



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022

No. 153

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Holy God, we know that You desire to set Your truth deep in our spirits, and we ask that You come to the hidden places of our hearts. Deepen Your truth in our souls. Speak to us there and teach us wisdom.

Create in us clean hearts. Fill our minds with pure thoughts and holy desires. Then may we be found ready and willing to do the work You put before us.

Delight in us today. May the words of our mouths, the thoughts in our heads, and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable to You.

For Your pleasure is not to be found in our performance. Our sacrifice of time and service do not impress You. But You desire a contrite heart, a yielding spirit, a kind word, and a gracious attitude.

Lord, unlock our hearts and open our lips that from them will pour out thankfulness and praise. Then may our joy be a blessing to those whom we encounter this day.

In Your gracious name, we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLOOD 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118, BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5768, VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6448, INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8542, MENTAL HEALTH JUSTICE ACT OF 2022

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1377 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1377

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4118) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes. 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) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5768) to direct the Attorney Gen-

eral to establish a grant program to establish, create, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, 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 117-62, modified by the amendment printed in 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) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6448) to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. 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 117-65 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) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8542) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond

□ 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.

H8069

in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes. 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) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DEMINGS). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam 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. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1377, providing for consideration of four measures: H.R. 4118, H.R. 6448; H.R. 5768, and H.R. 8542, all under closed rules.

For H.R. 4118 and H.R. 6448, the rule provides 30 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary for each bill and motions to recommit for each measure.

For H.R. 5768, the rule provides 30 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman NADLER, and provides a motion to recommit.

For H.R. 8542, the bill provides 30 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, Democrats in this Congress have been focused on building safer communities since day one. We believe that every child in America deserves the safety and security of growing up in a community free from violence, trusting that the people who keep them safe will do that regardless of the color of their skin or the ZIP Code that they live in. We believe that the need to fight crime and improve safety in our communities should unite us, not divide us.

These are good bills that we are considering today that will make our communities safer.

The Mental Health Justice Act creates a grant program for States and local governments to train and dispatch mental health professionals to respond to emergencies that involve people with behavioral needs.

The VICTIM Act establishes a grant program to hire, train, and retain detectives and victim services personnel to investigate shootings and support victims.

The Break the Cycle of Violence Act provides grants to communities for evidence-based community violence intervention and prevention programs designed to interrupt cycles of violence.

The Invest to Protect Act creates a grant program to provide police departments of fewer than 125 officers training resources for calls involving people with substance use disorders, mental health needs, and for people with disabilities.

I am glad that we are moving forward today. I am thankful to my colleagues who have worked on these bills.

Do I want more?

Of course.

Will I keep fighting for us to do more?

Absolutely.

The truth is we still haven't made meaningful gains when it comes to accountability. The House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. Sadly, the Senate is yet to act on that bill.

But I don't want the perfect to be the enemy of the good, and if you don't like what is in one of these bills or all of them, then you can vote against them. But I strongly urge everybody on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on the rule so we can at least move this forward and have the opportunity to debate these measures.

I am confident that many of the provisions of these four bills will help save lives. But this conversation can't end here. We need to keep making our communities safer in new, innovative, and imaginative ways. We can start by passing this rule and passing the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I thank the Representative and my colleague on the Rules Committee from Massachusetts for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this morning we are here to debate a rule providing for a series of bills that have been noticed multiple times going back as far as July. But we in the Rules Committee were given 1 hour to consider the changes that have been negotiated—negotiated internally—within the majority conference with no minority input. Presumably, the changes were made at the behest of the leftwing defund-the-police activists who, unfortunately, have become the loudest voice in their party.

It seems to me that these bills are a very transparent response to the nega-

tive reaction Democrats have experienced as a result of these continued calls while crime is understandably skyrocketing.

The VICTIM Act creates a new Federal grant program to help local governments cut down on homicide and nonfatal shooting backlogs. The funds can be used for hiring and training detectives and processing personnel, upgrading or replacing investigative or evidence-processing technology, and improving resources for victims and their families.

First of all, these programs largely replicate existing programs managed by the Department of Justice. This, again, reminds us of why we have been called to this debate. It is not to solve a problem. It is so that my Democrat colleagues can look like they are solving problems. Furthermore, programs like this would not be needed if the left had not prioritized defunding the police over keeping our country's citizens safe.

This bill effectively bails out governments like Austin, Philadelphia, and Rochester, New York, that decreased police budgets over the years.

The Invest to Protect Act expands COPS grant programs to include police departments with fewer than 125 law enforcement officers. Funds may be used for training, body cameras, signing and retention bonuses, and providing access to mental health services.

Just to point out, there is a clause in this bill that explicitly says that the Attorney General can give preference to activities that have nothing to do with recruitment or retention.

Madam Speaker, the left has been actively fighting against law enforcement, and, as a result, the American people are angry. They are angry about the increases in violent crimes across the country, and they are angry about repeat offenders being released to commit even more serious crimes.

□ 0915

They are angry that even after making these concerns clear, Democrats have been ignoring them in favor of an extreme anti-police agenda. This is a last-ditch effort for them to act like they are not deeply out of touch with the country, coming just in time to see the results from election polling.

This is an effort to sweep under the rug that my colleagues in the majority will seek private security while simultaneously seeking cuts to police budgets. My colleagues in the majority want to distract from the statements of their Members that apparently defunding the police is only one step toward fully dismantling police departments.

My colleagues want to distract from the fact that even some of the most senior officials of the Biden administration are echoing or applauding efforts to reduce budgets of law enforcement. Despite this hollow effort, I am confident the American people see

right through this charade and view this for what it is, a political exercise.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I have great respect for my colleague from Minnesota and appreciate serving with her on the Rules Committee, but I think the only talk about politics here is from the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

She talks about defunding the police. The bills that are before us are grant programs. So I am not sure what she is talking about. If you want to talk about politics, fine, let's talk about voting records.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Washington Post article titled "21 House Republicans vote against awarding Congressional Gold Medal to all police officers who responded on January 6."

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 2022]
21 HOUSE REPUBLICANS VOTE AGAINST AWAR-
DING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ALL
POLICE OFFICERS WHO RESPONDED ON JAN. 6
(By Felicia Sonmez)

Twenty-one House Republicans on Tuesday voted against awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to all police officers who responded to the Jan. 6 violent attack on the Capitol by a pro-Trump mob.

The measure passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support from 406 lawmakers. But the 21 Republicans who voted "no" drew immediate condemnation from some of their colleagues, and the vote underscored the lingering tensions in Congress amid efforts by some GOP lawmakers to whitewash the events of that day.

Rep. Robert C. "Bobby" Scott (D-Va.) called the "no" votes "a sad commentary on the @HouseGOP," while Rep. Adam Kinzinger (R-Ill.) declared, "How you can vote no to this is beyond me."

"Then again, denying an insurrection is as well," Kinzinger, a vocal critic of former president Donald Trump, said in a tweet. "To the brave Capitol (and DC metro PD) thank you. To the 21: they will continue to defend your right to vote no anyway."

In an interview on CNN Tuesday night, Rep. Gerald E. Connolly (D-Va.) called the 21 "no" votes "a new low for this crowd."

"They voted to overturn an election. But in their vote today, they kind of sealed the deal of basically affiliating with the mob," Connolly said. "They now are part of the insurrectionist mob. They brought enormous disrepute and dishonor on themselves in not honoring the brave men and women who defended the Capitol of the United States—everybody in it, but also defending the symbol of democracy in the world, not just here in the United States."

In March, when an initial version of the legislation was brought to the House floor, a dozen Republicans voted against the measure. Many of those who voted "no" said they objected to the use of the term "insurrectionists" in the resolution.

Those GOP lawmakers included Reps. Andy Biggs (Ariz.), Thomas Massie (Ky.), Andy Harris (Md.), Lance Gooden (Tex.), Matt Gaetz (Fla.), Marjorie Taylor Greene (Ga.), Louie Gohmert (Tex.), Michael Cloud (Tex.), Andrew S. Clyde (Ga.), Greg Steube (Fla.), Bob Good (Va.) and John Rose (Tenn.).

