in the United States in their capacity as sponsors of employee benefit plans for their nationwide workforces. With member companies that are leaders in every economic sector, ERIC is the voice of large employer plan sponsors on federal, state, and local public policies impacting their ability to sponsor benefit plans and to lawfully operate under ERISA’s protection from a patchwork of different and conflicting state and local laws, in addition to federal law.

ERIC member companies voluntarily offer comprehensive health benefits to millions of active and retired workers and their families across the country. Our members offer great health benefits to attract and retain employees, be competitive for human capital, and improve health and provide peace of mind. On average, large employers pay around 75 percent of health care costs on behalf of 181 million beneficiaries. As such, ERIC member companies have a significant stake in, and deep commitment to, efforts to curb unsustainable rising costs in the health care system.

Employers oppose H.R. 6833 because the bill imposes government-mandated prices, shifts costs to patients, and will not lower drug costs. The bill may in fact increase the costs of insulin by creating a perverse incentive wherein insulin manufacturers know that no matter how much they increase prices, their customers will pay government-set prices. This action will cause employers, insurers, and other health insurance enrollees to pay more to offset these high costs. This view is supported by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), which recently found that this policy would increase the federal deficit by around \$11 billion and increase health insurance premiums for all Americans.

ERIC and our member companies support legislation that would actually lower prescription drug costs, including for insulin, rather than shift costs to employers and

other patients. Congress could achieve this by enacting policies to:

Increase competition among insulin manufacturers;

Fix the regulatory problems that misclassify insulin and fail to properly align market exclusivity and patent protections to the drug; and

Address supply chain issues like rebates and bona fide service fees that lead to formularies that do not reflect value for patients.

Many of these proposals are already included in bipartisan legislation that could be quickly passed and sent to the President for his signature. They have been scored by CBO to lower drug costs and health insurance premiums for all Americans.

Because the “Affordable Insulin Now Act” fails to reduce drug prices and raises health insurance costs for all, ERIC urges members to vote NO, and oppose the passage of H.R. 6833. We look forward to working with Congress on productive, effective, value-driven solutions to make prescription drugs—including insulin—affordable for all Americans.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. GELFAND.

FREEDOMWORKS,
March 30, 2022.

KEY VOTE NO ON THE AFFORDABLE INSULIN
NOW ACT, H.R. 6833

On behalf of FreedomWorks’ activist community, I urge you to contact your representative and ask him or her to vote NO on the Affordable Insulin Now Act, H.R. 6833, introduced by Rep. Angie Craig (D-Minn.). This legislation would impose socialist price controls to cap the price of insulin at \$35.

Currently, Americans are grappling with the harsh reality of increased prices on everything from gas to groceries. We see firsthand the consequences of modern monetary theory and the devastation it brings. Unfortunately, the many Americans that struggle with diabetes are no stranger to increased prices. The cost of insulin has been steadily rising for decades.

While progressives are all too eager to blame high prices on “corporate greed,” the reality is that this is an issue created by the federal government. Heavy-handed price controls are a deeply flawed solution that misses the mark when identifying the problem.

Pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs) play a significant role in the dramatic rise in the cost of prescription drugs. PBMs are third-party administrators determining which drugs go on formularies (a list of approved prescription drugs that hospitals can prescribe and are covered under an insurance policy). Ostensibly, PBMs negotiate to obtain the best price. However, these “savings” are often pocketed by PBMs themselves and aren’t passed onto patients. Since they are reimbursed based on the markdown from the original list price, PBMs are incentivized to prioritize drugs with higher list prices, so they can receive a larger markdown.

There are free-market alternatives to lower the cost of insulin and healthcare in general. For example, it was reported in an article in *The Federalist*, “A consortium of hospitals recently announced plans to build a factory that can manufacture insulin within two years. Once their plant gets up and running, the non-profit consortium said it would sell the insulin at a cost of \$30 a vial—a fraction of what pharmaceutical companies currently charge.”

This legislation is a simplistic proposal to address a highly complex problem. We cannot afford half-hearted proposals based on unsound economics like this one for an issue that impacts so many.

FreedomWorks will count the vote for H.R. 6833 on our 2022 Congressional Scorecard and reserves the right to score any amendments, motions, or other related votes. The scorecard is used to determine eligibility for the FreedomFighter Award, which recognizes Members of the House and Senate who consistently vote to support economic freedom and individual liberty.

Sincerely,

ADAM BRANDON,
President, FreedomWorks.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION

As the calendar turns to April, the U.S. House of Representatives is planning to vote on legislation that would cap insulin costs for all Americans who are privately insured or on Medicare Part D at no more than \$35 per month in out-of-pocket payments. While the bill’s sponsors may have good intentions, and while Congress can certainly act to provide support for Americans facing high prescription drug costs, NTU has several concerns about the impact the “Affordable Insulin Now Act” will have on America’s taxpayers and broader health care system.

The legislation would impose new cost-sharing limits on insulin for almost all privately insured Americans, and would extend these limitations to the tens of millions of Americans on Medicare Part D. According to a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) cost estimate, the bill’s requirements would cost federal taxpayers around \$11 billion (\$6.6 billion in higher spending and \$4.8 billion in reduced revenues). It is likely this cost estimate is due to anticipated higher premiums in both Medicare Part D and the Affordable Care Act individual marketplace. In these programs, higher premiums usually mean higher federal subsidies for health coverage that are paid for by taxpayers.

Indeed, proponents of the legislation have not properly addressed the impact this legislation would have on premiums in both Part D and the private marketplace. The Affordable Insulin Now Act puts a cap on the out-of-pocket costs owed by insured enrollees for insulin products, but it does not ultimately change the price of insulin paid for by health insurers. If insurers face higher costs for covering these drugs, they will likely be forced to pass those costs on to customers in the form of higher premiums or higher cost-sharing on other health products and services. And, as noted above, some higher premiums will result in higher costs for taxpayers, who bear some of the burden for covering seniors under Part D and low- and middle-income Americans on the ACA marketplace.

Perhaps the most troubling part of the legislation, though, is the proposed offset for the cost of the legislation. House Democratic leadership is proposing to “pay for” the legislation’s \$11 billion cost with a shameless budget gimmick that NTU and NTU Foundation have called out before: delaying a Trump administration “rebate” regulation that was projected to raise federal government costs but was never likely to be implemented in the first place.

As NTU wrote in July of last year, when a bipartisan group of lawmakers proposed using rebate rule delay as a pay-for in the major infrastructure bill:

“This phantom \$49 billion “pay for” was called “Washington at its worst” by one health industry lobbyist speaking to *The Washington Post*. In short, the Biden administration has delayed until 2023 a Trump administration regulation that would change how prescription drug discounts are handled by insurers and pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs). Because the Congressional Budget Office projected that the so-called rebate rule would increase federal spending in Medicare and Medicaid by about \$177 billion over

a decade, due to a rise in Medicare premiums (and therefore, taxpayer-funded subsidies for Medicare premiums), lawmakers get to count a further delay in the rule (beyond the Biden administration's one-year delay) as "savings" for the federal government. Reports indicate Congressional Democrats may use additional phantom "savings" from the rebate rule in their larger reconciliation bill by repealing the rebate rule entirely.

... This rule has never been implemented, and there's no clear indication that the Biden administration would have followed through on implementing the regulation even after their one-year delay. And even if the Biden administration had implemented the rule, there's little clarity as to whether the rebate rule would have actually cost federal taxpayers over \$177 billion over the decade. In short, delaying the rebate rule does not present real, tangible savings to taxpayers, like a reduction in federal spending would."

Unfortunately, it seems like the rebate rule is becoming yet another tried-and-true budget gimmick that Congress dips into again and again, in order to appear as if they are paying for new spending. And according to the CBO estimate cited above, because the rebate rule is projected to offer \$20 billion in phantom savings—not just the \$11 billion needed to cover the insulin bill's costs—the revised insulin legislation proposes spending another \$9 billion on a broad-based Medicare Improvement Fund. That means \$9 billion more will ultimately be spent without real offsets and, in our view, be paid for by taxpayers in the long run with higher debt and deficits.

To be clear, high out-of-pocket costs for insulin are a real issue for many Americans. NTU continues to support several bipartisan and meaningful proposals that would provide relief for many Americans, including:

An out-of-pocket cap in Medicare Part D, along with Part D benefit redesign that would actually save taxpayers money in the long run;

An ongoing Medicare insulin model that represents a public-private partnership between the federal government, insurers, and drug manufacturers that has the potential to meaningfully reduce out-of-pocket insulin costs for up to millions of seniors on Part D; and

Allowing Part D enrollees to spread their out-of-pocket burdens over the 12 months of a plan year, rather than having to owe major bills in the first or second months of a new plan year.

This legislation could undermine the ongoing Medicare insulin model, Part D redesign efforts, and reported bipartisan work in the Senate to provide insulin cost relief for American patients who are struggling. The House should go back to the drawing board and focus on more bipartisan opportunities.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), who is an expert in health policy.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, you do realize what is going on here, and I am going to be a little sarcastic because I am frustrated.

Insulin prices are outrageous.

But why is it outrageous?

The fact of the matter is our regulatory mechanic and our payment mechanic are the very things that broke this, and here you do a piece of legislation that will break it more.

Please, I beg of the majority: Hire an economist. And I will walk you

through some of the facts on it. So, Madam Speaker, you are doing a bill here where you are going to subsidize the dollar amount in the back, but you are still going to keep the regulatory mechanics the way they are in their archaic designs, and then you are going to be joyful that individuals will pay what, \$35 a vial?

At the same time we are subsidizing it billions and billions and billions of dollars.

Does anyone have a subscription to an aggregator on healthcare policy on your side?

You do realize, there is a co-op coming out of the ground right now that is going to be \$50, \$55 for a box of five. It is lower than your subsidized price. And this is their market price.

If you were doing something good for society, you would actually be moving this covax to the top of the regulatory stack and say: We want them to get permitted and licensed as fast as possible because they are still a year plus away. But it is being built right now, and you are about to screw up the solution. And if you really, really, really, really care about people—remember, I represent the population with the second highest number of diabetes. I represent a Tribal community that is number two in the world. Come with me some time and let me introduce you to people who have had their feet cut off. If you actually care about solving the misery, then read the science journals that made it clear last November, December, the success.

We know how to cure. And for my friend over here, you have a family member type 1—I know I need to go through the Speaker—but a family member with type 1, we know how to cure it now. And there is even the next generation of this. We have even learned how to do the stem cell, the isolate cell, tag it with a CRISPR so you can do a bio-foundry, meaning it doesn't have to come from your skin cells, we can basically now cure type 1 and the same technology will work for type 2. But we are going to have to deal with some societal issues. If you want to end the misery in society don't build more clinics, don't do a subsidy, get this technology to people.

And for those of us who are fiscal hawks and actually care about where we are going, you do realize that 31 percent of all Medicare spending is just diabetes. Thirty-three percent of all healthcare spending is diabetes. And so the brain trust here decides: Hey, let's subsidize this by billions and billions and billions and billions and billions of dollars, screw up the movement to actually have cures to actually have a co-op provide the product dramatically less expensive.

Remember, the co-op is going to bring it in cheaper than the subsidized price without all the taxpayer money.

Please, I know the virtue signaling here is powerful. The economics are crap.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, to my friend from Arizona, I appreciate his passion. I wish it were true that he had somehow cured diabetes. It would be great news for my daughter and so many other Americans who say that they are looking for that cure. In the meantime, while we are working to get there—and I appreciate the effort, I do, because I am on board, I am completely on board with the notion that we ought to cure this terrible disease—however, until that day comes, let's make sure that the people who depend on insulin in order to stay alive can live to see that day that I know he and I both are looking forward to.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who is my colleague from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, the Affordable Insulin Now Act will cap out-of-pocket insulin costs at \$35 a month—not a miracle by any stretch of the imagination. And anyone who supports legislation in this order and others where we address other diseases obviously, we are working on new situations just about every month. So because you are working on it and you are trying to find a balance of the free market, and where the price goes without fixing the price of what something will cost, I mean, we have been called worse things than Socialists. When you come to this debate, I'll settle on that word.

Well, what does that mean?

You want to get into a debate about socialism?

I served in the Armed Forces. I fought for my country. I am tired of being called names.

Seven million Americans who use insulin want to stay alive. The average insulin costs rose 54 percent. We have heard that before.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, when insulin was discovered, Warren Harding was the President and the New York Giants won the World Series, yet there was no television to watch the New York Giants.

Insulin costs are a national disgrace. For a drug discovered over 100 years ago, \$1,000 price tag for a single vial is an outrage. You know it, and I know it.

So get beyond the argument that we are all a bunch of Socialists because we want to help people. We are doing what the folks sent us here to do. We can't do it on every drug. We need the technology. The gentleman from Arizona is right on target. It will save lives.

If we can't do that, then what the heck are we doing here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, it is interesting listening to the debate here. Certainly my colleague, Mr. DOGGETT, I think very appropriately pointed out:

This bill does not lower the price of insulin by one penny. It just simply shifts around who pays for what.

We have seen that pattern in healthcare across America for some time now, and I would hope that we could learn from that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

I will never forget the day a constituent in my district showed me his bottle of insulin. He told me that one day while traveling in Canada he found he forgot it, so he went to a pharmacy. He found that that same bottle of insulin that he buys here in the U.S. for \$200 cost only \$25 in Canada, the exact same product.

He started calculating how much it would cost him to fly to Canada once every 3 months, and then asked himself: Why are Americans the only ones paying these exorbitant prices?

Nobody should have to sacrifice just to afford medicine. That is why today's bill is so important. By capping the cost of insulin at \$35 a month, this bill will ensure that monthly costs for millions of families are truly affordable. It is time to prioritize the needs of our people so that every American can afford to stay alive.

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

Madam Speaker, I think that this discussion that we are having here today is important. I also believe that we need to work together on solutions to actually reduce the cost of insulin, again, not just shifting around who pays for what. But certainly I am willing to give my colleague on the other side more information about the information Mr. SCHWEIKERT was sharing. He is very knowledgeable on the subject. He certainly works with his constituents a lot, constituents in need. And we know that literally millions of people across America are in need for lower-cost insulin. We owe them, I think, a much better approach than just simple government intrusion and more government involvement shifting around the cost.

□ 1515

I was a bit alarmed earlier when I heard that we should maybe make Medicare prescription coverage more like the VA. We need to remember that the VA offers roughly 50 percent of the options for participants compared to Medicare. I don't think we want to reduce the choices that seniors would have with their formularies within

Medicare part D. If anything, we should make sure they have more choices. We know that more choices in the marketplace bring down the price, and we need to focus in that direction.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this bill. We owe the American people a diligent effort, working together to truly reduce the cost of insulin.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues' support of this legislation. This is important legislation.

I will say this: I understand the points that have been made on the other side. As a father of a type 1 diabetic, I am one of those many millions of families that pay very close attention to the important research that we think ultimately may lead to a cure for diabetes, so I embrace the suggestion made on the other side that we have hope for a cure. I have hope for a cure. Ever since my daughter was diagnosed, I have been waiting for that moment, as she has, for that cure to appear. If it is just outside our grasp, let's do everything we can to get there.

But that is not what this legislation is intended to attack. It doesn't mean we ignore that. It means we continue to push.

I have worked with my colleague on this side of the aisle, Congresswoman DEGETTE, to try to do everything we can to find these cures. But in the meantime, let's make sure that there is not a diabetic who is standing at the pharmacy counter with lifesaving medication just beyond their reach, not because it is unavailable but because it is unaffordable to them.

I take the point that while this legislation doesn't do what we all would like to do—and that is to reduce the overall cost of medication through the way markets actually work, negotiation between a buyer and a seller. I mean, that is the way the free market works. Let's let the free market work and not have law that allows the seller to dictate to us the price of a drug that can save lives and make huge profits while there are people in a pharmacy reaching for a drug that they can't get because the price is too high. This legislation will help save lives in the immediate term.

I hope there is a day when Democrats and Republicans can come together to establish policy that would allow negotiation on the overall price of these lifesaving medications. That would be a solution. We support it; you oppose it. In the meantime, let's do this and save some lives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Today, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

On top of weathering the economic fallout of the global pandemic, Americans are still paying far too much for insulin. This is particularly frustrating, given that these are not the prices that consumers in the rest of the world pay. The most commonly used form of insulin costs 10 times more in the United States than in any other developed country.

Tragically, there have been recent reports of deaths of patients with diabetes because they cannot afford the insulin they need to stay alive.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act would take a historic step to lower the cost of insulin and cap out-of-pocket costs at \$35 per month. This means individuals with private insurance could save up to \$500 per year.

This bill ensures affordable access to lifesaving medication for the more than 37 million people in the United States who have diabetes and the over 7 million Americans who rely on insulin to maintain their health and well-being.

Madam Speaker, it is past time, but today it is time to finally deliver on our promise to ensure that all Americans can get the medication they need and they deserve to stay healthy and thrive. The Affordable Insulin Now Act brings us one step closer to that promise.

There is certainly more work to be done. I look forward to working with my colleagues to get the cost of prescription drugs under control and to build upon this important first step.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6833.

Americans are rightly concerned about the price of prescription drugs, but Democrats are trying to solve this problem in the wrong way, as usual. Instead of discussing bipartisan, commonsense legislation to address the rising costs of prescription drugs, we are debating H.R. 6833. This radical bill is another attempt by the left to advance a government takeover of prescription drug pricing.

Don't be fooled. This legislation is a Trojan horse. H.R. 6833 claims to address insulin prices, but what it actually does is opens the door to government price controls without addressing the root problem, which is the rising cost of insulin.

H.R. 6833 won't lower costs. It is a smokescreen that will raise premiums for workers and seniors when inflation is at a 40-year high.

Why are Democrats knowingly raising healthcare premiums on the majority of Americans when so many Americans are struggling to pay for gas and put food on the table? Four out of five Americans in large group plans already pay under \$35 a month for insulin. This

bill will raise healthcare costs for the vast majority of working Americans.

When insurers are required by the Federal Government to cover an insulin product, this allows manufacturers to raise the price of insulin indiscriminately. Since insurers can charge only \$35 a month out of pocket to the patient, the insurer must make up for the increased cost of insulin by raising premiums for all beneficiaries. With a lack of competition in the market, this bill removes the bargaining power insurers use to keep insulin prices low, leading to increased insulin prices and higher premiums.

This legislation will only worsen the root problem of high insulin prices, which is a lack of competition in the market. H.R. 6833 will lead to fewer approved generic insulin brands, making the insulin monopoly even worse. If Democrats really want to decrease the price of insulin, they should pave the way for more competition, not less.

This legislation will cost taxpayers \$11 billion, giving the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services \$1.5 million in fiscal year 2022 to administer these drug-pricing caps. Trusting the Washington bureaucracy to manage drug pricing and distribution is a mistake. This legislation would be the largest expansion of Federal control over Americans' private health insurance since ObamaCare.

We must stop the Federal Government from wedging its foot in the door of our healthcare system and moving us one step closer to a socialist, single-payer system for Medicare for All. In fact, this week, the chair of the Progressive Caucus said she was "fighting to make it the law of the land."

H.R. 6833 sets a dangerous precedent. If the Federal Government can set prices for insulin, what is to stop it from implementing price controls for every drug on the market or in every other sector of the economy?

The free market is the reason the United States outpaces every other country in developing lifesaving cures and treatments, particularly countries with socialized medicine. Federal drug-pricing mandates will discourage medical innovation, resulting in fewer cures, which will keep Americans from receiving the therapies they rely upon.

Instead of perpetuating Obama-era schemes to expand Federal controls over Americans' health insurance, the Biden administration and congressional Democrats should bring to the floor H.R. 19, the bipartisan Lower Costs, More Cures Act.

Every single provision in H.R. 19 has bipartisan support. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle agree that this legislation will lower healthcare costs and protect America's status as a leading healthcare innovator.

Furthermore, H.R. 19 sets a new standard in healthcare affordability. This bill caps seniors' out-of-pocket insulin costs at only \$50 a month in the Medicare program. It also allows for high-deductible insurance plans to

cover insulin before a deductible kicks in, and it increases the availability of low-cost options for treatment in the marketplace.

The cost of insulin, like most healthcare costs in this country, are climbing rapidly. Yet, total Federal control is not the solution.

H.R. 6833 is a perfect example of legislative trickery. This bill will lower out-of-pocket costs for insulin for a minority of Americans by bloating premiums and other healthcare costs for the majority of Americans and leave our healthcare system worse off.

Supporting socialist drug pricing isn't a solution, which is why I am rejecting this one-sided, harmful bill. I urge my Democrat colleagues to support the Lower Costs, More Cures Act, bipartisan legislation that will lower drug costs for Americans without limiting access to cures.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a lead sponsor of this legislation and a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I really appreciate Mr. DESAULNIER giving me a few moments of time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

I want to take this time just to talk about the cost of healthcare and prescription drugs for all those in our community. It is a topic that I hear about every single day from my constituents, and it is something that touches the lives of every single American, whether you have diabetes or not.

Today, we will be voting on a bill that will actually provide desperately needed relief to some of the most vulnerable patients in the United States, in Georgia and all across this Nation.

There is no time off when you live with diabetes. It is a constant, ever-present disease that influences every aspect of your life. Listen to those who gave testimony about what they live with every single day with this chronic disease.

In 1920, before insulin was discovered, it would have been exceptional for those who had diabetes to live longer than 1 or 2 years. But over the past 100 years, we have been able to save lives with insulin. For over 100 years, it has remained the most effective treatment that we have.

Over 100 years later, some estimates state that diabetics spend around \$6,000 a year alone on insulin. This is just absolutely unconscionable for a drug that has been saving lives for over 100 years. We can and must make it more affordable for Americans who need it to live.

That is why I joined my colleagues, ANGIE CRAIG and DAN KILDEE, who I find to be healthcare champions, in introducing this critical legislation.

It is just really very simple. The Affordable Insulin Now Act would cap

out-of-pocket costs of insulin products at \$35 per month for Americans with health insurance.

This bill brings a measure of certainty and affordability to every American who needs insulin to continue living a healthy life.

Yes, I have heard arguments this afternoon that this doesn't take care of every individual in the country, specifically those who are uninsured. We know that. I assure you, we are not completely satisfied with this either. But if our Republican colleagues would come to the table with us, with any measures that you have—compromise, come to the table, consensus. Help us build the ability to make sure that every American in this country, whether they are insured or not, has the ability to be able to afford this lifesaving drug. We welcome that from you because people every single day are dying right beneath our noses. I am here to save lives.

I look forward to passing this vital legislation out of the House of Representatives today, and I look forward to continuing to fight for passage with Senator WARNOCK in the Senate.

As the President so rightly stated, this legislation can and will save lives, and it is long overdue.

□ 1530

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

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, it is a good-sounding bill. Everyone knows drug costs in general are too high, and insulin costs in particular are way too high. But it is a bill with a simple answer.

We look at a problem and solve the problem by having the Federal Reserve eventually print more money, \$15.5 billion over 10 years.

I realize you feel you have a pay-for here, but it is just by delaying another program by another year. And as a practical matter, this bill spends \$15.5 billion more over 10 years than we would without the bill.

We are already told this source of funds—we already used this type or source of funds in the infrastructure bill. It is just grabbing another year.

Why don't we just require PBMs to pass on their rebates to the patients as intended? That is something that would cost the Federal Government, in my mind, no new money. It would be a significant reduction in cost for the individual.

I appreciate that so many people on the majority side of the aisle would like to work together with us, and it shouldn't be difficult to find a solution to this problem that is fair to all concerned.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act which would cap

out-of-pocket insulin costs at \$35 per month and help fight the scourge of diabetes.

In 2019, as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I organized meetings with leading insulin producers to confront them about the strain their prices are putting on the American people.

In each of those meetings, I said the same thing; that for millions of Americans, including a disproportionate number of Latinos, access to affordable insulin is a matter of life and death.

And for me and many of us, those aren't just numbers. Four months before I graduated from college in 1996, my grandmother died of complications from diabetes. If we fail to bring down the price of insulin, more families will suffer just like mine did.

But our responsibility is to all our constituents, not just those with insurance. So I co-sponsored Representative DOGGETT's amendment to extend the benefits of this bill to the uninsured, and I hope we will make that happen in the days to come.

But this bill is an important step forward, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Person Speaker, and I say "Person Speaker" because I am not a biologist. And out of respect to our Supreme Court nominee, I don't feel qualified to say Madam Speaker.

But I do rise in opposition to this bill. The Affordable Insulin Now Act is just more of government controlling your healthcare.

Today, Democrats are using insulin as the gateway to their dream of fully socialized medicine where Joe Biden and his accomplices in Congress have more control over your healthcare than you or your doctor. After all, they got to decide whether or not you got a vaccine, and they fired you if you didn't obey.

If Democrats succeed in setting the price of insulin at \$35, the negative effects will ripple across the entire healthcare market.

I invite my Democrat colleagues to read my sophomore economics textbook to confirm what happens when you implement price controls.

It is estimated the average annual cost for the private sector of compliance with this mandate is \$2 billion. Not that Democrats care about billions of dollars, the way they throw around trillions of dollars. Don't tell them what comes after a trillion.

But we all remember the lies of ObamaCare. Please, say it with me. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Come on. This is participatory. If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep your healthcare plan. As a matter of fact, costs are going to go down. None of that was true.

And, instead, American families found themselves with plans they

didn't like, but at least they cost more, so it was a lose-lose.

Premiums will rise again if this bill becomes law because setting prices, again, has consequences, something our economically illiterate Democrat friends apparently don't understand, or maybe they do.

American innovation has brought amazing, lifesaving treatments to the healthcare market, but that research and development comes at a cost, like any other good or product or service in this country.

Don't we all want the best drugs, the best medicine, and the best healthcare? Instead of going with the Democrat default government-knows-best, one-size-fits-all mentality, we need to embrace free market principles.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What is the difference between us and them that was just on full display?

We care about everyday Americans. They don't.

We make life better for everyday Americans. They don't.

We get things done for everyday Americans, and they don't.

Insulin is a drug that is lifesaving and life-sustaining. It has been around for more than 100 years. It is off patent. There are no research and development costs associated with it.

Yet so many Americans pay approximately \$4,000 a year for insulin. That is unacceptable, un-American, and unconscionable. And that is why Democrats are doing something about it.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act will lower out-of-pocket costs to \$35 per month. That is not fiction. That is fact. That is not hyperbole. That is help that is game-changing for everyday Americans. Once again, Democrats deliver for the people.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I believe I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Insulin prices in the United States are the highest in the world. I support the Affordable Insulin Now Act, a bill that would cap patient costs at \$35 a month. It would make lifesaving medicine affordable for millions of Americans living with diabetes.

My committee's investigation found that since the 1990s, insulin manufacturers have been raising the price of this lifesaving medicine despite no improvements to the drug, while making record profits.

The price gouging has harmed Americans. More than one in four Americans with diabetes report having to ration insulin, and some have died.

Nearly 2 million New Yorkers have diabetes. Capping out-of-pocket costs to \$35 a month is an important step that Congress can take to reduce insulin costs for patients with diabetes.

Let's make prescription drugs affordable. Vote for this bill.

I thank Representatives KILDEE, CRAIG, and MCBATH for their leadership in authoring this bill.

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I have been so pleased to hear colleagues across the aisle speak in favor of competition and price negotiations.

I hope that they will follow through in their commitment to supporting competition and negotiation and co-sponsor Lower Drug Costs Now, H.R. 3.

But that is not the bill we are talking about today. Today, we are talking about the Affordable Insulin Now Act, a bill that would make changes in the lives of the more than 630,000 Virginians who are living with diabetes.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act would finally make sure that every affected child, teenager, family member, every American can afford the insulin that they need.

People living with diabetes do not have the choice of whether to purchase insulin or not. They depend on it to stay alive. People like my constituent, Joshua Davis, a 13-year-old Virginian with type 1 diabetes who accompanied Dr. Jill Biden to the State of the Union Address earlier this year.

I am proud to co-sponsor this legislation to make sure that no American is skipping lifesaving doses of their insulin or making choices between whether they take their insulin or put food on the table.

I am grateful to my colleagues for leading this effort.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Louisiana has the second highest diabetes mortality rate but only the 11th highest number of cases. The rate of diabetes among Blacks, Hispanics, and Native American adults in the State is disproportionately high as compared to other populations.

Insulin is a lifesaving medicine, allowing people to live healthy lives, raise families, and do their jobs. However, many can't afford this life-regulating medicine.

Many Louisianans have to pay over \$100 a vial in out-of-pocket costs every single month. And some are forced to ration prescriptions, risking complications or death. The people must always come before Big Pharma.

Today, we are finally taking action to cut the price of insulin. The Affordable Insulin Now Act would cap out-of-

pocket insulin costs for insulin for a month-long supply at \$35 and require plans to cover different types of insulin.

The bill is a strong move in the right direction to ease the burden, and we must do this now.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I cannot let go past one of our colleagues saying before that we don't believe in helping average people. Yes, we do.

Republicans are here every day. We are average people. We are here to help average people. But what we believe in most of all is freedom for Americans.

And we happen to believe that Democrats don't believe in that, and this bill is an exemplar of the fact that they want the government to control our lives in every way they possibly can.

In the past, Democrats and Republicans have worked together to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, but Democrats have once again pursued politics over progress.

H.R. 6833 is a massive power grab that will lead our country one step closer to socialized medicine. That is not what the American people think and want.

There is no such thing as a free-market system when government bureaucrats control prices. This legislation sets an extremely dangerous precedent.

We shouldn't pursue policies that will harm the health and well-being of American patients, and we should not knowingly raise healthcare premiums on American workers and their families when prices for goods are soaring.

Republicans stand ready to work with Democrats to advance legislation that promotes competition, lowers costs for consumers, establishes transparency and accountability in drug pricing, and advances the cause of freedom.

H.R. 6833 is not that legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, Americans pay too much for insulin. With the price hovering at three times what it was 15 years ago, this vital medication is not just expensive, it can be completely out of reach.

Every day, the more than 37 million Americans living with diabetes must choose between the insulin they need to stay alive and other basic necessities. Just last week, I heard about this issue from a couple who live in my district. Both people have diabetes, but one is forgoing insulin for the time being due to cost. Last year alone, their prescription costs topped \$10,000.

This outrageous expense is unacceptable, particularly since Americans pay far more for insulin than patients in similar countries. In some cases, American patients pay as much as 10 times the price of their counterparts in other nations.

Today's legislation finally rights this wrong. Capping the cost of insulin at \$35 per month will put the medicine within reach for millions of Americans. And we do this responsibly, by

delaying the prior administration's Rebate Rule. Bringing down the cost of insulin will also help to close health inequities that skyrocketing drug costs exacerbated.

This is an important and welcome step in lowering the cost of prescription drugs in this country. More must be done, and that's why in the Build Back Better Act, we empowered the Secretary to negotiate prescription drug prices for Medicare, capped Medicare Part D out-of-pocket costs, and required drug companies to pay a rebate if their prices outpace inflation. We will not stop until these commonsense reforms are signed into law.

I applaud Ways and Means member, Congressman DAN KILDEE, for his work in bringing this legislation to the floor, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, to cap the out-of-pocket price for one month's supply of insulin at \$35.

Insulin was discovered nearly 100 years ago and costs less than \$10 a vial to manufacture.

Yet there are millions of American families with insurance that are paying hundreds of dollars a vial.

No family in America should be forced to choose between buying insulin for their child and putting food on the table.

It's past time that this Congress says no to big pharma lining their pockets, at the expense of lives of the American people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act. The bill is simple and gets to the urgent need to limit cost-sharing for insulin under private health insurance and the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Specifically, the bill caps cost-sharing under private health insurance for a month's supply of selected insulin products at \$35 or 25 percent of a plan's negotiated price (after any price concessions), whichever is less, beginning in 2023.

The bill caps cost-sharing under the Medicare prescription drug benefit for insulin products at:

\$35 in 2023 regardless of whether a beneficiary has reached the annual out-of-pocket spending threshold, and

\$35 beginning in 2024 for those who have not yet reached this threshold.

The subject of the bill is public knowledge and well known by members of this body.

I have worked closely with the healthcare community that serve Houstonians to ensure that programs are receiving the appropriate level of federal support.

One of the most difficult challenges are the hurdles to healthcare created by lack of health insurance such as a lack of access to necessary medications due to the high costs of many prescription drugs.

Diabetes is a life-threatening disease that disproportionately affects communities of color.

Diabetes is associated with serious health problems, including heart disease and stroke, kidney failure, and blindness.

There are 15,000 Medicare beneficiaries in the Eighteenth Congressional District who have been diagnosed with diabetes.

These individuals are my constituents and I know that on average, each of them pays 4.8 times the cost of similar medication in Australia, 3.6 times the cost in the United Kingdom, and 2.6 times the cost in Canada.

Additionally, in the Eighteenth Congressional District, 26.7 percent of residents are uninsured.

For example, an uninsured resident of this congressional district pays 23 times more for this brand of insulin than their counterparts in Australia, 15 times more than they would in the United Kingdom, and 13 times more than they would in Canada.

The consequences of these staggering costs are not benign.

Many patients often speak of having to make heartwrenching decisions about what to buy with the commonly fixed incomes attendant to seniors.

Many medical professionals indicate that the high prices for prescription drugs are a function of a lack of competition, and authorizing Medicare to create a program to negotiate drug prices may be an estimable way to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

All told this reflects a disturbing trend: in our country, the cost of branded drugs tends to go up, whereas in other countries, the costs tend to go down.

Before insulin the prognosis for diabetics was bleak.

Over the past two decades, manufacturers have systematically and dramatically raised the prices of their insulin products by more than tenfold—often in lockstep.

In 2017, diabetes contributed to the death of 277,000 Americans and was the primary death for 85,000 of those individuals.

That same year diagnosed diabetes cost the United States an estimated \$327 billion—including \$237 billion in direct medical costs and \$90 billion in productivity losses.

Diabetes drugs, including insulin and oral medications that regulate blood sugar levels, play a critical role in helping people with diabetes manage their condition and reduce the risk of diabetes-related health complications.

Although insulin is the most well-known diabetes medication, diabetes patients are often prescribed other oral drugs to use in place of or alongside insulin.

Many of these non-insulin products used to regulate blood sugar levels are brand drugs that lack generic alternatives.

In recent years, the high prices of diabetes drugs have placed a tremendous strain on diabetes patients as well as the federal government, which provides diabetes medications to more than 43 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Because Medicare lacks the authority to negotiate directly with drug manufacturers, Medicare beneficiaries pay significantly more for their drugs than patients abroad.

Patients who are uninsured or underinsured and must pay for their drugs out of pocket bear an even greater cost burden.

I thank the committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor for the work they have done to bring H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act to the floor for a vote.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.R. 6833.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bucshon moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6833 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BUCSHON is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—MEDICARE PARTS B AND D**Subtitle A—Medicare Part B Provisions**

Sec. 101. Improvements to Medicare site-of-service transparency.

Sec. 102. Requiring manufacturers of certain single-dose container or single-use package drugs payable under part B of the Medicare program to provide refunds with respect to discarded amounts of such drugs.

Sec. 103. Providing for variation in payment for certain drugs covered under part B of the Medicare program.

Sec. 104. Establishment of maximum add-on payment for drugs and biologicals.

Sec. 105. Treatment of drug administration services furnished by certain excepted off-campus outpatient departments of a provider.

Subtitle B—Drug Price Transparency

Sec. 111. Reporting on explanation for drug price increases.

Sec. 112. Public disclosure of drug discounts.

Sec. 113. Study of pharmaceutical supply chain intermediaries and merger activity.

Sec. 114. Making prescription drug marketing sample information reported by manufacturers available to certain individuals and entities.

Sec. 115. Sense of Congress regarding the need to expand commercially available drug pricing comparison platforms.

Subtitle C—Medicare Part D Benefit Redesign

Sec. 121. Medicare part D benefit redesign.

Subtitle D—Other Medicare Part D Provisions

Sec. 131. Allowing the offering of additional prescription drug plans under Medicare part D.

Sec. 132. Allowing certain enrollees of prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans under Medicare program to spread out cost-sharing under certain circumstances.

Sec. 133. Establishing a monthly cap on beneficiary incurred costs for insulin products and supplies under a prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan.

Sec. 134. Growth rate of Medicare part D out-of-pocket cost threshold.

TITLE II—MEDICAID

Sec. 201. Medicaid pharmacy and therapeutics committee improvements.

Sec. 202. GAO report on conflicts of interest in State Medicaid program drug use review boards and pharmacy and therapeutics (P&T) committees.

Sec. 203. Ensuring the accuracy of manufacturer price and drug product information under the Medicaid drug rebate program.

Sec. 204. Improving transparency and preventing the use of abusive spread pricing and related practices in Medicaid.

Sec. 205. T-MSIS drug data analytics reports.

Sec. 206. Risk-sharing value-based payment agreements for covered outpatient drugs under Medicaid.

Sec. 207. Applying Medicaid drug rebate requirement to drugs provided as part of outpatient hospital services.

TITLE III—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION**Subtitle A—Pay-for-Delay**

Sec. 301. Unlawful agreements.

Sec. 302. Notice and certification of agreements.

Sec. 303. Forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity period.

Sec. 304. Commission litigation authority.

Sec. 305. Statute of limitations.

Subtitle B—Advancing Education on Biosimilars

Sec. 321. Education on biological products.

Subtitle C—Other Provisions

Sec. 331. Clarifying the meaning of new chemical entity.

TITLE IV—REVENUE PROVISION

Sec. 401. Safe harbor for high deductible health plans without deductible for insulin.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 501. Payment for biosimilar biological products during initial period.

Sec. 502. GAO study and report on average sales price.

Sec. 503. Requiring prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans to report potential fraud, waste, and abuse to the Secretary of HHS.

Sec. 504. Establishment of pharmacy quality measures under Medicare part D.

Sec. 505. Improving coordination between the Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

Sec. 506. Patient consultation in Medicare national and local coverage determinations in order to mitigate barriers to inclusion of such perspectives.

Sec. 507. MedPAC report on shifting coverage of certain Medicare part B drugs to Medicare part D.

Sec. 508. Requirement that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include truthful and non-misleading pricing information.

Sec. 509. Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator at the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

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

□ 1545

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4521, AMERICA COMPETES ACT OF 2022

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of March 30, 2022, I offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4521.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lucas moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4521 be instructed to agree to section 2502 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) each will control 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to instruct the conferees on our competitiveness legislation.

This motion instructs conference members to agree to section 2502 of the Senate legislation. This section is simple and common sense. It says that no person or entity of concern can receive grants, awards, or other support from the National Science Foundation, federally funded manufacturing programs, or technology hubs authorized by this legislation.

A person or entity of concern is generally defined by the Department of Defense as directed by Congress in previous Defense Reauthorization Acts.

DOD has identified entities of concern as Communist Chinese military companies and companies owned or controlled by the People's Liberation Army, and they have defined persons of concern as individuals affiliated with these CCP military entities.

Simply put, this motion ensures that we aren't giving taxpayer dollars to the adversaries who are trying to steal U.S. technology and use it against us.

The Senate was right to add this important guardrail, and it is only responsible that we urge our House conferees to ensure it is included in the final conferenced legislation.

I would like to point out that we wouldn't have this particular difference in our bills had the process of passing the House legislation been done in regular order.

The COMPETES Act was developed in a back room by the Speaker's office

with very little input or review from relevant committees.

Although thoroughly vetted and bipartisan Science Committee bills were included in that package, they were sandwiched in among unrelated, partisan spending that added up to a backdoor attempt to pass parts of the Build Back Better Act. Because of this rushed, opaque bill-writing process, unsurprisingly, the COMPETES Act had a lot of flaws.

Despite less than 3 days to review the bill text, Members submitted more than 600 amendments to the bill. But the Rules Committee, with very little input, made in order only 261; and of that number, only three Republican amendments were given individual debate time on the floor, with all other Republican amendments being considered en bloc. Not only did Members have little opportunity to write this bill, but they also had almost no opportunity to fix its flaws.

I could go on about the danger of passing massive bills like this out of regular order, but for now I will focus on this particular issue. This provision preventing funds from going to Chinese military entities and persons of concern was submitted as a part of multiple Republican amendments to the Rules Committee, but none of these amendments were made in order. I fail to see how amendments limiting taxpayer funds from going to China isn't relevant to a bill about competitiveness with China.

Democrats' failure to include similar language in the COMPETES Act is an unfortunate example of an unwillingness to be strong on China and protect our national security. But we have a chance to rectify that now.

Madam Speaker, surely we can all agree that we shouldn't be sending taxpayer dollars to Communist leadership in China. They are already stealing our discoveries and using them to surpass us economically and militarily. We are spending the time, money, and effort to plant the seeds of new technologies, but China is the one harvesting the crop.

We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to pass legislation to improve U.S. technology and to set us up to be globally competitive for the coming decade.

The Science Committee has spent 2 years preparing for this opportunity. Working together, Republicans and Democrats held meetings with stakeholders, conducted in-depth hearings, and individually marked up more than a dozen bills to strategically scale-up America's research and development capacities.

Those bills all passed out of committee unanimously, and many passed across the floor with strong bipartisan support. They double down on investment in basic research at the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy Office of Science and National Labs, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

They also direct the creation and regular review of a national science and technology strategy, as well as improving STEM education and regional research opportunities.

The Science Committee bills are targeted to the areas where government investment is most needed and will give us the biggest reward. We ensure our approach is strategic, focusing on the technologies of the future like quantum sciences, artificial intelligence, and advanced manufacturing. We will keep America competitive and secure and help create good jobs here at home.

This legislation should be the foundation for the conference legislation, not the COMPETES Act, which is more of a climate change bill than a technology bill, and not the bill formerly known as USICA, which is a grab-bag of special interest provisions cobbled together into a Franken-bill.

There is a lot of chaff to separate from the wheat of this bill, but I believe we can come to smart, consensus policy through the conference. The Science Committee worked together to pass strong bipartisan legislation, and I think our process, as well as our end result, should serve as a model moving forward.

I am looking forward to getting to work and paring down these bills to the smart policies we need. It is urgent that we act now. Democratic leadership delayed the legislation for 9 months. I assure you the Chinese Communist Party isn't doing the same. Let's stop playing politics with something so important.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong and enthusiastic support of moving forward to conference the America COMPETES Act of 2022 with the Senate.

For those watching back at home, a conference committee is a joint committee between the House and Senate, a temporary ad hoc configuration to negotiate elements of a bill; and it is, frankly, the best of legislative action; Congress working for the American people, debating through democracy and deliberation to produce an end result.

As a Member of Congress, I often ask myself, I often pose the question, what will drive our economy for the next 10 years, 20 years, 30 years? What is our moonshot of the next 50 years? What can I do today to ensure that my neighbors in southeast Michigan are on a strong path to a successful future? What are the technologies and research investments that we can make today to ensure the success of the Nation for all of us?

The legislation that we are moving to conference today, the America COMPETES Act, tackles those big ques-

tions and secures our competitive edge for generations to come. This bill is an investment in our people. It reflects our ability to reach higher, to think deeper, and to invent solutions to not only today's problems but solutions for tomorrow's opportunities.

Americans are known for their hustle, for their ingenuity. My job, our job in Congress is to connect people to the tools to unlock a good life, to connected opportunity for everyone. And, frankly, the tools of the future are in this bill.

The COMPETES Act turbocharges America's scientific research and technological leadership while strengthening America's economic and national security at home and abroad. Even more, this bold investment in innovation ensures our top scientific minds have the tools to rise to the challenge of our climate crisis, from clean energy technologies to emissions measurement.

Not only does this bill look to the future, but it also mends the acute stressors that we are all feeling today due to our years of Federal underinvestment in science and innovation. A conference committee to discuss this, my friends, the America COMPETES Act tackles our supply chain vulnerabilities to make more goods in America and surges production of American-made semiconductors, chips, that which we invented here in this Nation, and in the 1990s were producing 40 percent of a crucial component in everything from cars to computers to medical devices. And the American people are ready; ready for investments that will spur innovative solutions to create jobs across the Nation, support American manufacturing, and build a strong and diverse STEM workforce ready to address the challenges we face as a Nation.

□ 1600

During President Biden's State of the Union Address, he called on Congress to get our innovation package to him for his signature. So we should be proud—I certainly am—to be here as we move to take the next step in this process. There is, frankly, no time to waste in getting the COMPETES Act to the President's desk.

As the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology, I am so proud of the range of bipartisan Science, Space, and Technology Committee provisions that have long been championed that are included in this package.

I am especially proud of the NIST for the Future Act, my legislation. This critical investment in NIST will ensure the agency and its employees have the resources they require to be a key part of bolstering our American technology enterprise: a resilient supply chain, small and midsize manufacturers being brought to the table to deliver for America, and the American workforce that compels them.

Since Michigan's 11th District sent me to Congress, I have been laser-focused on bringing innovation economy

solutions not only to folks in south-eastern Michigan but also, obviously, all across the United States.

We built a transformative piece of legislation from the ground up. The ranking member is right—bipartisan years of work on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to do such legislation. We heard from the science community. We heard from industry. We heard from academia. We heard from other stakeholders. They all told us the same thing: Don't leave Americans behind. Don't leave anyone behind based on geography or demographics. Bring the scientific research enterprise to all.

We are here, and we are here with a lot of hardworking people from the Science, Space, and Technology Committee staff. We have not had a conference committee since 2018, albeit for NDAA. Many people have not been able to be privy to such an action, and they deserve our gratitude. These are the folks writing the text late into the night based on our corrections, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee staff who work so hard and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee members.

The United States has long been a beacon of excellence in science and innovation, and it is long overdue that we restore Federal support for these vital initiatives, that we invest now and lead the world.

The House's and Senate's approaches may certainly have some differences, but we seek the same goal: to deliver for this Nation.

I am very confident that we will have a very productive conference process and hope to get the America COMPETES Act to President Biden's desk for signature very soon.

The U.S. has endless potential to compete globally in science and innovation. The America COMPETES Act provides the critical resources and tools we need to achieve that.

I look forward to working with my colleagues throughout conference to invest in America's most valuable resource, the talent of our people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, last month, the House passed the COMPETES Act, better known as the Concedes Act, which was forced through this Chamber in a partisan fashion and lacked the policies needed to truly bolster our scientific infrastructure and combat threats from our foreign adversaries.

The hard work and the bipartisan collaboration of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee were left in the wake of partisan politics.

The House-passed Concedes Act let China off the hook very simply for failing to contain COVID-19. It failed to

ban funding to CCP-tied organizations. It failed to punish the CCP for its blatant human rights abuses. It failed to strengthen America's competitive edge over China.

Today, we have the opportunity to instruct conferees to bolster the language and actually stand up against Communist China.

That is why I support this motion to instruct. It will ensure that no entities identified as Chinese military companies operating in the United States are eligible to receive funds through the new technology directorate, the supply chain resiliency program that we set up through Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

We must put a stop to Communist China spreading misinformation, stealing our technology, and bolstering its economic advantages while weakening ours. The FBI and intelligence agencies have continually warned Congress about these same threats from Communist China.

China's investment in development, and not in basic research, implies that they are building their technological success on the backs of U.S.-funded basic research.

We have even seen the infiltration of Chinese influence in our university systems and academia on several different occasions at the top institutions of America. We must work to ensure that China cannot undermine our open system of research and development.

This time, let's support scientific discovery, advance American technology, and hold our foreign adversaries accountable, and let's not waste the American people's time again.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, the ranking member, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), has given us a motion to instruct, a negotiation that we will pursue in the conference to come.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, we are at a crucial moment in our Nation's history, and Congress has the chance to reinvigorate our economy and ensure that we can outcompete every other nation.

The America COMPETES Act will put us on a course to lead the pack in creating the strongest and most advanced economy of the 21st century. Today's actions move us one step closer to making this legislation a reality.

Over the past 40 years, America's manufacturing sector has lost market share to economic competitors like China. This decline in manufacturing, coupled with the COVID-19 pandemic, has led to severe supply chain disruptions across our economy that have raised prices for consumers.

As the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I would like to highlight several important provisions in the America COMPETES Act that will help reverse this trend, strengthen our economy, bolster our Nation's sup-

ply chains, and ensure that more critical goods are made right here in the United States.

The legislation invests \$45 billion in grants, loans, and loan guarantees to support supply chain resilience and manufacturing of critical goods, industrial equipment, and manufacturing technology right here in the U.S.

It also invests \$52 billion for the CHIPS for America Act, incentivizing private-sector investments in semiconductor fabrication. This funding will help eliminate disruptions in the semiconductor supply chain from abroad that have hurt American automakers, medical supply chain companies, and manufacturers of heavy machinery.

The bill invests \$3 billion to help build a domestic solar manufacturing supply chain so we can aggressively counter China's control of the solar chain that jeopardizes our energy security interests. The bill also keeps our electric grid secure and resilient in the face of evolving cybersecurity and physical security threats.

Madam Speaker, the America COMPETES Act also improves our medical product supply chain and strengthens our Strategic National Stockpile. During the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic, there were widespread shortages of essential medicines, medical supplies, and some personal protective equipment.

This legislation increases our domestic drug manufacturing base by expanding the use of advanced and continuous manufacturing practices. It also establishes a \$1.5 billion supply chain manufacturing pilot program that will help maintain domestic reserves of critical medical supplies. It creates a \$10.5 billion program that awards grants to States to expand or maintain a State strategic stockpile of products essential in the event of a public health emergency.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the America COMPETES Act will help innovate our wireless supply chain and network security by funding the deployment of cutting-edge technology and ensuring that next-generation mobile wireless networks and technologies are safe and secure from foreign adversaries.

Madam Speaker, for far too long, America has relied heavily on other nations to manufacture critical goods essential to our economy. That must come to an end as we work together to reinvigorate our manufacturing base and create new, good-paying jobs here at home.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Ranking Member LUCAS' motion to instruct.

This motion will agree with section 2502 included in USICA, which prohibits entities identified as Chinese military companies from receiving

funds through the new technology directorate, the supply chain resiliency program, the regional innovation program, or the Manufacturing USA program.

In other words, this motion ensures taxpayer dollars spent in this bill do not go toward the Chinese Communist Party.

On the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we spent several months working on a series of bipartisan competitiveness bills that we could have gone to conference with. Unfortunately, with little notice, we voted on a 3,000-page bill that was not bipartisan, did not include strong protections to safeguard U.S. investments from CCP, and provided \$8 billion for a climate slush fund that we have zero oversight over and China has already taken \$100 million from.

Republicans offered several amendments with similar language to that of Ranking Member LUCAS' motion to instruct in the Rules Committee, but unfortunately, the majority did not allow them to be considered on the House floor.

The CCP is watching us. Today, we have an opportunity to send a strong bipartisan and bicameral message: We are bolstering American competitiveness and national security to ensure we lead in the development and deployment of the technologies of the future.

It is imperative we have guardrails, such as Mr. LUCAS' motion to instruct, in order to ensure these investments do not fall into the hands of the CCP and to attain a true bipartisan, bicameral agreement.

I thank Ranking Member LUCAS for his leadership and his motion.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and allowing me to speak on this.

I think it is worth the wait to bring these important provisions together to the floor to work on a path forward and maybe a little hint of restoring regular order.

It is important that we invest in innovation for our future. And I would note not just the cutting edge, high-tech future developments that are so important in my State and in many others that are going to help keep us on the front lines, but it is also important to invest in legacy technology, legacy chips.

We had the manufacturing supply chain all over America halt for lack of chips that cost only a few pennies because it wasn't profitable for some to create the legacy chips moving forward. And I hope some of these billions will be invested in opportunities to ramp up that production. It happened very fast, and it will make a difference from automobiles to microwaves and washing machines.

I am proud of the work we have done in the Ways and Means Committee under the leadership of RICHIE NEAL to

develop pro-worker responsive efforts and deal with the Chinese challenge.

Now, because the benefits of trade are broadly understood and spread but the problems are localized, the impacts often hit individual communities. That is why our provision has a strong Trade Adjustment Assistance program. Sadly, it expired a year ago, setting us back, leaving people desperately in need of this help out of luck.

We have a very strong, carefully crafted provision that will help workers and communities alike with an updated, modernized Trade Adjustment Assistance program.

We hear a lot of concerns about China, and I share those concerns. Our provisions are tough on China.

For instance, we closed the de minimis loophole that allows 2 million packages a day to be imported into the United States directly to our consumers, uninspected in the main and evading tariffs. It is time for us to close that de minimis loophole.

I note that the Chinese give Americans \$7 of an exemption, and ours is \$800. The least we ought to do is close that de minimis loophole.

The trade title is strongly supported by American business and organized labor. We are dealing with a TSP and MTB that will improve global standards and strengthen American manufacturing.

The title is supported by AFL-CIO, American Alliance of Manufacturers, the autoworkers, machinists, electricians. People who want to build products in America are advantaged under this.

It meets workers' needs, bolsters America's ability to compete, and is attuned to what Americans want.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to the work with the committee moving this forward, and ultimately, its passage.

□ 1615

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for reminding us about the importance of legacy chips and the MTB. I also thank the previous gentlewoman from California for reminding us about Manufacturing USA, which was probably started under the Obama administration.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct from my colleague and Oklahoma delegation member, Mr. LUCAS.

Safeguarding our national security, improving our supply chain resiliency, and bolstering American innovation are things that we can all agree on. However, in the COMPETES Act, Democrats took these problems and drafted ineffective, partisan policies in response. As a member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and

Technology, we had previously advanced strong legislation to combat these very issues.

On top of this, when this legislation came to the House floor for a vote in February, Republicans in the House were denied the opportunity to provide input on these important issues through the restrictive processes of the majority.

While over 600 amendments were submitted, less than half of those were made in order by the Committee on Rules. Of the 600, there were a number that would have taken steps to address the ever-growing threat we face from the Chinese Communist Party and their affiliated companies operating in the United States.

This motion to instruct will ensure that the critical investments we are making in America's innovation don't fall into the hands of our foreign adversaries.

Democrats' failure to include similar provisions in the COMPETES Act exemplify their continued, weak policies on China that compromise our strategic advantage and our national security.

It is common sense that U.S. taxpayer dollars should not be lining the pockets of the Chinese Communist Party, and instead, should be used to strengthen our industries here at home. Investing in American companies will strengthen the economy while keeping the Nation safe.

Madam Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue. I encourage the adoption of the motion.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, we find ourselves in a competition to lead in the 21st century. And that is a competition that the United States cannot afford to lose, and if we do what we should do here, will not lose.

A month ago, Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping thought that America was in decline, that America could no longer lead the world, and that they could therefore simply overwhelm smaller states. They believed that they could undermine the rules-based order whenever they chose.

Well, this incredible global coalition, binding and getting us together, working with our allies, that President Joe Biden has put together to condemn Russia and support the Ukrainian people, has proven that their assertion is absolutely wrong. But the events of the past month have underscored the need to position America for this challenge on a long-term basis.

Therefore, it is absolutely critical that Congress get H.R. 4521 to the President's desk. It is an investment in science, innovation, and technology, which would allow us to excel in the global economy for decades, bolster our domestic industry, and create jobs for American workers.

Madam Speaker, I am proud that my bill, the EAGLE Act, serves as the foreign affairs division of America COMPETES. It bolsters our diplomacy to marshal a coalition of states to check the PRC's aggression, its theft of technology, its shirking of global rules, and its gross violation of human rights, of which we need to focus on.

And I know that if we put our minds to it, we can work together in a bipartisan and bicameral way to finalize this critical legislation and get it to the President's desk, and we must do it.

That is because our allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific are watching. They need our help to bolster international rules, combat the PRC's coercion, and address shared global challenges like climate change. And after what we have seen in Ukraine, the people of Taiwan are watching, to ensure that we deepen our economic ties, strengthen its defense, and create greater space for Taiwan globally.

Hong Kongers and Uyghurs are also watching to make sure we get this done because they urgently need the refugee protections that are in the COMPETES Act. They need Congress to send a message to Beijing that its genocide in Xinjiang, its destruction of Hong Kong's autonomy, and its lack of regard for human rights will not stand.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, we are lucky to have such a chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs here in the Congress.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, in a peewee sports competition, you can make the case that if you are competing, you are winning. But when it comes to global standing, energy independence, and economic security, there are no participation trophies. Our goal can't be to just compete. We have to dominate because if we are not winning in this area, we are losing. And if America loses, the world loses.

Unfortunately, this so-called COMPETES Act would place America on the loser's bench. I am baffled why, at a time when gas prices are skyrocketing from Putin's war in Ukraine, and more Americans than ever are facing economic instability, this majority is still laser-focused on a blind, green-energy political agenda when America needs a rational, domestic energy plan that results in reliable, affordable, and clean energy.

Our constituents are paying almost \$5 a gallon to fill their cars. Yet, I am hearing my Democrat colleagues suggest the solution is just to buy an electric vehicle. What a slap in the face to thousands of hardworking men and women that President Biden put out of their jobs by canceling pipelines and shuttering American mines, while turning to international adversaries like Russia, China, Iran, and Venezuela

to solve the energy and mineral crisis he created.

Madam Speaker, no, if we really want to win, we must unleash the full power of American energy and mineral development by processing permits, issuing leases, streamlining the regulatory process, and giving our own homegrown industries the ability to use our American resources. We can and we will do that safer, cleaner and faster than anyone else in the world.

Where China uses child and slave labor to mine minerals vital to batteries and computers, we can use state-of-the-art technology to access those minerals that are right here in the U.S.

Where Russia controls oil rights and uses it as political leverage, we can produce energy for our own people and be an exporter to our allies.

Madam Speaker, we have no other option than to win.

I urge my colleagues to give Americans the power to develop, innovate, and unleash our full potential. If you look around, Democrat strategies are proving to be losing strategies. Americans can't afford higher prices and more incompetence. Let's begin to put an end to the madness by passing this motion to instruct.

Madam Speaker, I encourage that.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). The gentlewoman from Michigan has 13¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 15 minutes remaining.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas reminds us, I am proud that Michigan is the destination where the combustion engine was invented and innovated, and very proud to be the destination where our workers are manifesting and innovating electric vehicles.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I confess, I cannot connect my friend from Arkansas' comments with this motion to instruct, but I won't take any time to refute these things.

Madam Speaker, manufacturing has long been a core strength of the American economy. But the decades-long decline of manufacturing jobs in the United States has cut off pathways to economic security for so many families across this country.

Passage of the America COMPETES Act will be a landmark investment in infrastructure, in clean technology, in innovation that will create and preserve high-quality jobs in communities across America, and advance U.S. competitiveness and drive long-term economic growth.

Disinvestment in American home-made products has also contributed to the severe supply chain disruptions during the coronavirus pandemic that have pushed up prices for so many American consumers. The America COMPETES Act will bolster supply

chains, ramp up domestic manufacturing of critical components, like semiconductors, and insulate U.S. workers and families from price volatility and help build their own economic resilience.

Part of the House-passed version is the National Secure Data Service Act, which will allow agencies to link together data collected through surveys, Federal program administration, non-governmental data sources to advance evidence-based policymaking. This will be a great boon for artificial intelligence and machine learning.

Also included in the COMPETES Act, is an amendment I cosponsored with Representative TRAHAN to increase investment in fusion energy, the holy grail for our climate and for world poverty.

The COMPETES Act bottom line gives the U.S. the competitive edge needed to maintain our global leadership in innovation and research.