The House and Senate then remained in a standoff for three months over whether to

honor all law enforcement who responded on Jan. 6 or to award the Congressional Gold Medal to one officer in particular, Capitol Police Officer Eugene Goodman, who single-handedly diverted an angry mob away from the Senate chamber.

The Senate had already unanimously voted to give the Gold Medal exclusively to Goodman. The medal, bestowed by Congress, is a symbol of national appreciation for distinguished achievements.

Ultimately, both chambers agreed to slightly modify the House legislation. Four Gold Medals will be awarded: one for the Capitol Police, one for the D.C. police, another for the Smithsonian Institution and another to be displayed inside the Capitol building along with a plaque that names all law enforcement agencies who helped repel the rioters that day.

On Tuesday, Gooden, one of the 12 House Republicans who voted against the legislation in March, voted in favor of the new bill.

But the number of opposing votes grew, with 10 other House Republicans switching their votes from "yes" to "no."

Those Republicans are Reps. Lauren Boebert (Colo.), Barry Moore (Ala.), Ralph Norman (S.C.), Matthew M. Rosendale (Mont.), Chip Roy (Tex.), Paul A. Gosar (Ariz.), Warren Davidson (Ohio), Scott Perry (Pa.), Jody Hice (Ga.) and Mary Miller (Ill.).

Some of those who voted "no" on Tuesday said they objected to the use of the words "temple" or "insurrection" in the resolution.

"I wouldn't call it an insurrection," Greene said, according to Politico.

Some House Republicans, such as Clyde, have sought to recast the violent mob's actions on Jan. 6 as little different from a "normal tourist visit" to the Capitol. Others have sought to play down that day's events in different ways.

During the storming of the Capitol on Jan. 6, rioters attempted to break into the House chamber, punching and busting glass, resulting in the death of Ashli Babbitt, whom police shot when she attempted to climb through a shattered glass door.

Gosar has previously claimed that Babbitt had been "executed"—even though she defied police warnings and the officer who fatally shot her was cleared of any criminal wrongdoing.

Gosar did so again Tuesday, claiming during a House hearing that a Capitol Police officer was "lying in wait" for Babbitt and that she was "executed," Politico reported.

Rep. Liz Cheney (R-Wyo.), who was ousted from House Republican leadership over her criticism of Trump's role in the Jan. 6 insurrection, denounced Gosar's remarks Tuesday evening.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, you heard that right: 21 of our colleagues across the aisle opposed a simple bill honoring the heroes of January 6; officers who now bear physical and psychological scars from that day because they fought to protect us in the Capitol. It is disgraceful. Yet, nothing about that from the other side of the aisle in terms of just how disgraceful that was.

You can talk politics, but if you want to talk about the substance of these bills, then do so and acknowledge what they are. They are bills that will help make our community safer. They are bills that, quite frankly—I should also point out that I think all but one of the bills is the same as they were in July.

I am not quite sure what the fuss over the fact that we are bringing

these things up right now is all about. They are good bills that will help make our community safer. Look, I trust that we pass the rule. Some thoughtful Republicans will vote in favor of some of them or all of them.

If you don't believe that this is an appropriate thing to do, then you can vote "no." That is your right, and you can go home and explain it to your constituents.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I believe it is two bills that are different, but we can check on that just to make sure that we understand what is going on.

To further illustrate the political charade, my colleagues in the majority have blocked any effort to include thoughtful policy solutions proposed by House Republicans.

In the Rules Committee, I even offered a motion to consider a bill I proposed earlier this year to support our law enforcement's efforts to train our next generation of peace officers. H.R. 7421, the Law Enforcement Education Grant Program Act of 2022, was a product of discussions with Minnesota State patrol officers and other members of the local community regarding the difficulty of not only hiring new officers but even finding potential recruits.

Police departments across the country are experiencing a serious shortage of officers. This lack of qualified officers has led to a drastic increase in crime. We need to invest in recruiting a number of well-trained and highly educated police officers to help keep our communities safe.

This bill provides education grants of up to \$4,000 per year, not exceeding \$16,000 total, to a student who is pursuing their first degree in a law enforcement or criminal justice-related field. As a requirement of receiving the grant, the applicant must commit to serving as a full-time law enforcement officer for 4 years within an 8-year period of completing their studies.

In order to instill integrity of the program and prevent abuse, if an applicant fails to complete their service requirements, the grants will be converted back into a loan and the applicant will be required to pay it back.

In order to ensure flexibility over what education program best fits the student, the grants are distributed directly to candidates, not educational institutions. In addition, the curriculum at an institution must have been approved by the State's Police Officer Standard and Training Board, or the related State agency.

Finally, there are exemptions from the clawback bill for officers who are injured in the line of duty and cannot serve out their 4-year requirement. These are the types of solutions that the majority refuses to even debate or bring forward under this rule. It further supports my argument that this is

simply political theatre, covering up for years of dangerous and irresponsible rhetoric that has put law enforcement in harm's way time and time again.

I would just like to add that there are many, many good and positive Republican proposals out there that the majority refuses to even consider in committee, and this is just one example of those.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, just for the record, because I think it is important to have an accurate record, the text of three of these bills has been available for over a month. Even the manager's amendment on the VICTIM Act of 2022, which the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) has introduced has been available for almost a month.

Again, the only one talking about politics is the gentlewoman from Minnesota, but I guess that is all they have.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of the VICTIM Act of 2022 from the National Association of Police Organizations, from the National Fraternal Order of Police, from the International Association of Chiefs of Police, from the National Police Foundation, all in support of the VICTIM Act.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, June 14, 2022.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), representing over 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers across the United States, I am writing to advise you of our support for the Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods (VICTIM) Act, H.R. 5768, and thank the Committee for considering this legislation.

Our nation's cities and communities are experiencing a historic rise in violent crime. Murders and non-fatal shootings are going unresolved at higher rates as law enforcement agencies do not have the officers and resources to dedicate to improving clearance rates for these horrendous crimes. The VICTIM Act will help address this issue by supplying much needed grant funding to agencies to fill, replenish, train, and support their detective and homicide personnel. Through this legislation, law enforcement will be able to focus on solving these violent crimes that have such a detrimental impact on our communities and improve the services that they render to victims.

We urge the Committee to join us in support of the VICTIM Act and we look forward to working with you to ensure law enforcement agencies have the support and resources necessary to serve and protect our communities.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, Esq.,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington DC, 13 June 2022.

Hon. JERROLD L. NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES D. JORDAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES NADLER AND JORDAN: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 5768, the "Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods (VICTIM) Act" and H.R. 6528, the "Active Shooter Alert Act" and to urge the Committee to favorably report these bills.

In 2020, the United States saw the largest rise in homicides since the start of national record-keeping in 1960. Approximately 21,570 people were murdered in the United States in 2020—the most since 1995—and a 29.4 percent increase over 2019. Additionally, the FBI estimates that 77 percent of all murders in the United States in 2020 were via firearms, up from 73 percent in 2019. At the same time that the murder rate rose, the clearance rate for murders fell significantly, from 61.4 percent in 2019 to 54.4 percent in 2020. In cities with a population above 250,000, the rate was even more dramatic, falling from 57.6 percent in 2019 to 47.3 percent in 2020.

Homicide cases can be very difficult to clear—especially those committed via a firearm—and non-fatal shootings even more so. Closing these types of crimes requires diligence, manpower, and a sustained investigative effort. Given the limited resources of law enforcement agencies, it's important to provide the significant, dedicated resources that clearing these crimes requires, especially given their oftentimes heinous nature.

The VICTIM Act would establish a grant program administered by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to help State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies improve their clearance rates for homicides and non-fatal shootings. Agencies can use these grant funds to train or hire additional detectives, investigators, or other police personnel that can investigate, solve, and respond to homicides and non-fatal shootings. The grants can also be used to improve training for agency personnel to address the needs of victims and family members of homicides and non-fatal shootings.

These important resources would improve law enforcement agencies' abilities to close homicide cases, which would punish the perpetrators of these crimes, provide justice for the victims and their families, and grant peace of mind for communities and the dedicated law enforcement officers that serve them.

Active shooter events, however, are not like normal firearms homicides cases. Rather than focusing on investigative methods after the fact, these kinds of events place a premium on the abilities of law enforcement to quickly react to a fluid and oftentimes unclear situation. Responding to an active shooter event is chaotic and can be fraught with peril, especially when the incident is not confined to one location. Law enforcement officers must prioritize preserving lives and ending the threat. Simultaneously, they need a way to notify the public about the incident, whether that is to avoid a certain area, shelter in place, or announce when the area is once again safe. The "Active Shooter Alert Act" is designed to improve the ways officers and agencies communicate with the public about active threats.

The bill would establish a national coordinator within the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to set up and administer an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network.

The Active Shooter Alert Coordinator, in coordination with other Federal components like the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), would develop best practices and training on the use of a secure communications system during an active shooter event. We believe as you all do—having a network for informing the public during these critical incidents will save lives.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I am proud to offer our support for these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
CHIEFS OF POLICE,
Alexandria, VA, June 14, 2022.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: On behalf of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 5768, the Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act of 2021" (VICTIM Act). By providing dedicated resources to law enforcement agencies to enhance their abilities to successfully investigate violent criminal acts, the VICTIM Act will bring justice to victims, remove violent offenders from our communities and bring closure to families.

Specifically, the VICTIM Act would, through a newly established a Department of Justice grant program, provide state, tribal and local law enforcement agencies with much needed resources to assist them in enhancing their investigatory capabilities. This includes allowing agencies to:

- hire and retain detectives to investigate homicide and non-fatal shootings;
- acquire resources for processing evidence, including the hiring of additional personnel;
- hire personnel trained to analyze criminal intelligence and crime trends;
- ensure victim services are sufficiently staffed, funded, and trained.

The IACP urges the Judiciary Committee and the members of the United States House of Representative to support and approve H.R. 5768.

Sincerely,

CHIEF DWIGHT E. HENNINGER,
IACP President.

NATIONAL POLICE FOUNDATION,
February 18, 2022.

Hon. VAL DEMINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. DEMINGS: I write on behalf of the National Police Foundation to enthusiastically support H.R. 5768, the VICTIM Act. The National Police Foundation is an independent and nonpartisan organization dedicated to advancing policing through innovation and science.

Many communities across America are dealing with increases in crime or concerns over their continued safety. In many places, violent crime and shootings have increased exponentially.

The grants authorized in the VICTIM Act will help law enforcement agencies overcome some of the challenges associated with responding to the current increase in violent crime. More specifically, this bill will provide law enforcement with critical resources

to address staffing challenges, enhance their forensics capabilities, further deploy investigative technologies, and provide services to victims of violent crime and their families.

Thank you for your continued leadership and support for America's law enforcement officers and all the people they serve. We look forward to seeing this bill become law and the resources getting into the hands of law enforcement where they are so critically needed. We commend you and the other sponsors for your commitment to funding the police and giving them the tools they need to protect and serve.

Sincerely,

JIM BURCH,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to my colleague that they are supporting this legislation not because of politics, they are supporting it because they think it is actually good for our communities and will make our communities safer.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Forbes article titled "Trump Loyalists' Calls To Defund the FBI, and Other Hypocrisies."

[From Forbes, Aug. 12, 2022]

TRUMP LOYALISTS' CALLS TO DEFUND THE
FBI, AND OTHER HYPOCRISIES

(By Shaun Harper)

Federal Bureau of Investigation agents executed a warrant to search former U.S. President Donald Trump's Mar-a-Lago estate in Palm Beach, Florida this week. They were reportedly looking for classified documents that weren't supposed to leave the White House during the presidential transition. Materials for which the FBI was looking apparently have national security implications. In a press conference yesterday, Attorney General Merrick Garland said he "personally approved" the search of Trump's home.

Shockingly and ironically, many Trump loyalists are calling for the FBI to be defunded.

Following the police-executed murders of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor in 2020, Black Lives Matter activists and other Americans called for a defunding of police departments across the country. Trump, most of his supporters, and several others fiercely rejected this proposal. They praised law enforcement officers and advanced what became known as the "Blue Lives Matter" campaign. There was occasional acknowledgment that a small number of bad apples sometimes engage in bad behaviors. But systemic racism in policing? Absolutely not. Opponents of the defund the police movement loudly applauded the bravery, sacrifice, and integrity of law enforcement officers.

Trump supporters who opposed defunding the police two years ago are now calling for the FBI, a law enforcement agency, to be defunded. Among them is Florida Republican congressional candidate Anthony Sabatini, who in a CNN interview deemed the FBI "totally useless." He also wants FBI agents to be arrested.

Garland, our nation's top cop, "needs to be assassinated," one person who may (or may not) be a Trump supporter tweeted. This is just one of many social media posts this week calling for violence against the Attorney General and the FBI. Ricky Shiffer, an armed man who allegedly fired into an FBI office building with a nail gun and was armed with an AR-15-style rifle, was killed following a car chase and standoff with law enforcement officers in Cincinnati yesterday. Shiffer was allegedly part of pro-Trump

extremist groups that attacked the U.S. Capitol last year.

The hypocrisy over opposing defunding the police in 2020, but calling for the FBI to be defunded now, is clear—though not at all atypical. Trump loyalists have done versions of this before.

"Lock her up," they chanted, as 2016 Democratic Presidential nominee Hillary Clinton was accused of storing classified information on private, unencrypted email servers in her home. Paradoxically, a version of this is why FBI agents searched Trump's Florida estate this week.

The same group that reached determinations of Clinton's guilt before, during, and after the investigation of her swiftly determined that the FBI is wrong about Trump and should therefore be defunded.

Another example are the "My Body, My Choice" posters that many Trump supporters carried during rallies held throughout the pandemic to oppose masking and vaccine mandates. That phrase had been long used in pro-choice demonstrations. Most Trump supporters aren't pro-choice, right?

The opposition of President Barack Obama nominating Merrick Garland for the Supreme Court seat that became vacant eight months prior to the 2016 election is a third example of hypocrisy. Trump supporters and other GOP members successfully argued that an outgoing president shouldn't have the authority to nominate a new justice to the Court with so little time remaining in his tenure. Yet, many of those same politicians and other conservatives were fully on board with Trump nominating Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court just 38 days before the 2020 presidential election.

And then there is the racialized double standard that played out in the January 6 Capitol Insurrection. On June 1, 2020, a group of mostly peaceful demonstrators gathered near the White House to protest George Floyd's murder. They killed no one and did no damage to the White House or any other federal building. But Trump still called in the National Guard to aggressively remove them from the streets. His supporters defunded the president's decision. Just six months later, hundreds of angry Trump loyalists, most of them white, violently attacked the U.S. Capitol. Their actions resulted in five deaths and the injuries of 140 law enforcement officers.

The inescapably obvious role that race played in the January 6 insurrection hasn't been talked about much, if at all, in the recent congressional hearings. Had Black Americans attacked the Capitol, I am certain that Trump supporters, as well as other conservatives and liberals alike, would have reached near-unanimous agreement on what happened that day and the necessary legal repercussions. I also remain convinced that most Black protestors would have been immediately killed had they scaled and otherwise violently entered any federal building, let alone the one in which Vice President Mike Pence and congresspersons were meeting at the time. Trump and his loyalists surely would've argued those Black insurrectionists deserved whatever law enforcement officers did to them that day, hence the hypocrisy.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I remind my Republican colleagues that just last month a number of them openly and unabashedly messaged around defunding and dismantling the FBI. Some even sold campaign merchandise with that tagline. Let that sink in, I would say to my colleagues.

In any event, pass the rule. Let's have the debate on these bills. If you

want to promote safer communities, then you will support them. If you want to just do politics as usual, then you will follow the lead of my colleague from Minnesota and vote against them.

Madam Speaker, these are good bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts says, oh, these were available; these were available for over a month.

Then my question would be: Then why the emergency meeting yesterday? Why, with an hour's notice, the Rules Committee is called together to push these bills through, other than some kind of political charade to get these bills to the floor today at 9 o'clock in the morning with very little notice?

It seems to me that as much as he says there are no changes, and that they have been available, still, an emergency meeting with an hour's notice at 3:25 in the afternoon yesterday, it seems like they are pushing things through without the notice that the American people and the Members of Congress deserve.