Madam Speaker, I am not sure why my Republican friends felt the need to offer this motion in the first place. Of course, we all understand that the essential subtext of the COMPETES Act has been to strengthen our competitive position versus communist China or, to restate my friend from Arkansas, to put us in the dominant position to compete against communist China.

Of course, nothing in this landmark initiative in American research, in American innovation, in American manufacturing, American artificial intelligence or American chips is intended to be transferred to the PRC. So if this is meant to show that Republicans are tougher on China than Democrats, that is silly and untrue.

Together, we will fight China's human rights abuses. We will fight its cheating on trade. We will fight its autocratic, dictatorial government. And the COMPETES Act gives us the strength we need to do that today.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Chinese Communist Party poses a generational threat to the United States and our freedom-loving allies around the world.

They are brutally oppressing their own people. They are committing genocide against ethnic and religious minorities. They are expanding their military reach and carrying out territorial aggression against their neighbors. We cannot wait any longer to address these issues.

Madam Speaker, I stand before you, quite frankly, disappointed. We had a great opportunity here, and this bill that passed the House is not the bill. I am very hopeful we can get to a good place in our conference committee.

Unfortunately, the Democrat leaders chose not to work with Republicans to pass a substantive, meaningful bill to counter this malign influence. Instead,

they jammed the partisan COMPETES Act through the House.

The COMPETES Act, in my judgment, is a Trojan horse filled with unserious, dangerous, and wasteful provisions.

□ 1630

Those provisions include fringe, progressive priorities, like \$8 billion worth of taxpayer money into an unaccountable U.N. slush fund. This U.N. slush fund has already provided at least \$100 million directly to China, a country that this Congress, former Republican administration, and current Democrat administration have all agreed is committing genocide.

In fact, it is worse. The Xinjiang Province—you get this money to make solar panels and batteries in the Xinjiang Province where they commit genocide itself. That is not good for America and it is certainly not good for the U.S. taxpayer.

Secretary Kerry admitted before our committee that the CCP is using slave labor to make these green energy products—like solar panels and batteries—that could be used by this U.N. fund. In effect, the bill would fund their slave labor and prop up their forced abortions. We tried to stop this from happening—to stop U.S. taxpayers from funding slave labor in my motion to recommit, and shockingly, we were outright rejected by the Democrats.

The motion to recommit prohibited taxpayer money going to slave labor, genocide, and the Wuhan Lab, and every Democrat voted against that measure. This is a test of our time.

Madam Speaker, so I remain the eternal optimist and hopeful that this conference process will be able to rectify these glaring issues that I have outlined. We can start today by supporting this motion that will block billions of dollars going to the CCP military PLA companies and human rights abusers.

Congress owes it to the American people to pass a bill that takes this threat seriously. That includes tough export controls, outbound investment screening and funding for the CHIPS for America Act, which I introduced, to give us a competitive edge, bring manufacturing to the United States to make advanced semiconductor chips and protect our national security at the same time.

This is vitally important to our national security, and it keeps critical U.S. technology out of the hands of the Chinese military, like hypersonics. It ensures U.S. taxpayers are not subsidizing their genocide.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct. I hope we can all work together in a bipartisan manner on what could be the most important legislation of this Congress.

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

Madam Speaker, I join the ranking member in being optimistic because we

are in a conference committee negotiating the America COMPETES Act, we will get this CHIPS legislation done. Proudly, I have led 29 Democrats and 29 Republicans in endorsing the CHIPS Act legislation, so it will be bipartisan. It will get done for the American people, and we will solve some of our supply chain woes.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I am very proud of the efforts that have been made by the House to advance COMPETES, an act that is about investment; a bipartisan effort promoted with higher prioritization by the leadership of this House to address investment: investment in research, investment in workforce, investment in manufacturing.

It is so important that we are now investing in research as the COMPETES Act requires so that we create the next generation of product line and chips. It is important to invest in that pipeline of workers that will have those precision-oriented skills in an innovation economy that requires such precision. It is important that we retrofit our manufacturing centers so as to compete and compete effectively.

I am impressed by the fact that we have taken the strengths of so many committees and brought them into the forefront of COMPETES to make certain that we invest in the CHIPS for America Act. I have industries for microelectronics, and certainly the semiconductor industry that are hosted in the 20th Congressional District that I am honored to represent. They deserve and they require, more importantly, a partnership with the Federal Government. Those resources will be there with the passage of this bill as we bring together a consensus.

We will invest in that \$52 billion worth of investment for the chips industry, the CHIPS for America Act. We will make certain that a bill that I authored, the Micro Act, is incorporated in the context of COMPETES, and that will complement the provisions in CHIPS by making certain that we accelerate early stage microelectronics research to feed into the national semiconductor technology center.

It is so important to have that cutting-edge investment so that we can lead the world in innovation, and making certain also that we promote strong global leadership by positioning the interests and the values of our United States, not China, to win on the world stage, including with strong action to hold the PRC accountable for its trade abuses which hurt U.S. workers, and for its human rights violations.

The America COMPETES Act will elevate American leadership in the global arena, putting diplomacy first, strengthening our alliances, combating unfair trade practices, and standing up for our national values.

The COMPETES Act ensures that American goods are made in America

by American workers and boosts competition addressing supply bottlenecks, strengthening U.S. manufacturing, and lowering those kitchen table costs.

This is a measure that is all-inclusive. It is the boldest, strongest statement on competitiveness for America. It is the great strength of COMPETES that I hope will carry us now into an innovation economy with the workforce prepared to go, a research investment that gives us the vision and tethers that vision into future product lines and chips development, and that will allow for us to strengthen our manufacturing partnership. They require that assistance and they require our partnership.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to strongly support Mr. LUCAS' motion to instruct conferees on the American COMPETES Act.

The House-passed version of the bill should really have been called—as a number of my colleagues have mentioned—the American Concedes Act. Democratic leadership cobbled this legislation together from mostly partisan bills without Republican support, in stark contrast to what our colleagues in the Senate did.

As ranking member of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over China, I am deeply disappointed by the partisan nature and the substance, in many ways, of this House-passed bill.

Competing with China should not be a partisan issue. On every front, the Chinese Communist Party is aggressively challenging the free world and our belief that open societies and free markets, and, yes, rule of law are the way to a prosperous and equitable civilization.

After decades of inaction, it is time to reevaluate our basic approach toward engagement with China. The Democrats' bill doesn't do that. When Republicans attempted to amend the bill to make it better, the Democrats rejected virtually every one of those attempts.

I would like to highlight two particularly concerning omissions from the House bill. First, we should have adopted provisions to modernize and strengthen our relationship with Taiwan which, by the way, got bipartisan support in the Senate.

Second, we should also have used the opportunity to advance strong export control policies to ensure that our critical technologies do not advance the PRC's own drive for technological supremacy.

Moving forward, as we seek to bridge the gap between the House and Senate bills, let's have these three priorities in mind. First, the CCP, the Chinese Communist Party, is an adversary. No amount of cajoling or diplomacy is going to get them to drop their hegemonic ambitions. They want to be the top dog.

Second, the legislation must not include irrelevant pet projects like money for the U.N. climate slush fund.

Third, at a bare minimum, we must ensure that any new technology or grant funding doesn't end up going to China. A bill aimed at competing with the Chinese Communist Party that simultaneously funds their military modernization simply makes no sense.

Mr. LUCAS' motion to instruct would go a long way towards making sure that American tax dollars don't go to fund the Chinese Communist Party. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for her leadership, along with my colleague from Texas, Congresswoman JOHNSON, who chairs the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and the many, many committees that have worked on the COMPETES Act.

As an alum of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee and a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I could not be more ecstatic for America, for Houstonians, for Texans. To really take the words of President Biden that were said to us in his comment on the COMPETES Act: It is transformational investment in our industrial base as well as research and development. It will help drive not only the American economy, but the global economy. It will, in fact, bring more manufacturing jobs back, and, yes, we will use the terminology, it will reimagine not only the Midwest, but it will reimagine the Southwest, the East, the West, the North, and the South. It will reimagine opportunities for young people.

And the chips we have been waiting for, as indicated by the gentlewoman from Michigan, I know we will have the opportunity to really join in in a bipartisan way in conference for something that nobody disagrees with. In addition, this ugly thing called the supply chain that for a moment clogged the system, raised the prices, which still have not been stabilized, but we will have the opportunity to address that question as well by unclogging the seaways, by investing with the infrastructure bill in ports, and getting products where they need to go.

Let me also suggest that we will be able to build other companies, smaller companies. Small businesses will improve or be able to result in more investment. At the same time, this bipartisan legislation will create opportunities for the next generation and the next generation.

I hope as well that minority businesses, minority scientists, historically Black colleges will have the opportunity to be part of the COMPETES Act, which I know that they will. This idea that we have a distance between us as Republicans and Democrats has to be closed.

This is an American bill. This is a bill to say to China: We are not going to take, sitting down, the unfair competition that you exert on many of the inventions that actually are made right here in the United States. Take the age-old internet and what China has done in many instances.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support the COMPETES Act and it going to conference, and at the same time recognize that any issue dealing with China and the chips dealing with semiconductors will be addressed in conference, and, as well, we will get the job done. It is transformational and we can do no less than to invest in the great mountain of research and development in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the COMPETES Act ultimately, and to work with conference as we go forward on this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. I welcome this opportunity to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate bills. This is an opportunity to finally hold China accountable, and I hope we get to a strong work product that we can be proud of.

The House version of this bill, the COMPETES Act, truly is a nonstarter for House Republicans—no surprise—for both sides of the Senate as well, and actually for the American people—and that is my concern.

While it was messaged as legislation to combat the Chinese Communist Party's predatory practices, the trade provisions in the House bill did little to level the playing field with China, adding hurdles that would hurt American consumers and small businesses.

Instead, that bill actually discourages work during a workforce shortage by expanding and delinking the trade adjustment assistance from new trade opportunities. It adds red tape and narrows eligibility of trade programs like GSP and MTB. These are relief measures that we know help small businesses and manufacturers in the marketplace. The bill also exacerbates our supply chain crisis by making unvetted changes to de minimus; and it also fails to address the administration's lackluster effort to compete with China in the Indo-Pacific and around the world.

The Senate's bipartisan approach, while imperfect, addresses China, promotes small businesses of all sizes across our country, and more than anything, it empowers American consumers right here at home.

□ 1645

It offers a clean renewal of MTB, retroactively extends GSP, mandates a section 301 exclusion process with retroactivity, and does not include the Green New Deal wish list.

Let's work together on a final product that actually holds China accountable.

Madam Speaker, I reiterate my support and certainly urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I am prepared to close, and I believe I have the right to close, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

We have heard today, Madam Speaker, a commitment to act, a commitment to move into a conference, a commitment to get the America COMPETES Act done for the United States, CHIPS Act funding, investment in scientific research, and more. This is an exciting moment in this Chamber.

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

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

I thank my colleagues for their words of support for this motion.

As I said when we began this debate, we have a once-in-a-generation chance to strengthen U.S. science and technology and secure a place in the global economy. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has passed strategic, bipartisan legislation to do just that. Our bills double our investment in critical research and technology. They are a strong commitment to America's technological development.

There is no question that our bills should be the core of the final conferenced legislation. We can't afford to pollute these critical policies with partisan poison pills and throw away our deliberate, strategic approach for long-term growth in favor of the one-time spending spree in the COMPETES Act.

There is a difference between empty spending and making an investment. The COMPETES Act is empty, unfocused spending. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has passed targeted, bipartisan investments in research and technology. They will pay off in more jobs, a stronger economy, and a more secure homeland.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support that approach and to support guardrails to ensure that our taxpayer investments aren't going to Communist leadership in China. That is why this motion is so important.

This isn't a partisan issue. It has been part of Senator SCHUMER's legislative text on competitiveness from day one. That is because this is basic, commonsense policy, and I can't imagine that any of our constituents would disagree with that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to pass this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 6833; and

Passage of H.R. 6833, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 74, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—351

Adams	Crawford	Guthrie
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Harder (CA)
Aguilar	Crist	Harris
Allen	Crow	Harshbarger
Allred	Cuellar	Hayes
Amodoi	Curtis	Hern
Arrington	Davidson	Herrrell
Auchincloss	Davidson	Herrera Beutler
Axne	Davis, Rodney	Hice (GA)
Babin	Dean	Higgins (LA)
Bacon	DeFazio	Higgins (NY)
Baird	DeLauro	Hill
Balderson	DelBene	Himes
Banks	Delgado	Hinson
Barr	Demings	Hollingsworth
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Horsford
Bentz	DesJarlais	Houlahan
Bera	Deutch	Hoyer
Bergman	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Beyer	Doggett	Huizenga
Bice (OK)	Donalds	Issa
Biggs	Doyle, Michael	Jackson
Bilirakis	F.	Jackson Lee
Bishop (GA)	Duncan	Jacobs (CA)
Bishop (NC)	Dunn	Jacobs (NY)
Boebert	Ellzey	Jayapal
Bost	Emmer	Johnson (GA)
Bourdeaux	Eshoo	Johnson (LA)
Boyle, Brendan	Estes	Johnson (OH)
F.	Fallon	Johnson (SD)
Brooks	Feenstra	Jones
Brown (OH)	Ferguson	Jordan
Brownley	Fischbach	Joyce (OH)
Buchanan	Fitzgerald	Joyce (PA)
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Kahele
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Budd	Fletcher	Katko
Burchett	Foster	Keating
Burgess	Fox	Keller
Calvert	Frankel, Lois	Kelly (MS)
Cammack	Franklin, C.	Kelly (PA)
Carbajal	Scott	Khanna
Cárdenas	Fulcher	Kildee
Carey	Gaetz	Kilmer
Carl	Gallagher	Kim (CA)
Carson	Gallego	Kim (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Garbarino	Kinzinger
Carter (LA)	Garcia (CA)	Kirkpatrick
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	Krishnamoorthi
Cartwright	Gimenez	Kuster
Case	Gohmert	Kustoff
Castor (FL)	Golden	LaHood
Castro (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	LaMalfa
Cawthorn	Gonzalez (OH)	Lamb
Chabot	Gonzalez,	Lamborn
Cherfilus-	Vicente	Langevin
McCormick	Good (VA)	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Gooden (TX)	Larson (CT)
Cline	Gosar	Latta
Cloud	Gottheimer	LaTurner
Clyburn	Granger	Lawrence
Clyde	Graves (LA)	Lawson (FL)
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lee (NV)
Comer	Green (TN)	Leger Fernandez
Connolly	Greene (GA)	Lesko
Cooper	Griffith	Letlow
Costa	Grijalva	Levin (CA)
Courtney	Grothman	Lofgren
Craig	Guest	Long

Loudermilk	Panetta	Smucker
Lucas	Pappas	Soto
Luetkemeyer	Pascarell	Spanberger
Luria	Pence	Spartz
Lynch	Perlmutter	Stansbury
Mace	Perry	Stanton
Malinowski	Peters	Stauber
Malliotakis	Pfluger	Steel
Maloney,	Phillips	Stefanik
Carolyn B.	Pingree	Steil
Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Steube
Mann	Porter	Stewart
Manning	Posey	Strickland
Massie	Price (NC)	Swalwell
Mast	Quigley	Taylor
McCarthy	Raskin	Tenney
McCaul	Reed	Thompson (CA)
McClain	Reschenthaler	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Rice (NY)	Tiffany
McCollum	Rice (SC)	Timmons
McEachin	Rodgers (WA)	Titus
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Tonko
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Torres (CA)
McNerney	Rose	Turner
Meijer	Rosendale	Underwood
Meuser	Ross	Upton
Miller (IL)	Rouzer	Valadao
Miller (WV)	Roy	Van Drew
Miller-Meeks	Ruiz	Van Dуйne
Moolenaar	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Mooney	Rutherford	Vela
Moore (AL)	Ryan	Wagner
Moore (UT)	Salazar	Walberg
Moore (WI)	Scalise	Walorski
Morelle	Scanlon	Waltz
Moulton	Schiff	Wasserman
Mrvan	Schneider	Schulz
Mullin	Schrader	Weber (TX)
Murphy (FL)	Schrier	Webster (FL)
Murphy (NC)	Schweikert	Welch
Neguse	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Nehls	Sessions	Westerman
Newhouse	Sewell	Wexton
Norcross	Sherman	Wild
Norman	Sherrill	Williams (TX)
O'Halleran	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Overnolte	Sires	Wittman
Owens	Slotkin	Womack
Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Zeldin
Pallone	Smith (NE)	
Palmer	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—74

Barragán	Gomez	Roybal-Allard
Bass	Green, Al (TX)	Rush
Blumenauer	Huffman	Sánchez
Blunt Rochester	Jeffries	Sarbanes
Bonamici	Johnson (TX)	Schakowsky
Bowman	Kelly (IL)	Scott (VA)
Brown (MD)	Kind	Scott, David
Bush	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Butterfield	Levin (MI)	Speier
Casten	Lieu	Stevens
Chu	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Ciçilline	Matsui	Takano
Clark (MA)	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Clarke (NY)	McGovern	Tlaib
Cohen	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Correa	Meng	Trahan
Davis, Danny K.	Mfume	Trone
DeGette	Nadler	Vargas
Dingell	Napolitano	Velázquez
Escobar	Neal	Waters
Españillat	Newman	Watson Coleman
Evans	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Payne	Yarmuth
Garcia (TX)	Pressley	

NOT VOTING—6

Armstrong	Bustos	Fortenberry
Brady	Cheney	Hartzler

□ 1724

Mses. CHU, LEE of California, Mr. TRONE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Messrs. VARGAS, COHEN, Mrs. MCBATH, Messrs. MFUME, GREEN of Texas, SMITH of Washington, LIEU, TAKANO, BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. TRAHAN, Messrs. MEEKS, EVANS, THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mses. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and PRESSLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MOORE of Alabama, SCHNEIDER, CÁRDENAS, Mses. SEWELL, UNDERWOOD, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. JONES changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct 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 (Walorski)	Kahele (Takano)	Sánchez (Gomez)
Bilirakis	Kind (Beyer)	Scott, David
(Fleischmann)	Kinzinger	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	(Meijer)	Sessions (Babin)
Brooks (Green)	Kirkpatrick	Sires (Pallone)
(TN)	(Pallone)	Speier (Scanlon)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi	Steel (Overnolte)
Comer	(Beyer)	Strickland
(Fleischmann)	LaMalfa	(Takano)
Crist	(Palazzo)	Suozzi (Beyer)
(Wasserman	Lawson (FL)	Taylor (Carter
Schultz)	(Wasserman	(TX))
Cuellar (Pappas)	Schultz)	Thompson (MS)
Curtis (Stewart)	Mace (Rice (SC))	(Evans)
DeGette (Blunt	Manning (Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
Rochester)	McClain	Waltz (Mast)
Españillat	(Fitzgerald)	Wilson (FL)
(Correa)	Mrvan (Takano)	(Jeffries)
Harder (CA)	Newman (Beyer)	Wilson (SC)
(Gomez)	Owens (Stewart)	(Rice (SC))
Jayapal (Gomez)	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth (Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	(Wasserman	
(Jeffries)	Schultz)	
Joyce (OH)	Salazar	
(Garbarino)	(Gimenez)	

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) 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 recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 225, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—197

Aderholt	Budd	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Burchett	DesJarlais
Amodoi	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Calvert	Donalds
Babin	Cammack	Duncan
Bacon	Carey	Dunn
Baird	Carl	Ellzey
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Banks	Carter (TX)	Estes
Barr	Cawthorn	Fallon
Bentz	Chabot	Feenstra
Bergman	Cline	Ferguson
Bice (OK)	Cloud	Fischbach
Bilirakis	Clyde	Fitzgerald
Bishop (NC)	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Bost	Comer	Fleischmann
Brooks	Crawford	Fox
Buchanan	Crenshaw	Franklin, C.
Buck	Curtis	Scott
Bucshon	Davidson	Fulcher

Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger

NAYS—225

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
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow

Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
Barragán
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Blumenauer
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele

Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

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
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Armstrong
Brady
Bustos

Baird (Walorski)
Bilirakis
(Fleischmann)
Bowman (Meng)
Brooks (Green
(TN))
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Comer
(Fleischmann)
Crist
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Stewart)
DeGette (Blunt
Rochester)
Españillat
(Correa)
Harder (CA)
(Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Joyce (OH)
(Garbarino)

Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Cheney
Fortenberry
García (IL)

Kahele (Takano)
Sánchez (Gomez)
Scott, David
(Jeffries)
Sessions (Babin)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Strickland
(Takano)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Carter
TX))
Thompson (MS)
(Evans)
Trone (Beyer)
Waltz (Mast)
Wilson (FL)
(Jeffries)
Wilson (SC)
(Rice (SC))
Yarmuth (Beyer)

Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Hartzler
Smith (MO)
Spartz

Kind (Beyer)
Kinzinger
(Meijer)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi
(Beyer)
LaMalfa
(Palazzo)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Mace (Rice (SC))
Manning (Beyer)
McClain
(Fitzgerald)
Mrvan (Takano)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Stewart)
Roybal-Allard
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Salazar
(Gimenez)

Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries

Kind (Beyer)
Kinzinger
(Meijer)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi
(Beyer)
LaMalfa
(Palazzo)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Mace (Rice (SC))
Manning (Beyer)
McClain
(Fitzgerald)
Mrvan (Takano)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Stewart)
Roybal-Allard
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Salazar
(Gimenez)

Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
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
Malliotakis
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters

Kind (Beyer)
Kinzinger
(Meijer)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi
(Beyer)
LaMalfa
(Palazzo)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Mace (Rice (SC))
Manning (Beyer)
McClain
(Fitzgerald)
Mrvan (Takano)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Stewart)
Roybal-Allard
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Salazar
(Gimenez)

Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
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
Malliotakis
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters

Kind (Beyer)
Kinzinger
(Meijer)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi
(Beyer)
LaMalfa
(Palazzo)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Mace (Rice (SC))
Manning (Beyer)
McClain
(Fitzgerald)
Mrvan (Takano)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Stewart)
Roybal-Allard
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Salazar
(Gimenez)

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1735

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the motion to recommit was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)
Bilirakis
(Fleischmann)
Bowman (Meng)
Brooks (Green
(TN))
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Comer
(Fleischmann)
Crist
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Stewart)
DeGette (Blunt
Rochester)
Españillat
(Correa)
Harder (CA)
(Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Joyce (OH)
(Garbarino)

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

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 193, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—193

Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
García (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

Harshbarger	Mast	Scalise
Hern	McCarthy	Schweikert
Herrell	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Hice (GA)	McClain	Sessions
Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Simpson
Hill	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Hinson	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Hollingsworth	Meijer	Smucker
Huizenga	Miller (IL)	Spartz
Issa	Miller (WV)	Stauber
Jackson	Moolenaar	Steel
Jacobs (NY)	Mooney	Stefanik
Johnson (LA)	Moore (AL)	Steil
Johnson (OH)	Moore (UT)	Steube
Johnson (SD)	Mullin	Stewart
Jordan	Murphy (NC)	Taylor
Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Tenney
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Keller	Norman	Tiffany
Kelly (MS)	Obernalte	Timmons
Kelly (PA)	Owens	Turner
Kim (CA)	Palazzo	Valadao
Kinzinger	Palmer	Van Drew
Kustoff	Pence	Van Dyne
LaHood	Perry	Wagner
LaMalfa	Pfluger	Walberg
Lamborn	Reed	Walorski
Latta	Reschenthaler	Waltz
LaTurner	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Lesko	Rodgers (WA)	Webster (FL)
Letlow	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup
Long	Rogers (KY)	Westerman
Loudermilk	Rose	Williams (TX)
Lucas	Rosendale	Wilson (SC)
Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Wittman
Mace	Roy	Womack
Mann	Rutherford	Zeldin
Massie	Salazar	

NOT VOTING—6

Armstrong	Bustos	Fortenberry
Brady	Cheney	Hartzler

□ 1747

Mrs. WAGNER changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I missed all votes on 3/31 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 98, “nay” on rollcall No. 99, “yea” on rollcall No. 100, “yea” on rollcall no. 101, and “yea” on rollcall No. 102.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Kahele (Takano)	Sánchez (Gomez)
Bilirakis	Kind (Beyer)	Scott, David
(Fleischmann)	Kinzinger	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	(Meijer)	Sessions (Babin)
Brooks (Green)	Kirkpatrick	Sires (Pallone)
(TN)	(Pallone)	Speier (Scanlon)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi	Steel (Obernalte)
Comer	(Beyer)	Strickland
(Fleischmann)	LaMalfa	(Takano)
Crist	(Palazzo)	Suozi (Beyer)
(Wasserman)	Lawson (FL)	Taylor (Carter
Schultz)	(Wasserman)	(TX))
Cuellar (Pappas)	Schultz)	Thompson (MS)
Curtis (Stewart)	Mace (Rice (SC))	(Evans)
DeGette (Blunt)	Manning (Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
Rochester)	McClain	Waltz (Mast)
Espaillet	(Fitzgerald)	Wilson (FL)
(Correa)	Mrvan (Takano)	(Jeffries)
Harder (CA)	Newman (Beyer)	Wilson (SC)
(Gomez)	Owens (Stewart)	(Rice (SC))
Jayapal (Gomez)	Roybal-Allard	(Wasserman
Johnson (TX)	(Wasserman)	Yarmuth (Beyer)
(Jeffries)	Schultz)	
Joyce (OH)	Salazar	
(Garbarino)	(Gimenez)	

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York) laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I write to inform you that I have notified Texas Governor Greg Abbot of my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, effective today at 11:59 PM EST.

It has been a profound honor to represent the people of the 34th Congressional District of Texas for the last nine years, and my distinct pleasure to serve under your leadership.

Please let me know if I can be of assistance during this period of transition.

Sincerely,

FILEMON VELA,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

Hon. GREG ABBOTT,
Governor of Texas,
Austin, TX.

DEAR GOVERNOR ABBOTT: I write to inform you that I am resigning my position as the U.S. Representative for the 34th Congressional District of Texas, effective today at 11:59 PM EST.

It has been a profound honor to represent the people of the Rio Grande Valley of Texas for the last nine years.

Please let me know how I can be of assistance during this transition.

Sincerely,

FILEMON VELA,
Member of Congress.

SUPPORTING CAP ON INSULIN PRICES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

In America, a unit of insulin costs almost \$100. I paid \$348 for a vial. Across the border in Canada, it costs \$12 for the same insulin.

This enormous price difference causes diabetics to take drastic steps to survive. They ration their insulin to make it last. Some of them stop taking it for days to save money. These are life-threatening financial decisions.

As a diabetic myself, I know the importance of insulin to daily life. This boot on my foot is not a fashion choice. It is for a diabetic ulcer that I have been fighting for 8 months, and I have had seven in 10 years. I am one of the more than 37 million diabetics in America.

If we can cap insulin payments to \$35 per month, it saves lives. That is why we need the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF RICHARD ROY KELLEY, M.D.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of Richard Roy Kelley, M.D., a true “keiki o ka aina,” “a child of the land,” son of Hawaii, just lost to us at age 88.

Doc Kelly was born to Hawaii’s original hoteliers, Roy and Estelle Kelley, founders of Outrigger Hotels and Resorts. He grew up in their Waikiki ho-

tels, graduated from Stanford and Harvard, and practiced in Honolulu before helming Outrigger through its second generation.

On Doc’s watch, Outrigger expanded throughout Hawaii and the Pacific into a world-famous iconic beach resort brand; success for any life.

But Doc Kelley did far more. He pioneered true cultural tourism in “Ke Ano Wa’a,” or “the Outrigger Way,” through which the entire lifeblood of each property embraces and embodies its special values and place. He led the World Travel and Tourism Council and advised our own Travel and Tourism Council. And he endlessly loved Hawaii and his “‘ohana,” “family,” and never stopped giving back.

Richard “Doc” Kelley, an amazing and unforgettable life. From all of us to you and yours, mahalo, and aloha.

CHRISTIAN NATIONALISM IS A DANGEROUS IDEOLOGY

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a dangerous ideology threatening our democracy: White Christian nationalism.

Most Members of Congress don’t even know what it means, but experts from the Freedom From Religion Foundation and the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty have studied it for years, and their new report shows this movement was at the heart of the January 6 insurrection.

White Christian nationalism fuses Christianity with a rigid view of civic life, a view that true Americans are White, native-born, and conservative. On January 6, it was the connective tissue that tied disparate groups together and propelled them to action.

It is infecting our government, from Members of Congress and top officials in the previous administration to the wife of a Supreme Court Justice, whose messages to the President’s Chief of Staff leading up to the insurrection smacked of White Christian nationalism.

Thankfully, good Americans, people of faith and nonbelievers, are standing up to this violent ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Members of Congress to educate themselves about White Christian nationalism and reaffirm the separation of church and State.

SUCCESS OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURING HELPS WORKING FAMILIES

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, from day one, House Democrats have been working with the Biden administration to build a stronger and more secure future for the American people. That is why we recently passed the COMPETES Act to fix our national supply chains, boost competition, and strengthen U.S. manufacturing.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit Haas Automation in my district in Oxnard, California. Haas manufactures over 90 percent of all American-made precision manufacturing tools and is the last standing major American manufacturer of the machines

that are essential to most manufacturing in America.

We are working to ensure American manufacturing companies like Haas can continue to compete globally and continue to thrive.

That includes ensuring a level playing field with foreign competitors and ensuring U.S. manufacturers have access to adequate supplies of essential semiconductor chips.

That is why we must get the America COMPETES Act across the finish line, because the success of American manufacturing will lead to the success of American working families.

□ 1800

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JACK LUMPKIN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Georgia golfing legend, Jack Lumpkin.

Jack was a master at the game of golf and a pillar of what Sea Island and Glynn County is today. When it came to the game, Jack was unparalleled in his understanding and knowledge. He spent his life coaching others and was recognized for his teaching ability numerous times.

In 1995, Jack was named PGA National Teacher of the Year, and he was named a Top 50 Golf Teacher in America every year since 2000.

I will always remember Jack teaching students at the first tee box at the Golf Performance Center, which is now known as Lumpkin's Tee. Jack would take his students to where the Golf Performance Center now stands because the area naturally blocked out the north wind coming from the ocean.

It was Jack's ideas, passion, and prowess that made this center possible.

My prayers are with his family, friends, and the staff of Sea Island, as well as those that he mentored.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the end of Women's History Month and highlight the contributions of women in my community:

From education leaders like Joliet-native, Margaret Haley, a teacher who led the Chicago's Teachers Federation to become the largest women's union in the country by 1900; and

Katharine Lucinda Sharp of Elgin, a founder of the Illinois Library Association who ran the Midwest's first library school;

To entertainers like Plainfield-native, Melissa McCarthy, whose comedy has graced our screens for two decades; and

Businesswomen, like Mary Foot Seymour of Aurora, who founded the Business Women's Journal, a publishing company led entirely by women.

These are just a few of the amazing women who have made a mark on my Northern Illinois community and our country, and I am proud to honor them.

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the passage of the Affordable Insulin Now Act and urge the other body to swiftly take up the bill.

Millions of Americans depend upon insulin every single day, but too many are forced to ration or cut back on their other essential needs just to pay for the medication that keeps them alive.

In Ohio, the cost of insulin can cost hundreds of dollars a month, and the pens that are used can cost between \$45 and \$600. It is simply unaffordable. Capping the price of insulin at \$35 a month means no longer will families have to choose between grocery and rent or their own lives. No longer should a diabetic be forced to ration out their injections just to ensure they have enough until next month.

Congress must act to pass the Affordable Insulin Now Act. Let's save people real money, improve their lives, and afford them the dignity that they deserve.

HORNET GIRLS ARE STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, what a great honor for me to be here today and pay tribute to the fighting Hornets of East Hartford High. The girls' team has won the State championship in the State of Connecticut for the first time in the school's history.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, Maureen Rodgers ushered in modern-day girls' basketball at then-Penney High School. The crown today is that these young women demonstrated that vision and brought home the State championship to East Hartford, Connecticut.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN DON YOUNG

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the dean of this House, Congressman Don Young, and to remember him from a perspective of far-reaching diversity and love of the institution.

I offer my deepest sympathy to his wife, his family, his extended family, and all of the people of Alaska and all of the people of the Nation.

Everyone who has offered a word of salute to Congressman Young emphasizes his 49 years, but most of all, his love of getting the job done—getting something done.

And, of course, when I was having the privilege of being in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I could always be reminded of that voice "regular order." And often you wanted to just do what Don Young said: Regular order. Gavel it down. But, again, he did so because of a respect for this institution.

I thank him for all of the introductions to Alaska that he made and, really, all of the work for the Alaskan people. No matter who they were, where they lived, in far reaches or inner cities, Don Young represented the State so ably.

I am grateful to have spent just a small amount of time—two decades—with Don Young in the House. And he will be remembered, and we will be reminded of what love of the institution truly means; unselfish commitment, and the commitment to work and get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the late Congressman Don Young. I thank him for teaching us how to get the job done.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

PARTISAN GAMES—SUPREME COURT JUSTICE THOMAS

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the latest partisan games being pushed by the radical left is the call for Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas to recuse himself from certain cases or face impeachment.

These demands stem from an email and other digital private communications of Justice Thomas' wife to and from government officials at the time.

If it becomes the standard that an elected official or a judge or a commissioner or other government appointees can be attacked because of the views and political actions of a spouse, then everyone is fair game.

How many members of the Democratic Caucus would like to be held accountable for the politics or actions of their spouse? How many governors, State legislators, or judges at any level would be able to withstand an assault based on the beliefs of their husband or wife? No good will come of this effort.

There are those who argue that the radical left wants such a toxic environment. The feeling is that those who

wish to radically transform America know that they are facing a harsh verdict from the American people come this November. These activist partisans are willing to literally throw our country into a frenzy of hate, suspicion, and personal vendetta in order to divert attention from the failure of their policies.

I pray that the members of the Democratic Caucus making these extremist demands are ignored and that statesmen can take the lead. But if, once again, the Democrat leadership is so beholden to the extremist fringe that they send us into such a fight, you will not succeed.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me the time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight is going to be a tricky presentation, and I want to apologize immediately to those who have to try take down our words. But tonight, I am going to actually try to focus on solutions.

Last week, I spent an hour behind this microphone begging our friends on the left, begging our Democrat colleagues to stop doing much of what they have been doing. And I demonstrated that it has been hurting people. Last year was miserable for the working poor, for the poor, for the middle class.

And in some ways, it is our own fault in this body because intellectually, this place is calcified—that is my word of the day. Because we see the math. We see the facts. And we have the folks lay out what is going to happen. But because it is already part of, particularly in this case, the left's dogma, we do it anyway. And then we act surprised here a year later when my community had 10.9 percent inflation last year.

Year over year, how many people is that crushing? And now we are seeing some data. And this is important; this isn't transitory. A number of the most powerful modelers in the economic world in this country are now starting to ring the alarm bells of both: We are heading towards a recession and that inflation may now be with us for decades because of how we have screwed things up in this place.

First, this is as of almost today, you have Goldman Sachs now saying there is a 27½ percent chance of a recession—not a slowdown, a recession, which means two quarters of negative GDP by the end of this year.

Citi is at 25 percent.

J.P. Morgan is still at 15, which were the numbers from last week.

These numbers have skyrocketed. If you and I looked at this three weeks ago, it was 9 percent.

Does anyone here actually care about people? Do you care about working men and women? Do you understand what a recession does to people? How long it takes to get your feet back underneath you? Let alone the head kick we are giving to the American public with inflation.

So here is my goal. I am going to race through just a boatload of slides here, and I am going to throw out concept after concept after concept. Some of them are marginal. Some of them you are going to go, Oh, that makes sense.

But the point is, there are actually solutions. If the left would ever allow us to offer a genuine amendment in committee, to actually have a genuine discussion and debate, maybe we could change some hearts and minds in this place, or just even enlighten some intellect around here. But that isn't what this place does.

So let's actually start to walk through the bill that a number of folks are so giddy about today.

I am fixated on diabetes because of what it does and the misery to parts of my district. I represent a Tribal community that is number 2 as a percentage of population who suffer from diabetes. Come to the reservation. I will introduce you to families that I have known where mom has her feet cut off.

But to tout the bill that was passed here today as a solution is an absolute fraud. You do realize the con job that the Democrats are touting here? And I am not sure it is purposeful. I don't think they spent time understanding.

First, you basically created a subsidy bill for Big Pharma. Congratulations. You didn't reduce the price. What you did is you created, functionally, \$20 billion of subsidy to buy down the price of insulin. And you bought it down with a fraud because you are doing a—well, we are going to pretend that the Trump administration's rule in regard to rebates is in effect, which it was never going into effect. So you made magic money again.

And at the same time, you just took away the pressure we could have done together to actually get a real solution on the price of insulin. And some of that solution could have been something as simple as the co-op that is in construction right now, that is saying they are going to bring \$30 a vial, \$55 a box—and a box is 5 vials—of insulin to market in a year.

So if we were actually doing solutions here, the Democrats' bill, working with Republicans, would have been, We are going to put it in the stack for licensing and permitting. We are going to put aside some money to make sure that they get their factory up and running in Virginia as soon as possible.

And, oh, by the way, this is substantially less expensive than the subsidized version that is going to cost society \$20 billion. And you are handing that to Big Pharma. Isn't that amusing?

I mean, amusing the speechifying here. And the Democrats' approach to helping people who can't afford their insulin is to blow up the market, screw up the incentives, and then screw up the actual solution. And the solution is coming.

Does anyone actually subscribe to something where they read?

And you have got to understand, we need to go—and the whole debate around diabetes, we have got to go much, much further.

Mr. Speaker, 31 percent of all Medicare spending is diabetes; 33 percent of all healthcare spending. Understand, in 29 years, the United States is scheduled to have about \$112 trillion of borrowed money in today's dollars.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of that is just Medicare, but if 31 percent of Medicare spending is diabetes, cure it. And you go, But, David, how would we do that?

Well, I have been to this floor a dozen times over the last 12 months saying the research is happening. The early numbers look good.

Guess what? It succeeded. Hey, the phase 1s worked. Now we are actually on another set of phase 1s where they are actually using CRISPR to tag the stem cell that has become an isolate cell to make it so you can do a bio-foundry. And it could be a production line, so it doesn't even need to come from your skin to get the stem cells.

□ 1815

Meaning, if we would get our reimbursement sets straight here, our licensing sets straight here, our incentives lined up. The modelers say in about 5 years you could actually be rolling out—the cure to type 1 is actually the easy part, it is the cure to type 2 which is much more difficult. We have to have a brutal conversation of nutrition support and maybe nutrition support that is healthy.

Encouraging our brothers and sisters in my Tribal communities, the lifestyles and things, to be ready to actually accept the cure. But the fact of the matter is it is here. So what did the Democrats just do? They did a subsidy bill for insulin that is going to cost \$20 billion. How about if they had taken that \$20 billion and put it into the price for getting this cure to market?

It is just an example we don't seem to get our heads around. The world works in incentives and disincentives. We have made it so bureaucratic and so expensive that we are in an incumbent protection racket here. It is not incumbent Members of Congress, it is incumbent bureaucracies, incumbent business models, and the disruptions like this that would end so much misery and also be the single biggest thing we can do to affect the debt in this country.

We applaud ourselves for voting through a bill that actually will have made things worse. If there is an economist in the room and you walk through saying, well, because you just functionally government-subsidized this, you just took away the pricing pressure to actually have the revolution of both the cost and the cure.

I am begging my brothers and sisters here to think. There is this incredible hope. They have already had the successes in the phase ones, and now the ability to actually tag it and make it

so you don't need to be on anti-rejection drugs. Think about what it means to the health of the country.

Why would I go to diabetes right after showing you that the projections of a recession at the end of this year are skyrocketing because you are heading in an approach where you are making a substantial portion of our population—making them available to participate in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to throw out a really uncomfortable subject for a second. I am the senior Republican on the Joint Economic Committee and we have been trying a little side project for almost a year. What makes people poor? What is the real cause of income inequality? And unlike the rhetorical crap virtue signaling that is said around here, we are actually starting to find out there are a lot of things, but health, education, things of that nature that we can affect are actually major precursors, then you look at the amount of the population that is in the lower quartiles that either they or their family or because they have someone who is horribly sick substantially because of renal failure or diabetes.

My other side of the argument is why this is moral to pursue. It also would end lots of misery. It would actually really help the poor. It actually might squeeze down income inequality. It is sort of the trifecta. Yet, I will do these presentations on how it works and that it would be amazing for economic growth, and if it truly brought more of our brothers and sisters to be able to participate in the economy, it would also be really good for inflation, too.

I have done this slide multiple times. I'm trying to sort of explain the mechanisms of a stem cell and you can now direct—think of it as a biofoundry mechanism, sort of like CRISPR. You can direct that stem cell to become an insulin-producing cell. In the previous slide you can walk through how you can actually do this in a fashion that it can be almost a factory production. So even beyond the personalized medicine concept.

Why this is so important is we are on the cusp of a revolution to make people's lives so much better—so much healthier. Instead, what we have done in this place over the last 12 months is we have set off inflation. We have set off crime. We have set off homelessness because of really, really bad policies. Lots of great virtue signaling. There have been beautiful speeches behind these microphones telling you how much we care and how we feel, and then the economics are just horrible.

Some more of the disruption that I believe would be great for the country—and the technology is already here, we just have to learn how to legalize it—is your ability to wear something on your wrist. This is one of my favorites. I am just going to walk you through a concept.

This is a breath biopsy. A couple versions of this out there think it

would be a couple hundred dollars, at most, and you could have functionally a medical lab in your medicine cabinet at home. Blow into it. Within a couple moments it tells you: Hey, guess what, you have a virus. It can then bang off your medical records, order your antivirals, and maybe Lyft or someone can drop it off at your house in a couple hours.

Would that make your life easier? Would that give you more time with your family and faster to get healed? Would it help crash parts of healthcare costs? Remember, three-quarters of that \$112 trillion is healthcare, it is Medicare. Healthcare is what is substantially bankrupting this country.

Do you know what the problem with that technology is? It is illegal. The fact of the matter is you would let this breath biopsy be able to order your antivirals, allow the algorithm—and the data says the algorithm is more accurate than those of us that are humans. I know that just hurt a bunch of people's feelings.

If you legalize the technology you could have a disruption in the price of healthcare. You could make this society—our country—dramatically more efficient and give us more time with our families and be healthy. It would be an economic virtuous cycle and a healthy one. It would just require us around here to actually have to deal with the avalanche of lobbyists that hate this technology. As I said before, we are sort of calcified intellectually around here, aren't we?

Mr. Speaker, now I want to talk about the heresy that is in President Biden's budget and the solutions. How many times have you gotten up here and seen the Speaker herself, multiple times—tax reform in 2017 was for the rich. No, it wasn't. CBO—more revenues came in. Corporate tax receipts leaped 75 percent after we reformed the tax code a couple years ago.

The fact of the matter is—what we call receipts in Ways and Means, revenues as most people would think of—coming into in government went up dramatically. Why that was so important is that 2018 and 2019 were our most successful years in modern economic history of poor people getting less poor, the middle class doing better, income inequality shrinking, food insecurity shrinking.

Minority populations had the biggest movement ever in U.S. history in getting less poor, getting wealthier. That income inequality gap shrank because we got the tax incentives correct. But because it was Republicans that did it, there is this running away from it—we have seen—great job, guys. Think about what has happened to this country in 1 year.

You are poorer today than you were 1 year ago. The fact of the matter is the setting off of inflation—God knows some of the other things that have gone on and we are going to touch on them—we are poorer today than we were 1 year ago. Yes, there was COVID.

We stood behind these microphones a year ago and said, you don't want to keep dumping money the way you are doing, you are going to set off inflation. They told us to go jump in the lake. Congratulations, they did it.

Now some of the economists are telling us a recession by the end of the year, oh, and maybe 10 years of an inflationary cycle before we can squeeze it out of the system.

Once again, if you actually look at the charts, it was actually working women that exploded. This big of a movement here—I know this chart doesn't express it—that type of steep curve increasing is remarkable. It is just remarkable in what happened after tax reform.

It was actually working women, substantially those from minority populations, that had just remarkable increases in income. They are the ones that also got crushed during the way we approached the pandemic. Anyone that tells you, oh, it was this huge give-away of money.

Well, it is sort of amazing because it was the second and the third highest receipts or revenues in 2018 and 2019. You got to remember there was a little bit of a con in 2017 because the expensing went in—you could expense in the last quarter before the tax reform. So the fourth quarter of 2017 you could begin expensing. So this actually had some of the economic growth effects pulled into the previous year—I know I am geeking out a bit—but it continued.

One of the reasons we actually economically held up pretty well is the Democrats haven't been able to repeal the 2017 tax reform. And I know this slide is a little hard to see, but it is the best one we could put together in the short timeframe. Guess what? We crossed over \$4 trillion in revenues and receipts.

If you go back—think about that, it was only a couple years earlier that we were at \$3.3 trillion. You understand, that is like a \$700 billion increase in receipts in a time when the Democrats told us we had eviscerated the tax code and gave it all away. At some point the calculator does tell the truth.

So back to our earlier thesis. Getting the tax system correct is amazing for the economics. This is the other side of the question I want to ask. How many here believe growth is moral? I will try to argue over and over that economic growth creates opportunity, and those opportunities driven by that growth is moral. I wish I could just get us to focus on—that growth also is a way we survive the debt bubble that is expanding like an alligator mouth. Here is the size of our economy and here is the scale of the debt.

You do understand that CBO basically says in 9 years, every single year just our interest payment will be \$1 trillion. That is where we are heading. Here is a crazy thought. If I needed to tap down inflation today but I wanted to do it by not solely having the Federal Reserve do monetary policy, which

is squeezing cash out of the system—remember, inflation is what, too many dollars chasing too few goods. You have the monetary side of inflation pull the dollars out of the economy. The other side is to make more stuff.

This year, expensing. The reality of it—tax reform—it was the expensing that drove much of the economic expansion, the investment in productivity, it goes to 80 percent this fiscal year and then drops down I think to 60 percent the next year. Do a mechanism where you add a bonus.

If you say: Business, if you are willing to take some of that cash functioning out of the system and go invest it in productivity capital, buy a new plant, put in new equipment, do things that will make it so you can pay workers more. We make more stuff because when we have more stuff you knock down inflation because it is now the number of dollars divided by numbers of stuff. Crazy idea.

□ 1830

Do a tax adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, say we are going to give you a bonus on your expenses to encourage you to take that money out of liquidity and buy things that make us more productive as a country. It is a win-win, and it has the benefit of being a long-term benefit to society.

It is sort of. We have been working on this. This is just as a thought experiment. And it may not be brilliant, but it is more the concept of right now. Today there are too many dollars chasing too few goods. Then create a deal with business in America saying, Hey, if you take some cash, set it aside, functionally, ah, screw it, and you are going to put it into new equipment that makes it more efficient so you can have more goods, better transportation, better supply chains, that is what we want to incentivize instead of trying to buy things today and shove them in a warehouse because you are worried the price is going to go up tomorrow.

This is the type of thought experiments policy we should be pursuing, Mr. Speaker, if you need to knock down inflation but you want to do it by growing an economy.

Instead, around here, we are going to sit around on our backsides and let the Federal Reserve basically squeeze us out and put many people through months and months and months of recessionary misery because that is how we are going to knock down inflation.

Another part of the thought experiment: I have some new areas—if I am blessed enough to represent in the coming cycle—and we did some polling. And they came back that crime is their number one issue.

I went on a ride-along with a sergeant who is actually a friend. He was showing me neighborhoods saying, You do realize the homelessness in these neighborhoods has doubled in a year. Doubled. He is explaining to me that someone now can get high for a frac-

tion of the cost they could a year ago. Every single one of those are what we call knockoff effects, second-degree, third-degree effects.

Do you all remember your high school economics class?

You opened up the borders. What did you think was going to happen?

My community of Phoenix is flooded with narcotics. As a matter of fact, we just had a bust a couple months ago. There was enough fentanyl to kill every single resident in Arizona.

So the compassion that this administration and Speaker PELOSI wanted to show for the border, thank you, because you are killing my neighbors.

The homelessness—I don't believe the Phoenix market is the only area that is seeing incredible increases in homelessness. The crime—go on to the city of Phoenix's heat map and click, click, click, and you can see the expansion of the crime and where it is moving and the number of overdoses.

The fact of the matter is when you screw up a policy, then you need to think through the knockoff effects.

You screwed up the border policy.

How much misery did you bring to society?

Remember, we have done a number of presentations.

What are the two ways you make the working middle class or the working lower class poorer?

Inflation. We are doing a great job at that. And you flood the marketplace with people with similar skill sets. So if you are that individual who may not have finished high school, but you are a good drywall and you are busting your backside—and it is hard work; I hung drywall as a young man—we just flooded the marketplace with people of similar skill sets.

Does anyone around here own a basic economics book?

So let's go to a couple other things. So the principle there is, get the border policy right because there is this incredible irony—legal immigration for individuals with specific talent sets that we actually need in this society, the young man who just got his Ph.D. at Arizona State University and is leaving because the State Department's ability to process visas and ability to be immigration has functionally become nonexistent in the last 2 years. But over here, a couple million cross the border.

Does anyone see just the weird irony of the Democrats' policies of, they hurt?

I don't think they were meant to hurt. I think they had the virtue signaling quality of sounding compassionate, but that is not what has happened.

So let's actually walk through a couple of things that are actually additional solutions.

How many times do we talk about supply chains?

And you have seen the latest data. It basically says—and I am not going to argue with it because I haven't had a

chance to break down the numbers—half of inflation is we spent too damn much money. But half of inflation is second degree knockoff effects in supply chains.

So we just did the transportation bill. The transportation bill was substantially green oriented, very little of the money actually went to roads and bridges. None of it actually went to disruptive technologies.

But there are ideas like this, where this was some SpaceX engineers who are out raising capital to build this, where you would actually have autonomous trains. So you pull a container off, stick it on one of these, the autonomous lorry right underneath it on the track drives it to the warehouse it is supposed to be dropped off at.

So you are telling me we have a crisis in truck drivers in the Alameda Corridor outside L.A. Our ability to use technology, why didn't we incentivize this sort of thing?

But do you want to know what the Democrats chose to incentivize in their Build Back Better, Mr. Speaker?

It wasn't creative things to make us more productive as a society. It was ideas like this: in their legislation it is illegal for the ports to automate.

Huh?

But they just told us that they were trying to fix the supply chains—except for the numbers of giveaways to the unions they put into their legislation that you can't automate the ports.

So on one hand, Mr. Speaker, you have breakthrough technology that says that we think we have a way to move these containers. And then the next thing that the brain trust around here does policy-wise is, we are going to make it illegal for you to do the automation that would move the supply chains that you are telling us is half the inflationary spike.

There are solutions. Stop putting up these impediments and start embracing the technology to fix the problem.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. So in the President's proposal, in the Democrats' proposals, they want to tax the rich more. The new President Biden's budget, I think, has 36 new taxes in it. But here is the great irony. Okay. So they want to do this one tax where they want to functionally tax unrealized capital or unrealized gains which is the taking—it will be ruled unconstitutional. But it is an interesting concept. We want to make a simple proposal that something both Republicans and Democrats might agree upon, stop subsidizing the rich. We have come here to this floor a couple of times and shown there are \$1.4 trillion every 10 years that the left subsidizes the rich.

And so what do the Democrats do?

They say: We need to tax the rich more.

Okay. And then they put in Build Back Better you can make \$800,000 a

year and we are going to hand you \$125,000 of tax credits—not tax deductions—credits.

Does anyone see the lunacy going on here?

So the virtue signaling is rich people aren't paying enough, and then over here we are going to give them 1 trillion-plus dollars in subsidies, and then they are going to add more in their Build Back Better for more rich people to have more subsidies. It is just infuriating.

Does anyone actually read this stuff? Does anyone own a calculator?

Mr. Speaker, you start to see the numbers.

I have a number of these slides here, and the point is really simple: policy after policy, if you can afford your fourth \$6-million house on a beach somewhere, do you deserve subsidized flood insurance?

But all through this government there are items like that where we wink and nod, we say we are going to tax rich people more, and then we are handing out massive subsidies.

As a Republican, I want to cut spending. You say you want more revenues, Mr. Speaker. Great. Stop putting through the Tax Code, regulatory code, these programs of wink, wink, nod, nod, a bunch of subsidies to people who write checks.

So, Mr. Speaker, you have had a number of, particularly, Republicans who have come behind the microphone and said: You canceled the Keystone pipeline. You made it really hard to put new land into production for pulling hydrocarbons out.

That is actually not the big thing that the left did. What the left did are things like this where the Securities and Exchange Commission is functionally adding new rules that if you invest in hydrocarbons or you are a pension system or these, you are going to have to fill out paperwork to explain your effect on global warming.

What are your effects on carbon?

They functionally did what we call, they screwed up the capital stack. So you could have a natural gas field that was substantially shut down when prices collapsed during the pandemic. It is ready to go, but you need a bunch of capital to put it back into production.

And where do you go to get a loan, Mr. Speaker?

The Democrats did something brilliant, if the goal was to make us much poorer and dependent on foreign countries' hydrocarbons like Venezuela. They said, Okay. We can do the regulatory side, by that is a little bit obvious, but if we make it so no one can get capital to actually put these fields into production, they have succeeded.

Do not let someone try to con you, Mr. Speaker, that what you are paying at the gas pump today and what you had to pay for your heating bill yesterday happened because of Putin's invasion. Natural gas prices exploded last September, October.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember this room being full of people wanting to talk about how we are going to survive the winter heating bills?

That was because if this. It didn't just happen.

But my proposal is, okay. I am fascinated with the use of natural gas. Our friends on the left, our brothers and sisters on the left, say, But, David, yes, it may burn about half the CO₂ emitting as coal, but there is methane.

Let's see if I can find this slide. The technology that is out there to basically gobble up methane—and maybe this works, maybe it doesn't work, but the fact that the technology exists and it has been scientifically proven to work, why wouldn't we pursue that saying: If you could get your natural gas out—because remember, President Biden just promised we are going to ship a bunch of liquified natural gas to Europe, except we don't really have the production right now and you can't get capital for it and the left is going to protest leakage from methane. Well, it turns out you can take clay, a copper oxide—so it is kitty litter. Think about that. It is a cheap solution to absorb that methane.

Why wouldn't we bring the brain trusts around here and say, We need the natural gas desperately. Some are worried about the methane bleed. Fine. Let's find a solution. It turns out there may be a really inexpensive one.

Why don't we invest and pursue it?

There are solutions.

Instead, around here, it is the Malthusian economics of let's just shut it down and see how long people are willing to live in poverty and misery.

The transportation bill again: What is one of the most powerful things you can do to move traffic in urban areas and suburban areas, Mr. Speaker?

Technology. It turns out if you actually care about the environment and you want to move more traffic, invest in the technology that synchronizes the stoplights that tell you when school is out, so it synchronizes the lights, the on-ramps to a freeway that tell you when an ambulance is coming. The studies over and over and over say whether it be in an algorithm or an AI-managed smart grid system for traffic is one of the most impactful things you can do, Mr. Speaker, to clean the air because you move the traffic.

We couldn't get anyone here willing to even listen to one of our amendments on the left about promoting that type of technology.

There is a biotech revolution going on around us and substantially this is happening because of what we did in that 2017 tax reform which moved—exploded—the investments. Whether it be messenger RNA, my fascination with synthetic biology, the stem cells, there are disease after disease after disease and misery after misery we are about to cure. We know how to cure hemophilia now. I think we are on the cusp of knowing how to cure sickle cell anemia, an incredibly painful disease. They are here.

This place should be doing everything we can to promote getting those things to market safely and quickly, as fast as we can to end the misery. By the way, it has amazing financial benefits to the economy and to our tax base.

And you start to look at the innovations that are coming right now from the biotech industry.

□ 1845

One of the reasons I did this—and I didn't bring the other slides. Then, the left offers their H.R. 3, which, functionally, the economists, even the leftwing economists, said, yes, it will lower some drug prices, because we are basically going to do scarcity pricing. Functionally, we are going to say you can't have certain drugs if it costs more than a certain amount, like they do in Europe. But it will also crash the capital stock once again. A lot of you are going to die because you are not going to get this next generation of cure, and this amazing cycle of cures that are coming goes away—great virtue signaling.

The left will tell you they are about to do a piece of legislation to lower drug prices, and we all go “yay,” because they are too high. But by the end of the decade, there are fewer cures, and the value goes away because you didn't remove people from being sick.

It is all about curing people. In the misery, help bring those cures to market.

Personalized medicine, let's legalize it. I showed you the wearables, those things. This here should be part of your ability to stay healthy. Legalize it.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Forgive me. I have been trying to talk fast so as to not chew it all up.

Mr. Speaker, in a couple of the pieces of legislation that passed here, we have put aside boatloads of cash to run wire to rural America, and they deserve to have internet access.

I thought this slide was amusing, but you are actually seeing it happening in Ukraine right now. These are a bunch of little kitties in a Starlink satellite dish because apparently a Starlink satellite dish stays a bit warm in the winter so it defrosts itself. See, it is cute—kitties.

But the fact of the matter is, every inch of North America now has broadband internet. It is a bunch of satellites flying over us.

So, let me get this straight: In Ukraine, they are now using this, Starlink, to be able to communicate, but we can't seem to get our brothers and sisters here in the House of Representatives to understand there is a solution to broadband all over the country. They just happen to be flying in low-Earth orbit above our heads. It is here.

Instead, we are going to turn around and put out billions and billions and

billions and billions of dollars of subsidies to put more fiber and more wire in the ground to the middle of nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, there is a huge disruption coming. We need to make sure that our regulatory and policy sets are ready for this.

This is another thing that would also dramatically help this coming decade's inflation cycle. Researchers, particularly at the University of Illinois, have done this remarkable thing. I did a series of presentations on this a year ago. I will do this real quick.

You-all remember your high school biology class. You remember a C4 plant, plants that really, really want carbon to turn it into a sugar and grow. But they accidentally grab an oxygen molecule, and they have to spend all of this energy purging that oxygen molecule and go back and try to get a carbon molecule. I know this is a little geeky, but it is important to get our heads around it.

They have come up with a way to tweak the plant so, every time, it always grabs the carbon so it turns it into a sugar. Some plants will grow 40 percent more efficiently on the same land, the same fertilizer, and the same water. You do realize, just that basic math—and it won't turn out this way, but just conceptually—that is like removing every car off the face of the Earth.

If our brothers and sisters really care about the environment, they would be running as fast as they can to allow these types of available technologies to feed the world and feed our country. Yes, it would be a disruption, but these things exist.

Mr. Speaker, the other topic I want to touch on is a tax policy. This is a conceptual one.

How many of you have ever heard of a VAT tax, a value-added tax? Okay, so much for the enthusiasm.

A value-added tax is what substantially most of the rest of the world uses. If we are going to have a conversation about: We want businesses back in the United States; we want manufacturing back in the United States; we want to take on China; we are going to do tariffs; we are going to do these regulations; and we are going to do import and export controls—great. Realize most of those aren't really going to do much. Here is how I am going to try to explain what the rest of the world does to stick it to the United States.

This is a picture of a beautiful Audi. Let's pretend it is a \$100,000 car. My guess is, this one is a little more expensive. It is being made in Germany, but someone in Scottsdale, Arizona, is about to buy this Audi.