Our Nation's law enforcement officers put on a badge every day and bravely put themselves in harm's way to keep our communities safe. The past few years have been especially dangerous for America's police as a direct result of the Democrat-led defund the police movement, and their soft-on-crime policies.

Cities across the country have suffered a dramatic increase in crime. Carjacking and smash-and-grab robberies are now common. Last year, major cities broke their annual homicide records. The national rise in crime has devastating costs for the communities and, also, for local police.

In California, Kern County Deputy Sheriff Phillip Campas was killed in the line of duty after his SWAT team responded to a domestic violence call. He was a marine veteran and a dedicated father whose legacy of heroism will never be forgotten.

In New York, New York City Police Officer Vogel was seen running through Times Square toward an ambulance after saving a 4-year-old girl who had been struck by a stray bullet. The officer's bravery and quick thinking made all the difference in getting the girl to safety.

In Alabama, Wilcox County Constable Madison Nicholson, who had protected his community for over 40 years, was shot and killed in the line of duty when he and a sheriff's deputy were responding to a domestic disturbance.

Our police are under attack like never before. According to the FBI, more police officers were murdered in the line of duty during President Biden's first year in office than in any year since 1995. Many of them were killed in ambush-style or unprovoked attacks.

Not only have calls to defund, dismantle, or abolish the police that come from the activists, or even within the Halls of Congress, have created a more treacherous climate for officers, but it has also negatively impacted morale among the police.

Nationwide, law enforcement agencies are short 7 percent of filling budgeted positions, and retirements are up 45 percent. Law enforcement is our essential line of defense in maintaining law and order. They deserve America's and Congress' full support.

House Republicans are grateful to our law enforcement officers for their service to our communities and understand the incredible commitment they make in choosing to wear the uniform. We will always stand with our men and women in blue and their families.

House Democrats would like to use these bills to convince the American people of the same, but Americans know and understand.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for conceding that the text of three of the bills was available for a month. I am glad we could set the record straight on that.

The second thing I will say is that at least two of these bills have bipartisan cosponsorship. The VICTIM Act has four Republican cosponsors. The Invest to Protect Act has 24 Republican cosponsors. Maybe they didn't get the memo that they are supposed to put politics ahead of people, but the bottom line is they are cosponsors of this. I would expect, unless their arms are twisted, that they will vote for the bills on final passage.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 101 human rights, civil rights, racial justice, religiously affiliated, and gun safety organizations who wrote in support of Congressman HORSFORD's bill, H.R. 4118, the Break the Cycle of Violence Act. I think that is worth noting.

JULY 30, 2021.

We the undersigned 101 human rights, civil rights, racial justice, religiously affiliated and gun safety organizations write in support of the Break the Cycle of Violence Act (S. 2275/H.R. 4118). We urge you to swiftly pass the Break the Cycle of Violence Act to provide at least \$5 billion in federal funding over eight years for community gun violence prevention programs.

Gun violence in the U.S. is a crisis, disproportionately impacting Black and Brown communities nationwide. Gun homicides are the leading cause of death among Black men ages 15-34 and the second-leading cause of death for Latino men and boys of the same age range. Black men are more than ten times as likely to be the victims of gun homicides than white men. In 2019, 14,414 people died from gun homicides in the U.S. Nearly 60 percent—8,607—of gun homicide deaths were Black people. Yet Black people represent just 14.7 percent of the U.S. population.

With a surge in gun sales in the wake of COVID-19, shootings are increasing across

the U.S., contributing to the crisis. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there were 39,707 deaths in 2019, the most recent year for which government data is available with 14,414 of those being gun homicides. The Gun Violence Archive, a non-profit organization that tracks and documents gun injuries and deaths, published data in May 2021 indicating that the number of deaths in 2020 had risen to a staggering 43,554 with 19,398 of those being gun homicides.

Evidence-based, community violence prevention programs have been proven to reduce gun violence and save lives, while investing resources in impacted communities. There are three well-established models of gun violence prevention programs that have proven successful in reducing violence, some of which are referenced in both President Biden's executive actions and guidance and in the Break the Cycle of Violence Act. The Group Violence Intervention ("GVI") strategy, a form of problem-oriented policing (as opposed to traditional "incident-driven" policing), was first used in the enormously successful Operation Ceasefire in Boston in the mid-1990s where it was associated with a 61 percent reduction in youth homicide. The program has now been implemented in a wide variety of cities with consistently impressive results. An analysis of more than 20 GVI programs showed a significant reduction in firearm violence. The most successful of these programs have reduced violent crime in cities by an average of 30 percent and improved relations between law enforcement officers and the neighborhoods they serve. The GVI model has a remarkably strong track record: a documented association with homicide reductions of 30 to 60 percent.

A study of the Cure Violence model, first implemented in Chicago, found that its implementation in several targeted districts in Chicago was associated with a 38 percent greater decrease in homicides and a 15 percent greater decrease in shootings, compared to districts that did not receive the intervention. A 2018 evaluation of Philadelphia's Cure Violence Program found that shootings decreased significantly, compared to other matched comparison areas.

An example of Hospital Based Violence Intervention, the third model of evidence-based violence prevention programs, is the San Francisco Wraparound Project, first introduced in 2005. In its first six years of operation the Wraparound Project was associated with a fourfold decrease in injury recidivism (re-injury from gun-shot wounds) rates. Moreover, studies have shown that this form of intervention saves hospitals money by preventing future injuries, both for the patient and for anyone the patient may have considered retaliating against.

Investment, training, and support for culturally appropriate violence prevention workers with lived experience in impacted communities has proven successful in cities across the U.S., yet lack of political will has resulted in many advocates and community leaders working with limited or no resources.

For example, Lamar Johnson of B.R.A.V.E. Chicago, said: "Our after-school program is a non-profit—we run it through the church—and the funding comes mostly from private donors. The majority of the city's budget goes to law enforcement—and that's not just Chicago, that's most cities. We've met with mayors' administrations so many times and presented our case, but they don't give us funding. The whole system is so broken, because the focus is on the criminal justice system. If someone is addicted to drugs, they go to jail before they go to the hospital to get treatment. It's the mindset."

Recognizing the effectiveness of these programs and the heroic people like Lamar who

lead them, President Biden, on March 31, 2021, announced his intention to include \$5 billion for gun violence prevention programs in the American Jobs Plan. This builds on the efforts of Senator Booker and Representative Horsford to pass the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, first introduced in the 116th Congress. If passed, it would provide funding for federal grants to communities that experience 20 or more homicides per year and have a homicide rate at least twice the national average, or communities that demonstrate a unique and compelling need for additional resources to address gun and group-related violence. Each grant awarded would be renewable over five years, and funds would be commensurate with the scope of the proposal and the demonstrated need.

While it is impossible to place a dollar amount on a person's life or the cost of that loss to their families, communities, and loved ones, the astronomical financial impact of gun violence on U.S. society cannot be overlooked. According to a 2020 study by physicians and researchers, gun violence costs the U.S. healthcare system \$170 billion per year. The Health Alliance for Violence Intervention estimates it would cost an estimated \$827 million per year, or \$5.36 billion over eight years, to fund sustained and adequate violence intervention programs in the 48 U.S. cities with the highest rates of violence—hence the call on Congress to pass at least \$5 billion over eight years for community gun violence prevention programs.

With sustained investment into gun violence prevention programs and a national comprehensive strategy aimed at reducing gun violence, particularly in Black and Brown communities, Congress can make inroads to reducing gun violence in all communities and ensure the right of everyone to live free from the threat of gun violence. Congress has an obligation to take action to invest in communities ravaged by gun violence and to make efforts to prevent gun violence and protect the lives and safety of all individuals, particularly in the face of evidence that the 2020 gun-related injury and death tolls in the U.S. have been the highest in decades.

We urge Congress to act urgently to pass the Break the Cycle of Violence Act to ensure at least \$5 billion in federal funding over eight years for community gun violence prevention programs that save lives.

Sincerely,

Amnesty International USA, Community Justice Action Fund, ACLU, African American Ministers in Action, Ban Assault Weapons Now!, Brady, BRAVE Youth Leaders, Ceasefire Oregon, Ceasefire Pennsylvania, Center for American Progress, The Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, CommonSpirit Health, Congregation of Sisters of St. Agnes and the CSA-USA Associate Community Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace, CT Against Gun Violence.

Dominican Sisters of Houston, Dominican Sisters—Grand Rapids, Dominican Sisters of Sinsinawa, Everytown for Gun Safety, First Unitarian Universalist Church of Houston, Franciscan Action Network, Franciscan Peace Center, Franciscan Sisters of the Sacred Heart, Generation Progress, Giffords, GPEC-ICHV, Grandmothers Against Gun Violence, Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart, Gun Violence Prevention PAC Illinois, The Health Alliance for Violence Intervention, Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters, USA-JPIC.

Honor with Action Coalition, Houston League of Business & Professional Women, IHM Sisters—Justice, Peace and Sustainability Office, Indivisible Northern Nevada, Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Intercommunity Peace and Justice Center, Iowans for Gun Safety, Jewish Women International, www.Journey4ward.org, Leadership

Conference of Women Religious, Leadership Team of the Pelican Sisters of North America, March for Our Lives DC, Marylanders to Prevent Gun Violence, Massachusetts Coalition to Prevent Gun Violence, Moms Demand Action.

NAACP, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Newtown Action Alliance, Newtown Junior Action Alliance, Non-violence Institute of Rhode Island, North Carolina Council of Churches, North Carolinians Against Gun Violence, Northwest Coalition for Responsible Investment, Not My Generation, Ohio Coalition Against Gun Violence, People for a Safer Society, Presentation Sisters, San Francisco, CA, Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association, Region VI Coalition for Responsible Investment, Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, Western American Area.

Restoration Ministries, Inc., Rhode Island Coalition Against Gun Violence, Sacred Ground Ministries, Saint Mark's Episcopal Capitol Hill DC, San Diegans for Gun Violence Prevention, Sandy Hook Promise, School Sisters of Notre Dame-Atlantic Midwest Office, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Central Pacific Province, Sisters of Bon Secours, USA, Sisters of Charity, BVM, Sisters of Charity Federation, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth Congregational Leadership, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth Western Province Leadership, Sisters of Charity of Saint Augustine, Sisters of Mercy of the American Justice Team.

Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur USA, Sisters of St. Dominic of Blauvelt, New York, Sisters of St. Dominic Racine, WI, Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, Sisters of St. Joseph of Boston, Sisters of Saint Joseph of Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, PA, Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, LA, Sisters of St. Joseph of NW PA, Sisters of St. Mary of Namur, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of the Humility of Mary, Squirrel Hill Stands Against Gun Violence, Stop Handgun Violence, Students Demand Action, Survivors Lead.

Team Enough, Trinity Health, Union of Sisters of the Presentation of BVM, USA Unit, United Church of Christ, Justice and Local Church Ministries, Ursuline Sisters of Cleveland, Ursuline Sisters of Louisville, KY, Ursuline Sisters of Mount Saint Joseph, Wheaton Franciscans JPIC Office, Youth Advocate Programs, Inc, Youth Over Guns.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again I inserted earlier an article talking about the Republicans that would not even honor the men and women of the Capitol Police who defended us on January 6. I continue to believe that that was a disgraceful moment.

But when the gentlewoman says that somehow they will always stand on behalf and honor members of law enforcement—let me just read a few quotations here. Representative JEFF DUNCAN from South Carolina:

“The FBI has proven time and again that it is corrupt to the core. At what point do we abolish the Bureau and start over?”

Representative PAUL GOSAR of Arizona says:

“I will support a complete dismantling and elimination of the Democrat brownshirts known as the FBI. This is too much for our Republic to withstand.”

Representative LAUREN BOEBERT of Colorado:

“The GOP majority must defund all forms of tyranny throughout Biden's government. @FBI.”

Representative MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE of Georgia:

“Impeach Merrick Garland and defund the corrupt FBI. End political persecution and hold those accountable that abuse their positions of power to persecute their political enemies, while ruining our country. This shouldn't happen in America. Republicans must force it to stop.”

□ 0930

On MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE's website, she is selling defund the FBI T-shirts, so it is my friends on the other side of the aisle who want to defund law enforcement, who want to defund the police.

There is an old saying: Physician, heal thyself. You ought to take that to heart. The bottom line here is that these are bills that will help improve safety in our communities. These are bills that local officials, local law enforcement organizations, want. The only people who don't want them are my friends on the other side of the aisle.

If you want to vote no, vote no. But I suspect that some on the minority side understand what their communities want, and they don't want politics as usual. They don't want people putting politics over people. What they want is help for their communities.

You have a chance. You can either vote yes to help the communities or vote no. That is your choice.

Madam Speaker, I think these bills are good bills. We should support the rule. We should support the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Madam Speaker, for years now, progressives in the media have disparaged law enforcement at every opportunity, from the defund the police movement to agenda-driven liberal district attorneys in cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and New York. There is a clear strategic effort on the part of Democrats to demean police officers nationwide at the expense of law and order.

In 2021, according to the Fraternal Order of Police, 346 officers were shot, 63 fatally. Additionally, there were 103 ambush-style attacks on law enforcement, a 115 percent increase from 2020.

Even as members of the Democratic Party are victims of increasing crimes, they are unwavering in their aggression on those in uniform who stand on the front lines and every day protect and serve our communities. Rather than acknowledging and thanking these brave men and women, Democrats have repeatedly gone out of their way to put the blame on those in uniform.

They may claim otherwise, but here are the words straight from their

mouths. If we need to make sure that we are quoting people today, I am more than willing to do that.

“... Police in our country are more concerned with protecting white supremacy than serving the communities that pay their salaries.”—Representative BOWMAN.

“Defunding the police isn't radical. It is real.”—Representative CORI BUSH.

“The truth is that abolishing ICE isn't that radical. We reorganize government all the time, creating some agencies and eliminating others. Nevertheless, it is a bold proposal. It is time to be bold. It is time to abolish ICE.”—Representative MARK POCAN.

“The defund the police movement is one of reimagining the current police system to build an entity that does not violate us, while relocating funds to invest in community services.”—Representative ILHAN OMAR.

“Defunding police means defunding police.”—Representative ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ.

“We are spending too much money on the police. There should be substantial cuts to the police budget and a reallocation of those funds.”—Representative JERRY NADLER.

Now, they expect us to believe they support our law enforcement. They think that putting these bills forward will make the American people believe they care about law enforcement. It seems that it has taken them until now to see how out of touch they are with the American people.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have to tell you, I have spent 40 years in law enforcement, 12 as a sheriff, as you know, and I have to tell you, never in my life have I seen law enforcement more under attack in America than I have for the last 2½ years—never.

I know the dangers that they face out there every day. I have been there. I have done that. I have to tell you, the attempts by those across the aisle to delegitimize, to demoralize, and to defund our State and local law enforcement is atrocious and unforgivable.

I hope that, come November, the American public will hold accountable some of these folks that you just heard read out. I can tell you, I don't think they are popular at all with the American public. Yet, now, leading into the midterms, we are going to come together, and we are going to throw four bills onto the floor to address law enforcement and show that we are supportive of law enforcement. I can tell you three of these bills are off that point.

First of all, the Mental Health Justice Act, the VICTIM Act, and the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, these three bills, let's take them one at a time.

The Mental Health Justice Act will actually make it more dangerous for

law enforcement, make it more dangerous for our citizens. We are going to literally send mental health workers to respond to volatile situations where police officers, who are armed, go in and are killed oftentimes.

Mental health calls are some of the most dangerous calls that we handle, and we want to send civilians in lieu of law enforcement? I don't think so.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The idea that we are going to send civilians to do a law enforcement officer's job in quelling a dangerous, volatile situation is bad business.

The VICTIM Act does nothing. There is nothing new in the VICTIM Act. All it does is add to the programs that already exist in DOJ—not one single new idea in the VICTIM Act.

The Break the Cycle of Violence Act, first of all, comes with a very hefty price tag, \$6.5 billion, but all that money goes to public health government bureaucrats, not law enforcement.

Listen, our job in Congress is to provide effective assistance to our law enforcement men and women. These three acts do not do that. They simply do not achieve that goal.