When it is in Germany, there is a 19 percent VAT tax on it, a value-added tax. But the moment it leaves the shore of Germany and is on its way to the United States, the car has been exported. They give them back the \$19,000, that 19 percent. When it comes to the United States, it is \$19,000 less

than it was sitting there in Germany. When it hits our shore, we put a small tariff or duty on it.

But the \$100,000 Tesla that is made in Texas, when someone in Germany is buying it, it has all the tax load—corporate tax, income tax, all the other things that we would do in the United States—in that price. When this car leaves the United States, we don't refund 19 percent of the taxes. It hits the German shore, and they put that \$19,000 on top of the price.

So, we get it both ways, coming and going. When we want to export, other countries put their VAT tax on our products. But when they send a product to us, they take it off.

We can be incredibly competitive. We can automate in ways to make up for labor differential costs. Our energy costs are actually much more competitive than the rest of the world.

Why isn't all manufacturing in the United States right now? It is because we are basically getting arbitrated on the value-added tax because the rest of the world refunds it. Until we fix that, all the talk of "we want made in America," the math doesn't work.

There are a couple of creative solutions. They are technically difficult, where you would have to take that refunded VAT and put it back on at our shore, so, functionally, everyone is treated exactly the same. The \$100,000 American-made car and the \$100,000 German-made car have the same tax load when they are being sold in their respective countries.

I have been trying to figure out a way to try to explain this concept simply, but the tax system, the current tax system as it is, is one of the reasons it is so difficult to compete with other countries' manufacturing, because they refund that value-added tax.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing is, I am truly worried about something. I believe it is going to affect the United States, but I fear it is going to affect the entire world.

How many of you have seen the stories that a number of the agrarian economists, food economists, believe that this coming fall, parts of the world are going to starve?

The price of fertilizer is up dramatically. The price of grain is up dramatically. Putin's war on Ukraine has screwed up the grain markets.

Do we have a moral obligation to step up and understand that, 6 months from now, part of the world may be starving? What happens in the world when you have people going hungry? You have violence and horrible things happening.

We see it coming. All the things we are seeing in the futures markets, the price of fertilizer blowing up, if they don't actually affect food supplies, if I am wrong, it is a free option. But if I am right, we should be pulling the alarm cord.

We should be begging farmers—in our farm policy, our ag committee, we should be removing set-asides, encour-

aging ways to take corn that would be used to make corn-based ethanol and turn it into animal feed, using the rotation that is already happening to soy because soy only uses—it is not my specialty—a quarter or a third of the amount of fertilizer.

If this is about to happen to the world, and we see it 6 months ahead, what is our moral obligation to pull that alarm cord and get it right? By getting it right, we also help our own inflation and maybe a couple of million people don't die in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I know that was a lot of different subjects thrown really quickly. If someone is interested, almost everything I touched on, we have done much longer presentations on how the policy would work, how it would help inflation, how it would make people's lives healthier and better.

But my point tonight is a really simple one. Stop doing the things that ultimately are hurting people. Start looking for the optimism and the opportunity that can make America more prosperous, that can make the poor less poor, and that can actually knock down inflation. It would actually be able to be done together.

A lot of these ideas aren't actually Republican or Democrat. They are just disruptive. If we would embrace the disruption, this could be an amazing decade. Right now, the data we are getting today, we may be in for years of misery because of policy from this last year.

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

RENAMING THE RUSSELL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise as a proud Member of this august body.

I rise with gratitude for the time that I have been afforded. I rise, understanding that time is precious. And I rise understanding that tonight, I have a topic that is going to be of interest to many and provocative to some, but still I rise.

I rise with the topic of institutionalized racism emanating from Capitol Hill. Institutionalized racism emanating from Capitol Hill.

This is hardly where one would expect institutionalized racism. And there are a good many people who say there is no such thing as institutionalized racism.

I trust that after tonight's message, many minds will be changed, and perhaps some hearts will be changed because if you know the truth, it can set you free. It can free your heart, it can free your mind, it can free your body, and it can free your soul.

So let's take the acts of truth tonight and slam it into the tree of circumstance and let the chips fall where they must. And still I rise.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. A picture is worth a thousand words. Here is a picture. This is a picture of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Russell Senate Office Building.

I think it appropriate that we get a better understanding of who Russell was. In 1972, some 50 years ago, the Old Senate Office Building, that would be this building, was named after Senator Richard Brevard Russell, Jr., an unapologetic racist, a white supremacist.

He was the chief legislative architect of the South's bitter opposition to the civil rights. He claimed that America was a White man's country. And he said:

And we are going to keep it that way.

Richard Brevard Russell, Jr., a Senator.

During his first run for the State legislature in 1920, he solicited the support and influence of every White voter and pledged he would serve only them, he would serve only them, if elected.

Russell said while campaigning in 1936:

As one who was born and reared in the atmosphere of the old South, with six generations of my forebearers now resting beneath southern soil, I am willing to go as far and make as great a sacrifice to preserve and ensure white supremacy and the social, economic, and political life of our State as any man who lives within her borders.

These are the words of Richard Russell, Senator Richard Russell. Senator Richard Russell whose name is on the Russell Senate Office Building, a building maintained with tax dollars. A building constructed with tax dollars. A building that I have to go into from time to time.

I try to limit my traversing through the building, but from time to time I must. But at some point, I am going to limit all of my movement into the building. I won't be going into it at some point.

And at some point, people of African ancestry are not going to go into this building. It is a symbol of national shame, not national pride. A symbol of national shame. The Russell Senate Office Building.

Senator Richard Russell successfully filibustered anti-lynching bills. We just passed an anti-lynching bill after many decades. One of the reasons why it took so long is because of Senator Richard Russell.

He blocked bills to eliminate poll taxes. He stood in the way of voting rights, especially for people of color. He also blocked bills to desegregate public schools, and this was done after *Brown v. Board of Education*.

He co-authored the "Southern Manifesto" to slow the integration of public schools after the Supreme Court unanimously ordered in its *Brown* case that schools would be desegregated with all

deliberate speed. Senator Richard Russell. Russell Senate Office Building.

Senator Russell proclaimed:

There is no such thing as a little integration.

This is what he said in 1957, he said:

They, meaning Black people, are determined to get into our White schools, and into White restaurants, and into White swimming pools.

He went on and indicated that he would warn his Senate colleagues that this would mean a mongrel race which would result in destroying America. Senator Richard Russell. A Senate office building named in honor of Senator Richard Russell.

He proposed a voluntary racial relocation program to adjust the imbalance of the Negro population between the South and the rest of the country, literally proposed moving Black people to some other States because there were too many in the South. Senator Richard Russell. The Russell Senate Office Building.

When President Truman fought to end segregation in the military, Russell responded with vile, racial libels. Here is what he stated, Senator Richard Russell, these are his words:

The incidence of syphilis, gonorrhea, chancere, and other venereal diseases is appallingly higher among members of the Negro race.

One would say that by this standard, all of us have been maligned, those of us who are members of the Negro race, as he called it.

He declared:

And allowing Black and White troops to serve together is sure to increase the numbers of men who will be disabled through communicable diseases.

The words of Senator Richard Russell.

Yes, the Senate Russell Office Building is named after a self-proclaimed white supremacist. It is a symbol of national shame.

On March 30, 1964, the Southern Bloc of 18 Democratic Senators and one Republican Senator, led by Senator Richard Russell, launched a filibuster to prevent the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, stood in the way of what we now consider some of the great legislative actions that were taken up by the House and the Senate.

Senator Russell proclaimed:

We will resist to the bitter end any measure or any movement which would tend to bring about social equality—some things bear repeating—we will resist to the bitter end any measure or any movement which would tend to bring about social equality and intermingling and amalgamation of the races in our States.

He voted against the 1964 Civil Rights Act which he called short-sighted and disastrous. He added that the civil rights bill's true intended effect was to intermingle races, eliminate States' rights, and abolish the checks and balance system.

A great President from the State of Texas, the Honorable President Lyndon B. Johnson, signed the Civil Rights Act

into law. And, as a result, Senator Richard Russell led a southern boycott of the 1964 Democratic National Convention.

I would that many who contend that there is no institutionalized racism could walk in the shoes of those of us who face it, who understand that for us, racism is more than a word.

It can sometimes be a way of life that you have to contend with, even into 2022. The Russell Senate Office Building.

You think I get great pleasure walking through a building named after a person who proclaimed himself a white supremacist? I get no great pleasure in moving through the facility.

And I find this to be very interesting. What the Senate does—the Senate named it. It was the Old Senate Office Building. What the Senate does, the Senate can undo.

This building does not have to bear the name of a white supremacist. This can be changed. We but only have to have the will to do it.

And, unfortunately, too many of us find ourselves having to deal with our concerns of this nature siloed. Siloed. Well, this concerns Black people, and as a result, Black people ought to solve this problem.

That is not the approach that I have taken. Long before I came to Congress, I thought that and still believe that if invidious discrimination exists against anyone, it is everyone's duty, responsibility, and, indeed, an obligation to challenge it. Not for myself, but for humanity.

And there are times when, in so doing, you have to stand alone. But I sincerely believe in the inner sanctum of my soul that it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

So I stand here tonight acknowledging that on many occasions when it has come to the rights of others, check my voting record. Check my voting record. Where were you, AL GREEN, when we took up the rights of the LGBTQ community? I was there.

Where were you when we took up the rights of the Latino community? I was there. Babies at the borders.

Where were you when we took up the rights of the Jewish community, those standing up against those who are anti-Semitic? I was there.

So I ask tonight: Where are we, friends, on the Russell Senate Office Building that, to this day, honors a self-proclaimed white supremacist?

This is institutionalized. It is institutionalized because the Congress, by and through the Senate as an institution, made it so.

You want to see institutionalized racism? A picture is worth a thousand words. There it is. That is it. The Russell Senate Office Building. All people of good will ought to want to see this changed.

I am not the first person, by the way, to say that it should be changed. I may be one of many, but as long as I am here, I am going to be fighting to

change the name of the Russell Senate Office Building.

Institutionalized racism. A picture of it, worth a thousand words. Emanating from Capitol Hill, a place where we passed civil rights laws, a place where we stand, one would assume, against all forms of invidious discrimination.

No one would have a building on Capitol Hill bear the name of a self-proclaimed white supremacist, but there it is. The Russell Senate Office Building.

Now, friends, I have not said what we should name the building after the name Senator Richard Russell is removed. I have not said that we should name it after any given person. I have not said that we should have a certain process in place to select the name.

I have said let it revert to the name that was there before we named it after a self-proclaimed white supremacist. Let it revert to what it was before, and that was the Old Senate Office Building.

Let it revert and then establish the proper protocols and all of the processes and whatever methodology you choose to select the name.

I believe that we won't make that mistake again, the mistake that we made with Senator Richard Russell, but let's let it revert, and that, we could do overnight. That, we could do overnight.

There is no requirement that we wait months, years, weeks. No requirement. We could change the name to the Old Senate Office Building overnight. We would only have to have the will to do it and believe that in so doing, it won't look like someone made us do it.

You know, that always enters into politics it seems. I shouldn't say always. Too often, we don't do things because we don't want it to seem as though someone made us do it. We have to find our own way to get it done.

We have to allow the parade to turn the corner and then run out in front of it and claim that we were there all the time.

Do whatever you must, but let's take the name off. Let's take Richard Russell's name off of the building.

□ 1915

Friends, if a picture is worth a thousand words, I contend that a song speaks for itself and its writer. A song speaks for itself and its writer. Let's now move on from the Russell Senate Office Building, and let's move on to Stephen Foster. Stephen Foster.

Stephen Foster has a memorial day. Stephen Foster Memorial Day in the United States is a Federal observance day, and we do observe Stephen Foster Day on January 13 annually. Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

Who, pray tell, was Stephen Foster? Well, let's talk about Mr. Foster and some of the lyrics in some of his songs. Not all of his songs, but too many of his songs contained lyrics that are offensive to people of color.

Before we examine the lyrics, let's do this. Let's just explain that you don't

get a day in your honor without the consent of the House and the Senate and the President of the United States of America. You don't get a day in your honor without voting. People have to vote. The President has to sign an order.

I will be reading for you the resolution in just a moment, but for now let's look at some of the songs, songs by Stephen C. Foster. Stephen C. Foster. Songs by Stephen C. Foster containing the n-word. Some of you may be familiar with "Oh! Susanna."

"Oh! Susanna." I trust at home that you can read this. He uses what I consider a demeaning vernacular.

I jump'd aboard the telegraph and
trabbled down de ribber.
De lectrick fluid magnified, and kill'd
500 n-words.

We are not allowed to say the word on the floor, and I appreciate that. I never say it. I am not one of those persons who—in my private life I don't use that word. Song by Stephen C. Foster.

Stephen C. Foster, by the way, was declared the Father of American Music. The Father of American Music. The date that we commemorate or celebrate, however you choose, is January 13 annually. The date was created by H.J. Res. 308, 82nd Congress, introduced in the House on August 2, 1951, passed the House on October 15, 1951, some 74 days after introduction. But 74 days after its introduction, it passed the House. It passed the Senate on October 19, 1951, some 78 days after introduction, and was signed into law by the President of the United States on October 27, 1951, some 86 days after introduction.

One can only but pray that legislation, righteous legislation that benefits people who have been demeaned, people who have been discriminated against, righteous legislation that would benefit them and prevent future discrimination, righteous legislation, would only pray that we could get such timelines for righteous legislation.

Stephen Foster performed in blackface. For those who are not familiar—and by the way, he started this at the age of 9, so he was influenced—blackface, this is a form of art—and I am being kind—wherein persons who are of European ancestry paint their faces black, and in a sense they perpetrate a vision of Black people as happy-go-lucky dancers, jumping around, simple and good-natured creatures in minstrel shows.

Minstrel shows were a form of racist entertainment developed in the early 19th century consisting of comic skits, variety acts, dancing, and music performances that depicted people specifically of African descent. The shows were performed by mostly White people in makeup, or blackface as I have explained, for the purpose of playing the role of Black people. Minstrel shows lampooned Black people as dimwitted, lazy, buffoonish, superstitious, and happy-go-lucky. Stephen Foster was a master of minstrel music.

Christy's Minstrels, the most successful minstrel shows of the time, made an arrangement with Foster for the show to be the first to sing his songs. Mr. Foster, if you have a song, a minstrel song, we want to be the first. I can imagine Mr. Christy saying that. He would have the rights to be the first to sing these songs, present these plays demeaning Black people. And Mr. Foster complied.

Before I read the resolution, let's take a look at another song, another song written by the Father of American Folk Music to this day, with a day that is celebrated on January 13 in his honor. The father.

"Old Uncle Ned," an excerpt:

Dere was an old n-word,
Dey call'd him Uncle Ned.
He's dead long ago, long ago!
No more work for poor Old Ned.
He's gone where the good n-words go.

The Father of American Folk Music institutionalized racism in song, institutionalized racism because this institution made it so. We. Not us personally, but this House made it so. More about that in just a moment.

Let's look at another song.

"Oh! Lemuel!" These are excerpts. It reads:

Go down to de cotton field!
Go down, I say!
Go down and call de n-word boys all:
We'll no more today.

The Father of American Folk Music. Proclaimed as such by the United States House of Representatives. Institutionalized as such with the concurrence of the United States Senate. Ordered as such with the signature of the President of the United States of America.

One final one. I shall not read it. I will simply place it before you. I trust that the camera allows you to see the words. "Away Down Souf," s-o-u-f.

So now we find ourselves with a day honoring Stephen Foster by way of a joint resolution, joint resolution authorizing the President—of the United States of America, I might add parenthetically—to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

It reads, in part, not in total:

"Whereas Stephen Collins Foster has become a national expression of democracy,"

"Stephen Collins Foster has become a national expression of democracy through his clear and simple embodiment of American tradition in his world-famous lyrics."

So says the House, the Senate, and the President such that we honor him on January 13 every year.

The resolution reads:

"Whereas the songs of Stephen Collins Foster belong to the people"—don't count me among the people that these songs belong to—"belong to the people and are the musical essence of democracy. . . ." This is the musical essence of democracy. What a sad state of affairs that we have to contend with.

"Whereas the songs of Stephen Collins Foster belong to the people and are

the musical essence of democracy so that he is now recognized as the father of American folk music and the true interpreter of the fundamental spirit of music.”

Stephen Collins Foster. “Whereas Stephen Collins Foster symbolizes in his works the unity of mankind through music.” This is the unity of mankind through music, so says the House, the Senate, and the President, and a day in honor of Stephen Collins Foster. His works symbolize the unity of mankind.

“Resolved by the Senate,” these are the words. Do a little bit of research, and you can read it in its entirety. I have given you excerpts, but these are the words. “Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day, and calling upon the people throughout the United States of America to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies, pilgrimages to his shrines, and musical programs featuring his compositions.” I assume that would be minstrel shows. “Approved October 27, 1951.”

□ 1930

I was alive when this was approved. I am the son of a segregated South. I know what racism looks like. I have seen the cross that the Klan burned in my yard. I know what it sounds like having been called these words. I know what it hurts like. I have been to some funerals.

Now, my dear friends, my dear brothers and sisters—and I say such because I am a student of Dr. King. I believe, as he proclaimed, that there really is but one race, and that is the human race. I believe that all persons were created equal from a base black, as Dr. King put it, to a treble white. He went on to say:

Fleecy locks and black complexion
Cannot forfeit nature's claim;
Skins may differ, but affection
Dwells in White and Black the same.

And, “Were I so tall as to reach the pole or grasp the ocean at a span, I must be measured by my soul. The mind is the standard of the man” and woman.

I believe this. Because I believe it, I believe that we all have a responsibility to eliminate this institutionalized racism emanating from the Capitol of the United States of America, institutionalized by the Congress, signed into law by the President, institutionalized by the Senate Russell Office Building.

I love my country. I sing the national anthem. There are some parts of it that we may want to address at some point, but I love my country. I say the Pledge of Allegiance. I love my country. It means something to me to have been born in the United States of America. I just want to make America

the beautiful a more beautiful America for all Americans.

I want every little Black baby to grow up in a world where we don't have a self-proclaimed white supremacist honored with our tax dollars on a building built with our tax dollars. They deserve that. I would do it for any other subset of this society. I would stand up for you.

When will we stand up against institutionalized racism emanating from the Capitol of the United States of America?

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

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their marks and submit extraneous material on this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to host this Special Order during National Agriculture Month on the strength of American agriculture. I am inspired by the American farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers who feed, fuel, and clothe not only this country but the entire world.

I grew up on a farm south of Quinter, Kansas, that my parents and brother still operate. Growing up there meant that I spent thousands of hours on a tractor working in fields and on horseback doctoring sick cattle in the family feed yard. Those hours turned into love of country and lessons about the values of hard work, creativity, flexibility, and putting others before ourselves.

My district, the Big First of Kansas, is home to more than 60,000 farms where farmers, ranchers, feedlot managers, ethanol producers, ag lenders, and agribusiness owners ensure that America remains the most food-secure country in the world.

As Congress becomes increasingly urban, the distance from farm to fork has never been greater, and since America's national security depends in large part on our food security, we need strong voices for agriculture in this Congress, which is why I am honored to serve on the House Agriculture Committee and to host this Special Order tonight.

If Congress is going to legislate effectively on matters relating to agriculture, Congress must first understand the agricultural perspective in America. There is something about being in the middle of the country where farmers pray for rain, parents

drive 30 miles both ways just to take their kids to school, and communities shrink and grow with oil and gas prices that gives you a greater perspective.

House Agriculture Committee Republican leader GT THOMPSON and I just returned from a trip to my district. While there, we saw an American heartland infused with both the innovative energy that creates new ideas and the love of tradition that respects tried-and-true methods. We saw the USDA National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility that will take American agriculture into the future, and we met with the family who owns and operates Brookover Feed Yards, one of the first feedlots in Kansas. We also saw oil production, ag lending, ethanol production, wheat innovation, and the next generation of leaders in food and agriculture at Kansas State University.

I look forward to celebrating the culmination of National Agriculture Month with my colleagues here tonight as we celebrate the force, passion, and strength of American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), a descendant of dairy farmers, a champion of rural development, my friend who joined me just last week on an agriculture tour of my district in Kansas, and the Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MANN for yielding and for hosting this Special Order tonight on an industry that I believe is the most important industry in America. It is the industry that impacts and touches the lives of American families more times in a given day than any other. It is not just the food. It is the fiber; it is the building materials; it is the energy resources; it is the economy.

I am honored to be here. I am proud to be the Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee, where we celebrate the contributions of American farmers, ranchers, producers, and foresters all year long.

Farm country is no stranger to struggle, and the past couple of years have been a punch to the gut. Between a global pandemic, historic fires and floods, wind events, and a President who is waging a never-ending war on agriculture, times have been particularly tough.

The supply chain crisis paired with skyrocketing inflation is kicking our farm families while they are down—folks who buy retail, sell wholesale, and pay shipping each way; the men and women who work around the clock to provide us with a safe and reliable food supply.

But rural America is tough; rural America is resilient; and rural America is the backbone of this Nation.

I am grateful to Congressman MANN for being on our farm team, as well as all the other agriculture advocates who will be speaking this evening.

Before I go, I specifically recognize Pennsylvania's contribution to agriculture, which is the Commonwealth's

number one industry. One out of every seven jobs is directly or indirectly related to agriculture: 59,000 farms; 280,500 direct jobs; and more than \$135 billion in revenue, or about 18 percent of Pennsylvania's economy. Agriculture's impact in the Keystone State is undeniable.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the families, the men and women who work 24/7, 365 days a year to feed, to clothe, and to fuel this great Nation. Once again, thanks to Congressman MANN for leading this important Special Order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON for being here tonight and sharing with us thoughts about Pennsylvania agriculture. It is very important to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), who is a third-generation family farmer and good friend. I always appreciate his perspectives of Washington State agriculture and what he brings to this body.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MANN for his leadership and also for hosting us tonight on this special occasion to talk about American agriculture.

I am truly proud to stand with my colleagues to talk about something that affects and impacts every single person not only in this room but listening tonight: the American agriculture industry.

In central Washington, where I am from, I know our industry is made up of honest, hardworking, freedom-loving Americans that provide food and fiber for this Nation. My community is home to some of the most dedicated, innovative agricultural producers in the entire country.

Washington farmers and ranchers produce over 300 different commodities, including high-quality hay, wheat, beef, dairy, wine grapes, hops—which I raise—potatoes, cherries, mint, and, of course, Washington's iconic apples.

Blessed with the conditions to produce such a diverse range of crops, central Washington is proud to share its natural abundance to help feed the country and feed the world. Those of us who live there have a deep appreciation for our Nation's farmers and recognize how important it is that we have a strong domestic agricultural sector.

But lately, unfortunately, the President and his far-left Democrats are so focused on radically altering the country with their trillion-dollar spending proposals, they are blind to the impacts their own policies are already having on Americans across the country. The cost of living is at a 40-year high and still going up. Now, they are looking to raise taxes again on small businesses, on family farms.

As a lifetime farmer and former director of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Washington and current chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, I understand the vested interests that we all share in supporting our agricultural pro-

ducers. I am proud to join my House Republican colleagues in advocating against burdensome regulations that impact rural communities and for real solutions, not just empty promises, to help our farmers and our ranchers, our farmworkers, and all Americans, who deserve a strong food supply chain.

I introduced the first serious agricultural labor reform bill to pass the House in over 30 years, the Farm Workforce Modernization Act, to ensure that those who wish to come to our country, abide by our laws, and contribute to our farms, ranches, and local communities are able to do so.

I, along with my Republican colleagues, am leading efforts to stop our foreign adversaries, such as Communist China, from gobbling up American farmland and taking control of our food supply chain.

I am protecting our hydroelectric dams in the Northwest that provide irrigation water, baseload power for central Washington and beyond, and serve as a sustainable and efficient way to transport our Nation's crops. The Columbia River barges carry more than 50 percent of U.S. wheat destined for export, and barging on the Columbia and Snake Rivers system keeps—get this—700,000 semitrucks off the roads and their emissions out of the air each and every year.

I am leading the entire Congressional Western Caucus in fighting against this administration's efforts to revive the single-most overreaching Federal regulatory action in history. It is called the waters of the United States rule, or the WOTUS rule. This dangerous policy empowers Federal bureaucrats to place every single body of water—every ditch, every puddle, every stream—under Federal regulation. As a result, the livelihoods of our farmers and rural communities across the Nation—not just in Washington; all over the country—are at stake.

While it is clear to me, just as I know it is clear to my constituents, President Biden and Democrats are failing to display the leadership America needs and deserves, there is a silver lining here. American agriculture is strong. We have overcome far worse, and we will not let these radical policies hold us back from the job of feeding this Nation.

I call on the administration to take a good long look at how their policies are harming us here in central Washington and in rural communities across the country and take immediate steps to reverse them. We deserve far better.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MANN for helping recognize the importance of American agriculture, and I appreciate his leadership.

□ 1945

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman. His leadership in agriculture, his leadership for the Western Caucus are very, very important, and I thank him for joining us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), a

staunch defender of farmers in his district and a fellow Congressional FFA Caucus member.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MANN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as National Agriculture Month comes to a close, I am reminded of a speech Paul Harvey delivered to the FFA in 1978. No truer words have ever been spoken about America's farmers.

Listening to the speech brings back memories of the days spent working with my stepdad on his farm. This is a tribute, again, to America's farmers, the work they do. And when I read this speech, it reminds me, I can see my stepdad those days working. But it is a tribute to all of the farmers in our great country.

So here are a few of the excerpts that I really like from this speech, and it goes like this.

It begins:

And on the 8th day, God looked down on his planned paradise, and said, "I need a caretaker."

So God made a farmer.

God said, I need somebody who can shape an ax handle from a persimmon sprout, shoe a horse with a hunk of car tire, who can make a harness out of haywire, feed sacks and shoe scraps. Whose planting time and harvest season will finish his 40-hour week by Tuesday noon, and then pain'n from tractor back, put in another 72 hours.

So God made a farmer.

It had to be somebody who'd plow deep and straight and not cut corners. Somebody to seed, weed, feed, breed, and rake and disc and plow and plant and tie the fleece and strain the milk and replenish the self-feeder and finish a hard week's work with a 5-mile drive to church.

Somebody who would bale a family together with the soft, strong bonds of sharing, who would laugh, and then sigh, and then reply, with smiling eyes, when his son says that he wants to spend his life doing what dad does.

So God made a farmer.

Thank you to America's farmers. This is a tribute to the work that you do every day on behalf of not just the United States, but our world.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for joining us tonight. And as you were reading that, I thought about my family, my grandparents and many producers all over America that that describes. Thank you very much for sharing that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), who runs a grain and livestock farm with her husband and who has raised her children to be the 4th generation of farmers on her family farm in Illinois.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MANN for hosting this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of National Agriculture Month, I would like to share how strongly I believe in the family farm as part of the American way of life. It has truly been a blessing to have our sons—who are the 4th generation—and their children—the 5th generation—working our land.

I am proud to be an Illinois farmer and to represent the farmers' needs in

Congress and on the Ag Committee. If Americans are hungry, really, what else matters?

The agriculture industry keeps Americans and the world fed, fueled, and clothed. I am so thankful for the work that the ag industry does and for their contributions to the GDP and Illinois and across our Nation.

America is on a dangerous path, losing our self-sufficiency in farming, which is why I introduced a bill in Congress to prevent China from buying up our farmland. Biden and the Democrats continue to push policies that promote Chinese-made batteries and solar panels instead of American biofuels.

National Agriculture Month is a great time to thank our farmers, ranchers, and agriculture professionals for their tireless work.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for joining us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), who represents our Nation's largest dairy district. He and his family operate a dairy farm; lives at the dairy.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, this is a great honor to be able to speak about the great people that feed our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the farmers that feed the world. With less than 1 percent of our Nation's farmland, the Central Valley supplies a quarter of our Nation's food. Our well-deserved reputation as America's breadbasket comes from the help of nature and a whole lot of hard work and skill from our farmers, ranchers, and producers. But without water, we cannot grow our Nation's food at all.

Our Central Valley farming community has endured drought conditions and low water allocations for years. At a time when even the President is warning about global food shortages, we need to be supporting our agriculture producers here at home. That includes making sure that the Central Valley has the water they need to continue providing food for the world. We must fix complex and contradictory laws, court decisions, and regulations, and improve water storage infrastructure to bring more water to the Valley.

The livelihoods of my constituents and our global food supply depend on it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ELLZEY), the pride of Levelland, Texas, who farmed and ranched in the Texas Panhandle before he came to Congress.

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House of Representatives to bring attention to National Agriculture Month. And, of course, before I begin my prepared remarks, I want to talk about what we see going on in Ukraine and Russia.

Ukraine is the breadbasket of that region. And 30 percent of all of the world's grain, wheat, is produced in that region. And as we talk about this

today, and in a few months we are going to be talking about it even more, about how the farms and ranches of the United States feed the entire world.

Over the past couple of years our farmers have faced unprecedented obstacles from COVID, COVID lockdowns, labor shortages, supply chain disruptions, high fuel prices, and record-high fertilizer prices. But as always, they have overcome those challenges, and they have kept Americans and the world fed during a time of great uncertainty.

Each American farmer feeds more than 165 people. Texas leads the Nation in the number of farms and ranches, with 248,416 farms and ranches covering 127 million acres. The ag industry is the pillar of a healthy and prosperous nation. And in the 6th Congressional District of Texas, we have a long history of farming and ranching. We are home to families like the Beeklys, the Patmans, the Buchholzes, the Borns, and the Dineens.

Many of them have earned the title of a "Texas Century Farm" or Texas Century Ranch." Those titles are only given to families that have served our country as farmers and ranchers for over 100 years. Families who get up before dawn to tend to crops and herd cattle. They are part of over 5,000 farms and ranches in my district.

So if you fed your family today, thank a farmer. Thank a rancher. And in Texas, thank a neighbor.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for joining us, and representing Texas in such a legacy of agriculture in a great State.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone who spoke today for helping Congress understand an agricultural perspective. As Dwight Eisenhower—who was from my State, from my district—said, Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil, and you are a thousand miles away from a cornfield. Today, it felt like the Members who spoke on this floor brought the farm a little closer to Capitol Hill, and for that, I thank them.

Congress uses the reauthorization of the farm bill every 5 years to determine the nature of our support for the men and women who feed, fuel, and clothe the world. America's food security is so important because it determines the strength of our national security. We will never be a secure country if we have to rely on other countries to feed ourselves.

Because of the tenacity of the American farmer, we are the most food secure country in the world, and I will do everything in my power to keep it that way.

As Congress determines how we will support farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers in the 2023 farm bill, I encourage Members to imagine how different their lives would be without healthy American agriculture. From the food on our tables to the fuel in our cars to the fibers in our clothing to the roofs over our head, agriculture is all

around us, and we tend to take it for granted.

Well, it isn't granted. It is gifted. Every day American farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers give us the gift of our quality of life in this country. Our comforts come from the sweat of their brows. The least this Congress can do is support their efforts wholeheartedly with a strong thoughtful 2023 farm bill and related legislation. The future of America depends on it.

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

RESCINDING TITLE 42 OF 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. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for coming down here and talking about the importance of farming in the United States. One of the things we are dealing with, obviously, and talked about, is some fertilizer shortages. I know that firsthand, seeing some of the farms in the district I represent, West Texas and so forth. And we have got a lot of issues we have got to address.

And I just want to note, as a Texan—we had my fellow Texan down here just a little bit ago—that here we sit again. Here it is, March 31, in an empty Chamber again. It is the close of a quarter, a fiscal quarter. Members got their places to go, their dinners to go to.

We just ran through a handful of votes today. No amendments. No debates.

Here is the people's House in all its glory. No debate. No discussion.

Did we have a single debate here in the people's House about what is happening at our southern border today? Any discussion at all?

Does the Speaker of the House of Representatives give a rat's rear-end about South Texas or the rest of this country; about the ranchers that are dealing with a flood of people coming across our border, endangering them and their families? No, they don't care. They don't care at all. But I can tell you, we in Texas care. And the leadership of this body better start caring soon.

And let me just say something to all my fellow Republicans who just funded this government two weeks ago. Those of you who cut a deal, a deal with the devil, you are responsible for this, too. You funded this government. You funded the government that is allowing people to come across our border, that is empowering cartels, that is allowing migrants to get abused, that is causing ranchers to lose their livestock, ranchers to be endangered, fentanyl to pour across our border.

And now this administration has the gall to shut down Title 42 while Americans are still wearing masks on airplanes, while we still have men and

women in uniform being forced to get a needle stuck in their arm from the power of government. And the leadership, so-called leadership, of our government has the gall to shut down Title 42. The one thing allowing us to stop the flood at our border, even partially.

March of this year. This year. Right now. March, 200,000 apprehensions; 100,000 turned away under Title 42. But now the head of the CDC, in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security Secretary, is saying we are going to stop using Title 42.

Well, then what in the hell are you going to do? Nothing. Other than process more immigrants coming across our border who are not truly seeking asylum. But that is what is happening. And what is actually happening at our border right now is there are shootouts going on as we speak on a daily basis, between the Gulf Cartel—technically, the Jalisco New Generation Cartel, but Gulf Cartel CDG warring with Cartel del Noreste of Los Zetas.

And we are talking about dead people, dead bodies. People getting shot in their car. Bullets firing, flying all over our southern border. Dead individuals.

This young girl here, head blown off. All of this is happening every single day. All while American kids are dying from Xanax laced with fentanyl.

And again, I want to be clear here. When you take Title 42 away—you, Secretary Mayorkas; you, CDC Director Walensky; you, my Democratic colleagues who are countering and funding it; you, President Biden—when you take away Title 42, the blood is on your hands.

□ 2000

And we're talking about dead Americans, dead migrants, destroyed communities in Texas, empowered cartels. Literally last night in talking to people coming across the border, saying they are spending \$3,000 to \$5,000 to come up from Nicaragua, Venezuela, Cuba. There were 13,000 apprehensions from Russia in the last 5 months.

We are about to see an unprecedented explosion on our southern border. Again, this administration not only doesn't care, it is purposeful. It is 100 percent purposeful. Endangering the people of the United States, endangering migrants while—in the false name of compassion saying it is good for them, empowering cartels, knowing they are doing it. Knowing for the most part you do not have a legitimate claim for asylum.

They are purposely not enforcing the laws of the United States. They are purposely not using the tools at their disposal, like now ending Title 42. For what reason? For crass political purposes. That is your modern Democratic Party. Using migrants for political purposes and endangering them and Americans in the process.

It is a gross violation of the oath taken to defend the Constitution of the United States. It is fully and entirely

impeachable and every Republican should be agreeing to impeach Secretary Mayorkas on day one when we come into this body and we are in charge of the House of Representatives next January after the absolute feckless destruction of this country by an incompetent, destructive Democratic majority in this body, an incompetent destructive and flat out reckless administration refusing to enforce the laws of the United States. That is what is happening.

Oh, you going down there ranting on the floor again about the border? Well, excuse me, but it is Texas. And Texas needs to be starting to take a little action to tell the rest of this country to shove it up its rear end because Texas is taking it on the chin because the leadership of this country is forsaking Texas, hurting Texas, hurting my neighbors, hurting my community.

It is about time that it stops. It is about time that Republicans on this side of the aisle stop giving lip service to border security, choose to actually do their job and not fund the government that is refusing to enforce the laws.

I listened to Republican leadership down here on the floor a few weeks ago trying to tell me, oh—thank me for giving us more money for ICE and Border Patrol. Well, how the heck is that working out now? More money for more processing of more migrants getting abused by cartels. More money for more processing of more migrants to come into Uvalde, Texas, where the mayor just texted me 5 minutes ago. Tell them—in case you are wondering, that is you Democrats across the other side of the aisle, and by the way, Republican leadership—Tell them to come and see the—I will edit his remarks—crap show they have created 500 to 1,000 a day in Eagle Pass in Del Rio. No vetting.

These are human beings, Texans, people we represent, our communities. I promise my colleagues on the other side of the aisle they don't give a whit. They sit in their smug chairs in their committee hearings saying: Oh, this is all made up. There is nothing to it. It is all lies.

Just like the lie that President Biden said and his press secretary said when he accused Border Patrol agents of whipping people. They are flat out lies. Where are those Border Patrol agents now? Have they been returned to their job? Has a report come out? No.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), my friend who accompanied me on a trip to the border about a month ago or so. He is a good friend and he understands what is actually happening at our border.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. We don't have a finer patriot and a more courageous warrior for freedom in the Congress, and I appreciate his leadership on this and so many issues. I appreciate him leading this discussion here on the floor tonight.

Never in the history of the country has our own President done more to intentionally harm the country than this President has done in his first year in Congress. Never in the history of the country has a President done more to harm the United States than this President has done willfully and intentionally than what he has done with the border in his first year.

We are averaging 7,000 illegals across the border a day right now. The administration is admitting that. They are allowing 7,000 illegals across the border a day. I had a constituent say to me on the phone just 2 days ago: Nothing this administration is doing makes sense unless they hate the country. Nothing that this administration is doing makes sense unless they hate the country.

Whether you are talking about the crime crisis, the inflation crisis, our diminished standing on the national stage, the spending crisis, the energy crisis, what we are doing to American energy and making us depend on foreign nations who hate us. I think at the top of that list is what we are doing at the border.

When I ran for the first time 2 years ago I identified the greatest threats to the country. I believe those threats are our education system, indoctrination of our kids K to 12 and college campuses, our runaway radical spending that is bankrupting our future, and then our immigration and border situation. Nothing has changed my mind to that effect in my first year here.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the border four times and I am well-aware that Virginia's Fifth District is not geographically physically located at the border. We just had an MS-13 gang member convicted of murder in my hometown of Lynchburg, Virginia, who illegally came across the border. This President's policies are making every town a border town, every State a border State.

Everything and everyone that comes across that border comes under the control of the Mexican crime cartels. It has threatened the security of our Nation. It is an economic security issue. It is a health security issue. It certainly is a national security issue.

The projection that I am seeing with the ending of Title 42—the egregious attempt to end Title 42—the projections I am seeing is it will take it from 7,000 a day to 18,000 a day. That is 7,000 a day to 18,000 a day, perhaps even tripling what has already happened. We had 2 million crossings a year ago. Extrapolate that out for 4 years.

Are we going to allow this President to have 8 million come across at the current pace? My most recent trip to the border that my friend from Texas was mentioning was to Del Rio, Texas. He led a trip to Del Rio, Texas. You might remember, that is where we had Bidentown just a few weeks ago with 20,000 Haitian migrants assembled under the bridge there in Bidentown in Del Rio, Texas.

While we don't have that still today because they distributed those migrants—those illegals—into the interior of the country, which they are doing all the time, by the way. Flying and bussing illegal aliens in the dark of night wherever they want to go throughout the country with no requirement of a court date to appear. It is a pinky promise that we will get back with you in the future and give you a date to appear.

While we don't have 20,000 in Bidentown under the bridge right now in Del Rio, Texas, right through that corridor, Border Patrol and the ranchers and the sheriffs that were there told us it is 1,000 a day through there. So every 3 weeks you got a repeat of what we saw with Bidentown just a few weeks ago in Del Rio, Texas.

Does this administration care? Every resource they have committed or directed to that border has been to facilitate—to willfully, purposely facilitate—more illegals crossing into our country and to hide it from the American people.

There has been no effort by this administration in this President's first year to stem it, to stop it, instead, they try to facilitate and hide it from the American people. Now they want to make it worse, two or three times worse with what they are doing with Title 42.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I just want to pick up on something that the gentleman from Virginia said and see if he would agree. If Title 42 goes away, our country is completely open to anyone who wants to come. Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. ROY. Everyone who has been turned away, it has almost entirely been done under Title 42.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. ROY. Now, for the listeners at home, Title 42 is a health code provision allowing our officials in government to turn people away if we have a communicable disease environment, like we do during the COVID pandemic. Now, we can do it for any number of communicable diseases, but we got that in place now.

Roughly half of the folks have been turned away under Title 42. Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Yes, but they are turnarounds coming right back.

Mr. ROY. So to that point, would it surprise the gentleman that under the administration we have turned away 1.7 million people under Title 42?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Since 2019 when that was instated, right?

Mr. ROY. Yeah, including the time under the Trump administration. So 1.7 million times during the pandemic all the people that were turned back would likely have been let in and released into the United States under this administration. Some of those are repeats.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. ROY. Something along the lines of a million people that would have been released into the United States last year. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. ROY. Another point. Of the people that have come into the United States and are being encountered, these are all not just nice people looking for a job, are they?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. There are 160 different countries.

Mr. ROY. One hundred sixty different countries. Roughly, 10,763 criminal noncitizens and at least 3,662 have been arrested thus far in fiscal year 2022. The combined timeframes include roughly 85 convictions of manslaughter or homicide, 604 sexual offenses, and 2,892 convictions of illegal drug possession and trafficking. Based on reports at least 14 illegal migrants who are on the terrorist watch list were stopped at the southern border in fiscal year 2021.

The biggest problem is what?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. The got-aways.

Mr. ROY. The got-aways. The more than half a million known got-aways—known—known got-aways—last year. So if we have got people we are catching on the terrorist watch list, if we have got criminals convicted of sex crimes, convicted of murder and manslaughter that we are catching—but that is all people the Border Patrol is running across and they are often turning themselves in. All of those known got-aways, do you think those are just the angels seeking a nice job?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. These aren't the ones dressed head to toe in camo with the carpet shoes on who are evading capture, are they?

Mr. ROY. It would be.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. How about that.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), one of the great patriots and I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, he has been the consummate crusader on this issue. If not for him, this would even be more ignored in Washington, D.C., than it is already. I just think about a scant month ago—a month and a half ago or so—the President of the United States stood right there and talked about securing the border.

It is unfathomable to me. We used to not say lie in the world of politics about your opponent or the other party, but I don't know what else that is other than a lie. I come from Pennsylvania, we are not on the border where Mr. ROY represents, where his communities and his State is being completely overrun. Pennsylvania is far from the border. We got Route 81. We got Route 83. The fentanyl comes up.

The President took an oath to faithfully discharge the laws of this country, but just abrogating them. You just wonder who is he representing? Whose citizens is he representing because the

people in my community, the people all across the country are dying at record levels from drugs coming across the southern border, and nothing is happening to stop it.

It is not only people coming here illegally and taking your jobs—all these different languages that your school has to teach now. Somebody is going to pay for that. Who can afford this? Whose job is it to safeguard America? If it is not the President's job, whose job is it? CHIP ROY is trying. BOB GOOD is trying.

We can't keep Title 42 in place. Even better yet, the question should be: Why isn't Remain in Mexico in place? Seek asylum the correct way. Stay in the first country you come to if you are indeed oppressed and you are suffering political retribution for your beliefs or religious persecution—the first country you come to.

The first country you come to when you travel through Mexico—when you fly into Mexico from one of the other 160-190 countries on the planet isn't the United States, it is Mexico. Yet, the President says the border is open. These people aren't coming to the White House, ladies and gentlemen, they are coming to your house. They are coming to your community. They are not going to Joe Biden's house in Delaware. They are not coming to Pennsylvania Avenue. They are coming to your house and your community and they are bringing the drugs with them, human trafficking.

And for goodness sakes—your taxes—75 percent of the people on this side of the aisle just supported more spending for this. You know what it does? BOB GOOD is right. You are not going see them all piled up under the bridge in Del Rio because we are going to hire more people to move them more efficiently into your town because they don't like that look.

They are not hired to stop them, they are hired to more efficiently have them come to your town and your community, including the people on the terrorist watch list, criminals, the fentanyl, the human trafficking coming to your town. Well, thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. ROY. I would ask my friend from Pennsylvania if he is aware that our colleague and colleague in the House Freedom Caucus, our friend YVETTE HERRELL from New Mexico, introduced legislation a year ago—actually over a year ago to require the use of Title 42. Is that right?

□ 2015

Mr. PERRY. That is right. And all we need is enough people to sign it. Whether you are a Democrat or you are a Republican, these folks are coming. The fentanyl is coming to your town. The overdoses are coming to your town. All you have to do, if your leadership says: We refuse to move this bill that the American people want, maintain this Title 42, all you have to do is go down and sign that piece of paper,

and we can do it. Leadership can't hold us up.

But they don't want to do it, do they?

Mr. ROY. They do not. And I want to make sure for every American out there to understand the truth. If you are disgusted about what is happening at our border, if you are concerned about what is actually happening to our communities, there is a way we can solve the problem without Speaker PELOSI making the decisions. Because that is how things work. We don't ever debate, we don't ever amend, and we don't actually have discussion in the people's House. The Speaker in a back-room decides what happens on the floor, vote "yes" or "no," walk out, and give a press conference.

But we can do something about that. There is a tool. It is called a discharge petition. We have a discharge petition at the desk to try to empower the actual Representatives of this country. We have 200 and I think now eight Republicans on that discharge petition.

Mr. PERRY. How many Democrats?

Mr. ROY. We have zero Democrats—not one Democrat—on that discharge petition. Now, I want everybody to think about that. The Democrats in this body apparently are so beholden to the radical idea of wide-open borders and not implementing Title 42 while Americans are being forced to wear masks on airplanes, and while Americans are getting a jab needle stuck in their arm by force of government if they are in the military or Border Patrol or any other Federal employee while there is still a Federal health emergency in place under order of the President.

Mr. PERRY. We are firing people who were on the front lines at the beginning of the pandemic without it, where there was no vaccine present, right?

They went out. They went out and risked their lives not knowing what they were dealing with, and now unless they take the jab, now they are out of work.

Mr. ROY. So while that is in place, we have a discharge petition where we can bring to the floor and vote to force enforcement of Title 42 in this country, and not one of our Democratic colleagues will join us in that.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. How many Democrat Members have we got from Texas?

Mr. ROY. We have 13.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That would get us past 218, wouldn't it, 13 plus 8, 208?

Mr. ROY. It sure would. I think there are somewhere around 50 Democratic Members from border States if you count New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Texas.

So where are my Democratic colleagues in border States?

I think they ought to be asked. I want to know why won't my Democratic colleagues from border States or anywhere else in the country say they believe that we ought to enforce Title 42?

Because guess what? There are a few Senators who have said so.

Isn't that right?

Mr. PERRY. There are a few Senators. I think there are a few Representatives who said so, too. They can put their money, so to speak, where their mouth is. You can say it, but you can take some action. Talk is cheap, right? Take some action and walk down there and sign the paper. And once one does, maybe a few more will because their constituents—their bosses, their citizens, and their communities—are being wrecked, too.

Mr. ROY. It is a way to wrestle control of the people's House away from a handful of self-anointed individuals who are wrecking this country in the name of so-called democracy.

Does my friend from Virginia agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely. You mentioned Secretary Mayorkas. He has said the border is secure. The border is secure he has said, when as you know we have lost operational control of our border.

The Mexican crime cartels are making hundreds of millions of dollars a month off sex trafficking, drug trafficking, child trafficking, human trafficking, you name it. Everyone and everything that comes across that border comes under the control of the Mexican crime cartel.

There is no humane component to it. They are finding dead bodies at the border of people who were trying—they starved or they got dehydrated or they just couldn't make the journey or something happened to them on the way. And you talk about Remain in Mexico policy, instead of Remain in Mexico policy, the MPP, that was in place under the Trump administration. We have got the United Nations using our own resources that we pay the United Nations to help illegals cheat our asylum system. So the United Nations is taking resources that the United States is giving to them to use to train illegals on how to cheat our asylum system and how to gain access into our country by claiming asylum.

Then the Democratic Party 20 years ago passed a law that prohibits the requirement of proof of citizenship to vote. Now, of course, they don't want any ID in order to vote, and you have got the President promising amnesty to anybody who is here illegally.

Do you think there is incentive to cheat our voting system and to vote illegally when there is no requirement of proof of citizenship, there is no ID to vote, and you have got the promise of amnesty?

We have essentially got illegals with a license to vote here in this country right now, and here we want to continue to ramp it up, to take it from 7,000 a day to an estimate of maybe 18,000 a day by eliminating Title 42.

Mr. PERRY. Would the gentleman also agree that it is not only the U.N. that your tax dollars are going for, actually in this body they voted recently to pay for attorneys to go help those

folks who came across the border illegally navigate the system.

Now, you go try that. You go break the law wantonly and then appeal to your Federal Government to pay for your attorney to get around the law that you just broke wantonly.

Mr. ROY. Both my friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Virginia, you guys are both fathers, correct?

Mr. PERRY. Indeed.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ROY. Do you think that there is anything compassionate—when my colleagues on the other side of aisle like to talk about their compassion for migrants who are seeking to come to this country, do my friends think there is anything at all compassionate about a little girl getting raped in a stash house in Houston, Texas, as we speak?

Or being driven up and put into the sex trafficking trade up I-35 or across I-10 in the southern part of the United States?

Or trafficked to anywhere throughout the rest of this country?

Do you think that is compassion?

Do you think it is compassionate for a young woman to be getting shot up in a cartel warfare happening at south Texas, happening along the Rio Grande in northern Mexico?

Is that compassion?

Is it compassion?

Mr. PERRY. What about the rape trees?

We have been to the border. We have seen the little shoes all stacked up at the border. These are little children. And Representative ROY is absolutely right, as trophies, can you imagine little girls, or somebody's—anybody's—little girls, little girl panties hanging from a tree as a trophy?

This is what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to acknowledge, like it is not happening, like it has never happened. But it is happening every single day. Somebody—somebody—has got to do something about it.

Mr. ROY. Is it compassionate for the young man or young woman of the 100,000 or so last year who died from drug overdoses to take Xanax and it be laced with fentanyl and die?

Is that something that is compassionate?

My friend from Virginia, do you think these are compassionate things to be doing?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. The number one killer of Americans between the age of 18 and 45 last year was drug overdoses. And yet we are allowing the most dangerous drugs, fentanyl and other dangerous drugs, to stream across the border.

The only way you get across the border, the Mexican border, into the United States is to pay the Mexican crime cartels. Border Patrol and the local sheriffs will tell you: If you try to cross apart from the cartels, they will kill you. You come either beholden to them, essentially an indentured servant, with pledge of your family back

home if you don't have the cash up front—they will kill your family if you don't pay—or you work it off. You work it off by trafficking drugs across or trafficking children or trafficking women across the border. There is nothing compassionate about that.

Mr. ROY. One of my good friends who was a former Texas Department of Public Safety expert on these issues dealing with cartels just sent me a text showing me video from last night at the border, and individuals they were recording were saying they were paying \$3,000 or \$5,000 to get across the river.

How is that compassionate?

They are going to have to make a monthly payment to cartels. A lot of those payments are going to come in the form of sex trafficking and labor trafficking.

I have about 1½ minutes remaining. I would just say—and I thank my friends for joining me down here on the House floor—that this is a solvable problem right now. This could be stopped right now. It could be stopped right now.

Mr. PERRY. This hour.

Mr. ROY. This hour. This moment.

But where is President Biden?

Where is Secretary Mayorkas?

Other than purposely ignoring the laws of the United States to endanger the American people and the migrants who seek to come here, where are they?

And why shouldn't we be impeaching Secretary Mayorkas for failing to faithfully execute the laws of the United States and causing death and destruction to Americans' property and to American people in the form of drug overdoses, in the form of the endangerment of our citizens and, again, the migrants who seek to come here?

I would ask that question of all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: You can take this back and wrestle it away from the administration. Sign that discharge petition. Let's have a vote. Let's have a debate.

What are my colleagues afraid of?

The truth?

What are they afraid of?

The rule of law?

What are they afraid of?

A secure America?

Migrants who get to come here safely?

Put aside the politics and stand up for our country. That is our job as Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from Virginia and Pennsylvania for their leadership.

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

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

Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022 RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA) and the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 (S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress)), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2022 published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

This adjustment responds to House consideration of the bill, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, or the MORE Act (H.R. 3617), as provided for consideration in the House pursuant to H. Res. 1017. This adjustment is allowable under sections 3003(b) and 4007 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th). It shall apply while that legislation is under consideration and take effect upon the enactment of that legislation.

Accordingly, I am revising the aggregate revenue level for fiscal years 2022–2031 and the allocation for the House Committee on the Judiciary for fiscal years 2022–2031. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Kellie Larkin of the Budget Committee staff.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET AGGREGATE TOTALS

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	4,167,897	n.a.
Outlays Total	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,957,374
Revision for the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833):		
Budget Authority	0	n.a.
Outlays Total	0	n.a.
Revenues	n.a.	8,075
Revised Aggregates:		
BA	4,167,897	n.a.
OT	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,965,449

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2023 through 2031 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATON OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
BA	16,626	145,384
OT	15,627	146,339
Revision for the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833):		
BA	0	8,095
OT	0	5,167
Revised Allocation:		
BA	16,626	153,479
OT	15,627	151,506

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022 RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA) and the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 (S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress)), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2022 published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

This adjustment responds to House consideration of the bill, the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833), as provided for consideration in the House pursuant to H. Res. 1017. This adjustment is allowable under sections 3003(b) and 4007 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th). It shall apply while that legislation is under consideration and take effect upon the enactment of that legislation.

Accordingly, I am revising the aggregate spending level for fiscal year 2022 and the aggregate revenue level for fiscal years 2022 and 2022–2031 and the allocation for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce for fiscal years 2022 and 2022–2031. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Kellie Larkin of the Budget Committee staff.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET AGGREGATE TOTALS

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	4,167,897	n.a.
Outlays Total	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,957,374
Revision for the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833):		
Budget Authority	9,044	n.a.
Outlays Total	5,788	n.a.
Revenues	n.a.	–3,500
Revised Aggregates:		
BA	4,176,939	n.a.
OT	4,511,059	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,953,874

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2023 through 2031 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Allocation:		
BA	640,914	8,627,826
OT	663,681	8,667,118
Revision for the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833):		
BA	9,044	–4,793
OT	5,788	–4,793
Revised Allocation:		
BA	649,958	8,623,033
OT	669,469	8,662,325

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 1, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV,

EC-3701. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Consolidation and Restructuring of Purposes and Definitions [Public Notice: 11657] (RIN: 1400-AE27) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1017. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3617) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 117-285). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1218. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps; with an amendment (Rept. 117-286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2501. A bill to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the Federal Communications Commission to update the memorandum of understanding on spectrum coordination; with an amendment (Rept. 117-287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. VAN DUYNE (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. KIM of California, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 7307. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration

to ensure that the small business regulatory budget for a fiscal year is not greater zero, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:
H.R. 7308. A bill to direct the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services to investigate and report on the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H.R. 7309. A bill to reauthorize the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. MANNING):

H.R. 7310. A bill to protect America's retirement security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 7311. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop and submit to Congress a strategy and implementation plan outlining United States efforts to counter the malign influence and activities of the Russian Federation and its proxies in Africa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MELJER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILD, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 7312. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to support or facilitate the participation of the Russian Federation in the Group of Seven, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 7313. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve programs for minority students in STEM fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 7314. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on the People's Republic of China's support to the Russian Federation with respect to its unprovoked invasion of and full-scale war against Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 7315. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family care-

giver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. CRENshaw, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 7316. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy to veterans with traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWN of Ohio (for herself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 7317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to incentivize food donation through tax credits and deductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 7318. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to clarify the career services provided to adults and dislocated workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAWTHORN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FOX, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MANNING, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7319. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 33 Coxe Avenue, in Asheville, North Carolina, as the "Dorothy Hansine Andersen Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. TLAB, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 7320. A bill to help local educational agencies replace zero-tolerance disciplinary policies and punitive discipline in elementary and secondary schools with restorative practices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H.R. 7321. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require certain air carriers to provide reports with respect to maintenance, preventive maintenance, or alterations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 7322. A bill to require coverage for scalp cooling items under group health plans and group and individual health insurance coverage, specified Federal health care programs, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, 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. ESPAILLAT:
H.R. 7323. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act to codify the Department of Labor's Reentry Employment Opportunities grants, authorizing a competitive grant program that aims to assist justice-involved adults and youth returning from incarceration with achieving academic success, employment, reducing the involvement of youth in crime and violence, and

avoiding recidivism; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ESTES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 7324. A bill to delay the effectiveness of certain new rules or regulations relating to the United States energy sector; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BUCK, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 7325. A bill to direct the Attorney General to prepare a report on the Department of Justice activities related to countering Chinese national security threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEG0 (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CURTIS, and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ):

H.R. 7326. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to explicitly authorize distribution of grant funds to the voting accessibility protection and advocacy system of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the system serving the American Indian consortium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 7327. A bill to encourage the timely use of funds provided under the emergency rental assistance programs administered by the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 7328. A bill to establish reporting requirements for issuers of fiat currency-backed stablecoins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 7329. A bill to amend the Smith River National Recreation Area Act to include certain additions to the Smith River National Recreation Area, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain wild rivers in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MANN, Mr. CARL, Mr. FALLON, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MEIJER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 7330. A bill to require annual reports on the military capabilities of Iran-backed entities and the impact of lifted sanctions on such capabilities, prohibit the availability of Federal funds to such entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COMER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MACE, Mr.

KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 7331. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide certain information with respect to unimplemented priority recommendations as part of the Comptroller General's annual reporting to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself, Mr. BERA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. STEEL):

H.R. 7332. A bill to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada (for herself and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas):

H.R. 7333. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program to assist certain schools with respect to the implementation of wraparound services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 7334. A bill to extend the statute of limitations for fraud by borrowers under certain COVID-19 economic injury disaster loan programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 7335. A bill to improve coordination between the Veterans Health Administration and the Veterans Benefits Administration with respect to claims for compensation arising from military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 7336. A bill to establish a Gender Equity in College Sports Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BUSH, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 7337. A bill 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 7338. A bill to require congressional notification prior to payments of Department of State rewards using cryptocurrencies, authorize the appointment of a Director of Digital Currency Security in the Office of Economic Sanctions Policy and Implementation of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEIJER (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 7339. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Infrastructure Projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEUSER (for himself and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 7340. A bill to provide for congressional oversight of certain sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 7341. A bill to move the taxpayer bill of rights to the front of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to establish minimum competency standards for tax return preparers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 7342. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act relating to adult education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 7343. A bill to exempt certain vessels transporting crude oil and petroleum products from certain coastwise endorsement requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 7344. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit certain grants from financing or refinancing projects that support the development, manufacturing, staging, maintenance, or deployment of offshore wind energy infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 7345. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen the provisions relating to child labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 7346. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment of Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency Disorder treatment under part B of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 7347. A bill to reauthorize workforce development innovation grants for the implementation, expansion, and evaluation of evidence-based workforce programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 7348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable tax credit for commercial truck drivers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. STEEL, and Ms. LETLOW):

H.R. 7349. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to identify or develop assessments to measure the prior knowledge, skills, competencies, and experiences of an individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CHU, Ms. PORTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 7350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain late unemployment payments from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 7351. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide for the supervision of nondepository persons offering or making small business loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 7352. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to extend the statute of limitation for fraud by borrowers under the Paycheck Protection Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. CRAIG, and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 7353. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income and Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat benefits for telehealth services offered under a group health plan or group health insurance coverage as excepted benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, 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 Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Black Americans in Congress, 1870-1989"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MACE:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2022 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2023 through 2031; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. WEXTON (for herself, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. WELCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. MENG, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. TITUS, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KILMER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of International Transgender Day of Visibility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER,

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 1018. A resolution recognizing March 31 as "César Chávez Day" in honor of the accomplishments and legacy of César Estrada Chávez; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. JONES):

H. Res. 1019. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2, 2022, as "Dr. John E. Fryer Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-151. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of Arkansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1001, expressing support of requests for federal grant funding for companies creating innovative technologies that benefit Arkansas' agricultural value chain through mitigating bio-security risks; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

ML-152. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of Missouri, relative to House Resolution No. 3658, urging the United States to take prudent and responsible measures to ensure that the required force posture is present in Europe to deter and, if necessary, defeat Russian aggression against any NATO member; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ML-153. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of Missouri, relative to House Resolution No. 3658, urging the United States to take prudent and responsible measures to ensure that the required force posture is present in Europe to deter and, if necessary, defeat Russian aggression against any NATO member; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ML-154. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 113, condemning the Russian invasion of Ukraine and urging the world community to join together in sanctioning Russia; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-155. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 22-1002, requesting that Congress allow the State of Colorado to conduct an analysis of and possibly move forward on harmonizing the gross vehicle weight for trucks on the interstate highway system in Colorado with that of other state highways; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 7307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 7308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 7309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. MCBATH:

H.R. 7310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Commerce Clause: To regulate commerce with states, other nations, and Native American tribes.