I am glad, however, that my colleagues have finally decided that defunding the police is not a good idea, but I wish they would look at the appropriation bills where they are basically federally defunding law enforcement because they are putting all of these strings attached to all of our DOJ grants that go to small-, medium-, and large-sized agencies.

They are never going to be able to meet those standards, never going to be able to meet all of those standards. So, basically, we just federally defunded State and local law enforcement if that passes. I hope to God it doesn't.

Instead of these misguided policies, let's work together on some solutions. Help us hire and retain some of the best and brightest officers that we have.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on all three of these bills: the Mental Health Justice Act, the VICTIM Act, and the Break the Cycle of Violence Act. These will do nothing but endanger our law enforcement men and women.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleague from Minnesota said, if I am quoting it right, "They expect us to believe they support our law enforcement." I will be honest with you. I don't expect my colleagues to believe anything, but I expect them to read the bills and to decide whether or not, if you pass these

bills, they will help make our communities safer or not.

The gentleman from Florida didn't like three of the bills, but he likes one of the bills. The beauty of this rule is you will be able to vote on all of them, and you can vote no on the ones you don't like, and you can vote yes on the ones that you do like.

When we talk about how law enforcement has been under attack, I don't want to hear any lectures from my friends on the other side of the aisle. I went through a whole litany of Republican Members who were calling for defunding the FBI.

My friends have a Member on the Republican side who actually is selling defund the FBI T-shirts on her web page. It says, "Defund the FBI." It is defund the police. My colleagues don't seem to care much about that.

I will go back to something else that I still can't get out of my mind, and that was the vote on awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Capitol Police officers who saved the lives of everybody who was here that day, and 21 Republican Members voted no. That is a disgrace. That has brought shame on this institution.

So, don't lecture any of us about our support for law enforcement when 21 of the Members on the other side of the aisle voted no on a Congressional Gold Medal to honor the brave men and women who protected us in this Chamber on that day. Enough.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, with all due respect, potentially, my colleague from Massachusetts didn't hear some of the quotes that I read earlier, many of them talking about "defunding police means defunding police," Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ.

I can go back through them, or I certainly am more than happy to provide them in writing to my colleague, but I just wanted to remind him that, yes, there were many quotes that I read regarding Democrats and defunding the police.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles, one titled "Even Democrats are now admitting 'Defund the Police' was a massive mistake," and another titled "'Defund the Police' still haunts Democrats."

[From CNN Politics, Nov. 5, 2021]

EVEN DEMOCRATS ARE NOW ADMITTING 'DEFUND THE POLICE' WAS A MASSIVE MISTAKE

(By Chris Cillizza)

(CNN).—On Tuesday, a proposal to fundamentally restructure the Minneapolis police department in the wake of George Floyd's death in 2020 was soundly defeated, a setback that even many Democrats acknowledged could be laid at the feet of the "defund the police" movement that some within the party embraced last summer.

"I think allowing this moniker, 'Defund the police,' to ever get out there, was not a good thing," Minnesota Attorney General

Keith Ellison (D) told The Washington Post's Dave Weigel on Thursday.

That's a remarkable turnaround from how politicians—in and out of Minnesota—acted in the immediate aftermath of Floyd's death and the summer of nationwide protests that followed.

Nine members of the Minneapolis City Council appeared at an event in June 2020 in which they pledged that they would work to dismantle the police force in the city. They did so on a stage that featured large cutout letters spelling out "Defund Police."

"We committed to dismantling policing as we know it in the city of Minneapolis and to rebuild with our community a new model of public safety that actually keeps our community safe," City Council President Lisa Bender told CNN at the time.

That message was picked up by some of the most liberal members of Congress—from Minnesota's Ilhan Omar to Michigan's Rashida Tlaib.

New York Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, perhaps the best known progressive in Congress, warned that dismissing calls to defund the police—or, at the very least, to reconsider the way police interact with a community—was a mistake. "It is not crazy for Black and brown communities to want what White people have already given themselves and that is funding your schools more than you fund criminalizing your own kids," she said.

Even as liberal members (and the activist community) were pushing for the party to embrace the "defund the police" movement, others within the party were warning of the political dangers inherent in the slogan.

"This movement today, some people tried to hijack it," House Majority Whip Jim Clyburn (D-South Carolina), the highest ranking African American in Congress, warned his party, according to reporting in Politico. "Don't let yourselves be drawn into the debate about defunding police forces."

Clyburn's warning proved prophetic. Then-President Donald Trump seized on the issue during the 2020 campaign, casting it as evidence that Democrats were out of touch with the average person. "LAW & ORDER, NOT DEFUND AND ABOLISH THE POLICE," Trump tweeted in June 2020. "The Radical Left Democrats have gone Crazy!" And then this the following month: "Corrupt Joe Biden wants to defund our police. He may use different words, but when you look at his pact with Crazy Bernie, and other things, that's what he wants to do. It would destroy America!"

Even as Trump and Republicans were working to make "defund the police" a national issue (Joe Biden had made clear he did not favor defunding), the Minnesota politicians who were at the forefront of the "defund" movement were beginning to back off in the face of rising crime in the city. As Minnesota Public Radio reported in September 2020:

"Just months after leading an effort that would have defunded the police department, City Council members at Tuesday's work session pushed chief Medaria Arradondo to tell them how the department is responding to the violence.

"The number of reported violent crimes, like assaults, robberies and homicides are up compared to 2019, according to MPD crime data. More people have been killed in the city in the first nine months of 2020 than were slain in all of last year. Property crimes, like burglaries and auto thefts, are also up. Incidents of arson have increased 55 percent over the total at this point in 2019."

(The City Council had, months before, moved \$1.1 million from the police department to the health department.)

After several fits and starts, Question 2 was added to the 2021 ballot. Among its Provisions was replacing the Minnesota police

department with a department of public safety, getting rid of language that requires a minimum number of police officers to be employed by the city and forcing the mayor to win the city council's support for someone to run the new department.

While the vote was expected to be quite close, it was, in fact, not. As CNN wrote of the results:

"The status quo-affirming result is a setback to both citywide and national efforts to fundamentally reduce or eliminate the role of police in America. Opponents of calls to 'defund the police' will point to the vote as fresh evidence that the backlash to police abuse that fueled last year's protests, which followed the killing of Floyd by then Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin. Talk of curbing police departments by cutting or limiting their resources has run into a countervailing wall of concern over public safety and waning support from early allies—including leading Democrats who largely view it as political poison."

The question now for Democrats is whether they totally abandon efforts to remake policing in this country. (A bipartisan police reform attempt failed in Congress earlier this year.) Or if they continue on while doing their best to leave the "defund the police" slogan behind them.

[From Roll Call, Apr. 27, 2022]

**'DEFUND THE POLICE' STILL HAUNTS
DEMOCRATS**

(By David Winston)

It's becoming increasingly clear that after the economy, crime is a hot-button issue driving voter sentiment in the lead-up to the November elections. But despite voter-concern, Democrats continue to be divided over the controversial "defund the police" mantra that has grabbed headlines for the past two years, and it's beginning to hurt their prospects for the fall elections.

The mixed messaging of party leaders versus the call to defund by progressives, especially extreme comments by members of the Squad, has become a costly roadblock to retaining the House as voters lose confidence in Democrats' ability to address rising violence across the country.

Even a cursory look at statements by Democratic leaders and radical backbenchers opposed to increased funding of police explains the party's dilemma.

On Feb. 13, George Stephanopoulos raised the issue of Rep. Cori Bush's statements calling for defunding the police during an interview with Speaker Nancy Pelosi. "With all due respect in the world to Cori Bush," she replied, "that is not the position of the Democratic Party."

Pelosi then declared, "Defund the police is dead."

Two weeks later, in his State of the Union address, President Biden called for increased funding for police: "We should all agree: The answer is not to defund the police. The answer is to fund the police. Fund them. Fund them."

Apparently, Squad member Bush didn't get the message. In a tweet after the speech, she said, "With all due respect, Mr. President, you didn't mention saving Black lives once in this speech. All our country has done is given more funding to police. The result? 2021 set a record for fatal police shootings. Defund the police. Invest in our communities."