Necessary and Proper Clause:

Authority to create laws that are necessary and proper to carry out the laws of the land

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 7311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 7312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 7313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 7314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 7315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article one Section 8

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 7316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article one Section 8

By Ms. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 7317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I Section VIII

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 7318.

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. CAWTHORN:
H.R. 7319.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 7320.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. DEFAZIO:
H.R. 7321.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.
By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 7322.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. ESPAILLAT:
H.R. 7323.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.
By Mrs. FISCHBACH:
H.R. 7324.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. FITZGERALD:
H.R. 7325.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. GALLEGO:
H.R. 7326.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. HILL:
H.R. 7327.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:
H.R. 7328.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 7329.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. JACKSON:
H.R. 7330.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. KILMER:
H.R. 7331.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. KIM of California:
H.R. 7332.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:
H.R. 7333.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order

to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."
By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 7334.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. LURIA:
H.R. 7335.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 7336.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 7337.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.
By Mr. MEEKS:
H.R. 7338.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. MELJER:
H.R. 7339.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. MEUSER:
H.R. 7340.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. NEWHOUSE:
H.R. 7341.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 7342.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 7343.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 7344.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 7345.121 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. SALAZAR:
H.R. 7346.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Ms. SHERRILL:
H.R. 7347.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America
By Ms. SPANBERGER:
H.R. 7348.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 7349.
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. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 7350.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I
By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 7351.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .
By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 7352.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
"The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . ."
By Mrs. WALORSKI:
H.R. 7353.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. GARCIA of California.
H.R. 95: Mr. KELLER and Mr. LATURNER.
H.R. 234: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 336: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 580: Ms. TITUS and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 608: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 829: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1219: Mr. CARL.
H.R. 1229: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1255: Mr. BACON and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1332: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1334: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. ROSS, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 1348: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.
H.R. 1397: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1436: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1481: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1569: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1623: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1624: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1696: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1730: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1803: Mr. KAHELE and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1813: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1842: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. BARR, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. MACE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BURCHETT, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BOST, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1916: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1918: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1957: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 2144: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2145: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2161: Ms. ROSS and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 2223: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 2228: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2244: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2252: Mr. PALAZZO.

- H.R. 2256: Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 2280: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2289: Mr. MELJER.
H.R. 2294: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 2303: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2489: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2517: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 2542: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2565: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 2648: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2654: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2718: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2773: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2784: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2876: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2916: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2965: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2974: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3054: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3108: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3271: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 3342: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3352: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3440: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3488: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3509: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3525: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3577: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3588: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3753: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 3808: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 3897: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3962: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 3990: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4003: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4058: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 4085: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 4122: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 4130: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 4134: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4277: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4410: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 4442: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4479: Mr. POSEY and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4693: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 4705: Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 4750: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WILD, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4756: Mr. COSTA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4766: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 4794: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 4831: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 4832: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4870: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COLE, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 4871: Mr. COHEN, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4943: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4944: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 4965: Ms. SEWELL and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 5008: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 5019: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5064: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 5227: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 5232: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 5313: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 5444: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5502: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 5585: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 5587: Mr. BACON and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5760: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 5768: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 5775: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 5801: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 5874: Mrs. BOEBERT and Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 5984: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 6015: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 6026: Mr. POSEY, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 6068: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6072: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 6104: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 6145: Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 6161: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 6235: Mrs. BOEBERT.
H.R. 6268: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 6375: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 6381: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 6398: Ms. BROWN of Ohio and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6410: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 6448: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6492: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 6509: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 6570: Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 6584: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 6600: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6613: Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 6639: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6686: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 6699: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 6722: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 6732: Mr. FEENSTRA.
H.R. 6737: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 6738: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 6757: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6785: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 6823: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6833: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 6858: Mr. BARR and Mr. GARCIA of California.
H.R. 6862: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 6872: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 6922: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 6926: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 6930: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CROW, and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 6938: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 7018: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 7038: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MENG, and Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 7041: Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 7062: Mr. CORREA and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 7073: Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BACON, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 7076: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. KAHELE.
H.R. 7077: Mr. GARBARINO and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 7099: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 7116: Mr. KILMER and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 7144: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 7151: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 7155: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 7163: Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 7180: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 7185: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 7188: Mr. ELLZEY.
H.R. 7236: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 7267: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 7276: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 7283: Mr. TRONE and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 7285: Mr. BENTZ and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 7302: Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 7303: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 7304: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. BENTZ.
H.J. Res. 53: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. FALLON and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. KELLER.
H.J. Res. 80: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. BEYER.
H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 237: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H. Res. 289: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H. Res. 302: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H. Res. 306: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 366: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H. Res. 583: Mr. KILMER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 629: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 821: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 832: Mr. LYNCH.
H. Res. 981: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
H. Res. 987: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. MENG, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. MANNING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. FEENSTRA.
H. Res. 998: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. GARBARINO.
H. Res. 1000: Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 1008: Ms. BOURDEAUX.
H. Res. 1010: Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H. Res. 1015: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. KUSTOFF.
H. Res. 1016: Mrs. GREENE of Georgia and Mr. GAETZ.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

PT-107. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Guam Legislature, relative to Resolution No. 260-36, relative to expressing the

support of the Guam Legislature for the pas- ers of America Equity Act”; Small Business.; which was referred jointly to the Commit-
sage of H.R. 6504, the “Native Pacific Island- tees on Natural Resources and



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 2022

No. 57

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

Mr. SULLIVAN. Today's opening prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Rabbi Mendy Greenberg, Director of Mat-Su Jewish Center, Chabad-Lubavitch, in Palmer, AK.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Master of the Universe, we stand before You in prayer in these troubling times when innocent men, women, and children have lost their lives and millions fled their homeland due to the catastrophic war in Ukraine. In the words of King David, Psalms, Chapter 121:

I lift my eyes to the mountains—from where will my help come? My help will come from the Lord, Maker of heaven and earth.

May You, Almighty God, grant the Members of this honorable body wisdom and understanding that the ultimate way to eliminate the cause of war and bring true peace to the world is by embodying the universal values of the seven commandments issued to Noah after the great flood, foremost of which is not to commit murder.

Almighty God, I beseech You to bless the U.S. Senate assembled today to fulfill one of Your seven commandments to govern by just laws and in the merit of the global spiritual giant and leader, Your servant, the Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, whose 120th birthday will be celebrated this coming month on the 11th day of Nissan, Tuesday, April 12.

In 1978, this honorable body established the Rebbe's birthday as Education and Sharing Day USA and is proclaimed annually by the President of the United States in recognition of the Rebbe's global campaign to bring awareness and educate our youth about these ethical values of the Seven

Noahide Laws as the basis for a just and compassionate society.

Almighty God, may it be in the merit of realizing the Rebbe's vision for humanity, we speedily see the fulfillment of Isaiah's promise:

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore.

With the coming of Moshiach, Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2022—Motion to Proceed—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 4373, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.R. 4373, a bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

RABBI MENDY GREENBERG

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, thank you for allowing me to open the Senate with you. It was a true honor to have Rabbi Mendy Greenberg, who is doing amazing work in Palmer, AK, open the Senate with his very powerful and meaningful prayer and very appropriate prayer for what is happening in the world.

I just want to say a little bit about our incredible Jewish community in Alaska. Rabbi Greenberg's parents are actually up in the Gallery watching—his father, Rabbi Greenberg and his incredible wife, Esti.

I just want to say what they do for our—community—communities throughout Alaska—is so powerful, so meaningful, and touches so many lives way beyond the Jewish community of Alaska—way beyond that community. I love the phrase referring to our wonderful Jewish community of Alaska, the “frozen chosen,” because it is a little cold in our State, as most Americans know.

But here is the thing about this community: They are incredible in terms of

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1875

bringing all Alaskans together. We have this annual event called the Jewish Gala that has hundreds and hundreds of Alaskans of all faiths who participate in this every year. It is one of my favorite things to do as an Alaskan, to come and celebrate not just the Jewish community, but the spirit of togetherness, the spirit of faith, and the spirit of taking care of one another. That is what this incredible community does, led by both Rabbi Greenbergs, who we saw the younger today give this very powerful prayer.

I want to thank him and his parents for being here today. It is not always easy to get to DC from Alaska—a couple of thousand miles at least. To our Jewish community back home, to the Greenbergs for all they have done, I just want to, on the Senate floor here, offer my deepest thanks for the example they set for the entire State of Alaska. It is great having them here, and what they do for our State is really powerful, really important.

Thank you, Madam President, for allowing me to participate in the opening and the prayer this morning.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

H.R. 4373

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first on COVID negotiations, yesterday, I met with a group of my colleagues—Senators MURRAY, COONS, ROMNEY, BLUNT, BURR, and GRAHAM—for another round of talks as we work toward a bipartisan COVID agreement. We spoke throughout the day; we talked late into the night; our staffs are continuing talks this morning.

The gap has been narrowed greatly, and we are intent on working with Republicans to cross the finish line because this is vital for our country if, God forbid, a new variant arises in the future, and that is all too likely. We would like considerably more money than our Republican colleagues, but we need to reach 60 votes to get something passed through the Senate, and so we are going to push as hard as we can.

When it comes to replenishing COVID response funding, we simply can't afford to kick the can down the road. The White House has been more than clear and more than transparent about the fact that public funds for COVID are at risk of running out. We all know that a possible future variant can quickly undo much of the progress we have made against the virus, so it makes no sense whatsoever to hold off on COVID funding that we know is very much needed right now. The more we wait, the bigger the problem will be later, God forbid a variant hits.

The bottom line is this: Both sides should work to complete COVID funding soon because that will mean more vaccines, more therapeutics, and more testing so we can keep schools and communities open. We can stay "back to normal," which we are doing right

now. Woe is us if a future variant extends its nasty tentacles across the country, and we don't have the resources in place to respond. Woe is us. So, again, I am pleading with my Republican colleagues: Join us. We want more than you do, but we have to get something done. We have to get something done.

We will keep working to arrive at a deal in good faith, and we hope—hope, hope, hope—our Republican colleagues ultimately join us in supporting a robust enough package to deal with this problem.

As I said, we are making good progress. We are getting closer and closer, but the sooner we get this deal done, the better for the country.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Madam President, on cost cutting, it has been a productive few days here on the Senate floor as we pass legislation that will help reduce costs, relieve supply chains, and build on the incredible economic growth we have seen under President Biden.

I am glad to announce that the Senate is on track to pass bipartisan legislation by Senators KLOBUCHAR and THUNE to reform unfair shipping practices that are clogging up our ports, diminishing American exports, hurting our farmers, and ultimately hurting consumers. It hurts both ways when shipping costs go way up, as they have. The exports we send over—a lot of it agricultural goods—the imports that come back—a lot of it consumer goods—all are higher priced, and Americans pay that higher price.

So the bipartisan shipping bill is exactly the sort of thing the Senate should focus on because when there is a logjam at the Port of Los Angeles, it hurts farmers and small businesses in Minnesota, North Dakota, and across the country, and it hurts consumers in every corner of the country, from Portland, ME, to San Diego, from Seattle to Miami, New York, and everywhere in between.

So I am glad we are making progress to getting this legislation done. The sooner the better, again.

The legislation, of course, is not the only step we have taken this week to strengthen supply chains to help lower costs throughout the economy. Earlier this week, the Senate passed a strongly bipartisan jobs and competitiveness bill in the works for over a year, which will help increase our domestic manufacturing, help address the critical chip shortage, and grow our economy by investing in American innovation.

Yesterday, the House passed a motion requesting a conference committee, and the Senate will soon do the same. We are on track to initiating a conference, hopefully, before the end of this work period.

Off the floor, committees held numerous hearings zeroing in on the many dimensions of our lowering cost agenda. To name just a few examples, the Banking Committee held a hearing on Monday on the growing burden of

medical debt, a problem that is facing so many Americans.

The Small Business Committee also held a hearing yesterday exploring the supply chain crisis and its implications for smaller businesses, including struggling restaurants.

And, today, the Banking Committee is on the matter of seniors who struggle with affordable housing.

These are just a few examples of how, both off the floor and on, Democrats are continuing our focus on legislation that will lower costs, help American families, and solve the deep and difficult challenges that everyday Americans face to make ends meet. And we are going to keep pushing in the months ahead to translate these ideas into legislation we can consider here in the Chamber, as we are doing with shipping right now.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, well, the Biden administration is on track for another record-shattering year on our southern border—in all the wrong ways.

The Department of Homeland Security is reportedly preparing for up to 18,000 attempted border crossings per day—18,000 per day.

President Biden's border crisis is a symptom of the modern Democratic Party's inability to support any remotely reasonable policy of border enforcement.

Now, thus far, the Biden administration has kept the chaos at least somewhat in check by leaning on emergency authorities that are specific to the COVID pandemic. To be clear, even with these title 42 authorities in place, our border has still been in crisis. Last month was the worst February in more than 20 years. We just saw the worst 12-month period for illegal crossings since at least—listen to this—1960. This is with title 42 in place. Just imagine if President Biden kills it.

But the open-borders far left doesn't like title 42. So now, according to public reports, the Biden administration is preparing to cave to the radicals, end title 42, and effectively throw our borders completely wide open.

Ending title 42 without any real border security plan in place would spark a humanitarian and security crisis like we have never seen before. But it is pretty obvious the far left doesn't care. Open borders are their objective.

So at the same time Washington Democrats are pushing for more Federal spending on the pandemic, they

want to declare the pandemic is finished at our southern border. This doesn't add up.

Throwing the floodgates open for an historic spring and summer of illegal immigration would be an unforced error of historic proportions. It would be right up there with the administration's \$2 trillion in inflationary spending and their botched retreat from Afghanistan.

But this goes deeper than just title 42 and COVID. The fundamental point is this: Today's Democrats need the pretext of the pandemic to justify having national borders at all. The left feels they need the pretext of COVID to have any—any—border enforcement whatsoever.

This is absolutely mind-boggling.

Republicans and the American people reject this false choice between permanent COVID versus open borders. We can't only be a sovereign nation during pandemics. Americans deserve secure borders all the time.

Functional open borders have pervaded the Biden agenda at literally every level. The President chose a Supreme Court nominee, Judge Jackson, who has displayed a major streak of judicial activism on this very subject, illegal immigration.

In 2019, the judge sided with the left-wing activists and overlooked plain statutory language that gave DHS "sole and unreviewable discretion" over the speedy removal of illegal immigrants. Judge Jackson literally just brushed aside the plain text of the law to reach the policy outcome she wanted, and she went even further. She issued a nationwide injunction—a nationwide injunction—to impose her radical policy view on our entire country.

This was a blatant case of judicial activism. The ruling read like it belonged on the opinion pages of the Washington Post. Even the very liberal DC Circuit completely disagreed and overturned Judge Jackson, with an Obama appointee writing the opinion.

It should not be this hard for an administration to understand that a nation actually needs borders.

I strongly urge the President to keep title 42 in place and quickly produce an actual strategy to do his job and secure our border.

THE ECONOMY

Madam President, on another matter, the American people know our country is hurting. One national survey just found that only 22 percent say our country is headed in the right direction. Seven in ten Americans just told another poll that our Nation's economy is "in poor shape."

The worst inflation in 40 years is fleecing American consumers from the gas pump to the grocery store. American workers are earning raises, but prices are climbing faster than their pay.

The Biden administration has tried to pass the buck for this mess. They have tried to blame everything but

their own radical policies. They have claimed that a year of runaway inflation was actually—listen to this—"Putin's price hike," because of a war in Europe that is barely a month old. They have claimed the problem is evil profiteering CEOs, because, apparently, the private sector was not seeking profits back when the Republicans had the economy humming with low inflation just a few years ago.

American families aren't buying the spin for one second. When asked by another poll what they think is the main reason for rising gas prices—listen to this—Americans' top answer was "the Biden administration's economic policies."

An outright majority of the country agrees the President has made inflation worse, but the administration isn't changing course. They are actually doubling down.

The Biden administration began the week by proposing a budget that would skyrocket domestic discretionary spending on liberal wish-list items and smack the country with the biggest tax hike in American history.

Just last night, Democrats tried to ram through another radical nominee who would only have compounded the economic pain. President Biden's choice of David Weil for a senior post at the Department of Labor was a naked attempt to achieve through bureaucracy what the far-left cannot achieve through legislation. This nominee is famous in Washington for hostility to small business. He has received tens of thousands of dollars from Big Labor to do their bidding. He openly sought to end both the franchise system and the gig economy as we know them.

Fortunately—fortunately—last night, a bipartisan majority of Senators rallied together. We saved the President and the Democratic leader from digging themselves into an even deeper hole with this nominee.

Also overnight, we learned President Biden is going to try to slap another bandaid on gas prices by draining more oil out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The reserve is supposed to exist for giant unforeseen crises, such as a war between great powers. It is not there so that anti-energy politicians whose policies have raised gas prices can try to hide that from the public.

It is also worth remembering that back in 2020, as oil prices were cratering, Republicans tried to seize the opportunity to rebuild the Strategic Reserve. It would have been a win-win-win to help stabilize our energy industry in the early days of the crisis, gotten American taxpayers an incredible deal with oil at bargain-basement prices, and enhanced our readiness going forward.

But you know what happened. Senate Democrats blocked it. They said buying oil at rock-bottom prices and building up our reserve would have been—listen to this—"a bailout for Big Oil." So the Democratic leader bragged about killing that proposal.

You can't make this stuff up.

Our colleagues misunderstand basic economics and basic national security every chance they get. Taxing, spending, radical nominations, and gimmicky half-measures—the American people already blame the Democrats for the fix we are in, and, every week, our colleagues seek new ways to prove them right.

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

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

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, this morning, I am going to announce my decision on Judge Jackson's nomination to the Supreme Court. I will oppose her, and I will vote no.

My decision is based upon her record of judicial activism, flawed sentencing methodology regarding child pornography cases, and a belief Judge Jackson will not be deterred by the plain meaning of the law when it comes to liberal causes.

I find Judge Jackson to be a person of exceptionally good character, respected by her peers, and someone who has worked hard to achieve her current position. However, her record is overwhelming in its lack of a steady judicial philosophy and a tendency to achieve outcomes in spite of what the law requires or commonsense would dictate.

After a thorough review of Judge Jackson's record and information gained at the hearing from an evasive witness, I now know why Judge Jackson was the favorite of the radical left, and I will vote no.

In the area of child pornography, there has been an explosion in this country of child pornography on the internet. In 2021, groups that follow sexual abuse of children on the internet reported 29.3 million reports of individuals accessing information regarding child pornography on the internet. It has gone from 100,000 in 2003 to 29.3 million in 2021.

It is estimated that there is 85 million images and videos and other files involving sexually exploited children on the internet.

Now, why is this important?

This is the venue of choice for the child pornographer. It is not the mail. As you can see, the internet is where these people go. In a matter of minutes, they can download hundreds, if not thousands, of images and videos of the most disgusting abuse of children; and my goal is to deter that, not discount it.

Judge Jackson's sentencing methodology, in my view, misses the mark. I don't doubt that, personally, she is offended by the behavior that we are all

talking about, but as a judge, she has an opportunity to deter the behavior of going on the internet and downloading images of exploited children. Every time she has that opportunity, she refuses to exercise it.

Now, why is Judge Jackson's sentencing so different?

In possession cases, she gives 29.2 months, and the average nationally is 68 months. In the distribution of child pornography, her sentence is 71.9 months, and the minimum is 60 months. That is what you have to give. The average nationally, they tell me, is 135 months. The length of sentence for the possession of child pornography imposed by Judge Jackson is 57 percent less than the national average. In the area of distribution, it is 40 percent less than the national average.

Why?

Under the sentencing guidelines, judges, if they choose, can enhance the sentence based on the fact that the perpetrator used the internet.

Now, why do we want that as a sentencing enhancement?

We want to deter the use of the internet when it comes to child pornography because there are already 85 million images and videos of children being abused, and that is the venue of choice. So, instead of deterring that behavior, Judge Jackson routinely says that she will not hold that against a perpetrator.

I think that is a mistake. She basically said: It is so easy, in a matter of minutes, to push a button and download a bunch of files. That seems, to me, to be an unfair way to sentence somebody.

She also takes off the table a sentence enhancement for the number or the volume of child pornography being possessed or distributed.

I think that is absolutely backward. I think what we should be doing is that every time you mash the button and download an image of a child being exploited, your time in jail should go up. That should be held against you. Accessing the internet should be deterred, not ignored.

What I have to say is that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children released a report on the 2020 data. There has been a 35-percent increase in child sex abuse material in a single year, 29.3 million reports last year of people accessing child pornography on the internet, and at least 85 million images and files on the internet.

When it comes time to sentence these people, Judge Jackson will not impose additional punishment on the fact of the volume involved and the fact they are using the internet, the venue of choice.

The more you download, the more you go to jail, is my view. I am going to work with Senator HAWLEY to correct these practices. I think she is making a terrible mistake by not enhancing sentences based on the volume because every click of the computer is

destroying a life. We should be deterring the use of the internet when it comes to child pornography. Judge Jackson chooses not to. When it comes to the volume, that should be held against you. The more you abuse children, the more in your possession, the more you distribute, the longer you go to jail.

The reason her numbers are so low is due to that sentencing methodology. I think, if we don't fix this, we are making the problem worse. I think her approach to this issue is absolutely wrong; it loses all deterrence. I will be watching like a hawk future nominees who are in the sentencing business to see if they follow this model.

The model Judge Jackson has created is one wherein the more you do, it doesn't matter. The fact that you use the internet where all the child pornography lies is not held against you, and I believe it should be. Every click, every download means you go to jail longer in the world that I want to create.

The other area of concern is Guantanamo Bay. Remember this? This is 9/11.

Guantanamo Bay has been a place to house enemy combatants captured in the war on terror. Judge Jackson was a public defender. I think, for four or five GTMO detainees, and that is a noble thing. I have no problem with somebody—a public defender anywhere in the country—defending very unpopular people, and people at GTMO deserve representation.

What I found during this representation is that her amicus briefs in the defense of GTMO detainees accused President Bush and his team of being war criminals. That is not defending somebody charged or held as an enemy combatant as being part of the enemy force. That is an accusation against your own government that, I think, buys into the language of the left.

You can vigorously defend anyone captured as an enemy combatant or who is potentially charged with a crime against terrorism. That is a noble thing. Yet, when you use the language that was in her brief—and she said: “Well, I really don't remember that”—I have a hard time believing that you put your name on a brief that calls the President of the United States and his team war criminals. That is not about defending somebody; that is an activist approach to the war on terror.

It goes further. In her legal briefs, she wanted to deny the United States the ability to hold GTMO detainees under the law of war indefinitely. There are about 37 or 38 GTMO detainees still being held who have never been charged. We know, through the intel and the evidence, that they are hardened killers committed to the jihadist cause. Under the law of war, once their habeas petition has been reviewed by the Federal courts—where the courts agree with the government that the person is, in fact, an enemy combatant—under the law of war,

there is no requirement to release him, but Judge Jackson took the position as an advocate that we could not hold them indefinitely, creating a dilemma whereby you have to charge them with a crime or let them go.

I don't consider these people criminals as much as warriors in the cause to destroy our way of life. If you choose to charge them with a crime, fine; but you don't have to make that choice. The reason that there are 30-plus still in detention is we have chosen—Republicans and Democrats—to hold these people off the battlefield. If we had accepted Judge Jackson's legal reasoning, that tool would not have been available to us as a nation, and it would have compromised our ability to defend ourselves.

I think that approach was the most extreme view of representation in this area, and I think it shows a lack of understanding of the war in which we are in. We are not fighting criminals. These are not wayward goat herders. These are people committed to the jihadist cause and would kill us all if they could.

Before I leave GTMO, 31 percent of the people who have been detained since the beginning of the war have gone back to the fight—I will introduce that at the hearing next week—and some of the senior leadership of the current Taliban government were GTMO detainees who have now not only gone back to the fight but have actually gone back to serve in the Taliban government that is reining oppression on the Taliban people.

So, to those who think this is a crime we are fighting, you are wrong. It is a war for the survival of good against evil.

Immigration—in case you haven't noticed, this country is being invaded by illegal immigrants. Right after taking office, President Biden rolled back virtually every policy of President Trump's regarding asylum and deportation. He basically destroyed the regime created by President Trump that gave us the lowest number of illegal crossings in this country in 30 or 40 years at the end of 2020. Now, every week, we are setting new records.

Why?

The policies that existed during the Trump administration worked. They are being reversed by President Biden, and we are being overwhelmed, and the worst is yet to come. If the Biden administration—the CDC—does away with the ability to deport illegal immigrants under title 42 of the public health law, presenting a threat to COVID, then you will see the numbers go up even further. There will be thousands—18,000 to 20,000 people a day—coming across our border from countries with low vaccination rates. So, when it comes to illegal immigration, policy matters.

When Judge Jackson was a district court judge, there was a case brought by *Make the Road New York, et al., v. McAleenan*, who was the Acting DHS

Secretary under President Trump. The group Make the Road New York was an Arabella activist group. This is kind of a holding company, for lack of a better word—an umbrella group—funded by George Soros and a bunch of other liberal billionaires. This group in that chain, in receiving money from these folks, filed a lawsuit, arguing against the Trump decision to deport, under expedited immigration authority, people who have been here 2 years or less. In changing the Obama policy and actually fully implementing the authority given to the DHS Secretary, they decided to go the full 2 years. Anybody here 2 years and under in the category in question could be deported with expedited procedure—meaning, it was a quick turnaround.

This was the authority given by the Congress to the DHS Director. Obama didn't use that authority fully. Trump decided to do it. Make the Road New York, et al.—a bunch of liberal groups—sued the Trump policy change. Judge Jackson was the judge, and she overruled the Trump decision. The statute in question says that the Secretary has the “sole and unreviewable discretion” to use expedited deportation for people here 2 years or less. The statute could not have been written any clearer.

If you are looking for what an activist judge is all about, this is the case, exhibit A.

The law was written in the most clear terms, saying the decision of the Secretary's is unreviewable and solely in their hands when it comes to using expedited removal procedures for people here 2 years or less. She ruled against the Trump administration. She basically said this was arbitrary and capricious; it reeked of bad faith; and it “[showed] contempt for the authority that the Constitution's Framers have vested in the judicial branch.”

That contempt she is talking about was a congressional act. The congressional act was designed to tell judges that the DHS Secretary has discretion in this area, solely and unreviewable. She found that concept offensive. Instead of following the plain letter of the law, she did legal gymnastics to find against the Trump administration.

When she says the statute “[created] contempt for the authority that the Constitution's Framers have vested in the judicial branch,” what she is saying is, I will be damned if I am going to be limited by a congressional act that tells me I can't do what I want to do.

The plaintiff in that case was from the radical left. She ruled for them in spite of the plain meaning of the statute, and she was overturned by the DC Circuit court.

The court said—and this is a fairly liberal court:

There could hardly be a more definitive expression of Congressional intent to leave the decision about the scope of expedited removal, within statutory bounds, to the Secretary's independent judgment. The “forceful phrase ‘sole and unreviewable discre-

tion” by its exceptional terms, heralds Congress's judgment to commit the decision exclusively to agency discretion.

She ignored the plain meaning of the statute, the language of the statute, to get a result she wanted, and the DC District Court of Appeals said that there could hardly be a more defended expression of congressional intent.

That is judicial activism on steroids, and it makes managing our immigration problem even worse when you have activist judges who ignore the law and take discretion away, given by Congress to the executive branch, because they don't like the outcome. That is, in fact, the premier definition of judicial activism. I find, in her judging a desire to get an outcome and no matter what she has to do to get that outcome, she will pursue it. This is a case where you couldn't have written a statute more clearly, and she did. She just went around it, got the results she wanted, and got slapped down on appeal.

Now, she is the first African-American female slated to go to the Supreme Court. She, however, is not the first African-American female who had potential to be on the Supreme Court.

Janice Rogers Brown was nominated by President Bush 43 to be on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals—one of the premier appellate courts—like Judge Jackson was nominated to. She is from Alabama. She was the daughter and granddaughter of sharecroppers, growing up in Alabama during the Jim Crow era. She moved to California as a teenager, and she wound up serving on the California Supreme Court. She was a single mother raising children.

In June 2005, she was confirmed to the DC court in a 56-to-43 vote. That was after the Gang of 14 broke a filibuster by my Democratic colleagues against her and others. She was nominated in 2003, and her nomination was stalled for 2 years.

Here is what Senator SCHUMER said:

Judge Brown was the least worthy pick this president has made for the appellate court, and that's based on her record.

Senator DURBIN in 2005:

One of the [President's] most ideological and extreme judicial nominees.

In 2005:

If the President sends us a nominee who, like Janice Rogers Brown, believes that the New Deal was the triumph of a “socialist revolution,” there will be a fight.

Here is what then-Senator Biden said about Janice Rogers Brown. Not only did he filibuster her, he said: “I can assure you that would be a very, very difficult fight, and she probably would be filibustered” if she were nominated to the Supreme Court.

So, to my Democratic colleagues, as you celebrate Judge Jackson's potential ascension to the Court, as those of us on the committee who asked penetrating, relevant questions of Judge Jackson's judicial philosophy, how she sentenced people and why—you know, the liberal media that is completely in the tank on issues like this sat on the

sidelines and watched you, my Democratic colleagues, stop the ascension of an African-American conservative nominee by President Bush. When it came to her potential of being on the Supreme Court, you threatened to filibuster her. You considered her ideology unacceptable and too conservative.

So if you are a conservative nominee of color, a woman, it is OK to use your ideology against you. If you question the ideology and the judging ability of a liberal African-American nominee, you are a racist. Those days are over for me. So I have very little respect for what is going on in modern America when it comes to judging.

Miguel Estrada was nominated by President Bush 43—a highly qualified man, Hispanic—to be on the Court, and he fell victim to the wholesale filibuster of Bush nominees in the 2003 era. He didn't make it through the Gang of 8. Judge Janice Rogers Brown got on the Court—2 years delayed, and when she was being considered to go on the Court, Joe Biden, Senator Joe Biden, said she will be filibustered very, very likely.

So we live in a world where, if you are a person of color, a woman, and you are conservative, everything is fair game. If you are a person of color and liberal, how dare anybody question or use the same standard against you that was used against the other nominees? I don't accept that.

Finally, about the hearing itself, to the liberal media, comparing this hearing to Judge Kavanaugh's is an absolute offense. Nobody on the Republican side held information back, accusing Judge Brown of doing something that was either made up, not credible. Nobody questioned her high school annual. Nobody took a bunch of garbage and made it seem like the nominee had been Bill Cosby in his teenage years. Crazy stuff. Offensive stuff.

What we did ask Judge Jackson is, Why do you sentence the people the way you do? Explain the reasoning in the cases involving child pornography. We went after her judicial philosophy, and it had to be contentious because the judge seldom would answer a question. But to me, if you are going to be nominated to the Supreme Court for a lifetime appointment, you should expect to be asked hard questions. You should not expect to have your life destroyed. And if you don't see a difference between the two hearings, then you are blinded by your desire to get an outcome.

Here is where we are in 2022: The only person qualified to go to the Supreme Court as an African-American woman is a liberal. You can be equally qualified as a conservative, but you need not apply because your ideology disqualifies you. That is not exactly the advancement I was hoping we would have in America in 2022.

So, Judge Jackson, I will vote no.

I find her sentencing methodology to reinforce and take deterrence of the most heinous offenses off the table.

The statements she made during the sentencing hearings showed a tilted sense of compassion. I am sure she doesn't like the behavior and feels sorry for the kids, but every time she had a chance to increase punishment for the volume of material in the hands of the perpetrators, she chose not to do that, and I think she should. Going to the internet, to her, and downloading a bunch of files was too easy to enhance punishment? Well, it is just too easy to destroy lives.

So when it comes to immigration, it is the most egregious case I have ever seen, quite frankly, of a judge ignoring the plain meaning of the law to get a result they wanted. When it comes to the War on Terror, I think the position she wanted our country to take would make us less safe. The language of the left in her briefs of calling Bush a war criminal says more about the politics than it does the merit of the argument.

So now, I know why Judge Jackson was the preferred pick of the radical left. Now, I know why they went after Michelle Childs, somebody I could have supported—even though she had been liberal—a highly qualified, sensible, commonsense person. Now, I know. Now, I understand better. And that is why I am voting no.

To my Democratic colleagues, I will work with you when I can, but this is a bridge too far.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the presentation by my colleague and friend, Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina. I wanted to come to the floor to make it clear that he didn't tell you the whole story. In fact, in some ways, he didn't even get close.

Who is this judge, Ketanji Brown Jackson? How could she even be considered for the Supreme Court if she is the preferred pick of the radical left? Well, let's take a look at her background: an extraordinary story of a daughter of two public school teachers; the daughter of a father who decided he was going to go to law school, basically stopped working full time. Her mother supported the family. She was a little girl at the time. She remembers it well because there would be law books stacked on the kitchen table. She would come in as a little girl and bring her coloring books to sit next to her daddy while he was studying for law school. He went on to become a lawyer. Family members were policemen. One of her uncles turned out to be the chief of police in Miami. She grew up in a very ambitious, determined, orderly family, and she certainly had respect for her family ties to law enforcement.

She was on the debate team in high school. One of the trips took her from Florida up to the campus of Harvard University. She was dazzled, believed that this just might be the answer to her dreams.

She came back to her high school and sat down with her high school coun-

selor, who said to this young Black woman: Honey, you are shooting too high. I don't want your heart to be broken. Think about other schools. Don't think about that Harvard University school.

Luckily, she ignored that advice, applied, and was accepted.

She told the story before the hearing about being on the campus at Cambridge, not sure that it was the right decision, looking around, seeing a much different world than the one she grew up in, a much different group of people than she was used to socializing with. She must have shown it in her face because as she was walking across the campus one day, an African-American woman saw her, looked at her, and said: Persevere. Persevere.

Just that simple word captured everything for her, and she did. She persevered and completed her education at Harvard and went on to Harvard Law School. She was an outstanding student at the law school, so much so that she became a clerk to the Federal district court. She did such a good job, she was promoted to become a Federal circuit court clerk and then—the ultimate prize for any graduating law student in America—clerk to a Justice of the Supreme Court—Ketanji Brown Jackson—and what an irony that she worked for Justice Stephen Breyer, whose retirement has created the vacancy which she seeks.

Along the way, she staffed the Sentencing Commission. She worked in the Public Defender's Office. She became a Federal district court judge, cleared by this committee, the Judiciary Committee. This was her fourth time before the committee. Each time she appeared, there was bipartisan support, including the Senator who just spoke against her. Then, ultimately, the opportunity of a lifetime to fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court.

For the hearing itself, first, I want to commend my Republican colleague CHUCK GRASSLEY. As chairman of the committee, a Democrat couldn't be any luckier than to have sitting in the chair next to you CHUCK GRASSLEY. He is a gentleman. He is a strong, faithful Republican, but he is a gentleman. We were determined to make this hearing for this judicial nomination to the Supreme Court different than some that had gone before.

I want to commend the Republicans on the committee. There are 11 of them. The majority of those Republicans asked tough, probing questions, as they should. They never got personal. They never raised their voices. They were respectful throughout, the majority of them. I am sorry to say that in a few instances, there were exceptions on that side of the aisle. But I think the hearing, by and large, was a good hearing despite a few differences, which I will note in a minute.

At the end of the day, you could not help but leave that hearing and think you had just seen, you had just witnessed a moment in history—not just

the first African American to aspire to serve on the Supreme Court but also a pillar of strength during her hearing. They threw it at her in every direction.

I can't tell you how many people have come up to me everywhere I have gone since that hearing and said the same thing: How did you sit through that? How could you put up with that?

And I thought, and I said to them: Think about her sitting in front of her husband and her daughters and some of the things that were said about her, things said again this morning on the Senate floor. She came out a pillar of strength, grace and dignity under pressure.

I looked up at that table several times and thought, Judge, if you stood up at this moment and said "Enough. I am taking my family, and we are out of here," I would understand. But she never did. She never wavered. She was solid as a rock, and that is why it is my honor to support her and believe that she is going to make history.

Some of the things they said were outrageous. This case they want to make about her sentencing guidelines when it comes to sex crimes involving children and child pornography—what did she say about it? She said they were horrible and despicable crimes. But she didn't just say it before the committee when she was under assault. Listen to what she said in one of her cases, *United States v. Hillie*, a case involving sexual misconduct toward children. The true nature of these offenses, Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson said, lies in how they affected the children who you tormented for nearly a decade when you lived on and off with their mother. That is a substantial portion of their childhood. These two children carried a burden no child should have to shoulder—the burden of protecting themselves from a man charged with their care but who instead exploited them.

Then she went on to say:

This family has been torn apart—

she said to the defendant—

by your criminal actions. You saw it on the faces of those women. You heard it in their voices. And the impact of your acts on those very real victims who are still struggling to recover to this day makes your crimes among the most serious criminal offenses that this Court has ever sentenced.

Does that sound like she is soft on crime? Does that sound like she didn't remember she is a mother of daughters who cared for the impact those criminals had on the children and the family? Not in any way whatsoever.

You would draw a much different conclusion if you just listened to the arguments being made recently here on the floor, and it would be an unfair conclusion.

The bottom line, as far as I am concerned, is this: What they have left out in the presentation is critical to the very truth of their allegations. Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson is in the mainstream of sentencing when it comes to these cases. Seventy to eighty percent

of Federal judges divert from the guidelines as she has in some cases. And, let me add, her accusers have been voting for Federal judges proposed by President Trump right and left who do exactly the same thing she does.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a New York Times article of March 25, 2022, entitled “Jackson’s Critics Backed Judges With Like Rulings.”

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 2022]
JACKSON’S CRITICS BACKED JUDGES WITH LIKE RULINGS

(By Linda Qiu)

WASHINGTON.—Several Republican senators repeatedly and misleadingly suggested during this week’s Supreme Court confirmation hearings that Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson had given uncommonly lenient sentences to felons convicted of child sex abuse crimes.

But all of the Republican critics had previously voted to confirm judges who had given out prison terms below prosecutor recommendations, the very bar they accused Judge Jackson of failing to clear.

Just 30 percent of offenders who possessed or shared images of child sex abuse received a sentence within the range suggested by nonbinding federal guidelines in the 2019 fiscal year, and 59 percent received a sentence below the guideline range. And in general, it is not uncommon for judges to impose shorter sentences than what prosecutors have recommended.

“I listed these seven cases in which you had discretion and you did not follow the prosecutor’s recommendation or the sentencing guidelines,” Senator Josh Hawley, Republican of Missouri, said at Judge Jackson’s hearing on Tuesday. “I’m questioning how you used your discretion in these cases.”

Mr. Hawley’s point was echoed by three of his Republican colleagues: Senators Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, Tom Cotton of Arkansas and Ted Cruz of Texas. Mr. Cruz said the sentences imposed by Judge Jackson in cases involving images of child sex abuse were 47.2 percent less than the prosecutor’s recommendations on average.

“You always were under the recommendation of the prosecutor,” Mr. Graham told the judge on Wednesday. “I think you’re doing it wrong, and every judge who does what you’re doing is making it easier for the children to be exploited.”

But Mr. Hawley, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cotton and Mr. Cruz all voted to confirm judges nominated by President Donald J. Trump to appeals courts even though those nominees had given out sentences lighter than prosecutor recommendations in cases involving images of child sex abuse. Mr. Graham had also voted to confirm Judge Jackson to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in 2021 in spite of the sentencing decisions she had made as a district judge.

In 2017, Judge Ralph R. Erickson was confirmed by a 95-to-1 vote to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, with Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cruz and Mr. Graham voting in the affirmative. (Mr. Hawley was not yet a senator.) While serving as a district court judge in North Dakota, Judge Erickson imposed sentences shorter than the prosecutor’s recommendations in nine cases involving child sex abuse imagery from 2009 to 2017, averaging 19 percent lower.

In the case with the greatest discrepancy—in which a 68-year-old man pleaded guilty to

possessing and transporting such illicit materials—prosecutors asked for 151 months and Judge Erickson imposed a 96-month sentence.

Judge Amy J. St. Eve was confirmed by a 91-to-0 vote in 2018 to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. While serving as a district court judge in Illinois, Judge St. Eve imposed lighter sentences than prosecutor recommendations in two such cases. In *United States v. Conrad*, she sentenced a man who transported images of child sexual abuse to 198 months, 45 percent less than the prosecutor’s recommendation of 360 months.

All four Republican senators voted to confirm Judge Joseph F. Bianco to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 2019. Previously, as a district court judge in New York, Judge Bianco sentenced three defendants to prison terms shorter than what prosecutors had sought.

At a 2013 hearing for a 25-year-old defendant who possessed and distributed illicit materials, Judge Bianco stated that the court had “discretion” to impose such sentences and spoke of “mitigating circumstances”—an echo of what Judge Jackson repeatedly told the senators during this week’s hearings. The defendant received a 60-month prison term, while prosecutors had asked for “a sentence above the 60 months.”

“The guidelines here are just way disproportionate under the facts of this case, and I don’t view them as particularly helpful in this case.” Judge Bianco said at the time. “I disagree with the government that this case is sort of in the heartland of normal cases. There are a number of mitigating factors in this case that I believe are compelling.”

Most recently, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cruz and Mr. Hawley voted to confirm Judge Andrew L. Brasher to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit in 2020. (Mr. Graham was not present for the vote.) As a district court judge in Alabama, Judge Brasher had sentenced a defendant to 84 months in prison, below the prosecutor recommendation of 170 months.

In a 2019 hearing before he issued the sentence, Judge Brasher noted that “one of the things that I’m required by law to evaluate and consider with respect to” the defendant “is disparities between offenders who are similarly situated.”

That, too, was similar to an explanation that Judge Jackson gave for her sentencing decisions.

“Judges all over the country are grappling with how to apply this guideline under these circumstances,” she told Mr. Hawley on Wednesday. “The judge is not just evaluating what the government says in these cases. In every criminal case, a judge has to take into account all sorts of factors.”

Mr. DURBIN. It tells a story, and the story is very clear. We have a situation in this country where we have not upgraded the child pornography and sexual misconduct statutes in years. Across the board, 70 to 80 percent of sentences by Federal judges take the same position as Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson. These so-called deviations from the guidelines have become commonplace. As I said, the overwhelming majority of Federal judges are doing this.

Well, is there a problem? There is. But the problem is that we have not upgraded the statute. We bear responsibility for this. The decision was made before the Supreme Court that these guidelines would not be mandatory. It was a decision joined by Antonin

Scalia—the originalist, the conservative. It put the burden back on Congress, and we have not picked up that responsibility.

So you say to yourself: Well, if she were so soft on crime, it surely would have shown up in other places. Well, let me tell you what happened. The American Bar Association did a review of her career as a prosecutor, as a defender, on the bench. They interviewed 250 individuals—judges, prosecutors, defense lawyers, other counsel who worked with her.

And I asked, pointblank, Judge Ann Williams, who led this investigation by the ABA: Did you hear from anyone who said she was soft on crime; that she somehow was not in the norm when it came to sentencing?

None. Not one. Two hundred fifty people interviewed, and not one came up with it.

All we have heard against her has come out of the mouths of three or four people on the committee, and that is it because there is no record for it.

Well, how did the American Bar Association grade her when it was all said and done? Unanimously “well qualified.” Unanimously “well qualified.” It doesn’t sound like the same person just described, does it, because it isn’t. What you have heard on the floor here is a mischaracterization of her record, and I am sorry to say it is unfair. And I wish it hadn’t been part of the record today.

What about Guantanamo? Well, I have some serious differences with the Senator from South Carolina about Guantanamo. Hundreds of detainees have been sent to Guantanamo since the War on Terror began. Many of them should have been there, but hundreds and hundreds of them have been released by Presidents, Republican and Democratic. We are now down to 39 detainees. We are spending over \$10 million for each one of them each year at Guantanamo Bay.

And when it comes to the resolution of who was responsible for 9/11, the families have come and testified before us. They have waited over 20 years, and they still don’t have an answer. They understand that the approach at Guantanamo Bay is not leading to justice, and it is not answering the basic factual questions.

So what is her situation? Why would she dare to call the Republican President of the United States a war criminal? What was she thinking? Well, it sounds like a terrible charge until you read the facts.

The facts were she presented a brief, and the brief referred to a body of law known as the Alien Tort Statute. And the person she was representing in this brief was arguing that he was tortured and mistreated at Guantanamo Bay. So he filed a claim under the Alien Tort Statute. When you do that, you sue the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense. They were the named defendants. That included President Bush.

What the Senator from South Carolina failed to disclose was that, as that case was winding its way through, the administration changed, and if there was an allegation of a war crime against President Bush, it was the same allegation that was made when the administration changed and the name of the defendant changed to Barack Obama.

To argue that this was a personal charge against the President of the United States as a war criminal is a gross exaggeration and unfair on its face. The named defendants were required under the Alien Tort Statute for the allegations that were made. That wasn't her decision; that was the decision of Congress to write the specifics of the Alien Tort Statute.

The third point I want to make is immigration. Yes, we have challenges in immigration. I think we all know it. But to blame her and say that she is somehow responsible for the invasion—you saw the crowd of people coming across the border—is really unfair.

What happened was there was a lawsuit filed challenging a Trump decision on policy, and she was asked to rule on it. And she ruled in one direction. The appeal was taken, and she was reversed at the circuit court.

Now, according to the Senator who just made the presentation, evidence she is in the pocket of the radical left when it comes to immigration, evidence that George Soros somehow is controlling her decisions, is preposterous. The fact of the matter is, if you look at almost 600 decisions handed down by Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, you will find a small, small percentage that were actually reversed.

And if you are looking for a second case to build the theory that she is on the radical left, I don't even think you found the first one. She has a balanced approach. She has ruled for and against Democratic and Republican Presidents. She has shown the kind of balance we expect on the Supreme Court.

I would say this notion that somehow Joe Biden has chosen someone who is radical is a shame. She is not. She is as solid as they come, and her testimony and her appearance before the committee proved that over and over again.

I also want to say I have nothing against the South Carolina judge who was in the finals but wasn't chosen by the President. In fact, President Biden has asked that she be promoted from the Federal district court to the Federal circuit court, and I would like to get that done as quickly as we can. I think Judge Childs is well deserving of that opportunity. She certainly is a good jurist.

But the choice by President Biden was clear, and it was the right choice. These charges that somehow she is soft on crime because she is an African-American woman and she was a public defender belie the actually record of this woman.

We should all be judged on our records. This notion that we are asked

to identify ourselves by labels—we know that story, the 100 of us who sit on this side of the Capitol in the Senate Chamber. We are attached to labels which we embrace and some we don't embrace, but most people who are fair will say: I am not going to judge you by your label; I am going to judge you by your record.

If you judge Ketanji Brown Jackson by her record—written opinions, the fact that this was the fourth time she appeared before the Judiciary Committee and had been approved the three previous times, serving on the Sentencing Commission and so many other things—you know that it is an outstanding and stellar record, but you know it almost has to be. If you want to be the first, you have to be the best. She is the best.

Despite some of the things that have been thrown at her today and in other places, the American people came out of that hearing and felt better and stronger about her nomination than before the hearing began. It is evidence of the strengths that she brings to this nomination and the value that she will bring to the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes, Senator MURPHY for up to 12 minutes, and Senator GRASSLEY for up to 10 minutes prior to the scheduled vote.

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

2023 FARM BILL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has now been more than 3 years since the 2018 farm bill, and it is time to start thinking about the next one. The House Agriculture Committee has already begun holding hearings on the 2023 farm bill, and I am hoping that the Senate Agriculture Committee will begin holding hearings soon as well.

Agriculture is the lifeblood of our economy in South Dakota, and advocating for farmers and ranchers is one of my top priorities here in the Senate. I am fortunate enough to be a longtime member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, which gives me an important platform from which to address the needs of South Dakota ag producers.

During my time in Congress, I have worked on four farm bills, and I am particularly proud of the nearly 20 measures I was able to get included in the 2018 farm bill. Among other things, I authored provisions to improve the Agriculture Risk Coverage Program, improve the accuracy of the U.S. Drought Monitor, and include soil health as a research priority at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I was also able to secure a number of improvements of the Conservation Reserve Program, including a provision to increase the CRP acreage cap, increased flexibility for acres enrolled in CRP, and cost sharing for fencing and

water distribution practices on CRP-enrolled acres.

I also secured approval for a new, short-term alternative to CRP—the Soil Health and Income Protection Program—to provide an option for farmers who don't want to take their land out of production for the 10 to 15 years required under the Conservation Reserve Program.

And I was able to secure important provisions to increase the approval rate of Livestock Indemnity Program applications for death losses due to weather-related diseases.

I would never have been able to get all this done without the input of South Dakota farmers and ranchers. These provisions were a direct result of extensive conversations with South Dakota ag producers that provided insight into the challenges that they were facing and what improvements could be made to make things easier in this demanding way of life.

As I look to the 2023 farm bill, I will once again be relying on South Dakota farmers and ranchers to lend their firsthand knowledge to this effort. In fact, last Friday, I held the first of a series of roundtables I am planning to hold to hear from South Dakota agricultural producers. Friday's roundtable focused on the commodity and crop insurance titles of the farm bill, and I was grateful to be able to hear from representatives of the South Dakota Farm Bureau; South Dakota corn, soybean, and wheat producers; as well as crop insurance industry representatives.

I will be holding additional roundtables to cover other farm bill priorities, including livestock, conservation, and forestry issues. And, of course, I will continue to rely on the many informal conversations I have with South Dakota ag producers as I travel around the State.

There is nothing worse than having "experts" in Washington come in and dictate to the real-world experts: the farmers and ranchers who spend every day producing the food that feeds our Nation. And my goal is always to make sure that any farm legislation is directly informed by farmers and ranchers in South Dakota and around the country. I already have a list of issues that I am looking to see addressed in the next farm bill, and I plan to refine that list over the coming months in my conversations with South Dakota ag producers.

One thing that emerged clearly from Friday's roundtable is the importance of the farm safety net and the critical role of crop insurance and commodity programs. Agriculture Risk Coverage and Price Loss Coverage payments, which help offset losses when prices for agricultural products drop, are not always proving sufficient, particularly with our current high inflation, which has sent the price of inputs like fertilizer soaring.

As I mentioned earlier, I was able to secure improvements to the Agriculture Risk Coverage Program in the

2018 farm bill, and I plan to seek further commodity title program improvements in the 2023 farm bill.

I also want to secure further improvements to the Conservation Reserve Program. From my conversations with South Dakota ag producers, it is clear that we need to make changes to ensure that CRP continues to be an effective option for producers and landowners. In fact, last week, I introduced the Conservation Reserve Program Improvement Act, which I will work to get included in the 2023 farm bill.

Among other things, my legislation would make CRP grazing a more attractive option by providing cost-share payments for all CRP practices for the establishment of grazing infrastructure, including fencing and water distribution. And it would increase the annual payment limit for CRP, which hasn't been changed since 1985, to help account for inflation and the increase that we have seen in land values. This would expand the enrollment options available to landowners to ensure the program effectively serves farmers and ranchers, as well as conservation goals.

The Conservation Program Improvement Act is the first of multiple bills I plan to introduce in the runup to the 2023 farm bill to address the concerns of farmers and ranchers.

The one issue I have been working on extensively over the past year is the challenges facing livestock producers, particularly cattle producers. I will work to make sure the farm bill will provide resources to help them face these challenges.

The life of a farmer and rancher is a challenging one. The work often starts long before the Sun rises and concludes long after the Sun has set. The labor can be backbreaking, not to mention the deep uncertainty that goes along with this existence. There are few other industries so subject to the whims of the weather, which can wipe out an entire crop or herd in a very short period of time.

I am profoundly grateful for all those who have chosen and continued this way of life, often for generations. The food we eat every day depends upon their work, and our country would not long survive without them. I am proud to have the honor of representing South Dakota's farmers and ranchers here in the Senate, and I will continue to work every day to ensure that their needs are addressed. I look forward to ensuring that the 2023 farm bill reflects the priorities of South Dakota farmers and ranchers and farmers and ranchers around our great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION
REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Today, I come to the Senate floor to discuss the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. This has been introduced in the House and now introduced in the Senate by this Senator and by my colleague and friend, Senator FEINSTEIN.

This bill is a product of bipartisan work and much collaboration. I also want to thank Senators CORNYN and KLOBUCHAR, who are true leaders in this area and also introduced their trafficking legislation this week. I look forward to continuing to work with those two Senators, as well, on this issue.

Many Americans tend to view human slavery as a thing of the past. We read about it in our history books and collectively cringe at the concept of such injustice. Unfortunately, however, the reality is that human slavery is alive and well, even today, in the form of sex and labor trafficking. According to the State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons Report, human trafficking is a \$150 billion business worldwide. Through deception, through threats, through violence, the perpetrators of these crimes will do whatever—whatever—it takes to turn a profit at their victims' expense.

With the introduction of this bill, we are acting as a voice for those human trafficking victims in the United States who cannot speak for themselves. To combat this crime within our borders, we have addressed the scourge on multiple fronts. The bill we have championed would extend several key victims' services programs that were established under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. It would promote screening of human trafficking victims, enhance training for Federal investigators, and start a pilot program for young people at high risk of being trafficked.

Our bill also includes the Survivor's Bill of Rights, a bill I developed with survivors and an advocate named Amanda Nguyen, which encourages States to ensure that survivors have, at minimum, the rights guaranteed to survivors under Federal law.

Fighting for victims has been one of my top priorities as chairman and now ranking member of Senate Judiciary. I consider it a privilege to shape the law to ensure that trafficking victims receive necessary services. I also take pride in helping law enforcement and prosecutors hold the perpetrators accountable for these selfish acts.

Lastly, this bill has the support of the National District Attorneys Association, Rights4Girls, Shared Hope International, Covenant House, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, and the National Center on Sexual Exploitation. I am grateful for all of these groups and the important work that they do.

This bipartisan bill is a strong start, and, of course, the work doesn't stop with a single piece of legislation. I look forward to marking this bill up in the Judiciary Committee and getting it signed into law.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. President, on another relatively short matter, as well, something I come to the floor frequently to speak about and something I waited through-

out last year to see if the Democrats' approach to prescription drugs was going to become law—and it doesn't look to me like that route is going to be successful.

So I continually bring up another piece of legislation that I am working on with Senator WYDEN. It is a bill that says very clearly that this Senator—and I think I speak for many, many Senators—that we want lower prescription drugs now. I said that in the Finance Committee hearing 2 weeks ago, and I say it again: I want lower prescription drugs now.

What are we waiting for? We have a bipartisan prescription drug package called Wyden-Grassley that will save seniors \$72 billion and the taxpayers \$95 billion.

Senator WYDEN said during the Finance Committee's most recent drug pricing hearing that "there is no question that the committee came" forward—I am going to start this quote over again:

There is no question that the committee came together in the last Congress and came up with a number of constructive bipartisan reforms. Period. Full stop.

Why aren't we then advancing this bipartisan bill? What is the majority waiting for?

One of my colleagues on the other side tweeted this:

POTUS has the authority to lower drug prices all on his own—he should use it.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus is calling for this same thing, as well.

And then in the Washington Post, I read this headline:

Advocates seek other pathways to lower drug prices.

Far-left groups are pushing President Biden to bypass Congress and exert executive authority. Is that some sort of statement that we are giving up on the legislative path? Why would we, in Congress, not move ahead? It is not like all options for legislation have been exhausted.

The majority has spent 15 months attempting to pass their partisan prescription drug bill. It has gone nowhere. It doesn't have 60 votes. But that is not the only option. Has the Democratic majority given up on lowering prescription drug prices and is counting on doing it only by Executive order? Are they saying they have to do it in a way where only Democrats get credit or not do anything at all? Do Democrats really want to help seniors or would they rather have a campaign issue?

The longer we wait, patients and taxpayers are going to continue to pay those high prices, and for some families, that is a suffering position to be in.

Let's work to advance a bipartisan prescription drug bill that can pass with 60-plus votes. We can do it today. It is already negotiated and ready to go. I will work with anyone who wants to pass the bipartisan Wyden-Grassley bill. Just give me a call.

I said something about last year, that you had to sit around and wait for the Democrats to get something done on a totally partisan basis. I don't say that they didn't work hard to get a bill passed that would have reduced prescription drug prices.

But I just didn't sit around all of 2021. In the past 15 months, I want to give you some of the things that I have been doing to try to sell a bipartisan bill. I spoke with President Biden's White House staff—although I did have a short conversation with President Biden himself. I met with Speaker PELOSI. I met with Leader MCCARTHY. I had a phone call with HHS Secretary Becerra. I met with the 10 Democrats who were wise to this issue that you can't pass a bipartisan prescription drug bill.

These 10 House Democrats wrote to the Speaker, way last summer, wanting a bipartisan prescription drug pricing bill. I met with not all 10 of them, but I will bet I met with at least 5 of them, and they were receptive to doing what I am doing. It doesn't mean they were receptive to doing it exactly the way I wanted to do it, but they were receptive to working in a bipartisan way.

Then I met with the Republican and Democrat group that is called the Problem Solvers Caucus Healthcare Working Group.

PETER WELCH, a Democrat from Vermont, has been on top of this issue for years and years. I had breakfast with him.

I met with Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS because she is the top Republican in the House dealing with this issue.

I met with Senators SINEMA and CARPER and other rank-and-file Members of Congress.

While Democrats talk about lowering drug costs, they haven't made any progress. The only bipartisan progress that has been made on drug pricing has been under Republican leadership. If Republicans take control of the Senate next Congress, Republicans will be lowering prescription drug prices. We shouldn't have to wait another 8, 9 months. And who knows who will control the next Congress in the first place. We don't have to wait a whole year. Let's lower prescription drug prices today.

I yield the floor.

TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION
REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY in introducing the Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2022.

Human trafficking and modern slavery are abhorrent crimes that are a scourge on our country and the world. In 2022, there are an estimated 40 million victims of human trafficking and modern slavery worldwide. These crimes generate approximately \$150,000,000,000 of revenue annually.

Perpetrators of human trafficking prey on vulnerable and marginalized

communities, which disproportionately impacts women and girls, migrants, people of color, and LGBT individuals.

According to Polaris—the anti-human trafficking organization that runs the National Human Trafficking Hotline—in 2021, the hotline was contacted directly over 13,000 times by victims and survivors of human trafficking in the United States. In the last 2 years, since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, the hotline has had a 60 percent increase in total contacts.

There is also evidence that labor trafficking in the agricultural industry may have increased during the pandemic. In June 2021, Polaris released a report finding that, “[a]mong reported labor trafficking victims, there was more than a 70 percent increase in those who held H2-A visas.”

This is unconscionable, and more must be done to combat human trafficking. That is why Senator GRASSLEY and I have introduced the Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2022.

This bill builds on the pillars of anti-human trafficking policy—prevention, protection, prosecution, and partnership—in order to protect victims and rid the world of this heinous crime.

This bill aims to prevent human trafficking by requiring enhanced anti-human trafficking education and training for all Federal departments and agencies.

It would also require all Federal contractors to certify that they do not engage in the trafficking of persons and that no human trafficking occurred in that contractor's supply chain. The bill also encourages large private corporations to make the same types of certifications.

I am particularly proud of how this bill advances the goal of protecting victims and survivors of human trafficking. This bill not only reauthorizes existing grant programs, but it also creates a new grant for education and employment training for survivors of human trafficking.

The bill establishes a pilot program that provides services—such as education and employment programs, housing, and substance use disorder treatment—for youth who face a heightened risk of trafficking.

And to continue learning how to best support victims and survivors of trafficking, the bill calls for a study on the accessibility of mental health and substance use disorder services for survivors.

This bill also enhances the Federal Government's ability to prosecute human traffickers.

Importantly, it bars government officials investigating human trafficking cases from engaging in sexual contact with victims during the course of the investigation. And it further provides protection from retaliation and intimidation and creates a new penalty for obstructing human trafficking investigations.

Finally, the bill will facilitate partnerships by creating a new grant program that encourages collaboration between State child welfare and juvenile justice agencies. This is important because youth involved in the juvenile justice and child welfare system face a heightened risk of human trafficking.

Additionally, the bill promotes coordination at the Federal level by encouraging enhanced communication and data sharing between State and Federal agencies and across the branches of government.

This bill will strengthen our government's response to human trafficking as well as the services that we provide to victims and survivors.

I am hopeful that we will be able to pass this bipartisan bill this Congress. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important, comprehensive legislation to protect trafficking victims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the process of confirming a Supreme Court Justice is supposed to be lengthy, thoughtful, rigorous. I am grateful to the Presiding Officer and Chairman DURBIN for doing it right with Judge Brown Jackson.

Judge Jackson has answered hours of questions about her judicial philosophy, why she made certain decisions, why she represented certain clients, how her background has shaped her world view. Nearly every detail of her professional and personal life has been and will continue to be interrogated publicly as she goes through the final stages of this process.

But a strange thing is going to happen when Judge Jackson finally takes her seat on the Supreme Court. She will, after all of this review and scrutiny, become effectively immune from ethics standards.

Why is that? Because every Federal judge—circuit judges, district judges, court of international trade judges, court of Federal claims judges, bankruptcy judges, magistrate judges—every Federal judge is bound by a code of ethics in order to safeguard the judiciary's neutrality and transparency—all Federal judges, except for nine: the Supreme Court.

It is not because the Supreme Court is so highly regarded by the American people. In fact, the opposite is true.

Trust in the institution's reputation is in rapid decline right now. According to a recent C-SPAN poll, only 30 percent—about 37 percent, actually—of likely voters believe that the Supreme Court acts in a “serious and constitutionally sound manner.”

In a democracy that prides itself on a fair and independent judiciary, that is unacceptable. It is worrying, but it is not surprising. Recent revelations surrounding Justice Thomas and his wife's involvement in the events of January 6 have finally brought attention that

those standards we try to uphold during the confirmation process quickly disappear upon confirmation.

Now, this isn't some new phenomenon. We have seen Justices—both liberal and conservative—promote political fundraisers, speak at partisan events, fail to recuse themselves from cases with pretty clear conflicts of interest. And if the past is prologue—the recent incident that has gained a lot of attention regarding Justice Thomas's family—it won't be the last.

Now, I first introduced a bill that would require the Supreme Court to adopt a code of ethics 10 years ago. And I have reintroduced a version of that bill in every Congress since.

The majority of Americans agrees with me: There is absolutely no reason why the Supreme Court shouldn't be subject to a code of conduct just like every other Federal judge.

But the Court disagrees. John Roberts said in 2011 when he was asked about this:

The Court has no reason to adopt a code of conduct as its definitive source of ethical guidance.

Well, it has a reason now. And to be clear, I am not talking about a code of conduct that is written by Congress. Instead, my legislation would require the Judicial Conference to create a binding code of conduct that applies to all Federal judges and Justices, including those on the Supreme Court.

It is a simple step that would improve transparency, enforce accountability, and restore some lost faith in the institution. And, frankly, because of that diminishing faith, it is in the Court's interest to do everything possible to try to help rebuild public confidence.

During Justice Kavanaugh's confirmation process, Justice Kagan put it best. She said:

The Court's strength as an institution of American governance depends on people believing [it has] a certain kind of legitimacy, on people believing it is not simply an extension of politics, that its decision-making has a kind of integrity to it.

If people don't believe that, they have no reason to accept what the Court does. Justice Kagan said it well.

And right now, that belief is teetering dangerously close to the edge. The spouse of a Supreme Court Justice was involved in an effort to organize a coup and overthrow of a democratically elected President of the United States. That is extraordinary. That is not normal. It should not be treated as just another flavor of legitimate political action, and the fact that there is no clear binding code of conduct that addresses this kind of behavior and no clear standards of recusal for Supreme Court Justices that the American people can see and trust is just unacceptable.

I think that my Democratic and Republican colleagues can agree on this, the American people deserve to know that our Supreme Court Justices are being held to the highest standards

whether they be Justices appointed by Democratic Presidents or Justices appointed by Republican Presidents. It is not enough for us to just trust the Court any longer to self-enforce a secret internal code of ethics.

The highest Court in the land cannot be exempt from the standards that we hold every other Federal judge to. I am glad that this piece of legislation has gained additional cosponsors just over the course of the last week. I hope that it eventually becomes a bipartisan piece of legislation, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in holding the Court to account.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE
CALENDAR

Mr. President, finally, I know votes are pending, but I am also coming to the floor to request, as I will in a moment, unanimous consent for the nomination and approval of Javier Ramirez to be Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

I would guess that not a lot of my colleagues know much about the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and that is because we normally don't have to have a debate over the confirmation of its Director on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The Agency is an independent one that has been in place since 1947. Its mission is to preserve and promote labor management peace and cooperation by providing mediation and conflict resolution services to industry, government agencies, and communities. The FMCS has 10 regional offices, more than 60 field offices. Its headquarters are here in Washington, DC.

It does the basic blocking and tackling of keeping our economy running. It is charged with trying to avoid conflict between labor and management so that we don't have strikes, so that we don't have work stoppages, so that our economy runs as smoothly as possible. It is a pretty noncontroversial Agency, and the individual who has been selected to run it is equally noncontroversial. He is a career public servant.

Javier Ramirez began at the FMCS in 2005. He is currently the director of Agency initiatives there. To me, this would be a no-brainer, that we could come together and decide as a body that we are going to make sure that we have someone running an Agency that is pretty vital to the smooth flow of our economy and the mediation of disputes between labor and management.

And so I would ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 665, Javier Ramirez, of Illinois, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, Senator MURPHY indicates there should be no discussion, really, because this is such a slam dunk. I am coming up to talk about it.

We do not do regular order. Our job is to be there for advice and consent on any nominee. We have tried to shortcut the process, not only on nominations, but even things as important as our budgets. We don't do anything anymore with discussion that gets out maybe the rest of the story.

I believe that on any of these, rather than proceeding to the floor, you ought to at least have a discussion in committee. That didn't happen. There was a vote, but not a discussion.

And when you look at this noncontroversial nominee, I think there are at least some things to think about. Harry Katz, a professor at the Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations, said Mr. Ramirez could be open to expanding the range of disputes that the Agency will consider.

So kind of hinting at some political enterprise that you would be doing more than just interpreting. He is not alone. Wilma Liebman, a former NLRB chair under President Obama, has told media that Mr. Ramirez should be "open to creative expansion of what the mediators do."

We need public servants who are going to strictly interpret the law, and this looks like if we don't at least have a recorded vote, it could slip through when it is not maybe as uncontroversial as Senator MURPHY might indicate.

I have reservations about the nominee, mostly about the process, very indicative of the way that things work here in general, not only for nominations, but critical policy. I think that has got to change.

Therefore, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURPHY. I know colleagues are eager to get this vote going, but 20 seconds in response.

This place is grinding to a halt. And it is absolutely extraordinary the number of noncontroversial nominees who are now required to move through full votes, cloture motions on the floor. U.S. Attorneys who never, ever had to come before this floor for votes and debate now do.

This is an exercise in fundamentally breaking the Senate. This place only works with UC. We cannot run every single nominee through regular order or we would be here 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

I am grateful for my colleague's comments. I hope that we will be able to confirm Mr. Ramirez. But this is the kind of work that the Senate used to be able to do through UC, and it is unfortunate that we continue to have this breakdown in process.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Geraghty nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Sarah Elisabeth Geraghty, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

VOTE ON GERAGHTY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Geraghty nomination?

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—48

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Castner nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Georgette Castner, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

VOTE ON CASTNER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Castner nomination?

Mr. MURPHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Hoeben	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young
Grassley	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Burr

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. KING assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an update on today's floor schedule. At 1:45, the Senate was scheduled to hold a procedural vote related to a shell legislative vehicle we could use to pass COVID response funding. Our Republican colleagues have requested that we do not hold a cloture vote on the mo-

tion to proceed at the present as we are getting close to a final agreement that would garner bipartisan support.

We are working diligently to finalize language, scoring, and a final agreement on what should be funded in the final COVID package, both domestic and international. As a sign of good faith and to encourage us to come to a final agreement, I will reschedule today's procedural vote to a later time.

H.R. 4373

Mr. President, now, when it comes to replenishing COVID response funding, we simply cannot afford to kick the can down the road. We need more money right away so we have enough vaccines and testing and lifesaving therapeutics.

We want our communities to go back to normal and stay normal.

If a new virus comes—if a new variant comes, and we are not prepared, we could lose that ability to go back to normality, for our schools to stay open, for events to occur, for people to gather. We don't want to do that.

Well, the best way to avoid that from happening if, God forbid, a new variant comes—and it is likely that it will—is to have us prepared, and this COVID legislation has us prepared by having an adequate supply of these new, almost miraculous therapeutics that can greatly reduce the severity of any illness and that can be given right after testing.

We need tests, and we need to make sure that the vaccines we have are ready and updated. We can't wait. We can't wait until COVID is upon us to do this.

The prospect of not being prepared is scary, and Americans should all—Democrats, Republicans—be able to unite in making sure we are prepared. We need to get COVID funding done for the country before the end of the work period. It is very much needed, and so we are going to keep talking with the Republicans so we can hopefully agree to a robust package that keeps our country prepared.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4373

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 310, H.R. 4373, ripen at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader.

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

SAVE THE LIBERTY THEATRE ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 309, H.R. 3197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3197) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the City of Eunice, Louisiana, certain Federal land in Louisiana, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 3197) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CHIRICAHUA NATIONAL PARK ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 297, S. 1320.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (S. 1320) to establish the Chiricahua National Park in the State of Arizona as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Chiricahua National Park Act”.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF CHIRICAHUA NATIONAL PARK, ARIZONA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—
 (1) IN GENERAL.—The Chiricahua National Monument in the State of Arizona established by Presidential Proclamation 1692 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note; 43 Stat. 1946) shall be known and designated as “Chiricahua National Park” (referred to in this Act as the “National Park”).

(2) BOUNDARIES.—The boundaries of the National Park shall be the boundaries of the Chiricahua National Monument as of the date of enactment of this Act, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Chiricahua National Park Proposed Boundary”, numbered 145/156,356, and dated March 2021.

(3) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, or other record of the United States to the Chiricahua National Monument shall be considered to be a reference to the “Chiricahua National Park”.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any funds available for the Chiricahua National Monument shall be available for the National Park.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the National Park in accordance with—

(1) Presidential Proclamation 1692 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note; 43 Stat. 1946);

(2) Presidential Proclamation 2288 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note; 52 Stat. 1551); and

(3) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(B) chapter 3201 of title 54, United States Code.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1320), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 311, S. 3580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3580) to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

Section 40101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) ensure an efficient, competitive, and economical transportation system in the ocean commerce of the United States;”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and supporting commerce” after “needs”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) promote the growth and development of United States exports through a competitive and efficient system for the carriage of goods by water in the foreign commerce of the United States, and by placing a greater reliance on the marketplace.”.

SEC. 3. SERVICE CONTRACTS.

Section 40502(c) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) any other essential terms that the Federal Maritime Commission determines necessary or appropriate through a rulemaking process.”.

SEC. 4. SHIPPING EXCHANGE REGISTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 405 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 40504. Shipping exchange registry

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No person may operate a shipping exchange involving ocean transportation in the foreign commerce of the United States unless the shipping exchange is registered as a national shipping exchange under the terms and conditions provided in this section and the regulations issued pursuant to this section.

“(b) REGISTRATION.—A person shall register a shipping exchange by filing with the Federal Maritime Commission an application for registration in such form as the Commission, by rule, may prescribe, containing the rules of the exchange and such other information and docu-

ments as the Commission, by rule, may prescribe as necessary or appropriate to complete a shipping exchange’s registration.

“(c) EXEMPTION.—The Commission may exempt, conditionally or unconditionally, a shipping exchange from registration under this section if the Commission finds that the shipping exchange is subject to comparable, comprehensive supervision and regulation by the appropriate governmental authorities in a foreign country where the shipping exchange is headquartered.

“(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022, the Commission shall issue regulations pursuant to subsection (a), which shall set standards necessary to carry out subtitle IV of this title for registered national shipping exchanges, including the minimum requirements for service contracts established under section 40502 of this title.

“(e) DEFINITION OF SHIPPING EXCHANGE.—In this section, the term ‘shipping exchange’ means a platform (digital, over-the-counter, or otherwise) that connects shippers with common carriers for the purpose of entering into underlying agreements or contracts for the transport of cargo, by vessel or other modes of transportation.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The registration requirement under section 40504 of title 46, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall take effect on the date on which the Federal Maritime Commission states the rule is effective in the regulations issued under such section.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 405 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “40504. Shipping exchange registry.”.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON RETALIATION.

Section 41102 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) RETALIATION AND OTHER DISCRIMINATORY ACTIONS.—A common carrier, marine terminal operator, or ocean transportation intermediary, acting alone or in conjunction with any other person, directly or indirectly, may not—

“(1) retaliate against a shipper, an agent of a shipper, an ocean transportation intermediary, or a motor carrier by refusing, or threatening to refuse, an otherwise-available cargo space accommodation; or

“(2) resort to any other unfair or unjustly discriminatory action for—

“(A) the reason that a shipper, an agent of a shipper, an ocean transportation intermediary, or motor carrier has—

“(i) patronized another carrier; or

“(ii) filed a complaint against the common carrier, marine terminal operator, or ocean transportation intermediary; or

“(B) any other reason.”.

SEC. 6. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.

Section 46106 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) PUBLIC DISCLOSURES.—The Federal Maritime Commission shall publish, and annually update, on the website of the Commission—

“(1) all findings by the Commission of false detention and demurrage invoice information by common carriers under section 41104(a)(15) of this title; and

“(2) all penalties imposed or assessed against common carriers, as applicable, under sections 41107, 41108, and 41109, listed by each common carrier.”.

SEC. 7. COMMON CARRIERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may not” and inserting “shall not”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) unreasonably refuse cargo space accommodations when available, or resort to other unfair or unjustly discriminatory methods;”;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “in the matter of rates or charges” and inserting “against any commodity group or type of shipment or in the matter of rates or charges”;

(D) in paragraph (10), by adding “, including with respect to vessel space accommodations provided by an ocean common carrier” after “negotiate”;

(E) in paragraph (12) by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(F) in paragraph (13) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) assess any party for a charge that is inconsistent or does not comply with all applicable provisions and regulations, including subsection (c) of section 41102 or part 545 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations);

“(15) invoice any party for demurrage or detention charges unless the invoice includes information as described in subsection (d) showing that such charges comply with—

“(A) all provisions of part 545 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

“(B) applicable provisions and regulations, including the principles of the final rule published on May 18, 2020, entitled ‘Interpretive Rule on Demurrage and Detention Under the Shipping Act’ (or successor rule); or

“(16) for service pursuant to a service contract, give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage or impose any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage against any commodity group or type of shipment.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) DETENTION AND DEMURRAGE INVOICE INFORMATION.—

“(1) INACCURATE INVOICE.—If the Commission determines, after an investigation in response to a submission under section 41310, that an invoice under subsection (a)(15) was inaccurate or false, penalties or refunds under section 41107 shall be applied.

“(2) CONTENTS OF INVOICE.—An invoice under subsection (a)(15), unless otherwise determined by subsequent Commission rulemaking, shall include accurate information on each of the following, as well as minimum information as determined by the Commission:

“(A) Date that container is made available.

“(B) The port of discharge.

“(C) The container number or numbers.

“(D) For exported shipments, the earliest return date.

“(E) The allowed free time in days.

“(F) The start date of free time.

“(G) The end date of free time.

“(H) The applicable detention or demurrage rate on which the daily rate is based.

“(I) The applicable rate or rates per the applicable rule.

“(J) The total amount due.

“(K) The email, telephone number, or other appropriate contact information for questions or requests for mitigation of fees.

“(L) A statement that the charges are consistent with any of Federal Maritime Commission rules with respect to detention and demurrage.

“(M) A statement that the common carrier’s performance did not cause or contribute to the underlying invoiced charges.

“(e) SAFE HARBOR.—If a non-vessel operating common carrier passes through to the relevant shipper an invoice made by the ocean common carrier, and the Commission finds that the non-vessel operating common carrier is not otherwise responsible for the charge, then the ocean common carrier shall be subject to refunds or penalties pursuant to subsection (d)(1).

“(f) ELIMINATION OF CHARGE OBLIGATION.—Failure to include the information required under subsection (d) on an invoice with any demurrage or detention charge shall eliminate any obligation of the charged party to pay the applicable charge.”.

(b) RULEMAKING ON DEMURRAGE OR DETENTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission shall initiate a rulemaking further defining prohibited practices by common carriers, marine terminal operators, shippers, and ocean transportation intermediaries under section 41102(c) of title 46, United States Code, regarding the assessment of demurrage or detention charges. The Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a final rule defining such practices not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTENTS.—The rule under paragraph (1) shall seek to further clarify reasonable rules and practices related to the assessment of detention and demurrage charges to address the issues identified in the final rule published on May 18, 2020, entitled ‘Interpretive Rule on Demurrage and Detention Under the Shipping Act’ (or successor rule), including a determination of which parties may be appropriately billed for any demurrage, detention, or other similar per container charges.

(c) RULEMAKING ON UNFAIR OR UNJUSTLY DISCRIMINATORY METHODS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission shall initiate a rulemaking defining unfair or unjustly discriminatory methods under section 41104(a)(3) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section. The Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a final rule not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) RULEMAKING ON UNREASONABLE REFUSAL TO DEAL OR NEGOTIATE WITH RESPECT TO VESSEL SPACE ACCOMMODATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission, in consultation with the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, shall initiate a rulemaking defining unreasonable refusal to deal or negotiate with respect to vessel space under section 41104(a)(10) of title 46, as amended by this section. The Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a final rule not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES OR REFUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 41107—

(A) in the section heading, by inserting “or refunds” after “penalties”;

(B) in subsection (a), by inserting “or, in addition to or in lieu of a civil penalty, is liable for the refund of a charge” after “civil penalty”; and

(C) in subsection (b), by inserting “or, in addition to or in lieu of a civil penalty, the refund of a charge,” after “civil penalty”; and

(2) section 41109 is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Until a matter is referred to the Attorney General, the Federal Maritime Commission may—

“(1) after notice and opportunity for a hearing, in accordance with this part—

“(A) assess a civil penalty; or

“(B) in addition to, or in lieu of, assessing a civil penalty under subparagraph (A), order a refund of money (including additional amounts in accordance with section 41305(c)), subject to subsection (b)(2); and

“(2) compromise, modify, or remit, with or without conditions, a civil penalty or refund imposed under paragraph (1).

“(b) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—

“(1) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In determining the amount of a civil penalty assessed or refund of money ordered pursuant to subsection (a), the Federal Maritime Commission shall take into consideration—

“(A) the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation committed;

“(B) with respect to the violator—

“(i) the degree of culpability;

“(ii) any history of prior offenses;

“(iii) the ability to pay; and

“(iv) such other matters as justice may require; and

“(C) the amount of any refund of money ordered pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B).

“(2) COMMENSURATE REDUCTION IN CIVIL PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the Federal Maritime Commission orders a refund of money pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B) in addition to assessing a civil penalty pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A), the amount of the civil penalty assessed shall be decreased by any additional amounts included in the refund of money in excess of the actual injury (as defined in section 41305(a)).

“(B) TREATMENT OF REFUNDS.—A refund of money ordered pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B) shall be—

“(i) considered to be compensation paid to the applicable claimant; and

“(ii) deducted from the total amount of damages awarded to that claimant in a civil action against the violator relating to the applicable violation.”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “may not be imposed” and inserting “or refund of money under subparagraph (A) or (B), respectively, of subsection (a)(1) may not be imposed”;

(C) in subsection (e), by inserting “or order a refund of money” after “penalty”;

(D) in subsection (f), by inserting “, or that is ordered to refund money,” after “assessed”; and

(E) in subsection (g), in the first sentence, by inserting “or a refund required under this section” after “penalty”.

SEC. 9. DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 411 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§41110. Data collection

“The Federal Maritime Commission shall publish on its website a calendar quarterly report that describes the total import and export tonnage and the total loaded and empty 20-foot equivalent units per vessel (making port in the United States, including any territory or possession of the United States) operated by each ocean common carrier covered under this chapter. Ocean common carriers under this chapter shall provide to the Commission all necessary information, as determined by the Commission, for completion of this report.”

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, and the amendment made by this section, shall be construed to compel the public disclosure of any confidential or proprietary data, in accordance with section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 411 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“41110. Data collection.”.

SEC. 10. CHARGE COMPLAINTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 413 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§41310. Charge complaints

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A person may submit to the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Commission shall accept, information concerning complaints about charges assessed by a common carrier. The information submitted to the Commission may include the bill of lading numbers, invoices, or any other relevant information.

“(b) INVESTIGATION.—Upon receipt of a submission under subsection (a), with respect to a charge assessed by a common carrier, the Commission shall promptly investigate the charge with regard to compliance with section 41104(a) and section 41102. The common carrier shall—

“(1) be provided an opportunity to submit additional information related to the charge in question; and

“(2) bear the burden of establishing the reasonableness of any demurrage or detention charges pursuant to section 545.5 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).”

“(c) REFUND.—Upon receipt of submissions under subsection (a), if the Commission determines that a charge does not comply with section 41104(a) or 41102, the Commission shall promptly order the refund of charges paid.

“(d) PENALTIES.—In the event of a finding that a charge does not comply with section 41104(a) or 41102 after submission under subsection (a), a civil penalty under section 41107 shall be applied to the common carrier making such charge.

“(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—If the common carrier assessing the charge is acting in the capacity of a non-vessel-operating common carrier, the Commission shall, while conducting an investigation under subsection (b), consider—

“(1) whether the non-vessel-operating common carrier is responsible for the noncompliant assessment of the charge, in whole or in part; and

“(2) whether another party is ultimately responsible in whole or in part and potentially subject to action under subsections (c) and (d).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 413 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“41310. Charge complaints.”

SEC. 11. INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 41302 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking “or agreement” and inserting “agreement, fee, or charge”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “Agreement” and inserting “Agreement, fee, or charge”; and

(B) by inserting “, fee, or charge” after “agreement”.

(b) REPORT.—The Federal Maritime Commission shall publish on a publicly available website of the Commission a report containing the results of the investigation entitled “Fact Finding No. 29, International Ocean Transportation Supply Chain Engagement”.

SEC. 12. AWARD OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.

Section 41305(c) of title 46, United States Code is amended by striking “41102(b)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (c) of section 41102”.

SEC. 13. ENFORCEMENT OF REPARATION ORDERS.

Section 41309 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “reparation, the person to whom the award was made” and inserting “a refund of money or reparation, the person to which the refund or reparation was awarded”; and

(2) in subsection (b), in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “made an award of reparation” and inserting “ordered a refund of money or any other award of reparation”; and

(B) by inserting “(except for the Commission or any component of the Commission)” after “parties in the order”.

SEC. 14. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 46106(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) an identification of any otherwise concerning practices by ocean common carriers, particularly such carriers that are controlled carriers, that are—

“(A) State-owned or State-controlled enterprises; or

“(B) owned or controlled by, a subsidiary of, or otherwise related legally or financially (other than a minority relationship or investment) to a corporation based in a country—

“(i) identified as a nonmarket economy country (as defined in section 771(18) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(18))) as of the date of enactment of this paragraph; or

“(ii) identified by the United States Trade Representative in the most recent report required by section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242) as a priority foreign country under subsection (a)(2) of that section; or

“(iii) subject to monitoring by the United States Trade Representative under section 306 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2416).”

SEC. 15. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 41108(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 41104(1), (2), or (7)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), or (7) of section 41104(a)”.

(b) Section 41109(c) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by section 8 of this Act, is further amended by striking “section 41102(a) or 41104(1) or (2) of this title” and inserting “subsection (a) or (d) of section 41102 or paragraph (1) or (2) of section 41104(a)”.

(c) Section 41305 of title 46, United States Code, as amended by section 12 of this Act, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “41104(3) or (6), or 41105(1) or (3) of this title” and inserting “paragraph (3) or (6) of section 41104(a), or paragraph (1) or (3) of section 41105”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “section 41104(4)(A) or (B) of this title” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 41104(a)(4)”.

SEC. 16. DWELL TIME STATISTICS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

(2) MARINE CONTAINER.—The term “marine container” means an intermodal container with a length of—

(A) not less than 20 feet; and

(B) not greater than 45 feet.

(3) OUT OF SERVICE PERCENTAGE.—The term “out of service percentage” means the proportion of the chassis fleet for any defined geographical area that is out of service at any one time.

(4) STREET DWELL TIME.—The term “street dwell time”, with respect to a piece of equipment, means the quantity of time during which the piece of equipment is in use outside of the terminal.

(b) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each port, marine terminal operator, and chassis owner or provider with a fleet of over 50 chassis that supply chassis for a fee shall submit to the Director such data as the Director determines to be necessary for the implementation of this section, subject to subchapter III of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) APPROVAL BY OMB.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall approve an information collection for purposes of this section.

(c) PUBLICATION.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than monthly thereafter, the Director shall publish statistics relating to the dwell time of equipment used in intermodal transportation at the top 25 ports, including inland ports, by 20-foot equivalent unit, including—

(1) total street dwell time, from all causes, of marine containers and marine container chassis; and

(2) the average out of service percentage, which shall not be identifiable with any particular port, marine terminal operator, or chassis provider.

(d) FACTORS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, to the maximum extent practicable, the Director shall publish the statistics

described in subsection (c) on a local, regional, and national basis.

(e) SUNSET.—The authority under this section shall expire December 31, 2026.

SEC. 17. FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION ACTIVITIES.

(a) PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS TO COMMISSION.—The Federal Maritime Commission shall—

(1) establish on the public website of the Commission a webpage that allows for the submission of comments, complaints, concerns, reports of noncompliance, requests for investigation, and requests for alternative dispute resolution; and

(2) direct each submission under the link established under paragraph (1) to the appropriate component office of the Commission.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICES.—The Commission shall maintain an Office of Consumer Affairs and Dispute Resolution Services to provide nonadjudicative ombuds assistance, mediation, facilitation, and arbitration to resolve challenges and disputes involving cargo shipments, household good shipments, and cruises subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

(c) ENHANCING CAPACITY FOR INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 41302 of title 46, United States Code, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairperson of the Commission shall staff within the Bureau of Enforcement, the Bureau of Certification and Licensing, the Office of the Managing Director, the Office of Consumer Affairs and Dispute Resolution Services, and the Bureau of Trade Analysis not fewer than 7 total positions to assist in investigations and oversight, in addition to the positions within the Bureau of Enforcement, the Bureau of Certification and Licensing, the Office of the Managing Director, the Office of Consumer Affairs and Dispute Resolution Services, and the Bureau of Trade Analysis on that date of enactment.

(2) DUTIES.—The additional staff appointed under paragraph (1) shall provide support—

(A) to Area Representatives of the Bureau of Enforcement;

(B) to attorneys of the Bureau of Enforcement in enforcing the laws and regulations subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission;

(C) for the alternative dispute resolution services of the Commission; or

(D) for the review of agreements and activities subject to the authority of the Commission.

SEC. 18. TEMPORARY EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMON CARRIER.—The term “common carrier” has the meaning given the term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

(2) MOTOR CARRIER.—The term “motor carrier” has the meaning given the term in section 13102 of title 49, United States Code.

(3) RAIL CARRIER.—The term “rail carrier” has the meaning given the term in section 10102 of title 49, United States Code.

(4) SHIPPER.—The term “shipper” has the meaning given the term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

(b) PUBLIC INPUT ON INFORMATION SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a request for information, seeking public comment regarding—

(A) whether congestion of the carriage of goods has created an emergency situation of a magnitude such that there exists a substantial, adverse effect on the competitiveness and reliability of the international ocean transportation supply system;

(B) whether an emergency order under this section would alleviate such an emergency situation; and

(C) the appropriate scope of such an emergency order, if applicable.

(2) CONSULTATION.—During the public comment period under paragraph (1), the Commission may consult, as the Commission determines to be appropriate, with—

(A) other Federal departments and agencies; and

(B) persons with expertise relating to maritime and freight operations.

(c) AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE INFORMATION SHARING.—On making a unanimous determination described in subsection (d), the Commission may issue an emergency order requiring any common carrier or marine terminal operator to share directly with relevant shippers, rail carriers, or motor carriers information relating to cargo throughput and availability, in order to ensure the efficient transportation, loading, and unloading of cargo to or from—

(1) any inland destination or point of origin; (2) any vessel; or

(3) any point on a wharf or terminal.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A determination referred to in subsection (c) is a unanimous determination by the commissioners on the Commission that congestion of carriage of goods has created an emergency situation of a magnitude such that there exists a substantial, adverse effect on the competitiveness and reliability of the international ocean transportation supply system.

(2) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In issuing an emergency order pursuant to subsection (c), the Commission shall tailor the emergency order with respect to temporal and geographic scope, taking into consideration the likely burdens on common carriers and marine terminal operators and the likely benefits on congestion relating to the purposes described in section 40101 of title 46, United States Code.

(e) PETITIONS FOR EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A common carrier or marine terminal operator subject to an emergency order issued pursuant to this section may submit to the Commission a petition for exception from 1 or more requirements of the emergency order, based on a showing of undue hardship or other condition rendering compliance with such a requirement impracticable.

(2) DETERMINATION.—The Commission shall make a determination regarding a petition for exception under paragraph (1) by—

(A) majority vote; and

(B) not later than 21 days after the date on which the petition is submitted.

(3) INAPPLICABILITY PENDING REVIEW.—The requirements of an emergency order that is the subject of a petition for exception under this subsection shall not apply to the petitioner during the period for which the petition is pending.

(f) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) TERM.—An emergency order issued pursuant to this section—

(A) shall remain in effect for a period of not longer than 60 days; but

(B) may be renewed by a unanimous determination of the Commission.

(2) SUNSET.—The authority provided by this section shall terminate on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall affect the investigative authorities of the Commission as described in subpart R of part 502 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 19. BEST PRACTICES FOR CHASSIS POOLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2023, the Federal Maritime Commission shall enter into an agreement with the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine under which the Transportation Research Board shall carry out a study and develop best practices for on-terminal or near-terminal chassis pools that provide service to marine terminal operators, motor carriers, railroads, and other stakeholders that use the chassis pools, with the goal of optimizing supply chain efficiency and effectiveness.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing best practices under subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall—

(1) take into consideration—

(A) practical obstacles to the implementation of chassis pools; and

(B) potential solutions to those obstacles; and (2) address relevant communication practices, information sharing, and knowledge management.

(c) PUBLICATION.—The Commission shall publish the best practices developed under this section on a publicly available website by not later than April 1, 2024.

(d) FUNDING.—Subject to appropriations, the Commission may expend such sums as are necessary, but not to exceed \$500,000, to carry out this section.

SEC. 20. LICENSING TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”) shall conduct a review of the discretionary waiver authority described in the document issued by the Administrator entitled “Waiver for States Concerning Third Party CDL Skills Test Examiners In Response to the COVID-19 Emergency” and dated August 31, 2021, for safety concerns.

(b) PERMANENT WAIVER.—If the Administrator finds no safety concerns after conducting a review under subsection (a), the Administrator shall—

(1) notwithstanding any other provision of law, make the waiver permanent; and

(2) not later than 90 days after completing the review under subsection (a), revise section 384.228 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that the discretionary waiver authority referred to in subsection (a) shall be permanent.

(c) REPORT.—If the Administrator declines to move forward with a rulemaking for revision under subsection (b), the Administrator shall explain the reasons for declining to move forward with the rulemaking in a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 21. PLANNING.

Section 6702(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Of the amounts” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to amounts made available for planning, preparation, or design under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 22. REVIEW OF POTENTIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST TRANSPORTATION OF QUALIFIED HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a review of whether there have been any systemic decisions by ocean common carriers to discriminate against maritime transport of qualified hazardous materials by unreasonably denying vessel space accommodations, equipment, or other instrumentalities needed to transport such materials. The Comptroller General shall take into account any applicable safety and pollution regulations.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Comptroller General of the United States may consult with the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Chair of the Federal Maritime Commission in conducting the review under this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.—The term “hazardous materials” includes dangerous goods, as defined by the International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code.

(2) OCEAN COMMON CARRIER.—The term “ocean common carrier” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

(3) QUALIFIED HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.—The term “qualified hazardous materials” means hazardous materials for which the shipper has certified to the ocean common carrier that such materials have been or will be tendered in accordance with applicable safety laws, including regulations.

(4) SHIPPER.—The term “shipper” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

SEC. 23. TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIALS.

(a) DEFINITION OF DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO A UNITED STATES PORT.—In this section:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term “direct assistance to a United States port” means the transportation of cargo directly to or from a United States port.

(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “direct assistance to a United States port” does not include—

(A) the transportation of a mixed load of cargo that includes—

(i) cargo that does not originate from a United States port; or

(ii) a container or cargo that is not bound for a United States port;

(B) any period during which a motor carrier or driver is operating in interstate commerce to transport cargo or provide services not in support of transportation to or from a United States port; or

(C) the period after a motor carrier dispatches the applicable driver or commercial motor vehicle of the motor carrier to another location to begin operation in interstate commerce in a manner that is not in support of transportation to or from a United States port.

(b) TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIALS.—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration and the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall jointly prioritize and expedite the consideration of applications for a Transportation Worker Identification Credential with respect to applicants that reasonably demonstrate that the purpose of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential is for providing, within the interior of the United States, direct assistance to a United States port.

SEC. 24. USE OF UNITED STATES INLAND PORTS FOR STORAGE AND TRANSFER OF CARGO CONTAINERS.

(a) MEETING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, in consultation with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration and the Chairperson of the Federal Maritime Commission, shall convene a meeting of representatives of entities described in subsection (b) to discuss the feasibility of, and strategies for, identifying Federal and non-Federal land, including inland ports, for the purposes of storage and transfer of cargo containers due to port congestion.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF ENTITIES.—The entities referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) representatives of United States major gateway ports, inland ports, and export terminals;

(2) ocean carriers;

(3) railroads;

(4) trucking companies;

(5) port workforce, including organized labor; and

(6) such other stakeholders as the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Federal Maritime Commission, determines to be appropriate.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the meeting convened under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, in consultation with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration and the Chairperson of the Federal Maritime

Commission, shall submit to Congress a report describing—

- (1) the results of the meeting;
- (2) the feasibility of identifying land or property under the jurisdiction of United States, or ports in the United States, for storage and transfer of cargo containers; and
- (3) recommendations relating to the meeting, if any.

(d) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—No authorization contained in this section may be acted on in a manner that jeopardizes or negatively impacts the national security or defense readiness of the United States.

SEC. 25. REPORT ON ADOPTION OF TECHNOLOGY AT UNITED STATES PORTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report describing the adoption of technology at United States ports, as compared to that adoption at foreign ports, including—

- (1) the technological capabilities of United States ports, as compared to foreign ports;
- (2) an assessment of whether the adoption of technology at United States ports could lower the costs of cargo handling;
- (3) an assessment of regulatory and other barriers to the adoption of technology at United States ports; and
- (4) an assessment of technology and the workforce.

SEC. 26. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 46108 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$29,086,888 for fiscal year 2020 and \$29,639,538 for fiscal year 2021” and inserting “\$32,869,000 for fiscal year 2022, \$38,260,000 for fiscal year 2023, \$43,720,000 for fiscal year 2024, and \$49,200,000 for fiscal year 2025”.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I further ask that the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn; that the amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 5017), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3580), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Senate has just passed very significant and much needed legislation that will reduce costs for the American people by passing a bipartisan bill to reform unfair shipping practices hurting exports and consumers alike.

We have all seen pictures of scores of ships lining up in ports from Los Ange-

les to Seattle, to New York, to Savannah. Supply chain backlogs have made it harder for goods to leave these ports and get to their international destinations.

Every single day that goods lie idle in our ports, it costs producers more and more money. It is a serious problem, rippling from one coast to the other.

These backlogs have created serious price hikes. Today, according to one study, the price to transport a container from China to the west coast of the United States costs 12 times as much as it did 2 years ago—12 times. Talk about supply chain backlogs. This is it—a glaring, glaring example.

And, of course, it hurts both ways when shipping costs go up. It affects exports that we send overseas. It affects many of our farmers, who need to export their goods. It also affects the imports that come back. It affects all the goods that Americans buy from overseas—appliances and food and so many other things.

When the cost of shipping is higher, the cost of the goods are higher, and people have to pay too much—a whole lot more.

At the end of the day, it is the American consumer that pays the higher price. Thankfully, this bill will make it harder for ocean carriers to unreasonably refuse American goods at our ports while strengthening the Federal Maritime Commission's ability to step in and prevent harmful practices by carriers.

This bipartisan shipping bill is exactly the sort of thing that the Senate should focus on. It is cost cutting; it is bipartisan; and it will directly give relief to small businesses and consumers alike.

And I would like to thank a good number of my colleagues who helped with this legislation. It was put together and sponsored in a bipartisan way by Senators KLOBUCHAR and THUNE. And Senator CANTWELL, who understands the maritime industry probably better than any other Member in this Chamber, was relentless in pushing this legislation. It went through her committee, and now it has passed the Senate and, hopefully, will become law soon, and she deserves our kudos and accolades for the good job she has done for American consumers, farmers, manufacturers, and everybody else.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Mr. Alex Wagner, the President's nominee to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; and Mr. Ashish Vazirani, nominee to be Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness.

As a Member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I know that

the most important investment for our national security is in our servicemembers—our real competitive advantage with Russia and China.

Mr. Wagner brings a combination of public and private sector experience to the table. He will be key in recruiting, training, and retaining the talent needed to compete in the 21st century.

Absent his leadership, we may miss important opportunities to invest in our servicemembers at a time when we are still standing up a new military branch, the Space Force.

Mr. Vazirani will be responsible for ensuring that we take care of our people, a priority for the Secretary and everyone in this body.

Mr. Vazirani has significant private sector experience as a consultant and manager. Further, he served in the Navy and is the father of a marine. He has the firsthand experience and knowledge that we need to help improve the opportunities available to military families and spouses.

Both of these nominees are needed to help implement important priorities, like the Independent Review Commission's sexual assault recommendations, improving diversity in the force, and addressing mental health and suicide.

Both of these nominees are focused on taking care of our people and ensuring the Department has in place the workforce with the skill sets that we need to be successful in strategic competition with Russia and China.

Put simply, if you are serious about countering Russia and China, you should allow these nominees to be confirmed. And if you are serious about taking care of those who serve, you should allow these nominees to be confirmed.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 477 and 599; 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; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, it is now March. It has been 7 months since the disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Thirteen servicemembers lost their lives in the attack on Abbey Gate along with hundreds of civilians. As a result of the botched evacuation operation, hundreds, if not thousands, of American civilians were left behind to the enemy.

We hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle that my insistence that we actually vote on nominees is unprecedented. I would humbly suggest that the Afghanistan crisis into which this President led our country was unprecedented.

And who has been held accountable for that disaster? No one. Who has the President fired? Who has offered their resignation? Which of the planners at the Department of State or the Department of Defense or the National Security Council have been relieved of duty? No one.

Until there is accountability, I am going to ask that the Senate do the simple task of its job, which is to actually vote on these nominees. The least we could do is observe regular order and vote on these leadership positions at the Department of Defense.

My colleagues say that we have got to put national security first. I agree with them about that. But I believe that begins at the top, with the President of the United States and the leadership of the Department of Defense and the Department of State. I, for one, am not going to stand by and look the other way while this administration systematically endangers our national security, imperils the American people, and watches the sacrifice of our soldiers go by without any accountability, without any change in direction.

Accountability for the Afghanistan disaster is all the more urgent given revelations last month from the U.S. Central Command investigation of the Abbey Gate bombing. The investigative report makes clear that the Administration had ample warning prior to mid-August that Kabul could collapse rapidly in the face of the Taliban's offensive. It shows further how the Administration refused to acknowledge those warnings and act in a timely manner to prepare for Kabul's fall. And it shows in astounding detail just how chaotic the final evacuation effort was, with U.S. servicemembers often left without clear guidance, the State Department constantly missing in action, and the Administration itself intent only on evacuating as many people as possible, regardless of whether those individuals were eligible for evacuation or might pose a threat to America's own security.

I am not willing to look the other way and just pretend that Afghanistan didn't happen, which seems to be the posture that many in this body have adopted. I am not willing to do that. I can't do that because I promised the parents of the fallen that I wouldn't do that.

I am going to discharge my responsibility. And as long as it takes, I will continue to draw attention to what happened at Abbey Gate and to demand accountability for the disaster that this administration has pushed upon this country and upon the people of my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Ms. BALDWIN. I am disappointed that my Republican colleague blocked confirmation of these nominations.

These nominees have been held up since last year. They were approved by the Armed Services Committee with a bipartisan vote and only one Member recorded as a no. It is time to end these delays and confirm these nominees.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE COMMISSIONING OF THE USS
"DELAWARE"

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to mark a moment in history for the First State, your neighboring State, to celebrate the first U.S. Navy vessel to be named after Delaware in more than 100 years.

In 2 days, I will be joined by the Secretary of the Navy, the First Lady of the United States, and what will feel like half of Delaware at the Port of Wilmington to commemorate the commissioning of the Virginia Class of nuclear submarine, the USS *Delaware*.

And while the vessel was first officially commissioned underwater and underway on a mission at sea due to the COVID restrictions on April 4, 2020—a first in Navy history—a first in Navy history—this weekend, we will get to give the USS *Delaware*, its crew, and the people of Delaware a fitting celebration above the surface of the water.

It has been a long time coming for the USS *Delaware*. So many people across Delaware and in the Navy have worked hard not just for weeks, not just for months, but for years to make this weekend a reality for our State and the crew.

I would be remiss not to mention my wingman in the U.S. Senate, Senator CHRIS COONS, and our wing-woman in the U.S. House of Representatives, LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, as well as our Governor John Carney for their longstanding support for the USS *Delaware*. They will be joining us on Saturday to celebrate.

You probably wouldn't be surprised to learn that SSN 791—that is the number assigned to the USS *Delaware*, is not the first Navy vessel to bear the name "Delaware."

The first USS *Delaware* was launched in 1776. Its role? Delaying the British Fleet's approach to Philadelphia and thus impeding the ability of the British to resupply their army in our War of Independence. That was the first USS *Delaware*.

The sixth USS *Delaware* was completed in April of 1910. Armed with ten 12-inch guns, it was the most powerful battleship in the world at the time. Over 100 years would pass before an-

other US Naval vessel would bear the name "Delaware."

Then, one day in 2012, I came across a letter to the editor from a constituent in Delaware whose name is Steven Llanso. He wrote to the editor. He said: You know, it has been a long time since a ship was built and named after the State of Delaware. Maybe somebody should do something about it.

I thought about it for a while. I thought about it for a couple of weeks, actually. I pulled my staff together and said, "Why don't we do something about this?" And they said "Let's do," and we did.

The next week, I was on the phone with then-Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus, former Governor of Mississippi—us both being former Governors—and a long-time friend, and he would go on to become the longest serving Secretary of the Navy in the history of our country.

I explained the situation to Secretary Mabus. He graciously heard me out and agreed 100 years was a long time. Before we hung up, he said to me, "Let me think about it, Tom. I will get back to you in a couple of months." And true to his word, 3 months later, he gave me a call and said that over the next several years, the Navy would begin construction on not one, not two, but three, maybe four Virginia Class nuclear submarines, and the first one off the line would be named the USS *Delaware*.

Now, I was talking on a mobile phone, but if I had a landline—if I was talking with him through a landline, I could have reached through the landline and kissed him. I was so happy. And I didn't do that. But it was a wonderful moment, one that I relished in, and I certainly do today. He is a great friend, a great leader of the Navy then and a patriot, and he has done so many things for our country. So thank you, Ray.

So this weekend, almost a decade since I first spoke with then-Secretary Mabus, I will have the honor of finally introducing the newest USS *Delaware* to the people of Delaware. And there is a whole lot of it to take in.

The USS *Delaware* is a Virginia Class U.S. nuclear submarine. The *Delaware* will carry 26 MK-48 torpedoes, which enable it to conduct the sub's more traditional role of tracking and, if necessary, sinking enemy submarines, as well as a wide range of surface vessels.

The *Delaware* is also designed for versatile operations in shallow water, closer to land, performing reconnaissance activities, delivering Special Forces. It is also configured to launch Tomahawk cruise missiles which can be launched while the *Delaware* is on patrol. The Tomahawk can strike targets nearly 1,000 miles away with pinpoint—pinpoint—accuracy.

This is one hell of a fighting machine. You know, they have a saying down in Texas you have probably heard. It says "Don't mess with

Texas," and I would just add to that, to our adversaries, "Don't mess with the USS *Delaware* because, if you do, we will eat your lunch. I promise."

And, oh, yes. There are 136 crewmembers aboard the USS *Delaware*. They hail from 20 States across our country. Almost half of the States are represented in the crew of our sub. The crew also includes 15 officers and 121 enlisted men, a dozen or so who are chief petty officers. My dad was a chief petty officer for nearly 30 years, World War II and beyond. And he always told me when I was a midshipman, he used to say, "Tom, the chiefs run the Navy." And you know, they did, and my guess is they still do.

But in addition to having an opportunity to introduce the crew of the USS *Delaware* to the people of Delaware this weekend, we will also have an opportunity to introduce Delaware to the crew of the State that they are representing.

With tongue in cheek, I like to describe Delaware as the 49th largest State in the Union, and it is comprised of three counties and 1 million people. We are about 100 miles from north to south and about 50 miles from east to west along our southern border with Maryland, the Presiding Officer's State.

Native Americans, including the Lenape Indians, lived in Delaware for hundreds of years before the Dutch arrived some 400 years ago and established Lewes, DE, the first town in the first State, located where the Atlantic Ocean meets the Delaware Bay.

A quick story: The Dutch were not all that kind to these Native Americans who lived in that greater area which is now Lewes. And the Native Americans literally wiped out the Dutch colony. Later on, the Dutch would come back in greater numbers, be more kind to the Native Americans, and the colony of Lewes grew and prospered.

The British looked askance at this and worried about the growth of this Dutch colony surrounded by British settlements and forces. One night, the Dutch went to bed to sleep in Lewes, DE, and the Brits burned the town to the ground. The next morning, when the Dutch surveyed what happened, there was one house still standing, the Ryves Holt House, believed to be maybe the oldest permanently standing house in North America. The Ryves Holt House is now a part of a national park.

Later on, in 1631, the first Swedes and Finns sailed by what would become the Port of Wilmington. Their sailing ships—the Kalmar Nyckel and the Fogel Grip—took a turn to the west for a couple miles on a smaller river that they named the Christina after Sweden's 12-year-old child queen. Along its banks, they established the colony of New Sweden, where Wilmington stands today. The church they built there is believed to be perhaps the longest continuously serving church in North

America—Old Swedes church—and believe it or not, there are now more Swedish-Americans than there are Swedes in Sweden.

Fifty-one years later, William Penn would sail up the Delaware, past Wilmington, past the Port of Wilmington now, to what is called Penn's Landing, about 25 miles north of Wilmington, and carried with him the deeds from the King of England to what would later become the Colony of Pennsylvania and something called "the Lower Three Counties." That would be us, Delaware. But the real Penn's Landing, ironically, was in what is now New Castle, DE—not Pennsylvania, but New Castle, DE.

And there is a legend. Legend has it that not only did he stop there, but he spent the night in Delaware. And later on, he was asked why did he stop in Delaware, and he said, "Tax-free shopping." "Tax-free shopping."

A few hundred years later, up the Christina River, 10,000 shipbuilders, mostly women, would build many of the ships, including destroyer escorts and troop landing ships that enabled us to emerge victorious in World War II. And that is only part of the storied history that the USS *Delaware* joins today.

Throughout Delaware history, the letter "C" has figured prominently. Our first settlers planted corn—a lot of it. They raised chickens, a lot of them, and fed them corn. Our State bird is, believe it or not, the "fightin'" blue hen. Today, there are nearly 300 chickens for every person who lives in the First State of Delaware. Later, we become known as the "Chemical Capital of the World." Thank you, DuPont, for hundreds of amazing, amazing inventions. Delaware's coastline is not large, but the last I checked, it was home to the most five-star beaches than any other State coastline in America—and one of them is Rehoboth. And Rehoboth is a name that is translated to mean "room for all."

Not long ago, we built more cars in Delaware per capita than any other State. Not surprising is that they were Chryslers and Chevrolets.

And while we have no sales tax, Delaware is the home of incorporation of half the Fortune 500 and half the New York Stock Exchange. So corporations are important to us. While I don't know what credit card is in the wallet of most of the people on the floor today, there is a good chance it is issued by a bank with operations in Delaware.

Now, that is a lot of C's, but even our political leaders have gotten into the act with names like Carvel, former Governor; Castle, former Governor; Carney, current Governor; COONS, our senior Senator; and CARPER, his wingman. And even though Joe Biden didn't start out as one of the C-boys, he was close, just off by one letter. Joe Biden has ended up, as you know, as our Nation's Commander-in-Chief. That is a lot of C's put together in a

very nice way. Not bad for a scrappy kid from Scranton, PA.

By far, the greatest contribution that Delaware has made since the founding of our country occurred on December 7, 1787, when Delaware became the first State to ratify our Constitution. I like to say we are the first to ratify, followed shortly thereafter by Maryland, Pennsylvania, and others; but for 1 whole week, Delaware was the entire United States of America. We opened it up and let others in. And I think for the most part, it turned out pretty well, at least until now. But the Constitution that we ratified on December 7, 1787, would become the most enduring Constitution in the history of the world and by far the most replicated.

You know, none of us are perfect—certainly not me—and our Constitution was not perfect either; but over time, we have made it better, a lot better. Along with the Bill of Rights, it provides a framework, if you will, and a path that has made our country the envy of much of the rest of the world.

But at the end of the day, our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence are words on a piece of paper without the resolve made real by the commitment and sacrifice of men and women who wear and have worn the uniform of our country.

Let me end with this. I suspect that most of my colleagues remember studying the Constitution in school—maybe in grade school, maybe in middle school. I remember it. In fact, my sister and I had to learn and actually recite the Preamble in middle school. As you know, it begins with something like this:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.

The Preamble of our Constitution doesn't say "in order to form a perfect Union"; it says "a more perfect Union." Why is that? Because as citizens of our great country, it is up to each of us to do our part to ensure that the arc of American history bends toward perfection and justice, even knowing that we will probably never fully achieve it.

The men who serve and will serve aboard the USS *Delaware* will bear our State's namesake literally for decades to come, maybe a half-century or more, in defense of our Nation. The crewmembers are answering the call of our Nation written over 230 years ago. Through their sacrifice, through their service, may we grow even closer to that more perfect Union. We are—I know I am—grateful for their service today.

May God bless and protect the crew of the USS *Delaware*, both now and in the decades to come, and may each of us live our own lives in ways to ensure

that America remains a nation worthy of their sacrifice so that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people will not perish from this Earth.

USS *Delaware*, long may she sail.

And before I yield back my time, I guess we have been joined on the floor by our friend and colleague, JOHN CORNYN from Texas. And Senator CORNYN, I think maybe before he arrived, I used the phrase—I acknowledged the phrase, “Don’t mess with Texas.” “Don’t mess with Texas.” And I went on to explain all the weapons systems that the USS *Delaware* has on board. It is a pretty amazing, incredible submarine. And I said: It is all right not to mess with Texas, but you better not mess—for our adversaries, you better not mess with Delaware, either.

With that, I yield the floor to my friend from Texas, Senator CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, next week, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to serve as a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Since Judge Jackson’s nomination was announced, I made it clear that I would go into this process with an open mind, just as I have tried to do with each Supreme Court nominee who has come before the Judiciary Committee during my time in the Senate. This is now my eighth Supreme Court Justice to participate in the confirmation of.

Now, I have seen the good, the bad, and the ugly when it comes to judicial confirmation hearings, and I know that some people expressed concerns about the tough questions that Judge Jackson fielded. I thought she did a credible job answering those questions. She is obviously incredibly smart, but I found her personally very charming as well.

Judge Jackson has received two degrees from Harvard, completed a Supreme Court clerkship, and served on the Federal bench for nearly a decade. I hear no one questioning Judge Jackson’s legal credentials, but a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court requires a lot more than just the right resume. Our constitutional Republic requires judges who rule based on the law, not based on their personal policy preferences or beliefs and certainly not based on a result and working your way back to a justification for that particular result. Judges are required to go wherever the law may lead them.

Justice Scalia, during his lifetime, said: If you haven’t made a decision as a judge that you personally disagree with because the law compels it, you are really probably not doing your job as a judge. And I think there is a lot of truth to that. As I say, the job is not to start with the desired result and work backwards and cherry-pick the legal reasoning to justify the decision.

The question we tried to answer—those of us who serve on the Judiciary Committee—last week is, Where would Judge Jackson fit in this mold if con-

firmed to the Supreme Court? Would she be an impartial umpire who follows the letter of the law or would she attempt to legislate from the bench? The reason that is important is because, under our Constitution, Members of the Senate are supposed to legislate. But that is also the reason why we run for election, and we are held accountable each election for the votes we take and the policy positions we embrace. That is how public policy in America is supposed to be made, not by judges who serve for a lifetime and whom the voters cannot unelect, like they can Members of the Senate. That is why their job is very different.

Before Judge Jackson was named as the nominee for this seat, President Biden outlined what he was looking for in a candidate. Among the many qualities and beliefs that he specified, the President said, tellingly, he wanted someone with a judicial philosophy that “suggests that there are unenumerated rights in the Constitution, and all the amendments mean something, including the Ninth Amendment.” Those are code words, and let me explain.

This wasn’t a one-off comment by President Biden. He even said on the campaign trail that he would not nominate somebody for the Supreme Court who did not have a view that unenumerated rights exist in the Constitution. Now, translated into English, that is tantamount to saying that judges shouldn’t be bound by a written Constitution.

You might wonder, if they are not bound by the text and the words of the Constitution, where does their authority come from?

The President stated and restated a litmus test for his desired Supreme Court candidate, and he has clearly determined that Judge Jackson fits the bill. So I spent my time during the Judiciary Committee hearing asking her about unenumerated or what you might call invisible rights during her confirmation hearing—invisible because they are not in the text.

I told Judge Jackson it is deeply concerning to me and to the people I represent that five unelected and unaccountable Justices could upend the will of the people by invalidating laws or inventing a new right out of whole cloth. We talked a lot about substantive due process. I suggested that she and I nerd out together, since that is not a topic that people typically talk about around the kitchen table, but maybe they do in a sense I will talk about in a moment.

Substantive due process is this theory that somehow, when you combine the 5th Amendment due process clause with the 14th Amendment due process clause, that out of that formula, unwritten and invisible rights can suddenly appear. This is really just judge-made law.

We have seen many examples of this. For example, in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Supreme Court established the shame-

ful doctrine of separate but equal when it came to the treatment of African Americans in our country. Thankfully, that was later overruled by *Brown v. Board of Education*. But it is an example of the sort of horrific outcomes that can occur when judges—five judges, unelected, lifetime tenured—decide to become policymakers in their own right.

Perhaps most famous in legal circles—certainly in law school—you learn about *Lochner v. New York*. That was another example of substantive due process where the Supreme Court invalidated some labor regulations with regard to how long bakers could work. In that, the Supreme Court discovered a freedom to contract right—again, nowhere written in the Constitution but another example of a result-oriented outcome based on unwritten constitutional rights.

Now, one of the most famous examples is *Roe v. Wade* in which the Supreme Court found a constitutional right to an abortion. I asked Judge Jackson if the word “abortion” or the word “marriage” was found anywhere in the Constitution, and she agreed with me that, no, they are not mentioned in the Constitution.

Now, here is my point. It is not the outcome necessarily, because substantive due process can be used for good or for ill. In other words, the good is when I agree with the outcome, and the ill is when I disagree. But the main problem is that unelected judges are making policy, binding the entire country under the guise of substantive due process, which is nothing but judicial lawmaking. So this doctrine of substantive due process can be used for things you agree with and things you disagree with.

The point is that this has, I think, helped us hone in on the limitless abilities of five Justices to discover new rights that aren’t even mentioned in the Constitution and then to eliminate any sort of debate or democratic process where people actually get to vote on public policies because essentially the Supreme Court has taken the issue out of the public square. They said: We have already decided it, and we don’t really care what you think.

Even Justice Hugo Black, a noted liberal in the classical sense, said the due process clause itself in the 5th and 14th Amendments was designed to make certain that men would be governed by law, not the arbitrary fiat of the man or men in power. And you would have to update to say “man or woman,” obviously.

We all know judges on the Supreme Court and on the Federal bench are unelected and therefore unaccountable to the people. Federal judges discovering rights that do not exist in the written Constitution essentially provides a rudderless and, I would argue, eventually lawless authority to the Supreme Court.

The very nature of our three branches of government is to divide responsibilities among those branches.

As I mentioned, the political branches are the executive branch, the President; legislative branch, obviously that is Congress, the House and the Senate. Our job is far different, and it is important to have judges understand their limited but vital role under the Constitution. Their job is to interpret the laws as written, not to make them up as you go along or to use a smoke-screen, like substantive due process, to identify new rights that do not appear anywhere in the Constitution.