A month later, a gunman shot up a New York subway train, and an inconvenient 2019 letter from Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Jerrold Nadler and other liberal New York House members resurfaced. The letter to then-Gov. Andrew Cuomo opposed a plan to put 500 new Metropolitan Transportation Authority officers in the subways to reduce crime.

But AOC was having none of it. She and her fellow members wrote that the MTA funding for increased police presence in the subways would be better spent on "desperately needed resources" like "subway, bus, maintenance, and service improvements," telling Cuomo, "The subway system is now safer than before."

Last week, Rep. Abigail Spanberger called defunding the police "a terrible idea," while a Politico story said, "As the midterm elections pick up, Democrats are calling for more police funding and attempting to co-opt traditionally Republican talking points on crime."

"Defund the police" may no longer be the position of the Democratic Party, but when Cori Bush, AOC or any member of the Squad weighs in on any issue, the Twittersphere lights up like a cop car in hot pursuit. It seems the media can't get enough of the Squad, and polling shows that this intraparty fight over the issue of policing and crime has not only become a major headache for Pelosi but is also taking a toll on the Democrats' credibility.

When the electorate was asked in the Winning the Issues (WTI) February survey if they believed that we need to defund the police, only 21 percent believed the statement, while 64 percent did not. Independents were even more adamant that defunding the police was a bad idea, coming in at an overwhelming 12 percent for and 70 percent against.

Despite Biden and Pelosi's efforts to stem the bleeding by offering up more funding to stop gun violence and invest in community policing, the WTI research shows that Democrats are losing the issue, with more voters believing that the Democratic Party supports defunding the police than not by a margin of 48 percent to 34 percent.

There are three main reasons for the Democrats' troubles on this issue. First, there is widespread recognition of just how serious rising crime is becoming, with 7 out of 10 voters believing that across America, violent crime is escalating.

Six out of 10 voters agree with the statement that "families, communities and small business are being endangered and experiencing the devastating effects of rhetoric about defunding the police and police department budget cuts at the hands of politicians."

These views extend across party, ideology, age and region, making a concept like defunding the police totally out of tune with most voters who oppose it by a 3-to-1 margin.

There's a second reason for the Democrats' weakness on the crime issue. The president and other Democrats have tried to have it both ways—trying to pose as supporters of the police while only reluctantly, if at all, acknowledging that crime is a major problem.

On the White House website list of priorities, crime doesn't even make the list. The White House's lack of acknowledgment and often dismissive rhetoric about crime, particularly in cities with progressive mayors and prosecutors, has led directly to its weak standing on the issue.

As a result, when voters were asked in the March survey whether they believed Democrats would focus on law enforcement efforts to deal with violent offenders, they were split, with 44 percent believing they would and 43 percent believing they wouldn't. Independents were even more skeptical, with 36 percent believing and 46 percent not believing.

In contrast, voters by a 61 percent to 27 percent margin believed that Republicans would stand with law enforcement in their efforts to ensure the safety of our commu-

nities and the protection of America's families and children.

Not surprisingly, Democrats trail on the handling of the crime and safety issue by 12 points (48 percent favoring Republicans, 36 percent favoring Democrats) and among independents by 13 points (42 percent—29 percent, with 29 percent undecided). The Democratic Party's silence about threats to safety has left Democrats supporting a policy position that voters find alienating.

Finally, with police officers, Democrats have chosen the wrong group to vilify. The police have a very favorable brand image (72 percent favorable, 20 percent unfavorable in the March WTI survey). Congressional Democrats have a negative brand at 44 percent favorable, 49 percent unfavorable. By affiliating themselves with the defund the police movement, they are seen by voters as opposing a very positive group of public servants who are well liked and supported by the electorate.

By trying to straddle the fence on crime and safety, Biden, Pelosi and Democratic members fearing primaries have been unwilling to take on their anti-police progressives. If the trend continues, this issue will haunt Democrats this November and for a long time to come.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, Democrats have long respected and supported our law enforcement. As Representatives GUEST and LETLOW so eloquently stated in their resolution to express support for recognizing National Police Week, they serve with valor, dignity, and integrity.

They are charged with pursuing justice for all individuals and performing the duties of a law enforcement officer with fidelity to the constitutional rights and civil rights of the public that the officers serve.

They swear an oath to uphold the public trust, even though through the performance of their duties of law enforcement officers, the officers may become targets of senseless acts of violence.

They have bravely continued to meet the call of duty to ensure the security of their neighborhoods and communities at the risk of their own personal safety in the time of a viral pandemic.

There were 619 officers killed in the line of duty in 2021. Republicans honor all of them and prioritize protecting and supporting today's officers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Guardian titled "Republicans are defunding the police: FOX News anchor stumps Congressman."

[From the Guardian, June 28, 2021]

**REPUBLICANS ARE DEFUNDING THE POLICE—
FOX NEWS ANCHOR STUMPS CONGRESSMAN**

(By Martin Pengelly)

The Fox News anchor Chris Wallace made headlines of his own on Sunday, by pointing out to a senior Republican that he and the rest of his party recently voted against \$350bn in funding for law enforcement.

"Can't you make the argument that it's you and the Republicans who are defunding the police?" Wallace asked Jim Banks, the head of the House Republican study committee.

The congressman was the author of a Fox News column in which he said Democrats were responsible for spikes in violent crime.

"There is overwhelming evidence," Banks wrote, "connecting the rise in murders to the violent riots last summer"—a reference to protests over the murder of George Floyd which sometimes produced looting and violence—"and the defund the police movement. Both of which were supported, financially and rhetorically, by the Democratic party and the Biden administration."

Joe Biden does not support any attempt to "defund the police", a slogan adopted by some on the left but which remains controversial and which the president has said Republicans have used to "beat the living hell" out of Democrats.

On Fox News Sunday, Banks repeatedly attacked the so-called "Squad" of young progressive women in the House and said Democrats "stigmatised" law enforcement and helped criminals.

"Let me push back on that a little bit," Wallace said. "Because [this week] the president said that the central part in his anti-crime package is the \$350bn in the American Rescue Plan, the Covid relief plan that was passed."

Covid relief passed through Congress in March, under rules that meant it did not require Republican votes. It did not get a single one.

Asked if that meant it was "you and the Republicans who are defunding the police", Banks dodged the question.

Wallace said: "No, no, sir, respectfully—wait, sir, respectfully ... I'm asking you, there's \$350bn in this package the president says can be used for policing . . ."

"Congressman Banks, let me finish, and I promise I will give you a chance to answer. The president is saying cities and states can use this money to hire more police officers, invest in new technologies and develop summer job training and recreation programs for young people. Respectfully, I've heard your point about the last year, but you and every other Republican voted against this \$350bn."

Turning a blind eye to Wallace's question, Banks said: "If we turn a blind eye to law and order, and a blind eye to riots that occurred in cities last summer, and we take police officers off the street, we're inevitably going to see crime rise."

Wallace asked if Banks could support any gun control legislation. Banks said that if Biden was "serious about reducing violent crime in America", he should "admonish the radical voices in the Democrat [sic] party that have stigmatised police officers and law enforcement".

Despite working for Republicans' favoured broadcaster, Wallace is happy to hold their feet to the fire, as grillings of Donald Trump and Kevin McCarthy have shown.

He has also attracted criticism, for example for failing to control Trump during a chaotic presidential debate last year which one network rival called "a hot mess, inside a dumpster fire, inside a train wreck".

Last year, Wallace told the Guardian: "I do what I do and I'm sitting there during the week trying to come up with the best guests and the best show I possibly can and I'm not sitting there thinking about how do we fit in some media commentary."

"We're not there to try to one-up the president or any politician."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, if you look at the voting record of many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you will see few to none supported recent funding bills that also direct money toward supporting local law enforcement. If they think that we are on a crusade to defund the police,

well, the last few years of funding the police say otherwise.

Madam Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a Rolling Stone article titled "'Back-The-Blue' Republicans Bail on Moment of Silence for Fallen Capitol Police Officers."