If the American people want to amend the Constitution, which they have done 27 times during our Nation's history, there is a way to do that. Sure, it is a tough battle. You have to win a supermajority of both Houses, and you have to get it ratified by the States. But you can do it, and it has been done 27 times.

But there are people who want to take a shortcut, and they want judges to abuse their authority by identifying these unwritten rights.

Well, what is at stake when that happens? When judges invent new rights, decide issues that are not in their lane, as Judge Jackson liked to say—she would say “making policy is not in my lane”—or when a judge acts as a policymaker, like Congress is supposed to do, like the executive branch is supposed to do, when judges act that way, they necessarily undermine the American people's right to choose.

The Declaration of Independence notes that the authority of government is derived from the consent of the governed. But how do judges, when they identify unmentioned rights out of whole cloth, how do we, as the American people, get to consent or withhold that consent? Thus, it is easy to see how judge-made law and these smoke-screens, like substantive due process, are really methods by which some members of the judiciary undermine the basic and fundamental premise and legitimacy of our laws because the consent of the governed to those judges is irrelevant.

Now, one unfortunate consequence of judge-made law that is not in the Constitution as written, is that anybody who disagrees with you—and this act of judicial activism—can easily be accused of discrimination or even labeled a bigot, even if their belief is derived from religious conviction, which is expressly protected by the Constitution. This is what happens when invisible rights conflict with rights that are actually written into the Constitution, like the First Amendment, like the right to religious liberty.

President Biden assured the American people that he would nominate somebody who believed in unenumerated rights, so I asked Judge Jackson a logical question: What unenumerated rights are there?

The American people deserve to know. Certainly, in casting our vote for or against a nomination, the Senate deserves to know. But she refused to provide an answer.

This isn't the only place where Judge Jackson was less than candid. My colleagues and I repeatedly asked Judge Jackson about her judicial philosophy, a standard question during these confirmation hearings. Now, Judge Jackson has a marvelous legal education. She has vast practical experience because she was a public defender, a Federal district judge, a circuit court judge, and now will serve on the Supreme Court.

So when you ask a judge with that sort of pedigree, “Tell us about the way you decide cases: What is your judicial philosophy?” Well, it is not a trap or a trick question. It is something that every Supreme Court nominee has been asked to describe.

Most recently, Judge Barrett identified her judicial philosophy, describing herself as a “textualist” and an “originalist.” Now, those are awkward terms, but I think what that means is she believes in interpreting the law as written and as understood at the time it was written. That is what she refers to as a “written Constitution.”

Judge Jackson previously suggested she didn't have a judicial philosophy at all—something I find impossible to believe with somebody with this sort of experience and background and incredibly impressive education.

During her confirmation hearing, she failed to provide much clarity beyond offering vague statements about her methodology. But her methodology is not a philosophy. We need a clear understanding of how Judge Jackson views judge-made law and the invisible—you might say “unenumerated,” in the words of President Biden—rights that she finds in the Constitution.

In order for me to fulfill my responsibility as a Member of the Senate to provide advice and consent, I need to know and understand how Judge Jackson interprets the law and the Constitution, not asking her to make specific commitments on results or outcomes. I would never do that because judges are supposed to interpret, apply the law to a case-by-case method. But after repeated questioning, the judge refused to answer that question.

The prism or philosophy through which a Supreme Court nominee views the law and interprets the Constitution is a critical indicator for determining if the judge will “stay in her lane”—again, those were the terms that Judge Jackson used—or whether she will become a policymaker that President Biden and outside groups like Demand Justice want her to be.

Demand Justice is an advocacy group that advocates defunding the police and progressive solutions to society's problems. They don't want her calling balls and strikes; they want her putting her thumb on their side of the scale and judging in a results-oriented fashion.

As I reviewed Judge Jackson's record, I saw some examples of activism bleeding through her decisions. One of Judge Jackson's opinions from

her time on the DC district court demonstrates the serious concerns that I have about her ability to follow the letter of the law as expressed by Congress as opposed to her personal preferences.

In the case *Make the Road New York v. McAleenan*, a progressive organization challenged the Trump administration's regulation of expedited removal proceedings for people who illegally enter our country without the appropriate paperwork. The Immigration and Nationality Act gives the Department of Homeland Security “sole and unreviewable discretion” to apply expedited removal proceedings. Expedited removal is actually a deterrent for illegal immigration because if migrants realize that without authorization they enter the country and they are going to be removed on an expedited basis, a whole lot of them won't spend the money and take the time on that dangerous journey from their home to our shores or to our border if they know they are not going to be successful. So this was not a minor matter. But the Immigration and Nationality Act doesn't leave any gray area for interpretation. Sole and unreviewable discretion is as clear as it comes.

Judge Jackson, who presided over this case, decidedly did not stay in her lane. She went beyond the unambiguous text to deliver a political win to a progressive group and, in the process, entered an injunction barring the use of this tool that is needed by our Border Patrol and immigration authorities in order to deter people from violating our immigration laws.

Unsurprisingly, her decision was appealed and ultimately overturned by the DC circuit court. I think this is a clear-cut example of Judge Jackson ignoring the law as written in order to achieve a result that she preferred.

The critical point to underscore is that as Members of Congress, we are elected and accountable. We can get elected, and we can get unelected when our constituents don't like what we are doing. But our authority comes from the electoral process, which is another way of saying the consent of the governed, as I mentioned, in the Declaration of Independence.

With each bill that is signed into law, we are interacting with the will of our constituents. And if they don't like what we are doing, you can bet we hear from them and certainly will in the next election, if not before.

But by ignoring these laws passed by Congress and signed by the President, Judge Jackson is doing more than just disregarding Congress; she is rejecting the right of the American people to govern themselves, to consent to the laws or withhold their consent.

If given a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court, I have to wonder: How many other laws would Judge Jackson ignore? How many other precedents would she seek to overturn simply because she doesn't agree with them? How far would she go to achieve

a specific result by discovering unenumerated and, hence, invisible rights, whether it relates to immigration, abortion, religion, the Second Amendment, or anything else you might imagine that the Supreme Court might consider?

The separation of powers between the three coequal branches of government is a central feature of our constitutional democracy. Not only do we have three branches, we also have multiple levels of Federal, State, and local governments—a Federal system. That is because the Founders of this great country and the people who ratified the Constitution believed that the best way to protect their liberty was by enacting checks and balances on the authority of government because they didn't trust any person to stay in their lane. They wanted checks and balances to make sure there was a method of enforcing elected officials, including judges, to stay in their lane.

Sixth Circuit Chief Judge Jeffrey Sutton recently wrote a book whose title sums up the overarching debate with a single, succinct question. Ultimately, this is a question of who decides. Do we the people decide? Do our elected representatives whom we delegate the authority to make decisions on our behalf, do they decide or do unelected, lifetime-tenured, unaccountable Federal judges—are they free to be roaming policymakers, enacting judge-made law, which actually contradicts or conflicts with the will of the American people, as evidenced by the laws passed by their elected representatives? When there is a conflict between the different levels or branches of government, who decides is how we determine who holds the power to make decisions that impact every citizen in this country. And as I said, all power, political and government authority, is derived from the people.

Voters select Senators, Congressmen, even the President of the United States, but they have no direct say in the process of selecting Supreme Court Justices. That is why our responsibility, part of the Constitution known as advice and consent—that is why our constitutional obligation is so important.

We have the responsibility to determine whether a nominee understands the important but limited role of Federal judges and can be expected to act with restraint, fairness, impartiality, and ultimately in the best interest of the American people.

Ultimately, I fear Judge Jackson has a blind spot when it comes to judge-made law, and she would use her seat on the Supreme Court to create new rights out of whole cloth and engage in result-oriented decision making.

For that reason, I will oppose Judge Jackson's confirmation to the Supreme Court of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here on a very important bipartisan

bill, but I first wanted to address the fact that I am proud to be supporting Judge Jackson.

I think she has incredible legal experience—more experience as a judge going into the job than four of the people had when they went on to the Supreme Court.

She is in the top two for trial experience. She showed incredible grace under pressure when one over-the-top, inappropriate question was asked of her after another.

She will be walking into that Supreme Court with her head held high, and she is going to be confirmed next week.

As I said, I will speak more to this later. I spoke a lot about it in the Judiciary Committee, but she is going to be a great Supreme Court Justice.

OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM ACT

Mr. President, I rise today to highlight my bill with Senator THUNE, which just passed the Senate, the Ocean Shipping Reform Act.

We worked for months together on this bill to come to an agreement. We did everything right and got cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. I particularly want to thank Baz, my staff member on the Commerce Committee, who did such a great job in working on this. And I also want to thank Senators CANTWELL and WICKER for their support of the bill as the chair and ranking member on the Commerce Committee. We worked together on some changes to the bill, and I appreciated their input.

As U.S. Senators representing Minnesota and South Dakota, Senator THUNE and I know how crucial it is for American businesses to be able to export throughout the country and across the globe. American farmers feed the world, and consumers and businesses look to them for in-demand agricultural goods like soybeans, corn, dairy, poultry, pork, and beef, just to name a few. And American manufacturers support so many of the essential parts and products that fill our jobs, businesses, and store shelves.

As I look at our economy as we come out of this economic downturn, we must be an economy and a country that makes stuff, that invents things, that exports to the world. No matter how much American ingenuity we have—and there is a lot of it—if ships owned by foreign interests are going to other countries with empty containers and exporting nothing but air and then come to our country filled with foreign goods, that is not exactly an even playing field.

As the past 2 years have highlighted, significant supply chain disruptions and vulnerabilities have occurred. There are many answers here, one of them being workforce, one of them being port infrastructure and rail infrastructure and the like, but what we have seen when it comes to shipping—and I am so glad my colleague from South Dakota has joined me here on the floor—what we have seen in the

middle of the country, where people are pretty sensible, all of a sudden they are looking at this, and they see the price of shipping containers increase by four times in just 2 years. Four times—that is not normal.

We have also heard from U.S. companies that they have only been able to ship 60 percent of their orders because they can't access the shipping containers. At the same time, these ocean carriers—almost all foreign-owned—have reported record profits. It is estimated that the container shipping industry made a record \$190 billion in profits in 2021, a sevenfold increase from the previous year.

Their financial performance isn't a result of improved performance when our manufacturers and farmers can't ship out their goods, no. They are fleecing consumers and exporters because they know they can get away with it, and this is all while exporters and consumers are literally paying the price for the supply chain disruptions caused by unreliable service.

(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

We need to get exports to those who need them, but it is plainly obvious that the ocean carriers are prioritizing non-American shipments at the expense of both American exporters—as in manufacturers, so many of them in Minnesota and South Dakota, as Senator THUNE knows, being small businesses—as well as farmers and American consumers. It isn't sustainable, and it isn't acceptable. We can't let ocean carriers slow down our supply chain while shaking down our American businesses and farmers for their own profit.

That is why we introduced the Ocean Shipping Reform Act. It just passed the Senate. Our bill protects American farmers and manufacturers by making it easier for them to ship ready-to-export goods waiting at our ports. Our bill aims to level the playing field for American exporters by updating the Federal rules for the global shipping industry.

It will give the Federal Maritime Commission greater authority to regulate harmful practices by these big international carriers. It directs the Federal Maritime Commission to issue a rule prohibiting international ocean carriers from unreasonably declining shipping opportunities for U.S. exports. This will make it harder for them to leave our products behind, just sitting there at a port, in favor of shipping over to China, sailing over to China, and then bringing their products back to us.

In addition to giving the FMC more authority to investigate bad practices by ocean carriers, the bill also directs the Federal Maritime Commission to set new rules for what the international carrier companies can reasonably charge and require them to certify and ultimately prove that fees that they charge are fair. As rates continue to climb, this is more urgent than ever.

And I personally believe that, even before this rule goes into effect, the fact that we passed this unanimously in the U.S. Senate sent a pretty strong shot across the bow because there is so much more we could do and we will do if this practice continues.

As I was working on this bill with Senator THUNE, I heard about exporters who wanted to speak out against these predatory practices but were scared into silence because they feared that the ocean carriers would retaliate. That is why our bill includes strong anti-retaliation protection for shippers. In short, this bipartisan legislation says to the foreign-owned shipping alliances: Charge fair prices, stop profiting off our backs, and fill your empty crates with American-made products.

Senator THUNE and I have a bipartisan group of 29 cosponsors representing a variety of regions: Senators CANTWELL; WICKER; BALDWIN; HOEVEN; STABENOW; MARSHALL; PETERS; MORAN; BLUMENTHAL; YOUNG; KELLY; CRAPO; SMITH of Minnesota; BLACKBURN; BOOKER; ERNST; CORTEZ MASTO, the Presiding Officer; BRAUN; WARNOCK; RISCH; BENNET; CRAMER; WYDEN; BLUNT; VAN HOLLEN; BOOZMAN; FISCHER; PADILLA; and HICKENLOOPER.

The legislation earned the endorsement of the American Association of Port Authorities, which represents more than 130 Port authorities across North and South America, including my own port of Duluth. This bill is also endorsed by more than 100 organizations, including the Agriculture Transportation Coalition, the National Retail Federation, the American Trucking Associations, and the Consumer Technology Association.

I also want to mention the House leaders on this bill—Representatives JOHN GARAMENDI and DUSTY JOHNSON of South Dakota—whose companion legislation has already passed the House. I see this as a truly bipartisan solution to a problem that is impacting millions of Americans and a great example of what is possible when we work together.

I want to congratulate Senator THUNE for his great leadership. He may be a bit taller than I, but we have worked together on many, many things across our borders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, let me just join my friend and colleague and neighbor from across the border, Senator KLOBUCHAR, in just acknowledging the passage of something that is really important and credit to her staff, who I know worked tirelessly on this, and members of my staff—in particular Chance Costello—who worked tirelessly trying to find that common ground and thread the needle to get this done in a way that would expedite its passage here in the Senate.

As Senator KLOBUCHAR pointed out, the leadership on the Commerce Committee—Senators CANTWELL and WICKER—and their staffs also were in-

strumental in helping us get this across the finish line. But as Senator KLOBUCHAR pointed out, I think this is a good example of how, if you are willing to keep grinding and keep working at it, you can come up with solutions that are bipartisan and solutions that really get at problems that we are facing in this country.

I don't think anybody would argue that we have a supply chain crisis in America. It has heightened the importance of addressing some of these shipping challenges; and our legislation, although it may not be the end-all, certainly takes us a long way toward addressing what have been identified as many of the problems associated with trying to get the goods and products through our port system into the United States and, as importantly, trying to get those products, those things that we raise and grow and manufacture here in the United States, to their destinations around the world.

And there have been lots of examples which Senator KLOBUCHAR has alluded to that she and I and our staffs have, in visiting with stakeholders out there, people who were impacted by these bottlenecks that exist today—as we have listened to them, much of that input and feedback was incorporated into this legislation.

So it does take strong measures to help tackle supply chain slowdowns, and it does level the playing field for American exporters, including South Dakota ag producers. It does this in several ways. She has covered it well, but let me just briefly touch on a couple of things. It does this by giving the FMC, or the Federal Maritime Commission, new authorities to crack down on unfair ocean carrier practices, whether that is a refusal to carry certain cargoes or discrimination against certain commodities for export.

We have all heard these examples—Senator KLOBUCHAR alluded to this—of containers leaving the ports in the United States that are empty, filled with air, or the carriers making determinations based upon the value of certain products instead of—and then assessing detention and demurrage fees sometimes on shippers that are unfair and unrelated, really, to anything that they have done.

So providing the FMC with more tools to quickly resolve detention disputes, bringing greater efficiency and transparency to a process that leaves many shippers frustrated—and especially small businesses—is what this legislation is all about. These improvements, we believe, are going to bring long-term, positive changes to the maritime supply chain, which I hope will benefit not only exporters but importers and consumers alike.

The legislation not only levels the playing field for producers in South Dakota and across the Nation, but it will also benefit exporters, small businesses, and, as I said, consumers across this country.

So I hope, as she does, that our colleagues in the House will be able to

take this up and pass it. There has been some good work done there already, much of it by my colleague in South Dakota, a Member of the congressional delegation from our State, DUSTY JOHNSON, who has been the leader on this legislation in the House of Representatives when it passed earlier this year. And now, we have our chance here in the U.S. Senate.

And it is a product of a tremendous amount of work. Senator KLOBUCHAR's staff and my staff spent not weeks but months negotiating—and, you know, there are always disagreements. There are always differences. Of course, when you present it to the rest of our colleagues on the Senate Commerce Committee, they have their ideas, unique ideas, about things that they want to fix and change and make better. So it went through that process.

But, ultimately, when we brought it up for consideration in front of the Senate Commerce Committee, there were some amendments that were offered and voted on. People got a chance to have their voices heard. A lot of the ideas that people had were incorporated into the base text, but, ultimately, when it was voted out, it was voted out of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee unanimously. It came out without a dissenting vote, and that, I think, set us up here on the floor of the U.S. Senate to process in a way that, again, included a high level of bipartisanship.

And I credit, too—as we brought it to the floor, there were a couple of issues we had to again deal with, individual Members who had concerns—some with the legislation, some with other issues. But as is always the case here in the U.S. Senate, an individual Senator can assert their rights in a way that enables them, gives them leverage on the process; but we were able to work through those things, and that product today has now passed the U.S. Senate.

Hopefully, if the House is inclined to do so, it would be great if they would pick it up, pass it, put it on the President's desk, and have him sign it into law because I think it will take us a long way down the road toward leveling that playing field and addressing many of the concerns that have been identified by our exporters.

I know that the farm organizations in my State of South Dakota have been very active in influencing this, very concerned about the bottlenecks and their ability to reach export destinations in a way that allows them to maximize their profitability and, in doing so, increase the prosperity of people all across the Midwest in States that we represent where agriculture is the No. 1 industry.

So congrats to those who worked on this, again, to the staff who have labored, and to my colleague from Minnesota. This is not the first time we have collaborated on issues. We share not only a border but, obviously, a lot of commonality in terms of the issues that impact our States; and this is one

in particular where I think the farmers, ranchers, small business people, manufacturers in Minnesota and in South Dakota will all derive a benefit once it is enacted into law.

We are going to do everything we can now to continue to press forward. We have gotten it this far. We need to now get some additional action by the House of Representatives. I am not sure exactly what that looks like, whether that is going to conference with them. Preferably, obviously, they pick up and pass this bill, put it on the President's desk and turn it into law.

I am pleased to be able to be a part of this and to get a result today.

Ms. STABENOW. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THUNE. I would be happy to yield to our colleague and the chairman of the Senate Ag Committee, who also has big equities in this discussion.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I thank Senator THUNE and Senator KLOBUCHAR. I know that the chair of the Commerce Committee is coming down to speak.

I just wanted to say congratulations. Thank you for your wonderful leadership on this. Obviously, with my hat on as chair of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, this is a big deal, as they would say. This is a very big deal to, certainly, all of our growers in Michigan but, I know, across the country.

So thank you for your great bipartisan work, and hopefully, we can get this all the way across the finish line. I know the President is anxious to sign it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I, too, would like to come to the floor and thank my colleagues from the Upper Midwest for their great work on this legislation, the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022.

Our colleagues from the Upper Midwest know how important agriculture products are, and they know how important it is for them to reach their destination. As Senator THUNE was the previous chair of the Commerce Committee, he knows all too well about how products can get boxed out because of other products on the rails.

My colleague from Minnesota knows all too importantly about exports and has been a big supporter of our export economy in general and represents a State that is very robust on the global economy. So her leadership on a very tough issue has been very, very appreciated.

I would like to thank, from the Commerce Committee staff, a variety of people, and from Senator WICKER's staff and from Senator THUNE's. A lot of people worked on this: Nicki Teutschel, Alexis Gutierrez, Dave Stewart, Grace Bloom, Charles Vickery, Eric Vryheid, Michael Davisson, Matt Filpi, and Megan Thompson. From Senator WICKER's staff: Andrew Neely, Fern Gibbons,

Brendan Gavin, Paul Wasik, Kyle Fields. And from Senator KLOBUCHAR's staff: Obviously Baz Selassie—couldn't have done it without all of his hard work. He is really the guy behind this. And Senator THUNE's staff: Chance Costello. And certainly Rob Hickman from Senator SCHUMER's staff.

So, today, the passage of this bipartisan legislation couldn't come at a more important time for our growers and producers and exporters; that is, today we are saying that American farmers matter, and their survival matters more than the exorbitant profit of international shipping companies. That is what we really tried to tackle in this legislation. Our two colleagues brought forth this legislation in record time. It was passed in the House of Representatives, led by Congressmen GARAMENDI and JOHNSON. Those two passed that in December, and our colleagues got this bill here in the Senate in February, and we were able to pass it now here at the very end of March.

I thank again our two colleagues—Senator KLOBUCHAR for her leadership and Senator THUNE for getting it done so quickly. Literally, it was introduced in February and passed in March. I hope it is an example of what we can do on other legislation that is affecting our supply chain.

Our economy is built on trading goods in a timely manner with our partnerships from all over the world. Anderson Hay Grain in Washington said:

The agriculture economy in our region does not work if we don't have competitive access to world markets.

Right now, the supply chain isn't working. Our ports have been clogged. Shipping companies have struggled to keep up with demand, and the costs for American exporters who are trying to get hay and milk and apples to the global market have gone through the roof. It is hurting our consumers here at home as they see prices increase, and it is hurting our exporters when they are looking at products that they are trying to get to market.

American exporters are being charged more and more for containers due to shipping delays that are really out of their control. They are trying not to increase these costs. But, basically, consumers are paying more, and our exporters are having a tough time getting their products to market.

According to the freight index, by September 2021, shipping a container had gone from \$1,300 a container to \$11,000 a container. Reports and news articles talk about how that has affected our supply chains, that there have been increases in costs in consumer electronics, like computers and other equipment, and in furniture and apparel. They are all seeing increases because of the increases in our shipping costs.

The Federal Maritime Commission found that between July and September of 2021, American businesses were charged \$2.2 billion in fees in addi-

tion to freight rates. That is a 50-percent increase compared to the 3 prior months.

Getting overcharged is only part of the problem. Some of our businesses can't even get their containers on the ship. During 2021, there was a 24-percent drop in full shipping containers leaving from the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma. That drop increased to 30 percent in January and February of this year. That means 30 percent less containers are leaving for international markets that are full of American products. American exporters and their products are being left on the docks. That is why we wanted to act quickly.

The American farmer, with growing season upon us, can't afford to wait another minute for the Federal Maritime Commission to do its job and help police this market and make sure that our products and our farmers are not being overcharged or left on the dock.

The Washington State Potato Commission reported an 11-percent decrease in exports in 2020 from 2019. According to Darigold, American dairy producers lost \$1.5 billion last year due to port congestion and related challenges.

All of this means that getting this legislation onto the President's desk could not be more important. That is why we acted fast in moving this legislation today to give the first reforms to the Federal Maritime Commission in two decades. Those new tools given to the Commission are to increase the rules to prevent American products from being left on the docks; increase transparency so that the fees the shippers are charged are known and they can't be overcharged; and three, prevent the shipping companies from retaliating against our local American businesses.

These three changes are significant changes to the authority, and the committee made sure in the changes to the legislation that these new rules need to be in place in the next few months. We cannot continue to wait for those rules to take place until next year. They need to be done now. That is why the Commerce Committee I am sure will work in a bipartisan fashion to see the implementation of this law and to make sure that the Commission is aggressive in going after the exorbitant fees that are being charged by these international shipping companies.

It is a huge task. The Commission is charged with regulating a \$14 trillion international shipping industry. But this industry has done nothing but become more concentrated in the last several decades. As the supply chain challenges unfold, it is clear that the Commission is left trying to rein in the practices of five very large international companies. That is why we had to act fast and we had to be aggressive in making sure the Federal Maritime Commission would work to put rules in place that will help American ag exporters and help protect American consumers.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their great work on this legislation.

The State of Washington desperately needed to see the Federal Maritime Commission reform. I am proud to say that we were able to get a new Federal Maritime Commissioner, Max Vekich—who I think will officially be sworn in soon—from the State of Washington, who has been working on the docks for 40 years. He knows what it takes to move product. He also knows that we need aggressive action by the Federal Maritime Commission to protect all of us from these exorbitant shipping costs and to help us in making sure that products—good American exports, like our apples and hay and wheat—are not left on any dock but reach their destination in foreign markets.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, before I give my remarks, I want to give a shout-out again to our great leader, the chair of the Commerce Committee, Senator CANTWELL. I don't know if this is a record, but Senator CANTWELL moved this bill so fast through the committee, it is amazing. It is just building on the great work of the committee with the Innovation and Competition Act and so on.

Again, on behalf of all the farmers in Michigan and across the country, this is really important legislation.

(The remarks of Ms. STABENOW pertaining to the introduction of S. 3979 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. STABENOW I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

TRIBUTE TO LEAH SEIGLE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, before I get underway with the business that brings me to the floor, I would like to take a moment to say farewell and thank you to a member of my staff who is going on to other pursuits. Her name is Leah Seigle. She is right behind me, and she was my scheduler for many, many years.

As every Senator knows, there is a special relationship between a Senator and a scheduler. They have to be on duty, more or less, 24/7 when we are up and about. They have to deal with our day-to-day life and how it integrates with our offices. They very often are close to and involved with our families, because of having to deal with keeping our family time extant and busy schedules.

So I want to say a word of appreciation to Leah.

I don't know how many speeches she has scheduled me here on the floor for—all the "Scheme" speeches, probably all of the "Time to Wake Up" speeches, and this one today. This one today she actually gets to be here for and doesn't have to watch on television.

So to Leah Seigle, thank you very much, and to schedulers everywhere, you are important to us.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Madam President, the reason I am here is to announce my intention to vote for Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and to congratulate her on the grace and dignity with which she withstood what Chairman DURBIN called her "trial by ordeal" in the Judiciary Committee.

Last week, Judge Jackson set the gold standard for patience and courtesy from a Supreme Court nominee. She demonstrated, hour after hour after often-agonizing hour, in plain view the qualities that Rhode Islander and Reagan First Circuit appointee Judge Bruce Selya has praised in her, an outstanding legal mind, an exemplary judiciary temperament, and a depth of experience in the courtroom that none of the sitting Justices possesses.

Judge Jackson reminded us, through her personal story of perseverance and hope, how historic and important it is to have a Black woman about to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. That story of perseverance and hope stretches back beyond Judge Jackson's own life and work into the experience of Black women through American history, and it illuminates a brighter American future. So I will be proud to cast my vote for her confirmation.

During the Judiciary Committee hearing, there were persistent efforts to rewrite Judge Jackson's own history, to assign to her beliefs she has never espoused. She dispensed with those attempts so effectively that I won't dwell on them here. But there were other attempts in that hearing to rewrite history that I feel obliged to correct here today.

The first is the notion that a Justice must have a "judicial philosophy." That is news to me. If a nominee has a judicial philosophy, it is definitely fair game. It is important to explore that, and it is particularly important to explore that because predisposition can come masked as judicial philosophy. But I don't see where a nominee has to have one, and I would actually suggest we are better off if judges don't, because judicial philosophy can so easily be code for predisposition.

Republicans persisted in that "judicial philosophy" quest, asking about "judicial philosophy" over 50 times. The favored theme appeared to be the so-called judicial philosophies of originalism and textualism, doctrines which illustrate my concern about predisposition.

The big, dark money donors who ushered the last three Justices onto the Supreme Court love the backward look of originalism. A backward look to an era when industry regulation did not exist because big industry did not exist. Moreover, Republican Justices completely ignore originalism when it suits them. As I pointed out in committee, the entire vast structure of corporate political power in America erected by Republican Justices over years is a continuing affront to originalism.

There was no corporate role in politics in the Constitution or the Philadelphia debates or the Federalist papers. Any of the customary wellsprings of originalism would say that this is a country to be run by we the people. But how happy—how happy—corporate political power makes big Republican donors. So originalism goes out the window, and corporate power gets baked into our system.

Unlike those judicial philosophies of predisposition and of convenience, Judge Jackson said her judicial philosophy is her methodology—"consistently appl[y]" the "same level of analytical rigor" to a case "no matter who or what is involved in the legal action." For a judge, following your oath of office, the constitutional precedents of the Court, and the text of the Constitution itself should suffice. You don't need a judicial philosophy.

So where did this Republican fascination with judicial philosophy come from? Here are talking points distributed by twinned rightwing, dark money influence groups, the so-called Independent Women's Law Center and the affiliated so-called Independent Women's Voice. These groups are tied in with Leonard Leo's massive, secretive \$580 million-plus archipelago of front groups, like these, that make up the rightwing donors' Court-capture operation.

They sent these talking points to Republican Senators even before Judge Jackson was selected. These dark money groups noted that "this nominee is likely to be a woman of color" and urged the Republicans not argue, "that the president's selection process led him to choose someone who may not be the best person for the job."

They said:

It is . . . important that you focus not on the selection process or on the nominee's paper qualifications, but rather on the need to learn more about the nominee's judicial philosophy.

The marching orders were clear, and 50 efforts at "judicial philosophy" discussion later, we saw these talking points play out in that hearing.

This rewrite of history, to presume that every nominee should have a judicial philosophy, just because rightwing nominees have a fake judicial philosophy of originalism that turns out to be sourced to rightwing dark money talking points, it seems to me to be an effort to erase the dangers of having a judicial philosophy, particularly a judicial philosophy that masks predisposition and is selectively applied.

Another rewrite of history came through the witness chosen to highlight Judge Jackson's amicus brief defending a 2000 Massachusetts law establishing buffer zones for protests around abortion clinics.

The witness was a sidewalk counselor, someone who encourages women not to go in and exercise their rights. She seemed like a very nice woman, and she testified that she acted with compassion and love. But history and

my experience don't align with that image of clinic protesters, as I recall personally.

Crowds outside of clinics in Rhode Island in those years leading up to the 2000 law were hostile and intimidating, screaming and accusing of murder, to the point where patients coming in required security escorts to protect them.

I remember pink sweatshirts that safety escorts wore outside Planned Parenthood so that patients could identify who was there to help them and then pass safely.

Activists went back and forth between Massachusetts and Rhode Island to protest outside of clinics.

On the morning of December 30, 1994, bad went to worse. A man walked into a pair of abortion clinics in Brookline, MA. At the first clinic, he shot and killed the receptionist with a modified semiautomatic rifle, then turned on others present—patients, their accompanying partners, staff. He left that clinic and traveled to the second clinic and there continued the slaughter. The man killed two people and wounded five others in this rampage, which shook New England to the core.

I was the U.S. attorney when word came out of these shootings at clinics just 1 hour up the road and that the shooter was still at large. I thought Rhode Island might very well be next. So I went and stood outside the Planned Parenthood clinic just off the highway with my friend and Federal law enforcement colleague U.S. Marshal Jack Leyden, and we stood there on that cold morning until a police cruiser could be posted outside.

I will just say that the environment that led to Massachusetts' buffer zone law passing in 2000 was not an atmosphere of compassion and love, and it is a disservice to the facts to try to rewrite history and pretend that it was.

Another rewrite of history that took place in this hearing was a rewrite of the Brett Kavanaugh hearings.

The Judiciary Committee had been provided evidence in those hearings that young Brett Kavanaugh was an out-of-control drinker with a bad history of behavior around women—most particularly the testimony of this woman that she had been physically assaulted as a young woman.

You would never know of her testimony from the history rewrite offered by Republicans in the recent hearings. You would never know that she came to the Judiciary Committee; that she testified under oath and intense public scrutiny; that she weathered the attentions of a professional prosecutor hired by the Republicans; that she was calm and credible.

And you would never know that the FBI tanked its supplemental background investigation into these allegations, including a tip line whose tips received zero FBI investigation. I have described it before as a tip dump, not a tip line.

The tips related to the nominee were segregated from the regular stream of

tips in the FBI tip line and sent, without investigation, to the White House.

Republicans sought to erase all of that by rewriting Kavanaugh hearing history during this Supreme Court hearing. Well, she has a face and she has a name: Dr. Christine Blasey Ford.

And the big rewrite—the big rewrite is to ignore all the evidence that our Supreme Court is now a captured Court, captured in the same way that Agencies and Commissions are sometimes captured by big special interests.

There is a whole literature in administrative law, there is a whole literature in economics about Agency capture or regulatory capture.

Well, even before the Trump Presidency, big, powerful, rightwing donor interests began spending massive sums of money to install Justices on the Supreme Court whom they expected to rule reliably in their favor.

Very often, as the Presiding Officer knows, if you can pick the judges, you can pick the winner.

The 5-to-4 and now 6-to-3 Republican majority on the Court has been steadily delivering for those big donors; over 80—eight, zero—80 5-to-4 partisan wins for big corporate and partisan donor interests under Chief Justice Roberts.

In those 5-to-4 partisan decisions, by the way, where there was an identifiable Republican donor interest involved, it wasn't just the 80 decisions that stood out; it was the fact that the score was 80-to-0. Every single one went their way.

Dark money lurked behind the Federalist Society turnstile that picked the Justices. Dark money lurked behind the secretive Agency down the hall from the Federalist Society that ran the ads for them. Dark money lurks behind the flotillas of front group amici curiae that tell the Justices, in orchestrated chorus, how to rule.

You would never know any of this from our Republican friends in the committee.

But the American people have seen those decisions, and more and more they understand that the Court is rigged; that it is now the Court that dark money built.

Judge Jackson, by contrast, is a walking reminder of what the Court ought to be. She didn't pass through the dark money-funded turnstile at the Federalist Society. She arrived after a lifetime of accomplishment, against unimaginable odds, through a fair and honest selection process, through her merit and abilities.

The attacks on her in the committee were unseemly, but there is no need to dwell on that because at the end of the day, they were sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Judge Jackson will excel on the Supreme Court, and I will proudly cast my vote to put her there.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, Donald Trump relit the fuse that leads to an Iranian nuclear bomb by abandoning the Iran nuclear deal. Now Republicans are urging President Joe Biden to let it go boom.

President Barack Obama crafted the Iran nuclear deal in 2015 to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. He had inherited two quagmires in Afghanistan and Iraq, and he was right to prioritize diplomacy to prevent us from falling into a third quagmire.

Donald Trump's unilateral exit from the Iranian deal in 2013 created a nuclear crisis where one did not exist. In the years since that withdrawal, Iran has crept closer to a bomb, restricted access to international inspectors, and set us on a potential collision course to war with Iran.

Our European allies wanted to build upon the Iran nuclear deal, but President Trump and his arms control assassin, John Bolton, used it as target practice, leaving the Biden administration and our allies to pick up the pieces.

On the Republicans' watch, Iran's breakout time, or time required to build enough nuclear material for its first nuclear bomb, went from more than 1 year down to just weeks.

There is simply no good alternative to reentering the Iran nuclear deal. Trump has already tried the alternative. It has failed miserably and made the United States more vulnerable and made the Middle East more vulnerable.

Then-Secretary of State Mike Pompeo laid out a series of demands for Iran in 2018 that read more like a fantasy novel than a foreign policy speech. And where did it get us? Absolutely nowhere, except it got Iran closer to a nuclear weapon than it has ever been before.

No, the reality is that the alternative to diplomacy, our Plan B, is likely to include more sanctions which will lead to more enrichment of uranium and the prospect of another Middle East conflagration. In short, Plan B stands for "Plan Bad." That is what is being urged by the Republican Party, by the Trump supporters. "Plan Bad" would endorse Trump's disastrous policy of "maximum pressure," one that gave us maximum enrichment of uranium and other activities prohibited under the Iran nuclear deal.

Plan B means that China's reported work to give Saudi Arabia—Iran's nemesis—the building blocks for a nuclear weapon will only accelerate, and other Gulf countries will jump into the race for a nuclear bomb as well.

Plan B means that Iran's nuclear facilities that are above ground will go underground.

Plan B means that cameras and international inspectors that keep a continuous eye on Iran's facilities will be shuttered permanently, leaving us in the dark about Iran's nuclear intentions.

Under Trump, we saw "maximum pressure" generate "maximum tension" that put us on a perilous path to war. Trump's Plan B to diplomacy was and continues to be a complete failure.

Indeed, we saw this in 2019, when tensions rose to a decades-long high with the assassinations of Qasem Soleimani, followed by Iran's retaliatory strike that injured 200 U.S. troops at an Air Force base in Iraq. Never had we been closer to a war with Iran.

If the sides currently negotiating a new Iran deal are unable to get to yes on a deal, I fear that we will see increasing calls from my Republican colleagues to take military action against Iran. That is not a good option.

My Republican colleagues need to be honest with the war-weary American people that doubling down on the failed policies of the Trump era will likely lead Iran to retaliate by lobbing greater numbers of missiles at our troops or at the region's energy infrastructure. Iran will double down on these failed policies, and that may lead to Iran creating a sea wall to stop traffic in the Strait of Hormuz, creating more of a supply chain pain. And my colleagues need to be honest that doubling down on these policies risks adding to the number of Gold Star mothers who have lost children to unnecessary wars far from home. And, perhaps, most importantly, my colleagues should be honest with the American people that these failed policies have led Iran closer to a nuclear weapon—not further away from a nuclear weapon, closer to a nuclear weapon—day by day, week by week that we have followed the Trump plan.

These are life-and-death stakes. Doubling down on the failed policies of Trump and expecting a different result in Iran is truly the definition of insanity.

The Iran nuclear deal is not a panacea nor was it ever intended to be a panacea. What it is, is a verifiable agreement that cuts off each of Iran's three pathways to a nuclear bomb.

First, Iran will, again, have to cap its enrichment level and ship out its stock of enriched uranium that would otherwise be potential feedstock for a nuclear bomb.

Second, Iran will finish the conversion of its Arak reactor, which will close off its plutonium path to a nuclear bomb.

And, third, and most importantly, inspectors from the international watchdog agency, the International Atomic Energy Agency, will once again get access to the soup to nuts of Iran's nuclear fuel cycle.

If we listen to the same voices who rejected a good deal in search of the impossible, who preached brinksmanship over diplomacy, we will

find ourselves stuck, as we are today, with an Iran that could have the ultimate weapon to back its coercion—a nuclear bomb.

Fortunately, this screenplay does not have to end with American men and women marching off to another war in the Middle East, and it does not have to end with Iran entering the worst of exclusive clubs, those with nuclear weapons.

Russian President Vladimir Putin's recent nuclear saber rattling has brought home the stakes of nuclear diplomacy with Iran. A homicidal leader armed with weapons of annihilation is a threat to global peace.

When Putin ordered an increase in the alert level of Russia's nuclear forces a couple of weeks ago, he postponed U.S. intercontinental ballistic missile tests for fear that, in the fog of war, Russia could misinterpret an ICBM launch off the coast of California as a first nuclear strike against Russia. That also explains President Biden's reticence to impose a NATO-enforced no-fly zone over Ukraine.

Putin is failing. Ukraine and its people are winning, with our help. Every fabricated justification for Putin's senseless and illegal war has crumbled. But a direct U.S.-NATO military intervention would pull the world's two largest nuclear powers closer to a war. No simulation, no exercise, no war game can assure us that such a war does not metastasize to engulf all of Europe and lead to the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, here is the scary reality: Vladimir Putin could kill millions upon millions of Americans right now using a fraction of his 4,500 nuclear weapons. That is the perennial threat of nuclear arms.

Conventional logic says that we are safe because a Russian nuclear strike would be both homicidal and suicidal for Putin, but we cannot bank on the fact that Putin, the pariah, has a moral basement. President George W. Bush famously said he looked into Vladimir Putin's eyes and he saw his soul. Thank goodness President Biden sees it for the dark space that it is.

As a result, Russia's war in Ukraine calls on us to challenge tired, old Cold War assumptions that basing our nuclear posture on the balance of terror and relying on the rationality of our leaders will keep the peace—no, it will not. That assumption has to be completely reanalyzed in view of what Putin is doing right now, that pursuing President Reagan's star wars fantasy to knock out nuclear-tipped missiles in space before they fall on American cities is wise; it is not. There is no guarantee that some of those nuclear weapons would not come and destroy American cities and that we should spend a quarter of a trillion dollars to replace the very same U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles that the President won't even test during a conflict due to fears of escalation; we should not.

Unfortunately, our American democracy and Russia's autocracy do share

one major thing in common: Both our systems give the United States and Russian Presidents the God-like powers known as sole authority to end life on the planet as we know it by ordering a nuclear first strike.

As President Richard Nixon grimly described these powers once:

I can go into my office and pick up the telephone and in 25 minutes, 70 million people will be dead.

We know all too well that American Presidents are not infallible, neither is our early warning system, which is why we need an emergency break to ensure that a case of mistaken identity—a false missile launch—or a President gone wild does not trigger the unthinkable.

We cannot uninvent the atom, its military applications, and technological know-how. The nuclear Pandora's box is sadly forever opened. We must, however, do everything in our power to be able to look the next generation in the eye and say that we did everything—everything—in our power to avert the unfathomable, a nuclear war on this planet; and that includes supporting negotiations that not only end Russia's war in Ukraine, but also future negotiations to end the budding 21st century nuclear arms race which is spinning out of control.

Mr. President, I was a teenager during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Had President Kennedy listened to his generals rather than to his better angels, we might not be here today. This building might not be here. "Bert the Turtle" public service advertisements told us to duck and cover under our school desks. Backpack nukes designed to repel the Soviet advance on West Germany rolled off the assembly lines. U.S. and Soviet leaders were awoken in the middle of the night to false alarms of nuclear Armageddon. These events must forever belong to our past, not to our future.

A future held together by the fear of annihilation is a burden, not an inspiration. But Congress can shape a safer more inspiring future by supporting President Biden's efforts to reenter a good Iran nuclear deal, and we can and we must hold ourselves to a higher standard than Russia when it comes to resting the fate of humanity in the hands of just one human being.

This is a subject that should command the attention of every single American. We have to move further away from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, not get closer to it; and that is why we must support a reentry into a good Iran nuclear deal. The alternative is frightening for the future, not just of the Middle East, but for our country and the entire planet.

MORNING BUSINESS

INCREASING MEMBERSHIP TO THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, due to the current events happening in Europe, the minority leader and I have

agreed to increase the membership of the Senate NATO Observer Group by two additional Senators. For the additional Democratic Senator, I ask that Senator ROSEN be added to participate in the Group.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN W. NESS

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JIM RISCH, Representative MIKE SIMPSON and Representative RUSS FULCHER, we congratulate Brian Ness on his retirement after 13 years of outstanding service as director of the Idaho Transportation Department, ITD.

In 2009, Brian Ness was appointed to serve as director of the Idaho Transportation Department, and he has been responsible for an annual budget of approximately \$800 million and leading 1,650 employees. We have greatly valued his input on advancing Idaho transportation priorities, including through the Federal appropriations process and other infrastructure-related proposals. He also testified before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Research and Technology in 2019 on “The Need for a National Surface Transportation Research Agenda.”

Director Ness has devoted considerable time utilizing his experience as a transportation professional to help lead a number of related organizations. He has served on the boards of directors and in many other leadership roles for the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, AASHTO; the Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, WASHTO; the Transportation Research Board, TRB; the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, ARTBA; and the Idaho Rural Partnership. His leadership roles include the Governor appointing Director Ness to chair the Idaho Autonomous and Connected Vehicle Testing and Deployment Committee. Additionally, in 2019, Director Ness became president of the ARTBA’s Transportation Officials Division. He also served as president of WASHTO in 2015.

Throughout his career, he has earned many recognitions for his remarkable work and led teams that have received many honors. For example, since Director Ness joined the ITD, it has received nearly 170 national awards for its programs and projects, including the prestigious Francis B. Francois Award for Innovation. ITD has also won an extraordinary 17 AASHTO President’s Transportation Awards. Director Ness also received the 2016 Navigator Award from the national organization, Route Fifty; was named Trine University’s—formerly Tri-State University—2014 Alumni of the Year; AASHTO’s President’s Award for Administration in 2013; and was honored in 2012 as Leader of the Year by the

Treasure Valley Chapter of Women’s Transportation Seminar.

Before becoming director at ITD, Director Ness worked for 30 years at the Michigan Department of Transportation, holding a variety of positions in research, operations, aeronautics, construction, and project development. He earned a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering from Tri-State University and a master’s degree in public administration from Western Michigan University, and he is a licensed professional engineer in Michigan and Idaho.

We understand the ITD’s employee-driven innovation program started during Director Ness’s leadership is credited with saving nearly \$35 million, creating 691 customer-service improvements, and saving 540,000 contractor and employee hours. Thank you, Brian, for your focus on ingenuity, efficiency, accountability, and results all these years at the helm of the ITD. Your work to empower employee-driven innovation and support emerging leaders will no doubt have lasting effects on government efficiency and countless individual careers. Thank you, especially, for your service to Idaho, the transportation department and its employees, and congratulations on your retirement.●

RECOGNIZING KELSEY’S ON MAIN

• Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize the small business, Kelsey’s On Main of Jackson, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Like a good Southerner, Kelsey Sebastian is passionate about hospitality. After leaving her native Jackson, she pursued a degree in hospitality management and tourism from University of Kentucky. However, instead of taking her university expertise to the opportunities of the big city, Kelsey returned home to put her knowledge and skills to work. Thus in 2014, with the help of her family, Kelsey Sebastian opened Kelsey’s On Main.

The idea for Kelsey’s On Main was born out of several needs for the little town of Jackson. With only a small number of sit-in dining establishments in Jackson, local residents needed more restaurant options. Moreover, there was a need for revitalization in the heart of downtown Jackson, a heady mission that Kelsey and her family bravely took on. The Hogg building, now home to Kelsey’s On Main, was 98 years old when she and her family began the renovation process in 2012. A former pharmacy and pool hall, this historic building located in the center of downtown needed a healthy dose of tender love and care. Renovating the establishment was by no means an easy task but the town of Jackson and its residents will tell you

that it was worth it. In 2014, the centennial anniversary of the Hogg building, Kelsey’s On Main opened their doors.

Kelsey’s desire to restore beauty to the dilapidated old Hogg building corresponded with her mission to provide great food and top quality service to her hometown. In keeping the original tin roof and leaving one of the old walls exposed in its brick, customers can see that this building is mature in age but well taken care of. To that end, Kelsey and her family keep old photos of downtown Jackson as well as photos of her friends and family throughout the historic building. Of course, her family is not just present in the photographs that hang on the wall; her parents often come by to pick up a shift or two to support their daughter. And as a tenant in her aunt’s building, Kelsey’s On Main is a true family affair.

Returning to Jackson to open her own business is not the only way Kelsey supports her community. She is an active member of the Jackson Women’s Group and as a Jackson City Council member, Kelsey always volunteers her restaurant to host the monthly Jackson Chamber of Commerce lunch. Kelsey is also involved in the Breathitt County Honey Festival, a tradition that has been around for over four decades, by supporting the festival’s musical committee. As someone so involved in the goings-on of her town, Kelsey does her best to bring life to the Jackson community, as illustrated by she and her family’s decision to revitalize a historic downtown building. Moreover, as a recent participant in Kentucky’s BRIGHT program, a professional and entrepreneurial development program, it is clear that Kelsey is headstrong in her desire to keep improving and impacting the community around her.

All across the country are little towns like Jackson whose downtowns have been left empty by a shift in industry, and it is businesses like Kelsey’s On Main that bring life back into those empty storefronts and keep historic communities thriving.

Congratulations to Kelsey and her family and the entire team at Kelsey’s On Main. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:11 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 233. An act to designate the Rocksprings Station of the U.S. Border Patrol located on West Main Street in Rocksprings, Texas, as the “Donna M. Doss Border Patrol Station”.

S. 1226. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 1501 North 6th Street in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as the “Sylvia H. Rambo United States Courthouse”, and for other purposes.

S. 2126. An act to designate the Federal Office Building located at 308 W. 21st Street in

Cheyenne, Wyoming, as the “Louisa Swain Federal Office Building”, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 400. An act to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, as the “William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building”.

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

H.R. 5343. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on case management personnel turnover of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5547. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to require eligible recipients of certain grants to develop a comprehensive economic development strategy that directly or indirectly increases the accessibility of affordable, quality care-based services, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5673. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to make technical corrections to the hazard mitigation revolving loan fund program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5706. An act to protect transportation personnel and passengers from sexual assault and harassment, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 5343. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on case management personnel turnover of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5547. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to require eligible recipients of certain grants to develop a comprehensive economic development strategy that directly or indirectly increases the accessibility of affordable, quality care-based services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 5673. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to make technical corrections to the hazard mitigation revolving loan fund program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5706. An act to protect transportation personnel and passengers from sexual assault and harassment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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-3501. A communication from the Chair of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft bill to reauthorize the National Transpor-

tation Safety Board for the next 5 years, through fiscal year 2027; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3502. A communication from the Attorney Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Railroad Workplace Safety” (RIN2130-AC78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3503. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Broadband Data Collection Mobile Technical Requirements Order” (WC Docket No. 19-195) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3504. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Updating Broadcast Radio Technical Rules” (FCC 22-13) (MB Docket No. 21-263) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3505. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Maumee River, OH” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0303)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3506. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Firestone Grand Prix of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Florida” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0075)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3507. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Deep Creek, Elizabeth River, Chesapeake, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0303)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3508. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Markers 636-655, Modoc, AR” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0917)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3509. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0931)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3510. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Cape Canaveral, FL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0139)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3511. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; St. Clair Icy Bazaar Fireworks, St. Clair River, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0006)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3512. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; 2021 Barge Based Fireworks, Hudson River, Manhattan, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0767)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3513. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Tugs Champion, Valerie B, Nancy Anne and Barges Kokosing I, Kokosing III, Kokosing IV operating in the straits of Mackinac, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0747)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3514. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Potomac River, Between Charles County, MD and King George County, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0072)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3515. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Coast Guard Island, Alameda, CA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0126)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3516. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Cape Lookout, NC” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0094)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3517. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Potomac River, Between Charles County, MD and King George County, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0112)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3518. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; CBWTP Outfall Diffuser Improvements, Columbia River, Portland, OR” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0647)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3519. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Jackson Firwroks Scattering; Yellow Bluff San Francisco Bay, Sausalito, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0069)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3520. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Shore (Belt) Parkway bridge Construction, Mill Construction, Mill Basin; Brooklyn, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0848)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3521. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Potomac River, Between Charles County, MD and King George County, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0072)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3522. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Coast Guard Sector Ohio Valley Annual and Recurring Safety Zones Update" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0874)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3523. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Delaware River Dredging, Marcus Hook, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3524. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Sector Ohio Valley Annual and Recurring Special Local Regulations, Update" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0873)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3525. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Lake Havasu, Lake Havasu City, AZ" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3526. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Navigation and Navigable Waters, and Shipping; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments" (Docket No. USCG-2021-0348) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3527. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Operational Risk Assessments for Waterfront Fa-

cilities Handling Liquefied Natural Gas as Fuel, and Updates to Industry Standards" ((RIN1625-AC52) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0444)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3528. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0040)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3529. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone for Navy Dining Exercise; Gastineau Channel, Juneau, AK" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0893)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3530. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Grounded Tug and Barge, Deerfield Beach, FL" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0074)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3531. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones; Christina River, Wilmington, DE; Darby Creek and Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0145)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3532. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones; Anacostia River, Washington, DC and Susquehanna River, between Cecil and Harford Counties, MD" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0127)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3533. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3534. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Willamette River, Portland, OR" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0778)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3535. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Old River, Between Victoria Island and Byron Tract, CA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0181)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3536. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Chicago River, Chicago, IL" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0035)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3537. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Tchefuncta River" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0963)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3538. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Part 95; IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 563" ((RIN2120-AA63) (Docket No. 31408)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3539. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Criteria; Special Class Airworthiness Criteria for the Matternet, inc. M2 Unmanned Aircraft" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1085)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3540. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Criteria; Special Class Airworthiness Criteria for the Zipline International inc. Zip UAS Sparrow Unmanned Aircraft" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1084)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3541. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39-21889" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0947)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3542. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39-21877" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0839)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3543. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39-21873" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0873)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to

Textron Inc.) Helicopters; Amendment 39-21899” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3592. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters; Amendment 39-21898” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0689)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3593. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Stemme AG Gliders; Amendment 39-21871” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0842)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3594. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders; Amendment 39-21884” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0878)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3595. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes; Amendment 39-21912” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0881)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3596. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters; Amendment 39-21875” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0189)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3597. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39-21880” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0218)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3598. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Stemme AG Gliders; Amendment 39-21924” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3599. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness

Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21890” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0514)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3600. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21886” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0615)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3601. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Criteria; for the Amazon Logistics, inc. MK27-2 Unmanned Aircraft; Amendment 39-21849” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1086)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3602. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engine GmbH Engines; Amendment 39-21920” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0013)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3603. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Umiaut Engineering GmbH (Previously P3 Engineering GmbH) HAFEX (Halon-Free) Hand Held Fire Extinguishers; Amendment 39-21891” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0843)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3604. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Support and Services (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21863” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0841)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3605. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Turbomeca, S.A.) Turboshift Engines; Amendment 39-21885” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0793)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3606. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness

Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Agusta S.p.a.) Helicopters; Amendment 39-21883” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0948)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3607. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Cameron Balloons Ltd. Fuel Cylinders; Amendment 39-21894” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1171)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3608. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Vulcanair S.p.a. Airplanes; Amendment 39-21874” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0871)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3609. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-21943” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0662)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3610. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Learjet, inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39-21952” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0144)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3611. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-21900” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0259)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3612. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Operations) Limited Airplanes and British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes; Amendment 39-21935” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0961)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3613. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Various Airplanes; Amendment 39-21932” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0715)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3614. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21923" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0696)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3615. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21919" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0694)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3616. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes; Amendment 39-21918" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0952)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3617. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Fiberglas-Technik Rudolf Lindner GmbH and Co. KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by GROB Aircraft AG, Grob Aerospace GmbH i.l., Grob Aerospace GmbH, Burkhart Grob Luft-und Raumfahrt GmbH & Co. KG) Gliders; Amendment 39-21925" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0944)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3618. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; AVOX System Inc. (Formerly Scott Aviation) Oxygen Cylinder and Valve Assemblies and Oxygen Valve Assemblies; Amendment 39-21951" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-0345)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3619. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited Helicopters; Amendment 39-21948" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0729)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3620. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Continental Aerospace Technologies, inc. and Continental Motors Reciprocating Engines; Amendment 39-21945" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0875)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3621. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH and Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders; Amendment 39-21942" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1015)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3622. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters; Amendment 39-21926" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3623. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc., de Havilland) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21921" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0960)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3624. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bell Helicopter Textron Inc.) Helicopters; Amendment 39-21899" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3625. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21904" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0444)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3626. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes; Amendment 39-21907" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0684)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3627. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-21906" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0835)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3628. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Raytheon Aircraft Company, Hawker Beechcraft Corporation, and Beechcraft Corporation) Airplanes; Amendment 39-21941" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3629. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3990" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31407)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3630. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3989" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31406)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3631. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3991" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31409)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3632. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3992" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31410)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3633. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3994" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31412)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3634. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3996" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31414)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3635. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3995” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31413)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3636. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3993” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31411)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3637. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Joseph State Airport, OR” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0935)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3638. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Monticello Airport, UT” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0924)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3639. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; South Florida” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0169)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3640. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “FINAL RULE CORRECTION; Amendment, Establishment, and Revocation of Multiple Air Traffic Services (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Neosha, MO” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0276)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3641. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment, Establishment, and Revocation of Multiple Air Traffic Services (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Neosha, MO” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0276)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3642. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Philadelphia, PA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0922)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3643. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bonham, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0746)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3644. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment and Establishment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Columbus, GA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0589)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3645. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hereford, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0815)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3646. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D Airspace; Columbus, OH” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1151)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3647. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; China Lake NAWS (Armitage Field) Airport, CA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0804)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3648. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace; Inyokern Airport, CA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0805)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3649. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment to Area Navigation (RNAV) T-302; Midwestern United States” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3650. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of V-37 and V-270; Removal of V-43 in the Vicinity of Erie, PA” ((RIN2120-AA66)

(Docket No. FAA-2021-0324)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3651. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Covington, GA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0820)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3652. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-170, V-175 and V-250; Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-400; in the Vicinity of Worthington, MN” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0479)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3653. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hugo, OK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0977)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3654. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of the Class D and Class E Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Hammond, LA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0978)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3655. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-170, and V-175, and V-250; Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-400; in the Vicinity of Worthington, MN” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0479)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3656. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace; Gold Beach Municipal Airport, OR” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0956)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3657. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace; Kit Carson County Airport, Burlington, CO” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0917)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3658. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Skaneateles, NY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0747)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3659. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Class E Airspace; Carrizo Springs, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0976)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3660. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Rochester and St. Cloud, MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0814)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3661. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Multiple Illinois Towns" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0979)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3662. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Janesville, WI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0980)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 3785. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to eliminate the restriction on veterans concurrently serving in the Offices of Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

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. HAGERTY:

S. 3970. A bill to establish reporting requirements for issuers of fiat currency-backed stablecoins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 3971. A bill to amend the America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 to modify a provision relating to cost-sharing requirements applicable to certain Bureau of Reclamation dams and dikes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3972. A bill to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 3973. A bill to help local educational agencies replace zero-tolerance disciplinary policies and punitive discipline in elementary and secondary schools with restorative practices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 3974. A bill to prohibit the consideration of patients' race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, vaccination status, veteran status, or political ideology or speech in determining eligibility for monoclonal antibody doses distributed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3975. A bill to reauthorize the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 3976. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to address entities that are not considered to be investment companies for the purposes of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNOCK, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3977. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to further enhance anti-retaliation protections for whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 3978. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to operate a uranium reserve consisting of uranium produced and converted in the United States and a program to ensure the availability of uranium produced, converted, and enriched in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAYNE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 3979. A bill to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 3980. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of the costs associated with small- and medium-sized companies to undertake initial public offerings; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3981. A bill to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 3982. A bill to require applicable Federal agencies to take action on applications for Federal energy authorizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 3983. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require, for purposes of ensuring cybersecurity, the inclusion in any premarket submission for a cyber device of information to demonstrate a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness throughout the lifecycle of the cyber device, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 3984. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide a process to lock and suspend domain names used to facilitate the online sale of controlled substances illegally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3985. A bill to prohibit the consideration of COVID-19 vaccination status in determining eligibility for organ donation or transplantation, and in providing services to Medicare or Medicaid beneficiaries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3986. A bill to delay the effectiveness of certain new rules or regulations relating to the United States energy sector; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 3987. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide grants and loan guarantees for commercial-scale implementation of transformative industrial technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KELLY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 572. A resolution honoring the accomplishments and legacy of Cesar Estrada Chavez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 573. A resolution to authorize testimony and representation in United States v. Robertson, et al; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 574. A resolution designating May 2, 2022, as "Dr. John E. Fryer Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of International Transgender Day of Visibility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 331

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 331, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retirement pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to establish the Department of State Student Internship Program as a paid internship program to provide students with the opportunity to learn about a career in diplomacy and foreign affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 692, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 744

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 744, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing incidents, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1079, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the troops from the United States and the Philippines who defended Bataan and Corregidor, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service during World War II.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 1642

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1642, a bill to require the Secretary of State to submit a report on the status of women and girls in Afghanistan, and for other purposes.

S. 2108

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2108, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for childhood disability beneficiaries.

S. 2172

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2172, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve grants, payments, and technical assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to serve homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2178

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2178, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for fire fighters and emergency medical services personnel employed by States or their political subdivisions, and for other purposes.

S. 2215

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2215, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs.

S. 2512

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2512, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices and judges of the courts of the United States.

S. 2854

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2854, a bill to allow for the transfer and redemption of abandoned savings bonds.

S. 3262

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3262, a bill to improve the efficient movement of freight at ports in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 3663

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3663, a bill to protect the safety of children on the internet.

S. 3742

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3742, a bill to establish a pilot grant program to improve recycling accessibility, and for other purposes.

S. 3761

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3761, a bill to support the provision of treatment family care services, and for other purposes.

S. 3817

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3817, a bill to improve the forecasting and understanding of tornadoes and other hazardous weather, and for other purposes.

S. 3850

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3850, a bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Customs and Border Protection officers and support staff and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry.

S. 3931

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3931, a bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to extend exemptions for securities offered as part of employee pay to other individuals providing goods for sale, labor, or services for remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 3956

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3956, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a grant program to improve the effectiveness of education and outreach

on “Do Not Flush” labeling, and to require the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Administrator, to issue regulations requiring certain products to have “Do Not Flush” labeling, and for other purposes.

S. J. RES. 25

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. J. Res. 25, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 568

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 568, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of “Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month” and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 3979. A bill to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, as the pandemic began, Congress, on a bi-

partisan basis, made sure our schools and our summer meal programs had easy-to-use flexibilities so they could continue to feed hungry children who were no longer physically in school or no longer able to go to a meal site in the summer because of COVID.

All across America now, because of a lot of hard work on a lot of people’s part, our kids are now back in school, which is great. But 90 percent of our schools are still struggling to provide children healthy food as a result of higher food prices, less available staff, and more supply chain delays and shortages that we know about all the time. In fact, part of that relates to this bill which was just passed on shipping. This is part of the supply chain breakdown that has affected the ability for our schools to be able to get what they need for our children.

We have 90 percent—all this in red, across the country—of the States saying: We need these flexibilities that have been in place from the very beginning of COVID. We extended the flexibilities before, and they need them to continue to be able to feed children in our country. School cafeterias, summer meal providers—everybody is working as hard as they can to get back to normal, but they need time to transition so our children aren’t hurt in the process. The USDA, school administrators, local mayors, even school food suppliers themselves have said they need these flexibilities to continue for another year.

Back in January, the Agricultural Secretary, Secretary Vilsack, called on Congress to once again extend what we call the nutrition waivers so that schools and meal providers had the flexibility they need to feed hungry children who may have their only meal at school or their only breakfast or their only lunch at school or, in the summer, through the feeding programs.

We have been working in good faith, as we always do, across the aisle to make this extension happens. We were working on having that happen as part of the omnibus. It was a real shock to me and to many of the Senators who care deeply about our children when Republican Leader MCCONNELL refused to agree to extending the school nutrition flexibilities as part of the omnibus bill that we just passed, that we know was critically important to pass. We don’t want the government to shut down. We had essential, critical resources for Ukraine and so many other issues. But our kids were left behind in this one, and it is not right. We need to fix it.

We are in a critical transition period right now, but we are not out of the pandemic yet. Without having these flexibilities extended, without this support, up to 30 million children who get their food, their only healthy meals at school will see their breakfast and lunch disrupted, and that makes absolutely no sense. Millions of kids will show up at their summer meal program this July and could very well see a “closed” sign.

That is why, today, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI and I are introducing the Support Kids Not Red Tape Act, along with Senator COLLINS and all 50 Members of our Democratic caucus.

Let me stress that this is a temporary extension with a clear end date and a lot of procedures put in place to safely get schools and summer meal programs back to normal operations. We want to give them time to transition.

I am so grateful for our colleagues’ support—52 colleagues. We only need eight more. We only need eight more Republicans to join us to get this done right away, just like we did the shipping bill.

Our schools need time. Our kids need time right now rather than having this abruptly end June 30, which is not very far away. So let’s be clear. To abruptly pull the lunch tray away from hungry kids at the end of June is just plain wrong.

Since the pandemic started in March 2020, food insecurity for families and their children has jumped by nearly two-thirds. We all know the stories. We have all seen the lines. People across the country are engaging to support each other. One in five kids comes to school hungry, and school and summer programs may be the only meal that they get. During the pandemic, it was even worse. Now, because of all the challenges continuing, we are not out of the woods on this yet in terms of feeding our children.

How have these flexibilities helped our children be able to get healthy meals? One example is in Rapid City, SD, where the local school district has partnered with Meals on Wheels in the summer to deliver meals to where the kids are. It makes sense. This has been a lifesaver for hungry children in their rural communities who had no way to get to the one school meal site that was miles and miles away.

In Arkansas, the food insecurity rate among children skyrocketed to over 32 percent during the pandemic, 32 percent of the children being food insecure, not being able to have a healthy meal.

Fayetteville and Bentonville schools’ summer meals programs have provided weekly meal pack pickups with a week’s worth of breakfast and lunch. So rather than a parent who is working trying to figure out, how do I get my child to a place to get a healthy breakfast, and by the way, I may have to take them back again for a healthy lunch—by the way, in the rural community, there is not a lot of public transportation. It certainly affects everyone in urban areas, suburban areas, and rural areas, but the distances in rural communities are an extra burden oftentimes. So they put together the capacity to do a week’s worth. Those were the flexibilities we gave them that we want to continue.

In Edgecombe County, NC, resourceful schools found a way to get meals to 100 kids during the summer by using

the schoolbus. The schoolbus wasn't being used, so they put the food on a schoolbus and went out to the neighborhoods, out to the kids.

As a result of these flexibilities, twice as many kids got summer meals during the pandemic, which is something we also need to learn from. Just as we have learned the importance of high-speed internet after the pandemic, and we have addressed that, which is great, we have now learned that we need to rethink some of these things here, in terms of the flexibilities for our schools and how we deliver summer meals, how we address schools during the school year.

So it goes to show you what a big difference it makes for hungry kids when we don't make them or their families or their meal providers jump through all kinds of hoops to get something as basic as a healthy meal.

In schools across Kentucky, from smalltown Madison County to metropolitan Jefferson County, these flexibilities have kept kids from getting caught in the redtape and going hungry if their struggling parent just missed one piece of paper on a form.

It has been a relief to school food service directors in small towns who are already working with half the staff, twice the stress of putting together healthy meals with all the food and supply chain shortages we have talked about.

Right now, school food service directors in Utah are placing orders for next year, knowing that many of the items they need are currently not available and the ones they can find have doubled in price.

The flexibilities and increased funding to deal with these costs—the things we have given them to deal with this—have made it possible to make substitutions when basic items like ground beef are not available or fruit is not available, to be able to put together something healthy in a different way.

Losing these flexibilities will cut their budgets by 40 percent and force meal providers to make pretty dire choices on which children to feed and how schools are going to pay for it.

Without our bill to support kids and cut redtape, all of these desperately needed flexibilities are going to go away at the end of June. They are just going to go away—all the support for schools, all the support for children, all the new creative things that have been able to be done to help children get healthy meals, done.

School meals, summer programs will have to scale back. Some will have to stop feeding kids altogether. Children will once again go hungry because of paperwork and bureaucracy outside of their control. I mean, you think about this: Are we on the side of bureaucracy or are we on the side of kids?

This legislation is on the side of kids. My colleagues supporting this bill and sponsoring this are on the side of kids, not redtape.

The unnecessary stress is going to be felt by families in every part of our

country, from small towns to big cities, to suburban areas. So our bill gives us a clear, easy path forward to make sure children and to make sure schools have the time and the support they need to get back on their feet as we recover from the pandemic and to be able to plan for how this phases out. Schools across the country are telling us that these flexibilities are critical to continuing—absolutely critical.

So it is time for us to listen to them and to do the right thing for our children. I urge my colleagues to pass the Support Kids Not Red Tape Act as soon as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 572—HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND LEGACY OF CÉSAR ESTRADA CHÁVEZ

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KELLY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 572

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was born on March 31, 1927, near Yuma, Arizona;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez spent his early years on a family farm;

Whereas, at the age of 10, César Estrada Chávez joined the thousands of migrant farm workers laboring in fields and vineyards throughout the Southwest after a bank foreclosure resulted in the loss of the family farm;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez, after attending more than 30 elementary and middle schools and achieving an eighth grade education, left school to work full time as a farm worker to help support his family;

Whereas, at the age of 17, César Estrada Chávez entered the United States Navy and served the United States with distinction for 2 years;

Whereas, in 1948, César Estrada Chávez returned from military service to marry Helen Fabela, whom he had met while working in the vineyards of central California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez and Helen Fabela had 8 children;

Whereas, as early as 1949, César Estrada Chávez was committed to organizing farm workers to campaign for safe and fair working conditions, reasonable wages, livable housing, and outlawing child labor;

Whereas, in 1952, César Estrada Chávez joined the Community Service Organization, a prominent Latino civil rights group, and worked with the organization to coordinate voter registration drives and conduct campaigns against discrimination in East Los Angeles;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez served as the national director of the Community Service Organization;

Whereas, in 1962, César Estrada Chávez left the Community Service Organization to es-

tablish the National Farm Workers Association, which eventually became the United Farm Workers of America;

Whereas, under the leadership of César Estrada Chávez, the United Farm Workers of America organized thousands of migrant farm workers to fight for fair wages, health care coverage, pension benefits, livable housing, and respect;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was a strong believer in the principles of non-violence practiced by Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez effectively used peaceful tactics that included fasting for 25 days in 1968, 25 days in 1972, and 38 days in 1988 to call attention to the terrible working and living conditions of farm workers in the United States;

Whereas, through his commitment to non-violence, César Estrada Chávez brought dignity and respect to organized farm workers and became an inspiration to, and a resource for, individuals engaged in human rights struggles throughout the world;

Whereas the influence of César Estrada Chávez extends far beyond agriculture and provides inspiration for individuals working to better human rights, empower workers, and advance the American Dream, which includes all individuals of the United States;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez died on April 23, 1993, at the age of 66 in San Luis, Arizona, only miles from his birthplace;

Whereas more than 50,000 individuals attended the funeral services of César Estrada Chávez in Delano, California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was laid to rest at the headquarters of the United Farm Workers of America, known as Nuestra Señora de La Paz, located in the Tehachapi Mountains in Keene, California;

Whereas, since the death of César Estrada Chávez, schools, parks, streets, libraries, and other public facilities, as well as awards and scholarships, have been named in his honor;

Whereas more than 10 States and dozens of communities across the United States honor the life and legacy of César Estrada Chávez each year on March 31;

Whereas March 31 is recognized as an official State holiday in California, Colorado, and Texas, and there is growing support to designate the birthday of César Estrada Chávez as a national day of service to memorialize his heroism;

Whereas, during his lifetime, César Estrada Chávez was a recipient of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Nonviolent Peace Prize;

Whereas, on August 8, 1994, César Estrada Chávez was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas, on October 8, 2012, President Barack Obama authorized the Secretary of the Interior to establish a César Estrada Chávez National Monument in Keene, California;

Whereas President Barack Obama first proclaimed March 31, 2010, to be "César Chávez Day" and asked all people of the United States to observe March 31 with service, community, and education programs to honor the enduring legacy of César Estrada Chávez;

Whereas President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. most recently honored the life and service of César Estrada Chávez by proclaiming March 31, 2021, to be "César Chávez Day" and by asking all people of the United States to observe March 31 with service, community, and education programs to honor the enduring legacy of César Estrada Chávez; and

Whereas the United States should continue the efforts of César Estrada Chávez to ensure equality, justice, and dignity for all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the accomplishments and example of César Estrada Chávez, a great hero of the United States;

(2) pledges to promote the legacy of César Estrada Chávez; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to commemorate the legacy of César Estrada Chávez and to always remember his great rallying cry: “¡Sí, se puede!”, which is Spanish for “Yes, we can!”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 573—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. ROBERTSON, ET AL

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 573

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. Robertson, et al.*, Cr. No. 21-34, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony from Daniel Schwager, a former employee of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and from Nate Russell and Diego Torres, custodians of records in the Senate Recording Studio, a department of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current and former officers and employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for evidence relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Daniel Schwager, a former employee of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and Nate Russell and Diego Torres, custodians of records in the Senate Recording Studio, are authorized to provide relevant testimony in the case of *United States v. Robertson, et al.*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Messrs. Schwager, Russell, and Torres, and any current or former officer or employee of their offices, in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 574—DESIGNATING MAY 2, 2022, AS “DR. JOHN E. FRYER DAY”

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 574

Whereas Dr. John E. Fryer practiced psychiatry in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, from 1967 to 2003, and was a professor of psychiatry and family and community medicine at Temple University School of Medicine;

Whereas, beginning in 1952, the American Psychiatric Association (referred to in this preamble as the “APA”) classified homosexuality as a mental disorder in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (referred to in this preamble as the “DSM”) and in the revised DSM-II;

Whereas, as a result of the classification and resulting therapeutic protocol, homosexuals in the United States were subject to chemical castration, electric shock therapy, mental institutionalization, and lobotomies;

Whereas the classification was used to demonize homosexuals and other non-heterosexuals as perverts to be feared and loathed and to buttress homophobic statutes and regulations;

Whereas many States would not grant professional licenses to known homosexuals and would revoke licenses from individuals who were later found to be homosexual;

Whereas, in 1971, gay rights pioneers Frank Kameny and Barbara Gittings successfully petitioned the APA for a panel on homosexuality at the APA annual meeting;

Whereas Kameny and Gittings sought to have a gay psychiatrist on the panel, but no one would risk losing their license and professional standing by admitting publicly to being homosexual;

Whereas Dr. Fryer agreed to appear on the panel under the pseudonym of Dr. Henry Anonymous, while in a mask and using a voice modulator;

Whereas Dr. Fryer’s testimony on May 2, 1972, at the APA annual meeting was so powerful that the APA undertook studies to determine whether the classification of homosexuality as a mental illness was based on science or prejudice;

Whereas, in 1973, after study and review, the members of the APA voted to declassify homosexuality as a mental illness;

Whereas, as a result of Dr. John E. Fryer’s courage and articulate presentation as the first psychiatrist in the United States to speak publicly about his homosexuality, the course of civil rights for individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as “LGBTQ”) was seminally advanced;

Whereas, during the human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (referred to in this preamble “HIV/AIDS”) crisis, Dr. John Fryer was among the first, if not the first, psychiatrists to provide professional services to individuals with HIV/AIDS and individuals who had lost loved ones to HIV/AIDS;

Whereas Dr. John Fryer’s contributions to the LGBTQ community have been adapted into the celebrated theater production entitled “217 Boxes of Dr. Henry Anonymous” and the movie “CURED”;

Whereas the Philadelphia Historical Commission has designated the John E. Fryer House at 138 West Walnut Lane, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as historic in the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places;

Whereas the Philadelphia City Council proclaimed May 2, 2022, as John Fryer Day in the city of Philadelphia to mark the 50th anniversary of his testimony on homosexuality at the 1972 APA annual meeting and to commemorate his momentous and seminal LGBTQ civil rights activism; and

Whereas Dr. John Fryer is a civil rights hero and was designated by the Equality Forum as an LGBT History Month Icon in 2016: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2, 2022, as “Dr. John E. Fryer Day”; and

(2) encourages the Federal Government, States, and localities to continue supporting the teaching of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this resolution as “LGBTQ”) history, including

the contributions of Dr. John E. Fryer and other LGBTQ civil rights heroes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF INTERNATIONAL TRANSGENDER DAY OF VISIBILITY

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 35

Whereas International Transgender Day of Visibility was founded in 2009 to honor the achievements and contributions of the transgender community;

Whereas International Transgender Day of Visibility is designed to be encompassing of a large community of individuals, including individuals who identify as nonbinary, gender-nonconforming, and gender-diverse;

Whereas International Transgender Day of Visibility is a time to celebrate the lives and achievements of transgender, nonbinary, gender-nonconforming, and gender-diverse individuals around the world, and to recognize the bravery it takes to live openly and authentically;

Whereas International Transgender Day of Visibility is also a time to raise awareness of the discrimination and violence that the transgender community still faces, which make it difficult and even unsafe or fatal for many transgender individuals to be visible;

Whereas the transgender community has suffered oppression disproportionately in many ways, including—

(1) discrimination in the workplace;

(2) discrimination in educational institutions; and

(3) subjection to violence;

Whereas forms of transgender oppression are exacerbated for transgender individuals of color, individuals with limited resources, immigrants, individuals living with disabilities, justice-involved individuals, and transgender youth;

Whereas a record number of anti-transgender State bills have been introduced in recent years;

Whereas the transgender community has made it clear that transgender individuals will not be erased and deserve to be accorded all of the rights and opportunities made available to all;

Whereas, before the creation of the United States, Indigenous two-spirit, transgender, nonbinary, gender-nonconforming, and gender-diverse individuals existed across North America in many Native American communities;

Whereas many Native American communities have specific terms in their own languages for the gender-variant members of their communities and the social and spiritual roles these individuals fulfill;

Whereas, while many two-spirit and gender-variant traditions in Native American communities were lost or actively suppressed by the efforts of missionaries, government agents, boarding schools, and settlers, many of these traditions have seen a revival in recent decades;

Whereas transgender, nonbinary, gender-nonconforming, and gender-diverse individuals continue to bravely tell their stories and push for full equity under the law;

Whereas the civil-rights struggle has been strengthened and inspired by the leadership of the transgender community;

Whereas 23 States have at least 1 transgender elected official, and there are 12 transgender, gender-nonconforming, or non-binary elected officials in State legislatures, including—

- (1) Danica Roem;
- (2) Gerri Cannon;
- (3) Cesar Chavez;
- (4) Brianna Titone;
- (5) Lisa Bunker;
- (6) Joshua Query;
- (7) Sarah McBride;
- (8) Stephanie Byers;
- (9) Taylor Small;
- (10) Mauree Turner;
- (11) Stacie Laughton; and
- (12) Mike Simmons;

Whereas voters in the State of Delaware elected Sarah McBride as the first openly transgender State senator in the United States;

Whereas voters in the State of Oklahoma elected Mauree Turner as the first openly nonbinary State legislator in the United States;

Whereas, in the State of Illinois, Mike Simmons became the first openly nonbinary or gender-nonconforming State senator in the United States;

Whereas 4 States have a transgender jurist on the bench, including—

- (1) Judge Phyllis Frye of Texas;
- (2) Judge Victoria Kolakowski of California;
- (3) Commissioner Tracy Nadzieja of Arizona; and
- (4) Judge Jill Rose Quinn of Illinois;

Whereas Admiral Rachel L. Levine, MD, was the first openly transgender Federal official confirmed by the United States Senate and is the highest ranking openly transgender Federal Government official in the history of the United States;

Whereas Stella Keating became the first transgender teen to testify before the United States Senate;

Whereas more transgender individuals are gracing the covers of magazines to raise awareness of their gender identity and the importance of living authentically;

Whereas transgender individuals have created culture and history as artists, musicians, healers, workers, and organizers; and

Whereas International Transgender Day of Visibility is a time to celebrate the transgender community around the world: Now, therefore, be it

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

- (1) supports the goals and ideals of International Transgender Day of Visibility;
- (2) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Transgender Day of Visibility with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities;
- (3) celebrates the accomplishments and leadership of transgender, nonbinary, gender-nonconforming, and gender-diverse individuals; and
- (4) recognizes the bravery of the transgender community as it fights for equal dignity and respect.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5017. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. THUNE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3580, to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5017. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. THUNE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3580, to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

Section 40101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) ensure an efficient, competitive, and economical transportation system in the ocean commerce of the United States;”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and supporting commerce” after “needs”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) promote the growth and development of United States exports through a competitive and efficient system for the carriage of goods by water in the foreign commerce of the United States, and by placing a greater reliance on the marketplace.”.

SEC. 3. SERVICE CONTRACTS.

Section 40502(c) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) any other essential terms that the Federal Maritime Commission determines necessary or appropriate through a rule-making process.”.

SEC. 4. SHIPPING EXCHANGE REGISTRY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 405 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 40504. Shipping exchange registry

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No person may operate a shipping exchange involving ocean transportation in the foreign commerce of the United States unless the shipping exchange is registered as a national shipping exchange under the terms and conditions provided in this section and the regulations issued pursuant to this section.

“(b) **REGISTRATION.**—A person shall register a shipping exchange by filing with the Federal Maritime Commission an application for registration in such form as the Commission, by rule, may prescribe, containing the rules of the exchange and such other information and documents as the Commission, by rule, may prescribe as necessary or appropriate to complete a shipping exchange’s registration.

“(c) **EXEMPTION.**—The Commission may exempt, conditionally or unconditionally, a shipping exchange from registration under this section if the Commission finds that the shipping exchange is subject to comparable, comprehensive supervision and regulation by the appropriate governmental authorities in a foreign country where the shipping exchange is headquartered.

“(d) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022, the Commission shall issue regulations pursuant to subsection (a), which shall set standards necessary to carry out subtitle IV of this title for registered national shipping exchanges.

For consideration of a service contract entered into by a shipping exchange, the Commission shall be limited to the minimum essential terms for service contracts established under section 40502 of this title.

“(e) **DEFINITION OF SHIPPING EXCHANGE.**—In this section, the term ‘shipping exchange’ means a platform (digital, over-the-counter, or otherwise) that connects shippers with common carriers for the purpose of entering into underlying agreements or contracts for the transport of cargo, by vessel or other modes of transportation.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The registration requirement under section 40504 of title 46, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall take effect on the date on which the Federal Maritime Commission states the rule is effective in the regulations issued under such section.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The analysis for chapter 405 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“40504. Shipping exchange registry.”.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON RETALIATION.

Section 41102 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **RETALIATION AND OTHER DISCRIMINATORY ACTIONS.**—A common carrier, marine terminal operator, or ocean transportation intermediary, acting alone or in conjunction with any other person, directly or indirectly, may not—

“(1) retaliate against a shipper, an agent of a shipper, an ocean transportation intermediary, or a motor carrier by refusing, or threatening to refuse, an otherwise-available cargo space accommodation; or

“(2) resort to any other unfair or unjustly discriminatory action for—

“(A) the reason that a shipper, an agent of a shipper, an ocean transportation intermediary, or motor carrier has—

“(i) patronized another carrier; or

“(ii) filed a complaint against the common carrier, marine terminal operator, or ocean transportation intermediary; or

“(B) any other reason.”.

SEC. 6. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.

Section 46106 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURES.**—The Federal Maritime Commission shall publish, and annually update, on the website of the Commission—

“(1) all findings by the Commission of false detention and demurrage invoice information by common carriers under section 41104(a)(15) of this title; and

“(2) all penalties imposed or assessed against common carriers, as applicable, under sections 41107, 41108, and 41109, listed by each common carrier.”.

SEC. 7. COMMON CARRIERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 41104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may not” and inserting “shall not”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) unreasonably refuse cargo space accommodations when available, or resort to other unfair or unjustly discriminatory methods;”;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “in the matter of rates or charges” and inserting “against any commodity group or type of shipment or in the matter of rates or charges”;

(D) in paragraph (10), by adding “, including with respect to vessel space accommodations provided by an ocean common carrier” after “negotiate”;

(E) in paragraph (12) by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(F) in paragraph (13) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) assess any party for a charge that is inconsistent or does not comply with all applicable provisions and regulations, including subsection (c) of section 41102 or part 545 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations);

“(15) invoice any party for demurrage or detention charges unless the invoice includes information as described in subsection (d) showing that such charges comply with—

“(A) all provisions of part 545 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

“(B) applicable provisions and regulations, including the principles of the final rule published on May 18, 2020, entitled ‘Interpretive Rule on Demurrage and Detention Under the Shipping Act’ (or successor rule); or

“(16) for service pursuant to a service contract, give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage or impose any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage against any commodity group or type of shipment.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) DETENTION AND DEMURRAGE INVOICE INFORMATION.—

“(1) INACCURATE INVOICE.—If the Commission determines, after an investigation in response to a submission under section 41310, that an invoice under subsection (a)(15) was inaccurate or false, penalties or refunds under section 41107 shall be applied.

“(2) CONTENTS OF INVOICE.—An invoice under subsection (a)(15), unless otherwise determined by subsequent Commission rulemaking, shall include accurate information on each of the following, as well as minimum information as determined by the Commission:

“(A) Date that container is made available.

“(B) The port of discharge.

“(C) The container number or numbers.

“(D) For exported shipments, the earliest return date.

“(E) The allowed free time in days.

“(F) The start date of free time.

“(G) The end date of free time.

“(H) The applicable detention or demurrage rule on which the daily rate is based.

“(I) The applicable rate or rates per the applicable rule.

“(J) The total amount due.

“(K) The email, telephone number, or other appropriate contact information for questions or requests for mitigation of fees.

“(L) A statement that the charges are consistent with any of Federal Maritime Commission rules with respect to detention and demurrage.

“(M) A statement that the common carrier’s performance did not cause or contribute to the underlying invoiced charges.

“(e) SAFE HARBOR.—If a non-vessel operating common carrier passes through to the relevant shipper an invoice made by the ocean common carrier, and the Commission finds that the non-vessel operating common carrier is not otherwise responsible for the charge, then the ocean common carrier shall be subject to refunds or penalties pursuant to subsection (d)(1).

“(f) ELIMINATION OF CHARGE OBLIGATION.—Failure to include the information required under subsection (d) on an invoice with any demurrage or detention charge shall eliminate any obligation of the charged party to pay the applicable charge.”.

(b) RULEMAKING ON DEMURRAGE OR DETENTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission shall initiate

a rulemaking further defining prohibited practices by common carriers, marine terminal operators, shippers, and ocean transportation intermediaries under section 41102(c) of title 46, United States Code, regarding the assessment of demurrage or detention charges. The Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a final rule defining such practices not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTENTS.—The rule under paragraph (1) shall only seek to further clarify reasonable rules and practices related to the assessment of detention and demurrage charges to address the issues identified in the final rule published on May 18, 2020, entitled ‘Interpretive Rule on Demurrage and Detention Under the Shipping Act’ (or successor rule), including a determination of which parties may be appropriately billed for any demurrage, detention, or other similar per container charges.

(c) RULEMAKING ON UNFAIR OR UNJUSTLY DISCRIMINATORY METHODS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission shall initiate a rulemaking defining unfair or unjustly discriminatory methods under section 41104(a)(3) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section. The Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a final rule not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) RULEMAKING ON UNREASONABLE REFUSAL TO DEAL OR NEGOTIATE WITH RESPECT TO VESSEL SPACE ACCOMMODATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission, in consultation with the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, shall initiate a rulemaking defining unreasonable refusal to deal or negotiate with respect to vessel space under section 41104(a)(10) of title 46, as amended by this section. The Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a final rule not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES OR REFUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 41107—

(A) in the section heading, by inserting “or refunds” after “penalties”;

(B) in subsection (a), by inserting “or, in addition to or in lieu of a civil penalty, is liable for the refund of a charge” after “civil penalty”; and

(C) in subsection (b), by inserting “or, in addition to or in lieu of a civil penalty, the refund of a charge,” after “civil penalty”; and

(2) section 41109 is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Until a matter is referred to the Attorney General, the Federal Maritime Commission may—

“(1) after notice and opportunity for a hearing, in accordance with this part—

“(A) assess a civil penalty; or

“(B) in addition to, or in lieu of, assessing a civil penalty under subparagraph (A), order a refund of money (including additional amounts in accordance with section 41305(c)), subject to subsection (b)(2); and

“(2) compromise, modify, or remit, with or without conditions, a civil penalty or refund imposed under paragraph (1).

“(b) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—

“(1) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In determining the amount of a civil penalty assessed or refund of money ordered pursuant to subsection (a), the Federal Maritime Commission shall take into consideration—

“(A) the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation committed;

“(B) with respect to the violator—

“(i) the degree of culpability;

“(ii) any history of prior offenses;

“(iii) the ability to pay; and

“(iv) such other matters as justice may require; and

“(C) the amount of any refund of money ordered pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B).

“(2) COMMENSURATE REDUCTION IN CIVIL PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the Federal Maritime Commission orders a refund of money pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B) in addition to assessing a civil penalty pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A), the amount of the civil penalty assessed shall be decreased by any additional amounts included in the refund of money in excess of the actual injury (as defined in section 41305(a)).

“(B) TREATMENT OF REFUNDS.—A refund of money ordered pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B) shall be—

“(i) considered to be compensation paid to the applicable claimant; and

“(ii) deducted from the total amount of damages awarded to that claimant in a civil action against the violator relating to the applicable violation.”;

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “may not be imposed” and inserting “or refund of money under subparagraph (A) or (B), respectively, of subsection (a)(1) may not be imposed”;

(C) in subsection (e), by inserting “or order a refund of money” after “penalty”;

(D) in subsection (f), by inserting “, or that is ordered to refund money,” after “assessed”; and

(E) in subsection (g), in the first sentence, by inserting “or a refund required under this section” after “penalty”.

SEC. 9. DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 411 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 41110. Data collection

“The Federal Maritime Commission shall publish on its website a calendar quarterly report that describes the total import and export tonnage and the total loaded and empty 20-foot equivalent units per vessel (making port in the United States, including any territory or possession of the United States) operated by each ocean common carrier covered under this chapter. Ocean common carriers under this chapter shall provide to the Commission all necessary information, as determined by the Commission, for completion of this report.”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, and the amendment made by this section, shall be construed to compel the public disclosure of any confidential or proprietary data, in accordance with section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 411 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“41110. Data collection.”.

SEC. 10. CHARGE COMPLAINTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 413 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 41310. Charge complaints

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A person may submit to the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Commission shall accept, information concerning complaints about charges assessed by a common carrier. The information submitted to the Commission shall include the bill of lading numbers and invoices, and may include any other relevant information.

“(b) INVESTIGATION.—Upon receipt of a submission under subsection (a), with respect to

a charge assessed by a common carrier, the Commission shall promptly investigate the charge with regard to compliance with section 41104(a) and section 41102. The common carrier shall—

“(1) be provided an opportunity to submit additional information related to the charge in question; and

“(2) bear the burden of establishing the reasonableness of any demurrage or detention charges pursuant to section 545.5 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

“(c) REFUND.—Upon receipt of submissions under subsection (a), if the Commission determines that a charge does not comply with section 41104(a) or 41102, the Commission shall promptly order the refund of charges paid.

“(d) PENALTIES.—In the event of a finding that a charge does not comply with section 41104(a) or 41102 after submission under subsection (a), a civil penalty under section 41107 shall be applied to the common carrier making such charge.

“(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—If the common carrier assessing the charge is acting in the capacity of a non-vessel-operating common carrier, the Commission shall, while conducting an investigation under subsection (b), consider—

“(1) whether the non-vessel-operating common carrier is responsible for the noncompliant assessment of the charge, in whole or in part; and

“(2) whether another party is ultimately responsible in whole or in part and potentially subject to action under subsections (c) and (d).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 413 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“41310. Charge complaints.”.

SEC. 11. INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 41302 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking “or agreement” and inserting “agreement, fee, or charge”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “Agreement” and inserting “Agreement, fee, or charge”; and

(B) by inserting “, fee, or charge” after “agreement”.

(b) REPORT.—The Federal Maritime Commission shall publish on a publicly available website of the Commission a report containing the results of the investigation entitled “Fact Finding No. 29, International Ocean Transportation Supply Chain Engagement”.

SEC. 12. AWARD OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.

Section 41305(c) of title 46, United States Code is amended by striking “41102(b)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (c) of section 41102”.

SEC. 13. ENFORCEMENT OF REPARATION ORDERS.

Section 41309 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “reparation, the person to whom the award was made” and inserting “a refund of money or reparation, the person to which the refund or reparation was awarded”; and

(2) in subsection (b), in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “made an award of reparation” and inserting “ordered a refund of money or any other award of reparation”; and

(B) by inserting “(except for the Commission or any component of the Commission)” after “parties in the order”.

SEC. 14. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 46106(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) an identification of any otherwise concerning practices by ocean common carriers, particularly such carriers that are controlled carriers, that are—

“(A) State-owned or State-controlled enterprises; or

“(B) owned or controlled by, a subsidiary of, or otherwise related legally or financially (other than a minority relationship or investment) to a corporation based in a country—

“(i) identified as a nonmarket economy country (as defined in section 771(18) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(18))) as of the date of enactment of this paragraph;

“(ii) identified by the United States Trade Representative in the most recent report required by section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242) as a priority foreign country under subsection (a)(2) of that section; or

“(iii) subject to monitoring by the United States Trade Representative under section 306 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2416).”.

SEC. 15. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 41108(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 41104(1), (2), or (7)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), or (7) of section 41104(a)”.

(b) Section 41109(c) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by section 8 of this Act, is further amended by striking “section 41102(a) or 41104(1) or (2) of this title” and inserting “subsection (a) or (d) of section 41102 or paragraph (1) or (2) of section 41104(a)”.

(c) Section 41305 of title 46, United States Code, as amended by section 12 of this Act, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “41104(3) or (6), or 41105(1) or (3) of this title” and inserting “paragraph (3) or (6) of section 41104(a), or paragraph (1) or (3) of section 41105”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “section 41104(4)(A) or (B) of this title” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 41104(a)(4)”.

SEC. 16. DWELL TIME STATISTICS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

(2) MARINE CONTAINER.—The term “marine container” means an intermodal container with a length of—

(A) not less than 20 feet; and

(B) not greater than 45 feet.

(3) OUT OF SERVICE PERCENTAGE.—The term “out of service percentage” means the proportion of the chassis fleet for any defined geographical area that is out of service at any one time.

(4) STREET DWELL TIME.—The term “street dwell time”, with respect to a piece of equipment, means the quantity of time during which the piece of equipment is in use outside of the terminal.

(b) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each port, marine terminal operator, and chassis owner or provider with a fleet of over 50 chassis that supply chassis for a fee shall submit to the Director such data as the Director determines to be necessary for the implementation of this section, subject to subchapter III of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) APPROVAL BY OMB.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall approve an information collection for purposes of this section.

(c) PUBLICATION.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 240

days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than monthly thereafter, the Director shall publish statistics relating to the dwell time of equipment used in intermodal transportation at the top 25 ports, including inland ports, by 20-foot equivalent unit, including—

(1) total street dwell time, from all causes, of marine containers and marine container chassis; and

(2) the average out of service percentage, which shall not be identifiable with any particular port, marine terminal operator, or chassis provider.

(d) FACTORS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, to the maximum extent practicable, the Director shall publish the statistics described in subsection (c) on a local, regional, and national basis.

(e) SUNSET.—The authority under this section shall expire December 31, 2026.

SEC. 17. FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION ACTIVITIES.

(a) PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS TO COMMISSION.—The Federal Maritime Commission shall—

(1) establish on the public website of the Commission a webpage that allows for the submission of comments, complaints, concerns, reports of noncompliance, requests for investigation, and requests for alternative dispute resolution; and

(2) direct each submission under the link established under paragraph (1) to the appropriate component office of the Commission.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICES.—The Commission shall maintain an Office of Consumer Affairs and Dispute Resolution Services to provide nonadjudicative ombuds assistance, mediation, facilitation, and arbitration to resolve challenges and disputes involving cargo shipments, household good shipments, and cruises subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

(c) ENHANCING CAPACITY FOR INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 41302 of title 46, United States Code, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairperson of the Commission shall staff within the Bureau of Enforcement, the Bureau of Certification and Licensing, the Office of the Managing Director, the Office of Consumer Affairs and Dispute Resolution Services, and the Bureau of Trade Analysis not fewer than 7 total positions to assist in investigations and oversight, in addition to the positions within the Bureau of Enforcement, the Bureau of Certification and Licensing, the Office of the Managing Director, the Office of Consumer Affairs and Dispute Resolution Services, and the Bureau of Trade Analysis on that date of enactment.

(2) DUTIES.—The additional staff appointed under paragraph (1) shall provide support—

(A) to Area Representatives of the Bureau of Enforcement;

(B) to attorneys of the Bureau of Enforcement in enforcing the laws and regulations subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission;

(C) for the alternative dispute resolution services of the Commission; or

(D) for the review of agreements and activities subject to the authority of the Commission.

SEC. 18. TEMPORARY EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMON CARRIER.—The term “common carrier” has the meaning given the term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

(2) MOTOR CARRIER.—The term “motor carrier” has the meaning given the term in section 13102 of title 49, United States Code.

(3) RAIL CARRIER.—The term “rail carrier” has the meaning given the term in section 10102 of title 49, United States Code.

(4) SHIPPER.—The term “shipper” has the meaning given the term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

(b) PUBLIC INPUT ON INFORMATION SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Maritime Commission shall issue a request for information, seeking public comment regarding—

(A) whether congestion of the carriage of goods has created an emergency situation of a magnitude such that there exists a substantial, adverse effect on the competitiveness and reliability of the international ocean transportation supply system;

(B) whether an emergency order under this section would alleviate such an emergency situation; and

(C) the appropriate scope of such an emergency order, if applicable.

(2) CONSULTATION.—During the public comment period under paragraph (1), the Commission may consult, as the Commission determines to be appropriate, with—

(A) other Federal departments and agencies; and

(B) persons with expertise relating to maritime and freight operations.

(c) AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE INFORMATION SHARING.—On making a unanimous determination described in subsection (d), the Commission may issue an emergency order requiring any common carrier or marine terminal operator to share directly with relevant shippers, rail carriers, or motor carriers information relating to cargo throughput and availability, in order to ensure the efficient transportation, loading, and unloading of cargo to or from—

(1) any inland destination or point of origin;

(2) any vessel; or

(3) any point on a wharf or terminal.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A determination referred to in subsection (c) is a unanimous determination by the commissioners on the Commission that congestion of carriage of goods has created an emergency situation of a magnitude such that there exists a substantial, adverse effect on the competitiveness and reliability of the international ocean transportation supply system.

(2) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In issuing an emergency order pursuant to subsection (c), the Commission shall tailor the emergency order with respect to temporal and geographic scope, taking into consideration the likely burdens on common carriers and marine terminal operators and the likely benefits on congestion relating to the purposes described in section 40101 of title 46, United States Code.

(e) PETITIONS FOR EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A common carrier or marine terminal operator subject to an emergency order issued pursuant to this section may submit to the Commission a petition for exception from 1 or more requirements of the emergency order, based on a showing of undue hardship or other condition rendering compliance with such a requirement impracticable.

(2) DETERMINATION.—The Commission shall make a determination regarding a petition for exception under paragraph (1) by—

(A) majority vote; and

(B) not later than 21 days after the date on which the petition is submitted.

(3) INAPPLICABILITY PENDING REVIEW.—The requirements of an emergency order that is the subject of a petition for exception under this subsection shall not apply to the petitioner during the period for which the petition is pending.

(f) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) TERM.—An emergency order issued pursuant to this section—

(A) shall remain in effect for a period of not longer than 60 days; but

(B) may be renewed by a unanimous determination of the Commission.

(2) SUNSET.—The authority provided by this section shall terminate on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall affect the investigative authorities of the Commission as described in subpart R of part 502 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 19. BEST PRACTICES FOR CHASSIS POOLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2023, the Federal Maritime Commission shall enter into an agreement with the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine under which the Transportation Research Board shall carry out a study and develop best practices for on-terminal or near-terminal chassis pools that provide service to marine terminal operators, motor carriers, railroads, and other stakeholders that use the chassis pools, with the goal of optimizing supply chain efficiency and effectiveness.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing best practices under subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall—

(1) take into consideration—

(A) practical obstacles to the implementation of chassis pools; and

(B) potential solutions to those obstacles; and

(2) address relevant communication practices, information sharing, and knowledge management.

(c) PUBLICATION.—The Commission shall publish the best practices developed under this section on a publicly available website by not later than April 1, 2024.

(d) FUNDING.—Subject to appropriations, the Commission may expend such sums as are necessary, but not to exceed \$500,000, to carry out this section.

SEC. 20. LICENSING TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”) shall conduct a review of the discretionary waiver authority described in the document issued by the Administrator entitled “Waiver for States Concerning Third Party CDL Skills Test Examiners In Response to the COVID-19 Emergency” and dated August 31, 2021, for safety concerns.

(b) PERMANENT WAIVER.—If the Administrator finds no safety concerns after conducting a review under subsection (a), the Administrator shall—

(1) notwithstanding any other provision of law, make the waiver permanent; and

(2) not later than 90 days after completing the review under subsection (a), revise section 384.228 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that the discretionary waiver authority referred to in subsection (a) shall be permanent.

(c) REPORT.—If the Administrator declines to move forward with a rulemaking for revision under subsection (b), the Administrator shall explain the reasons for declining to move forward with the rulemaking in a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 21. PLANNING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 6702(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Of the amounts” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to amounts made available for planning, preparation, or design under paragraph (1).”.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—Amounts for which outlays are affected under the amendments made by subsection (a) that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, and to section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 22. REVIEW OF POTENTIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST TRANSPORTATION OF QUALIFIED HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a review of whether there have been any systemic decisions by ocean common carriers to discriminate against maritime transport of qualified hazardous materials by unreasonably denying vessel space accommodations, equipment, or other instrumentalities needed to transport such materials. The Comptroller General shall take into account any applicable safety and pollution regulations.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Comptroller General of the United States may consult with the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Chair of the Federal Maritime Commission in conducting the review under this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.—The term “hazardous materials” includes dangerous goods, as defined by the International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code.

(2) OCEAN COMMON CARRIER.—The term “ocean common carrier” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

(3) QUALIFIED HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.—The term “qualified hazardous materials” means hazardous materials for which the shipper has certified to the ocean common carrier that such materials have been or will be tendered in accordance with applicable safety laws, including regulations.

(4) SHIPPER.—The term “shipper” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 46, United States Code.

SEC. 23. TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIALS.

(a) DEFINITION OF DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO A UNITED STATES PORT.—In this section:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term “direct assistance to a United States port” means the transportation of cargo directly to or from a United States port.

(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “direct assistance to a United States port” does not include—

(A) the transportation of a mixed load of cargo that includes—

(i) cargo that does not originate from a United States port; or

(ii) a container or cargo that is not bound for a United States port;

(B) any period during which a motor carrier or driver is operating in interstate commerce to transport cargo or provide services not in support of transportation to or from a United States port; or

(C) the period after a motor carrier dispatches the applicable driver or commercial motor vehicle of the motor carrier to another location to begin operation in interstate commerce in a manner that is not in

support of transportation to or from a United States port.

(b) **TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIALS.**—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration and the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall jointly prioritize and expedite the consideration of applications for a Transportation Worker Identification Credential with respect to applicants that reasonably demonstrate that the purpose of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential is for providing, within the interior of the United States, direct assistance to a United States port.

SEC. 24. USE OF UNITED STATES INLAND PORTS FOR STORAGE AND TRANSFER OF CARGO CONTAINERS.

(a) **MEETING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, in consultation with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration and the Chairperson of the Federal Maritime Commission, shall convene a meeting of representatives of entities described in subsection (b) to discuss the feasibility of, and strategies for, identifying Federal and non-Federal land, including inland ports, for the purposes of storage and transfer of cargo containers due to port congestion.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF ENTITIES.**—The entities referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) representatives of United States major gateway ports, inland ports, and export terminals;

(2) ocean carriers;

(3) railroads;

(4) trucking companies;

(5) port workforce, including organized labor; and

(6) such other stakeholders as the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Federal Maritime Commission, determines to be appropriate.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the meeting convened under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, in consultation with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration and the Chairperson of the Federal Maritime Commission, shall submit to Congress a report describing—

(1) the results of the meeting;

(2) the feasibility of identifying land or property under the jurisdiction of United States, or ports in the United States, for storage and transfer of cargo containers; and

(3) recommendations relating to the meeting, if any.

(d) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—No authorization contained in this section may be acted on in a manner that jeopardizes or negatively impacts the national security or defense readiness of the United States.

SEC. 25. REPORT ON ADOPTION OF TECHNOLOGY AT UNITED STATES PORTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report describing the adoption of technology at United States ports, as compared to that adoption at foreign ports, including—

(1) the technological capabilities of United States ports, as compared to foreign ports;

(2) an assessment of whether the adoption of technology at United States ports could lower the costs of cargo handling;

(3) an assessment of regulatory and other barriers to the adoption of technology at United States ports; and

(4) an assessment of technology and the workforce.

SEC. 26. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 46108 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$29,086,888 for

fiscal year 2020 and \$29,639,538 for fiscal year 2021” and inserting “\$32,869,000 for fiscal year 2022, \$38,260,000 for fiscal year 2023, \$43,720,000 for fiscal year 2024, and \$49,200,000 for fiscal year 2025”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 31, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 31, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 31, 2022, at 10 a.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 Thursday, March 31, 2022, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 31, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE, TRANSNATIONAL CRIME, CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND GLOBAL WOMEN’S ISSUES

The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women’s Issues of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 31, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following legislative fellows in my office be granted the privileges of the floor for the remainder of the Congress: Joshua Melko, Arthur Bowman, Violet Doucette, Natalya Scimeca, and Meghan Kleinsteiber.

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

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. ROBERTSON

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 573, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 573) to authorize testimony and representation in United States v. Robertson, et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the third criminal trial arising out of the events of January 6, 2021, is scheduled to begin on April 4, 2022, in Federal district court in the District of Columbia. One of the two defendants in this case pleaded guilty earlier this month. The remaining defendant, Thomas Robertson, is going to trial and is charged with six counts: obstructing the counting by Congress of the electoral ballots for President and Vice President; obstructing the grand jury investigation related to the events of January 6, 2021, and his Federal prosecution by altering and destroying one or more cell phones; impeding and interfering with law enforcement officers during a civil disorder; entering and remaining in a restricted area within the U.S. Capitol and its grounds; and two counts of engaging in disorderly and disruptive conduct.

The prosecution has requested trial testimony from Daniel Schwager, formerly counsel to the Secretary of the Senate, related to the obstruction count, including his knowledge and observations of the process and constitutional and legal bases for Congress’s certification of the electoral college vote. The prosecution is also seeking testimony at trial, if necessary, from Nate Russell and Diego Torres, custodians of records in the Senate Recording Studio, which operates under the authority of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to authenticate Senate video of the proceeding that day. Senate Secretary Berry and Senate Sergeant at Arms Gibson would like to cooperate with these requests by providing relevant testimony in this proceeding from Messrs. Schwager, Russell, and Torres, respectively.

In keeping with the rules and practices of the Senate, this resolution would authorize the production of relevant testimony from Messrs. Schwager, Russell, and Torres, with representation by the Senate Legal Counsel.

Mr. MARKEY. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 573) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 400, 647, and 775; 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; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; 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

Alan F. Estevez, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security; Enoch T. Ebong, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Trade and Development Agency; and Joseph F. DeCarolis, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 4,
2022

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 3 p.m., Monday, April 4; and that following the prayer and the pledge, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

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

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 4,
2022, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before

the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:24 p.m., recessed until Monday, April 4, 2022, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 31, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ALAN F. ESTEVEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INDUSTRY AND SECURITY.

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

ENOCH T. EBONG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY.

THE JUDICIARY

SARAH ELISABETH GERAGHTY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

GEORGETTE CASTNER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JOSEPH F. DECAROLIS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING JARED LLOYD

HON. MONDAIRE JONES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, March 23 marks 1 year since the tragic passing of my constituent, Jared Lloyd, whose memory I wish to honor today.

Mr. Lloyd was a volunteer firefighter with the Spring Valley Volunteer Fire Department in the village of Spring Valley, New York, where I grew up. On March 23 of last year, Jared Lloyd died a hero. He sacrificed his life to rescue residents of Evergreen Court Home for Adults from a horrific fire.

Jared's colleagues have said that he saved as many as 30 lives that day. I know that I speak on behalf of the people of Rockland County when I say that I cannot express how incredibly proud I am of him for his bravery and his selflessness, and how sad I am over his loss.

Jared Lloyd was 35 years old. He was a son, a companion, and a loving father of two wonderful children, Logan and Darius. Jared was a schoolmate of mine. He was a graduate of Spring Valley High School. He had so much life left to live. He will never be forgotten. Today, he is remembered in the House of Representatives for his heroic actions.

MASON LARUSSO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mason LaRusso for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Mason LaRusso is a 12th grader at Washington Square and Legacy High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Mason LaRusso is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Mason LaRusso for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

HONORING ROBERT DARDANO

HON. JOSEPH D. MORELLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I want to pay tribute to one of Monroe County's finest residents, Mr. Robert Dardano, Sr., who died at the age of 93 in February of this year.

Mr. Dardano was well-known in the Rochester community for his life-long commitment to working on behalf of our nation's veterans. He was a veteran himself, having served our country in the U.S. Navy Seabees as well as the 58th CB Battalion in Okinawa, Japan during WWII. He also served as a Naval reservist during the Korean War.

At the conclusion of his active service, he devoted himself to serving the veterans of his community at the local, state, and national levels as a member of a plethora of veterans organizations including the Italian-American War Veterans, the Veterans Memorial, and Executive Council for the City of Rochester, the Veterans Advisory Committee of Monroe County, and among many others.

Mr. Dardano also organized the annual placement of American flags on the graves of veterans in cemeteries throughout our community, and he logged over 6,250 hours of community service at events for the local Canandaigua VA Medical Center. He and his wife Virginia also donated much of his paperwork and photographs from his service with veterans' organizations to the University of Rochester.

I extend my deepest condolences to the Dardano family during this time. We here in Monroe County will never forget Robert's selflessness and compassion, and I hope we as a community can do well to continue Robert's devotion to selflessness and helping others.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUPPORTING DIVERSE STEM STUDENTS ACT

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, today, I am proudly introducing the bipartisan Supporting Diverse STEM Students Act, along with my colleagues, Representatives FITZPATRICK, SEWELL, and TURNER.

I am especially proud to do so during my 5th Annual HBCU STEAM Days of Action, a time where hundreds of participants from HBCUs, advocacy organizations, technology companies, and industry leaders meet with Republican and Democratic Members of Congress. They're here to advocate for equitable federal resources to make sure that every talented student has access to world class science, technology, engineering, arts, and math education.

We know that a well-prepared workforce—inclusive of America's diverse communities—is necessary for cultivating our United States' Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, or STEM, capacity.

However, underrepresented minority students are disproportionately left behind in their STEM studies. Researchers find over a third of Black and Latino students switch out of their STEM majors before earning their degree, in part due to a lack of access to the academic resources that traditionally help support students to completion.

This bill focuses on supporting those diverse STEM students into career success by supporting institutions that predominantly serve minority students in their capacity to provide direct scholarships and comprehensive wrap-around services, such as academic advising and tutoring, work-study, and undergraduate research opportunities.

As the United States continues to support the cultivation of our STEM talent, we must help better provide the resources that help retain, prepare, and promote the success of underrepresented and diverse students in STEM.

CARE IS AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 2022

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5547, the Care is an Economic Development Strategy Act or the CEDS Act, which requires grant applicants for certain public works and economic development projects to describe how they will increase the accessibility of affordable, quality, care-based services.

These services include childcare, early childhood education, disability and long-term care, and elder care.

This legislation increases the accessibility of affordable, quality, care-based services, and will expand quality childcare and support the dire needs of single parent homes.

The CEDS Act will amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, which provides grants for public works and development facilities, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

By amending this law, this bill would require recipients of certain grants to develop a comprehensive economic development strategy that directly or indirectly increases the accessibility of affordable, quality care-based services, and for other purposes.

The economic development strategy will ensure that all funds are being dispersed to programs that need them and will utilize the funding to provide quality care-based services.

• 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.

The COVID-19 pandemic has unveiled and emphasized how vital care-based access is to ensure that we have a functioning economy.

According to the Family Caregiver Alliance, annually, about 8,357,100 people receive support from the 5 main long-term care services.

These include: Home health agencies 4,742,500; Nursing homes 1,383,700; Hospices 1,244,500; Residential care communities 713,300; Adult day service centers 273,200.

The number of individuals using paid long-term care services in any setting will likely double from 13 million using services in 2000, to 27 million people by 2050.

This estimate is impacted by steep growth in the population of older people who tend to need an increasing amount of care.

Among the disabled and elder population in the world, about two-thirds rely solely on family members to provide care, which often results in conflicts with their professional careers.

These conflicts often limit their ability to work outside the home and provide for their families.

For many parents, especially single mothers, a lack of childcare reduces workforce participation and prevents upward economic mobility.

Fifty-seven percent of working families spent more than \$10,000 on childcare in 2020.

Twenty-seven percent of families have difficulty accessing childcare because of high demand and low supply of available childcare providers who have not yet reached capacity.

On average, Americans with children spend at least 10 percent of their household income on childcare.

Fifty-eight percent of working parents rely on childcare centers which equates to about 6.38 million parents across the nation.

This bill is a stepping stone towards economic stability and allows hardworking American parents to return to their jobs.

We must continue working alongside parents, employers, and childcare advocates to secure an economy that helps working parents thrive.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5547.

HONORING THE COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the College of San Mateo on its 100th Anniversary. The college, known to locals as CSM, is a shining star on the peninsula's hillside, set high above the City of San Mateo and serving as a gateway to jobs or additional higher education for tens of thousands each year. That includes me. I attended summer school one year on this beautiful campus.

The numbers prove the college's success. CSM offers 68 associate and transfer degree programs and an additional 81 professional and career certificates. Students at CSM regularly transfer to San Francisco State, San Jose State and the University of California. CSM has contracts guaranteeing transfer with these universities, and more.

The college started at a site in downtown San Mateo in 1922, the answer for a crisis in

the affordability of higher education in America at that time. It seems like the same problem that we have today. For 100 years, it's been the go-to place for students who needed a high-quality education but couldn't afford Stanford, Yale, Harvard or even the University of California.

Since its birth, CSM has innovated. For example, in recent years it began an innovative program known as Middle College, accepting high school students who take college-level classes while in high school. We talk a great deal about equal opportunity for all. After graduating from high school, many students in this program matriculate to CSM or state colleges and the University of California having earned thousands of dollars of reduced-cost college credits while in high school. I view this program as one of the most important offered by CSM because through affordable access to higher education our local students come one step closer to avoiding student debt while earning a valuable college degree.

Even when students do not go to college during their high school years, the affordable classes at CSM are an enormous savings. A third of the college's students are even eligible for a waiver of all fees. As one former CSM student put it, "Calculus is the same at the University of California as it is at CSM. It just costs thousands of dollars less." This young man transferred from CSM to the University of California, Santa Cruz and graduated with a Bachelor's in Computer Science. He estimated that he saved \$60,000 and noted that he also had money in his college account—zero college debt—when he graduated from Santa Cruz. He enjoyed many of his CSM classes more than those at UC Santa Cruz and, at CSM, the professors even knew his name.

So who are the dreamers of our current day who go to CSM? The college sends a message that all are welcomed, and that it is committed to a campus culture that is antiracist and equity-advancing, where students and employees who are People of Color, Indigenous, LGBTQIA+, differently enabled, justice impacted, and undocumented are included, embraced and celebrated for who they are. I also would be remiss if I didn't mention that the CSM campus and adjacent land is the site of the district's affordable housing development for faculty and staff. Employee turnover has plummeted since this development was created, offering rents that are frequently 50 percent or less of market rate. Other school districts in our county now plan to copy this strategy, and thus CSM, in so many different ways, teaches our community how to succeed.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to note that Dr. Jill Biden is right. Community college is the key to a great future for many Americans. We should do more to reduce the costs of attending community colleges like CSM. They are not simply a community jewel on the hill. They are a vital tool to shape an American economy that offers hope and lifetime learning opportunities for every inquisitive student. Congratulations CSM. They are 100 years old, and still packing them in like they're a youthful major league star on the playing field. Well, in fact, they are.

COMMENDING AUSTAL ON THE LAUNCH OF NEW STEEL LINE

HON. JERRY L. CARL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. CARL. Madam Speaker, I commend Austal USA for the launch of their steel manufacturing line on April 12, 2022. This world-class steel expansion is not only a valuable asset for Mobile, but it is also vital for our national defense. Austal has invested \$100 million in the development of this venture, including the necessary facility upgrades, new buildings, and state-of-the-art equipment.

The addition of the steel line will create jobs both at Austal shipyard and throughout the steel line supply chain. Austal's partnership with SSAB Americas to provide the steel inventory for the Navy T-ATS program shows their commitment to utilizing regional resources and labor. Austal is developing and growing the local workforce by hiring a multitude of tradesmen and women to meet the demands of the new line. Additionally, they work with over 280 vendors in Alabama, including many small businesses, who will greatly benefit from this new enterprise.

Ensuring that Austal and the Gulf Coast can continue competing for future programs to meet the growing needs of the United States Navy and United States Coast Guard is incredibly important to our local economy, our state, and the defense interests of our entire nation. Austal USA is well equipped to meet these critical needs, and I'm proud of the work they do right here in Alabama's First Congressional District to keep our country safe and secure.

ANA MARIA ARROYO ALVAREZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ana Maria Arroyo Alvarez for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Ana Maria Arroyo Alvarez is an 11th grader at North Valley School for Young Adults and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ana Maria Arroyo Alvarez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ana Maria Arroyo Alvarez for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

HONORING EARL FRANCIS LLOYD

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Earl Francis Lloyd, born in my home City of Alexandria.

Mr. Lloyd was the first African American player to play a game in the National Basketball Association. In addition, his stellar career included honors as an All-American player at West Virginia State University when in 1948 he helped lead them to an undefeated season. As a professional, Mr. Lloyd helped lead the Syracuse Nationals to the 1955 NBA Championship and was inducted into the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame in 2003. His achievements will be forever recognized with the dedication Earl Lloyd State Historical Marker on Montgomery Street in Alexandria this Saturday, April 2, 2022.

Please join me in commemorating Mr. Lloyd, a native Alexandrian who exemplified excellence throughout his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 90; YEA on Roll Call No. 91; YEA on Roll Call No. 92; YEA on Roll Call No. 93; YEA on Roll Call No. 94; NAY on Roll Call No. 95; YEA on Roll Call No. 96; and YEA on Roll Call No. 97.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, yesterday I entered my vote incorrectly for Roll Call No. 95 on S. 2938. I mistakenly voted NAY when I intended to vote YEA.

FEMA CASEWORKER
ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 2022

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5343, the "FEMA Caseworker Accountability Act."

This bill directs FEMA to report to Congress on case management personnel turnover.

Specifically, FEMA must report on the turnover rate for their case management personnel, the average and median length of employment for such personnel, the steps that FEMA is taking or plans to take to lower the turnover rate, and other specified points.

Madam Speaker, FEMA's importance cannot be overstated. They have invaluable abilities to plan, coordinate, and execute very complex strategies to fulfill the disaster response and mitigation needs of local and state governments through collaboration and cooperation among a broad range of federal government agencies.

Following the havoc inflicted by Hurricane Harvey, I experienced firsthand the power of FEMA's skill, care, and rapid execution.

The nine-county Houston metro area that was impacted by Hurricane Harvey covers 9,444 square miles, an area larger than five states, including New Hampshire, New Jersey and Connecticut.

Harris County covers 1,778 square miles, enough space to fit New York City, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Seattle, Austin and Dallas, with room still to spare.

Over 41,500 square miles of land mass were impacted by Hurricane Harvey and the subsequent flooding that covered an area larger than the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont combined.

Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

Harvey dropped 51.88 inches of rain near Cedar Bayou, the highest total ever recorded for a single U.S. weather event.

At its peak on September 1, 2017, one-third of Houston was underwater.

At the peak on August 31, there were 34,575 evacuees in shelters across Texas.

Hurricane Harvey is the largest housing disaster to strike the U.S. in our nation's history, damaging 203,000 homes, of which 12,700 were destroyed.

Months after Hurricane Harvey, in February 2018, an estimated 10,098 families were still residing in hotel rooms, in over 1,500 hotels. Thousands of others whose homes were severely damaged were living with family or friends.

It was also the second costliest disaster ever recorded in the United States, with an estimated \$125 billion dollars in damages.

In its wake, 889,425 people registered for assistance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

There were scores of families, including small children and the elderly, living in mold-infested or gutted-out homes.

When this once-in-a-lifetime disaster struck my district, FEMA did their jobs exceedingly well, for which I am incredibly grateful.

However, there is always room for improvement in federal agencies, and FEMA is no exception.

A high rate of caseworker turnover is the last thing that vulnerable families need. In my district, the recovery from Hurricane Harvey is ongoing, which can be seen in the caved-in roofs, torn-up streets; and shuttered buildings across my district.

Those problems do not linger singularly because of caseworker turnover, but it is certainly a significant reason. If no one is working on closing these cases, or they are being managed by only a few overwhelmed individuals, that's a problem which needs fixing.

Therefore, passing this legislation will set us on a path to fix that problem, Madam Speaker, which is why I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

H.R. 5343 will play a critical role in FEMA's post-disaster response operations, and I look

forward to reviewing Administrator Criswell's future report and implementing its recommendations.

CONGRATULATING SHAQUILLE O'NEAL FOR WINNING AN OSCAR FOR "THE QUEEN OF BASKETBALL"

HON. NIKEMA WILLIAMS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my Fifth Congressional District constituent, Olympian, four-time NBA Champion, NBA All-Star, and member of both the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame and FIBA Hall of Fame, Shaquille Rashawn O'Neal, on winning an Oscar.

"The Queen of Basketball," produced by executive producers Shaquille O'Neal and Steph Curry, won the Academy Award for short subject documentary on March 27, 2022.

The film shines a light on the incredible story of Lusia Harris, the first and only woman to be drafted by the NBA and the first to score a basket in women's Olympic history.

In addition to shattering glass ceilings herself, Harris helped lead her teams to excellence, including winning three consecutive Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women National Championships and a silver medal at the 1976 Summer Olympic Games in Montreal.

Harris, who recently passed away in January 2022, is a trailblazer in professional basketball and must be celebrated and commemorated for years to come. I thank you Shaquille O'Neal for doing just that.

Congratulations to Shaq and the entire production team on the award-winning "The Queen of Basketball."

TRIBUTE TO RENEE POWELL

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, as we continue our celebration of Women History Month, I rise today to pay tribute to a trailblazing woman, an extraordinary athlete, and a stalwart advocate, for equal rights.

Renee Powell is being honored with the Charlie Bartlett Award by the Golf Writers Association on April 8, 2022, on the eve of the Masters golf tournament in August, Georgia. I echo their recognition of Renee for her lifelong contributions as a professional golfer and player on the national and world stage.

Renee Powell started life with a golf club in her hand, if not literally, at least figuratively. She was born in Camden, Ohio in 1946, the same year her father William Powell returned from World War II and was confronted with discrimination on and off the golf course. He worked nights as a security guard and spent his days building a golf course on farmland in East Canton, Ohio. He opened Clearview Golf Club, which he dubbed "America's Course" in 1948, where people of all colors were welcomed to play. He owned and operated the golf course for the remainder of his life.

Renee began playing golf on her father's course at the age of three and competed for the first time as a 12-year-old. Renee went on to play in college at both Ohio University and Ohio State. In 1967, she made her professional debut on the Ladies Professional Golf Association (LPGA) tour in the U.S. Women's Open, becoming only the second African American woman to play on the LPGA tour. The first was South Carolina native, Althea Gibson, a tennis legend, who also played in the LPGA from 1963 to 1977.

The two women faced death threats and were prohibited at times from staying in tour hotels or eating in local restaurants. They received the support of the LPGA, whose members decided they would not play in tournaments that discriminated against Black golfers. Renee went on to compete in more than 250 professional golf tournaments, finally retiring from the Tour in 1980.

Following her retirement, Renee became a television commentator for ABC and CBS and travelled the world teaching the game of golf. In 1995, she returned home to Canton, Ohio, and assumed the role as head professional golfer at Clearview Golf Course, which she manages today with her brother, Larry Powell. Under their leadership, and a little help from some congressional friends, the course was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 2001.

That same year, the Powell family established the Clearview. Legacy Foundation for Education, Preservation, and Turf Grass Research. In 2011, Renee launched Clearview H.O.P.E., which serves female veterans. The program provides free recreational and therapeutic activities for former servicemembers, many of whom suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

Renee has received numerous honors including the Professional Golfers' Association's First Lady of Golf Award in 2003, and she was the first recipient of the Rolex "For the Love of the Game" Award in 2007. She has been awarded honorary membership in the Royal and Ancient Golf Club in St. Andrews, Scotland, known as "the home of golf." She has received an honorary doctorate from the University of St. Andrews and a dormitory on the campus is named in her honor. In 2019, Renee was elected the first at-large member of the PGA of America board of directors.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating Renee Powell's contributions to the game of golf and her courage to make the sport more accessible and affordable for all people. Her life serves as an example to many young minority golfers today to follow their dreams and fight to overcome any barriers they may encounter.

SARAH KRATZER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sarah Kratzer for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Sarah Kratzer is a 12th grader at FutureForward Bollman and Horizon High School and received this award because their

determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sarah Kratzer is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sarah Kratzer for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

HONORING THE CAREER AND RETIREMENT OF HAMBURG VILLAGE MAYOR THOMAS J. MOSES, SR.

HON. CHRIS JACOBS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Hamburg Village Mayor Thomas J. Moses, Sr. in honor of his retirement and decades of service to his community. It's been an honor to represent the Village of Hamburg for a decade now, as Erie County Clerk, the New York State Senate, and now in Congress. All that time having the great honor to work with and get to know this truly good man and model public servant.

Mayor Moses was born on April 1, 1947 and began serving the Village of Hamburg at the age of 11, when he volunteered at the playground. He graduated from Saints Peter & Paul and Hamburg High School in 1966, then attended Erie Community College. He was later hired by the Village and went on to serve as Recreation Supervisor for 32 years.

Mayor Moses has worked to improve the lives of village residents by developing and improving Hamburg's parks and playgrounds, as well as by overseeing renovations to village assets like the Village Swim Center.

Mayor Moses has always believed in volunteerism and community service. He was one of the founders of the Hamburg High School EMT program and is a member and past president of the Hamburg Volunteer Fire Department. He also served as Assistant Village Disaster Coordinator. Mayor Moses has served on numerous committees and boards, all with a focus on improving the aesthetics, services, opportunities, and educational offerings in the Village.

During his 16 years of service as Hamburg Village Mayor, Mayor Moses oversaw the transformation of the Village of Hamburg with the Route 62 project that has drawn recognition from across the country. He has worked tirelessly to make the community he calls home a special place to live, and his leadership has made a significant impact on the Village of Hamburg.

Mayor Moses has been married to his wife, Mary Lou Leyda, for 54 years. They have two sons, Tom Jr., and Tim, 6 grandkids, and 3 great-grandkids.

Mayor Moses represents the very idea of public service and passion for his community is unmatched. Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mayor Moses on his re-

tirement, in thanking him for service, in wishing him a happy 75th birthday, and in honoring the positive impact he has had on the Village of Hamburg.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF MONICA GAYLE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Monica Gayle on the occasion of her retirement from FOX 2 Detroit after twenty-five years. Her significant contributions to our Metro Detroit community are worthy of commendation.

A Washington State native, Ms. Gayle graduated from the University of Washington with a degree in Communications in 1982. She began her career in local news at home in Washington and then joined CBS in New York. She joined the main news anchor team at WJBK-TV in 1997. Along with her co-anchor, Huel Perkins, she is a part of one of the longest running anchor teams in Metro Detroit and has spent the last twenty-five years keeping the people of Southeastern Michigan informed on the issues of the day. Together they've covered the stories that define us—9/11, the inauguration of President Obama, Kwame Kilpatrick, and the implosion of the Hudson Building in Downtown Detroit.

Described by her co-anchor Huel as compassionate and brilliant, full of love and kindness Ms. Gayle has been a familiar face behind the news desk for a quarter of a century. She is a five-time Regional Emmy Award winning journalist and has anchored for a number of top-rated television markets throughout her over four decades-long career. Her work has taken her overseas to cover important stories in England, Ireland, Russia, Bosnia, and Honduras. A mother herself, she has always had a passion for covering the issues that matter to women and families and in 2006 she received the Operation Smile "Humanitarian of The Year" award. Ms. Gayle continues to reside in Michigan with her husband Dean and son Tanner.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Monica Gayle for an exemplary career at FOX 2 Detroit. I join with Ms. Gayle's family, friends, and colleagues in extending my gratitude to her for her tireless commitment to our community and to thank her for her role in keeping the people of Michigan informed for over two decades. Though we will miss her skilled reporting and seeing the familiar faces of Monica and co-anchor Huel on FOX 2, we wish her the very best in retirement.

STOP SEXUAL ASSAULT AND HARASSMENT IN TRANSPORTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 2022

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5706 the Stop Sexual Assault and Harassment in Transportation Act to

protect transportation personnel and passengers from sexual assault and harassment.

The bill would require certain passenger transportation carriers, including passenger airlines, buses, passenger railroads, and transportation network companies (Uber or Lyft) to establish formal policies, trainings, and reporting structures to crack down on sexual assault and harassment.

The bill would also institute penalties for individuals who physically or sexually assault or threaten transportation personnel.

Public transportation is essential to the lives of millions of Americans. The threat of being sexually assaulted or harassed obstructs their ability to get to work, school or to pick up their kids from day care.

Passengers of public transportation live with a constant fear of being sexually victimized or threatened. Women especially have a higher chance of experiencing these sorts of encounters.

In Houston there have been several cases of men and women both passengers and employees of the Metropolitan Transit Authority, that have faced harassment and assault on public transport.

Public transportation should be the last place where Americans fear for their lives.

We must use our authority as Members of Congress to put in place a system that would help protect passengers from these obscene crimes. This bill would help protect the single mom in Houston trying to get to work on time, or the middle schooler in New York City using the subway to get to school.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5706 the Stop Sexual Assault and Harassment in Transportation Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I was regrettably unable to vote on S. 2126 (Roll Call No. 97) on March 30, 2022. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

RECOGNIZING CAROL BROWNER FOR HER CONTRIBUTIONS TO ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

HON. JERRY MCNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating former Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Carol Browner, who is this year's recipient of the Pure Earth Force of Nature Award.

A lifelong environmental advocate, Administrator Browner spearheaded the creation of the EPA's first policy that focused on the link between children's health risks and exposure to environmental hazards, resulting in the establishment of the EPA's Office of Children's Health Protection (OCHP). Today, the OCHP remains vigilant in its work to increase environmental health literacy among health care

providers, in addition to evaluating and raising awareness about environmental contaminants that may contribute to childhood disease.

Administrator Browner holds the title of the longest serving EPA Administrator in the agency's history, and under her leadership, much was accomplished. She continues to work to combat environmental risks to children's health through a public-private partnership that is tackling the global lead poisoning crisis, which impacts 800 million children in low- and middle-income countries.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD THEODORE GREENER, THE FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN TO GRADUATE FROM HARVARD UNIVERSITY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, Academician, Attorney, businessman, Civic leader and accomplished American, Mr. Richard Theodore Greener, the first African American to graduate from Harvard University. Richard Greener was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on January 30, 1844. He quit school in his mid-teens to earn money for his family, but one of his employers helped him enroll in a preparatory school at Oberlin College. He graduated from Phillips Academy in 1865, and he spent three years at Oberlin College before transferring to Harvard College. His admission to Harvard was an experiment by the administration and paved the way for more Black students to attend Harvard.

Richard Theodore Greener graduated from Harvard College in 1870. In 1875, Richard Greener became the first African American to be elected as a member of the American Philological Association. He graduated from law school at South Carolina university, and practiced law in South Carolina, then Washington, D.C. before joining the Howard University Law School as a professor, and eventually a dean.

In 1875, Richard Greener was chosen by the General Assembly of South Carolina to be a member of a commission to revise the South Carolina School system. In 1880, he became a law clerk of the first comptroller of the United States Treasury; from 1876 to 1879 he represented South Carolina in the Union League of America and was President of the South Carolina Republican Association in 1887. From 1885 to 1892, he served as Secretary of the Grant Association, where he is credited with having led the eventual fundraising effort which brought in donations from 90,000 people worldwide to construct Grant's Tomb, still the largest mausoleum in North America. From 1885 to 1890, he was Chief Examiner of the Civic Service Board for New York City and County; and in the 1896 election, he served as the Head of the Colored Bureau of the National Republican Party in Chicago. In 1875, he was appointed as the United States Commercial Agent in Vladivostok, Russia, and stayed in the foreign service until 1905.

Richard Greener was well recognized for his work. While at Harvard in 1868 and 1870, he earned the Bowdoin Prize. He received two honorary Doctor of Laws degrees, one from Monrovia College in Liberia in 1882 and the

second one from Howard University in 1907. In 1902, the Chinese government decorated him with the order of the Double Dragon. Phillips Academy has the Richard T. Greener 1865 Endowed Scholarship. The University of South Carolina's Black Alumni Council Sponsors the Richard T. Greener Endowment Fund, the Central Quadrangle at Phillips Academy was named in his honor in 2018, and the University of South Carolina is honoring his legacy by erecting a statue on campus.

Richard T. Greener eventually settled in Chicago where he worked for an insurance company, practiced law and lectured about his life and times.

Much of this information came from Mr. Greener's Harvard diploma and personal papers discovered in an attic in Chicago.

What a great man, what a great history, what a great American.

DAEVION TURNER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Daevion Turner for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Daevion Turner is an 11th grader at Vantage Point High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Daevion Turner is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Daevion Turner for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING JAY CAMPBELL

HON. TROY E. NEHLS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of my staff, Senior Legislative Assistant Jay Campbell, as he prepares to leave my office and Capitol Hill to pursue a new career path.

Jay is one of the most genuine and loyal people I have met during my time in Washington. Through his hard work, dedication, and his passion for identifying legislative solutions, Jay embodies what it means to be a public servant.

Amongst his colleagues Jay is respected as a knowledgeable and effective Transportation and Infrastructure policy work. I could not have asked for a better Transportation and Infrastructure advisor for my first year in Congress. I will certainly miss his intellectual insight to help solve the problems facing the people of TX-22.

While Jay's career on the Hill has come to a pause, I know he will have immense success in all of his future endeavors.

I want to wish Jay the best of luck in his new career. While he may no longer be on staff in my office, Jay will always be a member of the Team Nehls family.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF DR. OLIVIA LEOLA TORRES
CRUZ

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Olivia Leola Torres Cruz. Dr. Cruz was an esteemed leader, selfless advocate, and dedicated servant to the People of Guam. Our people will fondly remember her as a trailblazing force that meaningfully contributed to shaping our island's healthcare sector and improving the lives of countless others throughout our island.

Widely recognized for her historic achievement as Guam's first female CHamoru physician, Dr. Cruz navigated a path unpaved with unwavering courage and determination. As a young girl that had endured World War II, her education was interrupted. Yet upon its conclusion she remained steadfast in her resolve to excel in school, consistently passing bi-annual examinations to elevate her grade level. After graduating from George Washington High School as one of its Top Ten scholars in 1953, Dr. Cruz moved thousands of miles away from home to pursue an undergraduate career at the University of Wisconsin. She then continued with graduate level research and courses in chemistry at the University of Cincinnati and, in 1962, graduated from the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania. Shortly after medical school, Dr. Cruz went on to complete an internship at the Denver General Hospital in addition to residencies for internal and pulmonary medicine at the Denver General Hospital, Herman Houston Hospital, and Allegheny General Hospital respectively.

Though Dr. Cruz pursued her professional education in the continental United States, she kept her people at the forefront of her mind and proudly held her identity as a daughter of Guam close to her heart. In 1967 she returned home impassioned with a mission to increase our community's access to medical care. From serving at the Guam Department of Public Health and Guam Memorial Hospital (GMH) to collaborating with the National Institute of Health Research Station as a consultant on lytico-bodig research, a neurodegenerative disease endemic to the CHamoru people, Dr. Cruz devoted her expertise, talents, and decades of work toward standing up a system of care that holistically addresses the needs of our island. This commitment to community is further demonstrated in her persistence to serve as many people as possible by opening her very own private practice clinic, wherein she often provided care to those who could least afford it, and continuing to work part time at GMH despite having retired from government service in 1998.

Beyond her professional capacities, Dr. Cruz embodied a strong sense of character, unquestioningly prioritizing others before self—

a notable example of which was illustrated by her heroic actions to save three individuals who had been involved in an incident in which a twenty-ton compactor toppled over a two-hundred-foot cliff. Without hesitation, Dr. Cruz climbed twenty-five feet down the face of the cliff to render first aid to the injured operator and had them hoisted up to the surface first. Her personal undertaking to lead with compassion is both evident over the course of her lifetime and serves an inspiring blueprint for the many women today who similarly endeavor to pursue a career in medicine.

Dr. Olivia Leola Torres Cruz is an icon of servant leadership and unconditional compassion who poured her heart into securing a better health future for our people. As Women's History Month and Mes CHamoru come to a close, it is further fitting that we reflect on the meaningful contributions of leaders like Dr. Cruz, whose life and legacy have and continue to impact the story of our island community. We extend our deepest condolences to her husband, Dr. Robert Haddock, their children, Michele and Ray, their grandchildren, Robert, Olivia, Francisco, Carlos, Gregorio, Stephen, and Jose, and the rest of their family and friends, and join the People of Guam in remembering and celebrating her life and legacy of selfless service. Dr. Cruz will be deeply missed, and her love and memories will forever remain in the hearts of the People of Guam.

REMEMBERING BRENT RENAUD

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize award-winning journalist Brent Renaud, who was killed in Ukraine at the hands of Russian soldiers.

Brent was a Little Rock native who traveled around the world to share the stories and lift the voices of individuals who otherwise may not have been heard.

At the time of his tragic death, Brent was in Ukraine, covering the current refugee crisis that has developed because of Russia's unwarranted and illegal invasion of the sovereign nation of Ukraine.

Brent made a difference in the Arkansas arts community as co-founder of the Little Rock Film Festival and serving as a mentor within the community.

My prayers are with Brent, his family, his friends, and all that were blessed to know him.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDGAR
WINFIELD BARCLIFF, JR.

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Edgar Winfield Barcliff, Jr. after his passing on March 16, 2022. Edgar was a beloved husband and family man as well as a proud son of Newark, NJ.

Born in Newark in 1944, Edgar knew that helping his community and those most in need

would be his life's work. He started off as a young cadet in the 1960s before he passed the examination to become an Essex County Correction Officer in 1970. He would serve a long and accomplished career at the Essex County Jail in Newark. In 1986, he became the first Correction Officer in Essex County to receive the Officer of the Year Award. Later, Edgar was the first Correction Officer from the State of New Jersey to be recognized as one of the top five Correction Officers in the country.

Edgar continued his exemplary record of service when he completed a training course for investigators at the Criminal Justice Academy's New Jersey Division. After that, he was appointed as an Investigator at the Internal Affairs Bureau. In 1996, Edgar was promoted to Sergeant and became a Supervisor in the Internal Affairs Division of the same jail where he began his career. He was active in Newark's West Ward Civic Organization and received numerous awards and commendations from federal, state, county, and municipal agencies for his contributions.

After more than 31 years of service, Edgar retired in 2002. But he continued his service with several local and national law enforcement organizations. He was a member of the Board of Trustees for the New Jersey Chapter of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE) and the National Director and Vice Chairman of the Correctional Peace Officers Foundation (CPOF). He was committed to supporting officers and their families as they navigated through the very demanding law enforcement profession. Edgar's law enforcement and volunteer work were both personal and professional for him. He was a fierce protector of his family, neighbors, and friends and a true advocate for safer, more just neighborhoods and community service. His legacy will live on through the people he touched—from the officers he mentored to the people in Newark and surrounding communities that he served to the family he loved.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating his life of public service and extend my deepest condolences to his spouse, children, grandchildren, great-grandchild, cousins, nieces and nephews, and friends.

RECOGNIZING THE JOE CAMPOS
TORRES PLAZA DEDICATION

HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the plaza dedication in honor of Jose "Joe" Campos Torres taking place Saturday, April 2, 2022.

On May 5, 1977, Army veteran Joe Campos Torres died of injuries inflicted by several on-duty officers of the Houston Police Department (HPD). Following a cruel, racially-motivated beating that evening, the police officers took him to the city jail where the jail staff refused to process Joe due to his grave visible injuries. Officers were instructed to transport him to the hospital for medical care. Outrageously, the officers instead pushed Joe off a wharf into the Buffalo Bayou. Tragically, he did not survive.

Joe Campos Torres was taken from his family and our community too soon, but his legacy was the light shone on violent police incidents plaguing Latinos and minorities in 1977. This set a new course of police reform for HPD. In 2021, Houston Police Chief Troy Finner issued a public apology for the brutal murder at the hands of HPD officers more than 40 years ago. Following sincere attempts to address racism within their ranks, today, HPD reflects the diversity of the city and is committed to building powerful relationships with minority communities. Joe Campos Torres' sacrifice sparked this movement and continues to protect countless numbers of Latino and minority community members.

Madam Speaker, let the record show Jose "Joe" Campos Torres is a national and local hero. With this plaza dedication in honor of his life, residents across Houston and the State of Texas will welcome a permanent memorial worthy of his legacy.

RECOGNIZING THE VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

HON. VERONICA ESCOBAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to commemorate Vietnam veteran alumni from Bel Air High School who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our country.

On March 29, 2022, we commemorate the 49th anniversary of the last United States combat units leaving South Vietnam. Every year on this day, we observe National Vietnam War Veterans Day to honor the service that veterans made and gain a deeper understanding of their sacrifice. Additionally, the Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps (JROTC) students and staff at Bel Air High School spend countless hours learning about the war and work to find ways to honor the Vietnam veterans.

I would like to recognize the Bel Air Vietnam veteran alumni who gave their life in honor of their service. The veterans who paid the ultimate sacrifice are:

CPL Charles Peter Barnes, CPL Luis Carlos Borrego, SP4 Roberto Dominguez, SGT Bobby W. Jobe, SP4 Fred V. Jurado, PFC Daniel Leon Navarro, PFC James Wayne Parham, SPC4 Thomas Edward Ross, CPL Hugo H. Ulloa, CPT. James Robert Valtr.

Our Vietnam veterans fought bravely for our country, and we are eternally grateful. Upon their return home, they continued their service in other capacities by continuing their military careers or reentering the workforce. Because of these veterans, America is a stronger nation for generations to come. I am also humbled to recognize the Bel Air High School JROTC cadets in their work to memorialize Vietnam veterans.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing our Vietnam veterans everywhere. We are forever grateful for their service.

DON YOUNG COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 2022

Ms JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6865 the Don Young Coast Guard Authorization Act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard.

For the last 230 years, the Coast Guard has played a vital role in protecting the marine environment, guarding our nations extensive coastline, and has performed crucial life saving missions.

Over the years, I have had the opportunity to see the Coast Guard in action leading up to and following hurricanes like Ike and Harvey that impacted the Houston area.

I convey thanks and appreciation from Houstonians to the members of the Coast Guard for their service to our great Nation.

The history of the United States Coast Guard can be traced to the United States Revenue Cutter Service, which was founded on August 4, 1790, as part of the Department of the Treasury.

The Coast Guard has protected the United States throughout its long history and served proudly in every one of the Nation's conflicts.

The Coast Guard served as the nation's only armed force on the sea until Congress launched the Navy Department in 1798.

On January 28, 1915, the Revenue Cutter Service and the United States Life-Saving Service were merged to become the Coast Guard.

The U.S. Coast Guard conducts operations that ensure the safety of our nation's waterways and provides humanitarian assistance during national disasters.

The Coast Guard conducted critical search and rescue missions in response to Hurricane Harvey, which devastated my home district in Houston, Texas.

The Coast Guard's response included 2,600 active duty, reserve, civil servant, and auxiliary personnel: 50 rotary and fixed-wing aircraft, 75 shallow-water boats, and 29 coast guard cutters.

The efforts from the Coast Guard resulted in the rescue of over 11,000 people along the Texas and Louisiana coast during and after Hurricane Harvey.

During and in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey 51 members of the Coast Guard suffered catastrophic property loss and 124 others reported property damage in the impacted areas of Texas during Harvey.

This authorization will ensure that our country's devoted naval personnel have the means to effectively protect and defend our borders as well as expand our sea and land capabilities.

Authorizing funding for the Coast Guard is essential to sustaining our place in the international system as the world's most powerful naval force.

Donald Edwin Young was a dear colleague of mine. For the past 49 years, he represented Alaska's at-large congressional district and made a significant impact on his constituency.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Don Young Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2022.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAMAICA'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of sixty years of independence of the nation of Jamaica, and over sixty years of cooperative and friendly relations between Jamaica and the United States.

The United States was among the first countries to recognize Jamaica's independence in 1962 and has enjoyed strong diplomatic and cultural ties with the stalwart island nation since. This diplomatic support has expressed itself through the work of organizations like USAID and direct commercial links between our nations for six decades. And in the last year alone, the United States has demonstrated its strong support for Jamaica through its fight against COVID-19. The United States has sent hundreds of thousands of COVID-19 vaccines to Jamaica to combat the pandemic, and as of December 2021 we have shipped over 400,000 vaccines to the island. But the effects of this crisis expand beyond public health; Jamaica has relied heavily on tourism for its economic successes, and the COVID-19 pandemic hit the nation extraordinarily hard.

To help alleviate those pains, Vice President HARRIS met Prime Minister Andrew Holness at the White House this week. There she announced \$30 million in economic assistance to further augment Jamaica's economic recovery from the pandemic, including investments in human capital and violence reduction. These essential investments were capped by the announcement of even more investments to help Jamaica survive a rapidly changing Caribbean climate, as evidenced by the ever-stronger storm systems and hurricanes that ravage the region every year.

The United States and Jamaica also cooperate proactively on Caribbean security. Under the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative, the United States provides Jamaica with support in tackling trafficking, including training, equipment, and technical assistance on maritime security procedures and more. Our cooperative efforts help to counter public corruption and enhances the Jamaican justice system's efforts to fight crime across the country.

But good relations between our nations goes beyond diplomatic ties, as Jamaicans have emigrated in droves over the decades to the United States. In New York City we are able to enjoy such cultural staples such as Jamaican jerk chicken and ox tails, live Reggae music and more as a result of our neighbor's cultural heritage. Even the highest levels of government enjoy cultural links to Jamaica, where the father of our Vice President was born.

Congratulations to Jamaica for six decades of independent governance, and for being such a longstanding and firm partner of the United States.

LEONARDO DOMINGUEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Leonardo Dominguez for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Leonardo Dominguez is a 12th grader at North Valley School for Young Adults and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Leonardo Dominguez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Leonardo Dominguez for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF A FIERCE EDUCATION ADVOCATE, DR. WALTER LEE SMITH

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life and contributions of Dr. Walter Lee Smith, seventh president of Florida A&M University (FAMU) and outstanding citizen of Tampa and Hillsborough County, who passed away on Thursday, November 25, 2021 at the age of 86. A scholar, historian, advocate and educational leader, Dr. Smith was a native of Tampa, Florida, but the impact of his great work reached far beyond our community, having touched the lives of those across Florida, our nation and the world.

Dr. Walter Lee Smith was born in Tampa, Florida on May 13, 1935, to the late Eva Smith (Reynolds). Raised by his mother and stepfather, Ruben Reynolds, a strong work ethic was instilled in Smith from a very young age and applied throughout his childhood raised in Florida, Georgia and New York. He excelled both academically and in sports, all while living through firsthand experiences of racism and segregation within his communities. Smith's perseverance during these instances not only showed signs of his strong character but would go on to influence his professional interests and achievements. Years down the line, Smith would go on to work for the federal government and help to develop Titles IV and VI programs for school desegregation.

As a young adult, Dr. Walter Lee Smith worked pushing clothing racks in the New York Garment district before he went on to enlist in the U.S. Army, having served his nation during the Korean war. Following his military service, Smith returned to Tampa Bay where he enrolled at Gibbs Junior College, the first of

Florida's junior colleges for African American students. Smith was elected as the first student body president during his time at Gibbs. Following this, he went on to attend Florida A&M University and earned a Bachelor's Degree in Biology and Chemistry and subsequently a Masters of Education. Smith completed his education by earning a Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from The Florida State University.

Before becoming FAMU's seventh president, Smith worked in various roles throughout Tampa as: a 7-Eleven Store manager in Progress Village, a science teacher at Marshall High School in Plant City, assistant director of the Florida Education Association and provost at Hillsborough Community College. From 1974 to 1977, he served as president of Roxbury Community College in Boston, Massachusetts.

Smith was appointed the seventh president of FAMU in 1977, serving in this role until 1985. Under his leadership, FAMU as an educational institution was positively impacted in innumerable ways. The university grew to eleven schools and colleges. Among those added were the School of Allied Health Science, School of General Studies, the School of Journalism & Graphic Communication, the FAMU-FSU College of Engineering and a Division of Graduate Studies and Continuing Education. Various Graduate and Doctorate programs were established under Smith's administration, with the university having offered its first Doctor of Philosophy degree, a Ph.D. in Pharmacology, in 1984. Beyond academics, FAMU's athletic department was greatly developed during Smith's tenure and a \$10-million Centennial Celebration Fund endowment was established, having since grown to more than \$150 million.

But Dr. Smith's educational efforts did not stop there. Following his departure from FAMU, Smith was appointed as a senior Fulbright Scholar and worked abroad with the University of Malawi. In 1994 through 1995, he founded FUNDA, an American style two-year college, specifically in Malawi and South Africa. After his time abroad, Smith worked as a professor at the University of Florida until his retirement in 2000. In 2002, he opened a privately held community library in his hometown of Tampa.

Dr. Smith is survived by his wife, Barbara Abrams Smith; children: Col. John L. Smith (ret.), Andre Smith, Salesia Smith-Gordon, Walter Lee Smith II, Tracey Abrams Butler; grandchildren, great-grandchildren and other members of their extended family.

Along with his family, Smith's lifelong commitment to education will be carried on in a legacy across the various institutions he worked with. In 2007, FAMU named its School of Architecture and Engineering Technology building in honor of Dr. Smith. At the University of Florida, colleagues and former students of Smith's funded the creation of the Walter L. Smith Scholarship to support minority graduate students in educational administration. The Florida State University also holds a scholarship in Dr. Smith's name and in 2015, Hillsborough County Libraries named a reading room at the Robert Saunders Library in his honor as well.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Florida and my neighbors across Tampa Bay, I am proud to honor Dr. Walter Lee Smith and his selfless devotion of strengthening edu-

cation institutions and expanding their accessibility in Tampa, Florida, the United States and beyond. Dr. Smith's legacy is cemented into the history of our community and will live on and inspire others for many years to come.

HONORING SCOTT BUSBOOM'S RETIREMENT

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scott Busboom of Decatur, Illinois.

Scott has worked in the radio industry for more than 30 years. Most recently, he has spent over 20 plus years broadcasting in Decatur. He spent the past 10 years waking up Decatur with the "Busboom and Wolfe" morning show, which he hosted with long-time television reporter and friend, Doug Wolfe.

Scott was an avid fan and supporter of local high school and college athletics. He has broadcast more than 350 boys' and girls' high school basketball games and more than 325 Millikin University men's and women's games. He broadcast the first Decatur High School girls' game on the radio and was at the microphone for the Millikin women's 2005 NCAA Division III National Championship victory.

Scott helped form the Decatur Thanksgiving Tournament and was inducted into the Illinois Basketball Coaches Association Hall of Fame in 2013.

As a monthly guest on "Busboom and Wolfe" for many years, I will miss our conversations and his presence on Talk 101 FM. I want to congratulate Scott on a long and accomplished career, and I wish him a restful retirement. He truly deserves it.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF LYNN MARIE HAMSTRA

HON. PAT FALLON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and commemorate the life and service of Lynn Marie Hamstra. Lynn, with great courage and vigor, lived a full life of loving service to her family and her community. After four and a half years of fighting a fierce battle against an aggressive form of pancreatic cancer, Lynn peacefully passed into the arms of the Lord on March 26, 2022, surrounded by her loved ones. Lynn is survived by her husband, Daniel Hamstra; her daughter, Rachel Hamstra LeMier; her son-in-law, Ryan LeMier; her granddaughter, Olivia Lynn LeMier; her sons, Timothy Hamstra and Zachariah Hamstra; her mother, Adeline Coffey; her sisters, Laura (Coffey) Girgis and Lee Ellen (Coffey) Wilson; and her brothers, Larry and Tony Coffey.

Lynn was born in Chicago on April 19, 1961 to Lawrence Raymond Coffey, Jr., and Adeline Frances Coffey. She was the oldest of five children and excelled in her role as the big sister. During her high school years at Hinsdale Central, Lynn was a world class

cheerleader who not only found the time to cheer at her brother's games but also coach her sisters in cheer. After graduating from high school, she went on to attend Purdue University where she studied electrical engineering. During her collegiate years she met the love of her life Daniel Lee Hamstra who played baseball with her brother Larry at the University of Illinois. On the same night of their first meeting Dan pitched a no-hitter, the only one of his baseball career. Needless to say, it was a match made in heaven and just a few years later Dan and Lynn were married on July 26, 1986.

Lynn and Dan thrived together, and their marriage was a model of fidelity, love, and devotion to all they encountered. Even in the midst of their busy lives Lynn and Dan managed, for over ten years, to make it to ballroom dancing classes. During the course of their thirty-five years of marriage Lynn and Dan had three beautiful children: Rachel Marie Hamstra, Timothy Lee Hamstra, and Zachariah Andrew Hamstra. Each of Lynn's children are uniquely gifted and had their own precious relationship with their mom. Each of the kids have a little bit of their mother that they will carry on. From her boisterous laugh and keen intuition to her strong convictions and creative streak.

Lynn continued her education later in life and obtained a Master of Liberal Studies with a concentration in Art History from the Southern Methodist University in 2017. One of the proudest accomplishments of her life was her development of the "Focused Looking" program which was designed to help doctors to increase observation skills by taking a deeper look at a single piece of art for one hour. Lynn's graduate work was influential in both the art and medical fields. She leaves behind a legacy from this work that has blessed many patients and doctors alike.

There is no doubt in my mind that this very special woman will be dearly missed. She lived a life full of joy in her marriage, her motherhood, professional and academic spheres. Lynn's husband, children, and family will carry all of her exemplary virtues as a little piece of Lynn lives on in each of their hearts.

I have requested the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capital to recognize Lynn Hamstra's well-lived and beautiful life. Furthermore, Madam Speaker, I extend my personal condolences to the Hamstra family for the loss of such an extraordinarily brave and loving woman. May God rest the soul of this great American.

HONORING EARL G. GRAVES,
FOUNDER OF BLACK ENTER-
PRISE MAGAZINE

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an icon in the civil rights movement, business world, and political landscape, Mr. Earl G. Graves, who passed away on April 6, 2020.

Mr. Graves founded Black Enterprise magazine in 1970, a publishing company dedicated to lifting up and recognizing Black entrepreneurship. Over the next 50 years, Mr. Graves

took Black Enterprise from a single-magazine publishing company to a diversified multimedia business that spread the message of financial empowerment to more than 6 million African Americans through print, digital, broadcast, and live-event platforms. He wrote a New York Times bestselling book in 1997, titled "How to Succeed in Business Without Being White," that discussed the strategies he used to achieve such success, and was selected as a finalist for the 1997 Financial Times/Booz-Allen & Hamilton Global Business Book Award.

As a champion for Black excellence, Mr. Graves received numerous awards. Two years after launching Black Enterprise, he received the National Award of Excellence and was named one of the 10 most outstanding minority businessmen in the country by President Richard Nixon. He was named by Time magazine as one of 200 future leaders of the country in 1974 and became part of the National Black College Hall of Fame in 1987. Mr. Graves has lectured at Yale University as a Poynter Fellow and received honorary degrees from more than 65 colleges and universities, including his alma mater, Morgan State University. In recognition of Mr. Graves's staunch advocacy for higher education and equal opportunity, Morgan State renamed its school of business and management the Earl G. Graves School of Business and Management in 1995. In 2002, Fortune magazine named Mr. Graves one of the 50 most powerful and influential African Americans in corporate America.

Mr. Graves threw himself into causes and projects that supported and empowered his communities in New York and the Black community at large. He held a seat on the board of selectors of the American Institute for Public Service, the Advisory Council of the Character Education Partnership, the board of the Steadman-Hawkins Sports Medicine Foundation, the board of The Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, and the national advisory board of the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center. He was also a trustee of Howard University, the Committee for Economic Development, the Special Contributions Fund of the NAACP, and the New York Economic Club. He was appointed to serve on the presidential commission for the National Museum of African American History and Culture by the George W. Bush Administration and was a vice president on the national executive board and a member of the marketing committee for the national office of the Boy Scouts of America.

Mr. Graves's wife of 51 years, Mrs. Barbara Graves, was his closest companion. You didn't see one without the other. She lived for him, he lived for her, and they both lived for their three children. All three sons, Earl "Butch" Jr., Johnny, and Michael, worked at Black Enterprise throughout their lives, developing their business acumen under the watchful eye of Mrs. Graves, who served as a mentor and guide to several generations of employees. Butch took over as CEO of Black Enterprise in 2006, after spending decades growing the company together with his father.

Earl G. Graves was raised in the Bedford Stuyvesant neighborhood of New York, where he learned hard work and perseverance from his parents, Earl Godwin and Winifred Sealy Graves. After receiving a B.A. in economics from Morgan State University, he served two years in the Army, followed by a three-year

stint as Senator Robert F. Kennedy's administrative assistant. After Kennedy's assassination, Graves entered the business arena, where he realized his unprecedented success as a public servant, intellectual, and businessman.

It is my honor to stand today, Madam Speaker, in recognition of Earl G. Graves, a successful entrepreneur, caring father, dedicated philanthropist, and friend.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF
HUEL PERKINS

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Huel Perkins on the occasion of his retirement from FOX 2 Detroit after thirty-three years. His significant contributions to our Metro Detroit community are worthy of commendation.

A native of Louisiana, Mr. Perkins first started working as an anchor in Baton Rouge. He planned on continuing law school until a new career path appeared in the form of a phone call and he moved to work at a local station in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1989, he joined TV 2 in Detroit and has since then become a household name here in Metro Detroit. Along with his co-anchor, Monica Gayle, he is a part of one of the longest running anchor teams in Metro Detroit and has spent the last twenty-five years keeping the people of Southeastern Michigan informed on the issues of the day. Together they've covered the stories that define us—9/11, the inauguration of President Obama, Kwame Kilpatrick, and the memorable implosion of the Hudson Building in Downtown Detroit.

The sharp and larger than life host of Let It Rip, Mr. Perkins has received two Emmy Awards for reporting and four nominations for Best Anchor. Known for his boundless optimism, he has delivered the news that matters to Southeast Michigan with integrity and compassion. Mr. Perkins has traveled the world reporting on figures like Nelson Mandela and Pope, but this hasn't stopped him from being engaged in the community he calls home. Over the years he has made a difference in the lives of so many Metro Detroiters and in return, Michigan has adopted him as of our own. Even as he leaves FOX 2, his words of wisdom will not be forgotten. Mr. Perkins resides in Michigan with his wife Priscilla and together they have two sons, Jared and Vincent.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Huel Perkins for an exemplary career at FOX 2 Detroit. I join with Mr. Perkin's family, friends, and colleagues in extending my gratitude to him for his tireless commitment to our community and to thank him for his role in keeping the people of Michigan informed for over three decades. Though we will miss his skilled reporting and seeing the familiar faces of Huel and co-anchor Monica on FOX 2, we wish him the very best in retirement.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR.
ELNARDO WEBSTER

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Elnardo Webster after his passing on March 22, 2022. Elnardo was a beloved School Superintendent, devoted husband and father, and a proud member of the West Orange community.

Dr. Webster was born on March 6, 1948, in Jersey City, NJ. He earned a B.S. and M.A. from Saint Peter's University and, in 2000, he received a Doctorate in Educational Leadership from Seton Hall University. While a student, he played a pivotal role on the renowned 1967–68 "Run Baby Run" men's basketball team. Dr. Webster went on to play professional basketball for seven years with the New York Nets, Memphis Pros, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, and Eastern League for the New York Knicks. In 2018, Dr. Webster was named to a list of the top 25 men's college basketball players in New Jersey's history.

Following a distinguished career in education, Dr. Webster retired as superintendent for Roselle Public Schools and became a consultant for the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Education as a Highly Skilled Professional. Of late, Dr. Webster served as director for Saint Peter's Center for After School and Expanded Learning (C.A.S.E.L.). He was a former council member of the West Orange Township Council and a former commissioner of the Hudson County Freeholders.

Dr. Webster also served as a member of the Board of Trustees at Saint Peter's University, a member of the Trustee Board of the Ethics Committee New Jersey Supreme Court District VI, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Urban League of Hudson County, a member of the King Solomon Masonic Lodge No. 19, and a member of the National Sorority of Phi Delta Kappa Alpha Chapter Anthropos. He will be greatly missed by his wife Sandra Webster, his two sons Elnardo and Damarko Webster, and his entire extended family.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the life of Dr. Elnardo Webster.

**SAFEGUARDING TOMORROW
THROUGH ONGOING RISK MITI-
GATION TECHNICAL CORREC-
TIONS ACT**

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 2022

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5673, the Safeguarding Tomorrow through Ongoing Risk Mitigation Technical Corrections Act.

This bill revises provisions related to the hazard mitigation revolving loan fund program, by requiring capitalization grant recipients to supplement these two most recently published editions of relevant building codes, specifications, and standards.

The Safeguarding Tomorrow through Ongoing Risk Mitigation Act authorizes the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to enter into agreements with any state or Indian tribal government to make grants for the establishment of hazard mitigation revolving loan funds.

The funding would enable local governments that carry out projects to reduce disaster risks for homeowners, businesses, non-profit organizations, and communities to decrease the loss of life and property, the cost of insurance claims, and federal disaster payments.

The Infrastructure Act of 2021 provides \$500 million to the STORM Act, or \$100 million per year for five years.

This new FEMA grant program finances water, wastewater, infrastructure, disaster recovery, community, and small business development projects.

This revolving loan fund can be utilized for projects intended to protect against wildfires, earthquakes, flooding, storm surges, chemical spills, seepage resulting from chemical spills and floods, and any other event deemed catastrophic by FEMA.

This legislation makes a huge impact on the nation's efforts to prevent and recover from natural disasters.

My community, the 18th Congressional District of Texas will benefit greatly from this bill.

Houston's Hurricane Harvey wreaked \$125 billion in damage to the Houston area.

Houston's Third and Fifth Wards and in surrounding communities of Baytown and Gulfport, took the brunt of flooding damage due to Hurricane Harvey in 2017.

In February 2021, many of these same neighborhoods endured a much higher rate of power outages from Winter Storm Uri.

These low-interest loans will allow for cities and states to repay the loan, with savings from mitigation projects.

It also gives states the flexibility to prepare for oncoming disasters without paying high-interest rates.

They can invest in their communities—cutting red tape and they will no longer have to wait on the federal government.

For my district, and others living on the coast, it is not a matter of "if" a hurricane will strike our coast, it's a matter of "when" it will strike.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 5673 because hazards are going to happen and we must do everything we can to protect our people.

We need the Safeguarding Tomorrow through Ongoing Risk Mitigation Act.

NEYRELY MUNOZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Neyrely Munoz for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Neyrely Munoz is a Freshman at Hofstra University and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Neyrely Munoz is exemplary of the type of achieve-

ment that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Neyrely Munoz for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

**CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ALICE
BEATTY**

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of World War II veteran Alice Beatty and to honor her service in the Women's Auxiliary Army Corp.

Alice Beatty was born in Conway, Arkansas on August 23, 1921. At the age of 21, Alice joined the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps and landed on the beach at Normandy just weeks after D-Day.

Alice Beatty was awarded the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with one bronze star, the World War II Victory Medal, three overseas service bars, and the Women's Army Corps Service Medal in recognition of her service during World War II.

Alice was also the first woman in the state of Arkansas to receive the French Legion of Honor Medal.

Alice was a pioneer of her time, and I am proud to highlight her service to our Nation and honor her memory during Women's History Month.

REMEMBERING BRENDA HARRIS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Brenda Harris and her legacy as an educator and a civil rights champion. Patti and I are deeply saddened by Brenda's passing, and our hearts are with her family during this difficult time.

In 1951, Harris was born in Montgomery, Alabama as the daughter of civil rights activists. After graduating high school, Harris moved to California to study communications and sociology at the University of San Francisco (USF). In 1972, Harris began to immerse herself in the world of education through tutoring at Benjamin Franklin Middle School and counseling through Junior League. She went on to receive a master's degree in administration and her elementary and secondary school teaching credentials. In 1990, Harris' efforts culminated in her appointment to the position of Education Program Consultant by Dr. Shirley Thornton, Deputy Superintendent of Specialized Programs at the California Department of Education.

As the daughter for civil rights activists, Harris was keenly aware of the disadvantages that underprivileged communities faced. While

continuing her successful work as an educator, she took up her parents' cause and became an impactful advocate for improving education in minority and economically disadvantaged neighborhoods. This led her to become a member of USF's Board of Trustees, where she was committed to supporting USF's mission of social justice.

In 2018, she was awarded the Engage San Francisco Community Partner Award for Western Addition Changemakers. Harris' life work undoubtedly had an indelible positive impact on countless students in California and inspired those around her. She will be deeply missed, and Patti and I send our condolences to the Harris family.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH AND SLAVIC CENTER

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 2022

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the

Polish and Slavic Center (PSC) on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. For five decades, PSC has promoted the culture and heritage of Poland, whilst providing a broad range of services and opportunities to the Polish American community.

Working alongside Polish immigrants who had just arrived in New York City, Reverend Longin Tolczyk established PSC in 1972. In the 50 years since, PSC has expanded rapidly, becoming an important cultural institution for the Polish-American community in the tri-state area and has over 40,000 members.

Over the course of this period, PSC has continuously expanded the services it provides to the local community. For over 48 years, the Extended Social Services Program has provided information and assistance for elderly Polish and Slavic-Americans, in matters as varied as social security, healthcare, and housing. PSC further assists seniors by providing daily low-cost meals at the Krakus Senior Center and John Paul II Friendship Center.

Since 1994, PSC has expanded its reach by providing immigration and legal support. Through its bilingual services, PSC works to provide free legal aid to all members of the community. Beyond these services, PSC offers ESL classes each year to over 100 re-

cently arrived immigrants, and a scholarship program for Polish and Slavic-American youth seeking higher education degrees.

PSC works to provide enriching cultural experiences for all, partnering with both established and emerging Polish and Slavic-American performers to host exhibitions, concerts, and other cultural events. PSC seeks to inspire creativity and confidence in the younger generation through programming for aspiring young artists.

As PSC enters its sixth decade, it plans to continue expanding its services. A 3-K for All Preschool Program will serve the growing population of young Greenpoint families. PSC also plans to open a new cafeteria at its 177 Kent Street location. To enhance its cultural programming, PSC intends to renovate its old church premises into a modern venue for holding concerts, conferences, and community gatherings.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the ongoing work of PSC for the Polish and Slavic-American community. For 50 years, it has made a significant contribution in making New York the vibrant city of immigrants and diverse cultures that exemplifies the promise of the United States and the American Dream.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1875–S1920

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3970–3987, S. Res. 572–574, and S. Con. Res. 35. **Pages S1910–11**

Measures Reported:

S. 3785, to amend title 49, United States Code, to eliminate the restriction on veterans concurrently serving in the Offices of Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. **Page S1910**

Measures Passed:

Save the Liberty Theatre Act: Senate passed H.R. 3197, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the City of Eunice, Louisiana, certain Federal land in Louisiana. **Pages S1886–87**

Chiricahua National Park Act: Senate passed S. 1320, to establish the Chiricahua National Park in the State of Arizona as a unit of the National Park System, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1887**

Ocean Shipping Reform Act: Senate passed S. 3580, to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S1887–S1901**

Schumer (for Cantwell) Amendment No. 5017, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1891**

Authorize Testimony and Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 573, to authorize testimony and representation in *United States v. Robertson, et al.* **Page S1914**

Measures Considered:

Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 4373, making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022. **Pages S1875–86**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to invoke cloture with respect to the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, ripen at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader. **Page S1886**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 124), Sarah Elisabeth Geraghty, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia. **Page S1886**

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 125), Georgette Castner, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey. **Page S1886**

Alan F. Estevez, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

Enoh T. Ebong, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Trade and Development Agency.

Joseph F. DeCarolis, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Energy Information Administration. **Page S1920**

Messages from the House: **Pages S1902–03**

Measures Referred: **Page S1903**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1903–10**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1911–12**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1912–15**

Additional Statements: **Page S1902**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1915–19**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1919**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1919**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—125) **Page S1886**

Recess: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and recessed at 4:24 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, April 4, 2022. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1920.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

HOUSING NEEDS OF AMERICA'S SENIORS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine addressing the housing needs of America's seniors, focusing on affordability and accessibility, including S. 567, to provide for conservation and economic development in the State of Nevada, after receiving testimony from Jennifer Molinsky, Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Audra Hamernik, Nevada HAND, Las Vegas; and Thomas Wade, American Action Forum, Norbert J. Michel, Cato Institute, and Shannon Guzman, AARP, all of Washington, D.C.

DOMESTIC CRITICAL MINERAL MINING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the opportunities and challenges facing domestic critical mineral mining, processing, refining, and reprocessing, after receiving testimony from Steven M. Fortier, Director, National Minerals Information Center, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; Scott Melbye, Uranium Producers of America, Corpus Christi, Texas; Julie Padilla, Twin Metals Minnesota, St. Paul; Abigail Wulf, Securing America's Future Energy, Washington, D.C.; and Paul Ziemkiewicz, West Virginia University, Morgantown.

TRADE POLICY AGENDA

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's 2022 trade policy agenda, after receiving testimony from Katherine Tai, U.S. Trade Representative.

CHINA'S ROLE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues concluded a hearing to examine China's role in Latin America and the Caribbean, after receiving testimony from Kerri Hannan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs; Peter Natiello, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Latin American and Caribbean Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development; Andrew Herscowitz, Chief Development Officer, U.S. International Development Finance Corporation; and Margaret Myers, Inter-American Dialogue, and R. Evan Ellis, Center for Strategic and International Studies, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Derek Kan, of California, and Daniel Mark Tangherlini, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

PREVENTING TRAGEDIES

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine preventing tragedies and promoting safe, accessible, and affordable homes, after receiving testimony from Anand K. Parekh, Bipartisan Policy Center, Washington, D.C.; Denise Cleveland-Leggett, The Integral Group, Atlanta, Georgia; Tracey Kelly, IKEA USA, Trappe, Pennsylvania; and Janet McGee, Parents Against Tip-overs, Eagan, Minnesota.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 47 public bills, H.R. 7307–7353; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 83–84; and H. Res. 1018–1019, were introduced. **Pages H4071–73**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4074–75**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 1017, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3617) to decriminalize and deschedule

cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–285);

H.R. 1218, to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–286); and

H.R. 2501, to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the Federal Communications Commission to update the memorandum of understanding on spectrum coordination, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–287).

Page H4071

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cárdenas to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H4009

Recess: The House recessed at 11:44 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H4020

Affordable Insulin Now Act: The House passed H.R. 6883, to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 232 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 102.

Pages H4033–46, H4053–55

Rejected the Bucshon motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce by a yeas-and-nays vote of 197 yeas to 225 nays, Roll No. 101.

Pages H4053–54

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–38, modified by the amendment printed in part C of H. Rept. 117–285, shall be considered as adopted.

Page H4033

H. Res. 1017, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3617) and (H.R. 6883) was agreed to by a yeas-and-nays vote of 219 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 99, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 219 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 98.

Pages H4023–33

America Creating Opportunities for Manufacturing, Pre-Eminence in Technology, and Economic Strength Act of 2022: The House agreed to the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 351 yeas to 74 nays, Roll No. 100.

Pages H4046–53

Member Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Vela, wherein he resigned as Representative for the Thirty-Fourth Congressional District of Texas, effective at 11:59 p.m. today, March 31, 2022.

Page H4055

Senate Referrals: S. 442 was held at the desk. S. 3969 was held at the desk.

Pages H4009–10

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on pages H4009–10.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yeas-and-nays votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4031–32, H4032–33, H4053, H4053–54, and H4054–55.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

STATE OF THE CFTC

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “State of the CFTC”. Testimony was heard from Rostin Behnam, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Health and Human Services. Testimony was heard from Xavier Becerra, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

MILITARY PRIVATIZED FAMILY HOUSING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held an oversight hearing on Military Privatized Family Housing. Testimony was heard from Cody Calderon, Private First Class, U.S. Army; Patricia Coury, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Housing, Department of Defense; Elizabeth A. Field, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

UPDATES ON MODERNIZATION OF CONVENTIONAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled “Updates on Modernization of Conventional Ammunition Production”. Testimony was heard from Douglas R. Bush, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (ASA(ALT)), Department of the Army; General Edward M. Daly, U.S. Army, Commanding General, Army Materiel Command; Brigadier General William M. Boruff, U.S. Army, Program Executive Officer, Joint Program Executive Office, Armaments and Ammunition; Brigadier General Gavin J. Gardner, U.S. Army, Commanding General, Joint Munitions Command; and public witnesses.

POSTURE AND READINESS OF THE MOBILITY ENTERPRISE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittees on Seapower and Projection Forces; and Subcommittee on Readiness held a joint hearing entitled “Posture and Readiness of the Mobility Enterprise”. Testimony was heard from General Jacqueline D. Van Ovost, U.S. Air Force, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, Department of Defense; and Lucinda Lessley, Acting Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

CONNECTING AMERICA: OVERSIGHT OF THE FCC

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled “Connecting America: Oversight of the FCC”. Testimony was heard from the following Federal Communications Commission officials: Jessica Rosenworcel, Chairwoman; Brendan Carr, Commissioner; Geoffrey Starks, Commissioner; and Nathan Simington, Commissioner.

THE END OF OVERDRAFT FEES? EXAMINING THE MOVEMENT TO ELIMINATE THE FEES COSTING CONSUMERS BILLIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Consumer Protections and Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled “The End of Overdraft Fees? Examining the Movement to Eliminate the Fees Costing Consumers Billions”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN: EXAMINING U.S. INTERESTS AND REGIONAL COOPERATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism; and Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment, and Cyber held a joint hearing entitled “Opportunities and Challenges in the Eastern Mediterranean: Examining U.S. Interests and Regional Cooperation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROGRESS AND PRESENT CHALLENGES ON COVID-19 IN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Global Human Rights held a hearing entitled “Progress and Present Challenges on COVID-19 in Africa”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY’S EFFORTS TO COUNTER UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability; and Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security held a joint hearing entitled “Assessing the Department of Homeland Security’s Efforts to Counter Unmanned Aircraft Systems”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Homeland Security officials: Samantha Vinograd, Acting Assistant Secretary for Counterterrorism and Threat Prevention, Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans; Rear Admiral Scott W. Clendenin, Assistant Commandant for Response Policy, U.S. Coast Guard; Austin Gould, Acting Executive Assistant Administrator for Requirements and Capabilities Analysis, Transportation Security Administration; and Dennis Michelini, Deputy Executive Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

EXAMINING CIVIL RIGHTS LITIGATION REFORM, PART 1: QUALIFIED IMMUNITY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Examining Civil Rights Litigation Reform, Part 1: Qualified Immunity”. Testimony was heard from Jon O. Newman, Senior Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; and public witnesses.

BENEFITS OF THE LEGACY POLLUTION CLEAN-UP PROGRAMS IN THE BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE LAW

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Benefits of the Legacy Pollution Clean-Up Programs in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law”. Testimony was heard from Steven H. Feldgus, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior; Uduak-Joe Ntuk, State Oil and Gas Supervisor, California Geologic Energy Management Division, California Department of Conservation, California Natural Resources Agency; John Baza, Director, Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, Department of Natural Resources, Utah; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing on H.R. 4715, the “Quapaw Tribal Landowner Settlement Act of 2021”; H.R. 5715, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund,

and for other purposes; and H.R. 6707, the “Advancing Equality for Wabanaki Nations Act”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Grijalva and Representative Golden; and public witnesses.

FOLLOW THE MONEY: TACKLING IMPROPER PAYMENTS

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Follow the Money: Tackling Improper Payments”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE NEW NORMAL: PREPARING FOR AND ADAPTING TO THE NEXT PHASE OF COVID-19

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing entitled “The New Normal: Preparing for and Adapting to the Next Phase of COVID-19”. Testimony was heard from Karen Ayala, Executive Director, DuPage County Board of Health, Illinois; and public witnesses.

SKILL, UPSKILL, AND RESKILL: ANALYZING NEW INVESTMENTS IN WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Workforce Development held a hearing entitled “Skill, Upskill, and Reskill: Analyzing New Investments in Workforce Development”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HELPING VETERANS THRIVE: THE IMPORTANCE OF PEER SUPPORT IN PREVENTING DOMESTIC VIOLENT EXTREMISM

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Helping Veterans Thrive: The Importance of Peer Support in Preventing Domestic Violent Extremism”. Testimony was heard from Chris Buckley, Veteran, U.S. Army; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations, hearing entitled “FY23 Hearing to Review Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, Full Committee, hearing entitled “America’s Natural Solutions: The Climate Benefits of Investing in Healthy Ecosystems”, 9:30 a.m., HVC-210 and Zoom.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, April 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, April 1

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 3617—Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Alma S., N.C., E327
 Beyer, Donald S., Jr., Va., E329
 Brady, Kevin, Tex., E329
 Carl, Jerry L., Ala., E328
 Castor, Kathy, Fla., E334
 Clyburn, James E., S.C., E329
 Davis, Danny K., Ill., E331
 Davis, Rodney, Ill., E334
 Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E330, E335

Emmer, Tom, Minn., E331
 Escobar, Veronica, Tex., E333
 Fallon, Pat, Tex., E334
 Garamendi, John, Calif., E329, E336
 Garcia, Sylvia R., Tex., E332
 Hill, J. French, Ark., E332, E336
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E327, E329, E330, E333, E336
 Jacobs, Chris, N.Y., E330
 Jones, Mondaire, N.Y., E327
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E333, E337
 McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E331

Mfume, Kweisi, Md., E335
 Morelle, Joseph D., N.Y., E327
 Nehls, Troy E., Tex., E331
 Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E332, E336
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E327, E328, E330, E331, E334, E336
 San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E332
 Speier, Jackie, Calif., E328
 Williams, Nikema, Ga., E329



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.