[From Rolling Stone, Jan. 6, 2022]

'BACK-THE-BLUE' REPUBLICANS BAIL ON MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR FALLEN CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS

(By Tim Dickinson)

The Republican Party holds itself as the champions of law enforcement. They campaign on slogans of "Back the Blue." They hold rallies flying the "Thin Blue Line" flag. They purport to celebrate the cops who shield the nation from violence and anarchy.

But when it came time to show up in the halls of Congress for a remembrance of the sacrifices Capitol and Metropolitan Police made defending our democracy from violence last Jan. 6, Republicans lawmakers didn't bother to show up. Only one sitting Republican officeholder showed up, Wyoming Rep. Liz Cheney. She was accompanied by her father Dick, the former vice president.

On that dark day one year ago, the "Thin Blue Line" was not a metaphor. Police put their bodies and lives in harm's way, attempting to blockade the joint session of Congress from the violent mob of Trump supporters who sought to stop the peaceful transfer of power after a lawful election. These cops were beaten, tased, tear gassed, dragged down steps, and crushed in doorways. More than 140 were injured in the insurrection, and five officer deaths (including subsequent suicides) have been linked to the violence and trauma of Jan. 6.

"I want to acknowledge our fallen heroes of that day," said Speaker Nancy Pelosi, leading a House session marking the anniversary of the attack. "Now I ask all members to rise in a moment of silence in their memory."

As the officials rose, the visual of a nearly empty GOP side of the aisle was chilling, as Sen. Chris Murphy of Connecticut noted on Twitter:

At the moment of silence for the Capitol Police officers who died, there were only two Republicans who showed up.

Rep. Lynn Cheney. And her father. The 80 year old former Vice President.

An extraordinary image of where this country's politics are right now.

—Chris Murphy January 6, 2022

Speaking to reporters at the Capitol, the former vice president said he attended the House session to mark "an important historical event." Cheney elaborated that he was "deeply disappointed we don't have better leadership in the Republican Party to restore the Constitution." The swipe at Senate minority leader Mitch McConnell and House minority leader Kevin McCarthy—who could not be bothered to attend the remembrance, and who have done little to combat Trump's destructive and ongoing lies about the 2020 election—was unmistakable.

Rep. Cheney's attendance was not surprising. She is the top Republican on the bipartisan congressional committee investigating the events of Jan. 6, and has been consistent and unabashed in her criticism of Donald Trump, blaming him directly for the violence at the Capitol. Cheney has been treated as a pariah by Trump—who has called her a "bitter, horrible human being"—and was ousted from GOP House leadership earlier this year for refusing to kowtow to the Dear Leader.

Rep. Adam Kinzinger, the other Republican on the Jan. 6 committee, is expecting

the birth of a child and could not attend. "Wish I could be there too, but I'm on baby watch," he tweeted. "I am in spirit."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I find it hard to believe that someone says they back the police when they don't even do the bare minimum and show up and remember those who fought to save the lives of our very democracy and every single person in this Chamber that day.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I point out that my good friend and colleague from Minnesota, Congressman STAUBER, who is former law enforcement, has twice now released the JUSTICE Act, a commonsense police reform bill, that would rebuild trust between law enforcement and communities they serve.

□ 0945

Why is it that that has not come to the floor yet? And why is that not part of the package that we are looking at?

Congressman STAUBER was a police officer for 20 years. He knows law enforcement exists to serve America's communities, and he knows what is needed to rebuild the damaged relationship between officers and civilians.

The Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere, or the JUSTICE Act, would fund better training for police officers, increase the number of body cameras, and provide important grants to police departments to help implement community policing best practices. Sound familiar?

He introduced this bill this Congress and last Congress and, yet, despite its past bipartisan support, Democrats continuously blocked efforts to bring this to the floor.

Why would Democrats block such a commonsense bill for years and now decide it is necessary to pass these bills?

Let's just take a look at what they spent time promoting instead. For example, the Democrats so-called George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is a divisive bill being pushed through by the majority without any Republican input. Disguised as accountability, the bill would make communities less safe, hinder law enforcement's ability to do their job, limit the readiness of law enforcement, and demonizes an entire profession for the actions of a few.

It eliminates qualified immunity protections for Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers which protect officers who have to operate in high-pressure, quick-decision environments.

It lowers the mental standard for Federal civil rights lawsuits. It allows officer convictions, even if the officer has no specific intent to deprive a person of a Federal right.

I have given a couple of examples of good, strong Republican legislation that was not considered as even part of the Democrats' so-called police or law

enforcement support grouping of bills that they have put together today in an emergency meeting yesterday.

If there was truly support for law enforcement, they would have come together in a bipartisan manner, discussed it with law enforcement, discussed it with the minority, and really come together and created legislation that would truly do what we need it to do, and that is support and help our law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, today's debate is nothing more than a political stunt, as I have mentioned. The Democrats have put forward these bills at the last minute so they can go home this weekend and pretend they have done something to help police in this country.

I mentioned it before. If the majority was sincere about supporting law enforcement, they would have involved the minority. They would have had discussion about the bills, good solid bills that the minority has put forward, and they would have had discussions with law enforcement across the country to find real solutions.

Our police do need our help. There is a war on police in this country, thanks to the efforts of those on the far left. They know it; I know it; and the American people know it.

But these bills are just one more insincere attempt. One mostly recreates programs that already exist within the DOJ. The other includes a section that still gives preference to efforts that do not include recruitment and retainment.

Honestly, Madam Speaker, my colleagues should be embarrassed and ashamed of this political stunt, especially when it comes to something that affects everyone's safety and the American people's safety.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I encourage Members to do the same.

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

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

I thank the gentlewoman for that closing statement. I keep hearing the Democrats want to defund the police, so here we are on the House floor talking about creating grant programs to help keep communities safer. Now the Republicans are the ones who are talking about defunding the police. Do you see the irony?

Democrats actually have solutions in these four bills; real ideas that have been publicly available for months to make our streets safer and reduce crime. Republicans are the ones talking about defunding and abolishing the FBI.

I will remind my colleagues that you have Republican Members who are raising campaign funds by selling Defund the FBI T-shirts. Want to talk about disgusting?

No mention of that from my colleagues. Fundraising off of selling T-shirts to defund the police; that is what my friends are doing.

Again, I go back to my point earlier. I still can't get over that 21 Republicans couldn't even vote to give a Congressional Gold Medal to the men and women who defended us on January 6. I mean, talk about disgusting. Couldn't show up on the House floor for a moment of silence to honor those police who lost their lives as a result of what happened on January 6. Talk about disgusting.

We have ideas here that I think are worth bipartisan support. Some of this stuff I think should have been brought up under suspension. But, again, my friends put politics ahead of people. We want to put people ahead of politics.

Take the VICTIM Act, H.R. 5768. This establishes a grant program in the Department of Justice to help State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies improve their clearance rates for homicides and nonfatal shootings. To me, that seems common sense.

The Break the Cycle of Violence Act, H.R. 4118, creates a nationwide strategy to make our communities safer by addressing both the symptoms and root causes of violence.

The Invest to Protect Act, H.R. 6448, makes targeted investments to ensure that local police departments have the training they need to keep our communities safe.

The Mental Health Justice Act, H.R. 8542; one in four fatal police encounters ends the life of an individual with severe mental illness. The Mental Health Justice Act makes it easier to send trained mental health professionals to respond to individuals experiencing a mental health crisis.

To me, these are basic, commonsense bills that I think the overwhelming majority of people in this country, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, would all support.

You want to talk about not supporting our law enforcement. Republicans voted against \$350 billion in the American Rescue Plan that could be used for policing. So please don't lecture us about defunding the police. Republicans only seem to support law enforcement when they are looking for votes. That is a common theme here, when it is politically convenient for them. It is really shameful, and it is cynical. It is why people get frustrated with Washington because everything has a political motivation.

On stuff that we all should come together on, my friends on the other side of the aisle always come up with an issue, an excuse not to do the right thing. You don't have to agree on everything to agree on something, and this is something we ought to agree on and we ought to come together on and get it done.

These are good bills, Madam Speaker, bipartisan bills. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker. I rise today in strong support of this robust public safety package—legislation rooted in two of Demo-

crats' most cherished values: safety and justice.

On behalf of our Caucus and the Congress, I salute the persistent, values-driven leadership of CBC Chairwoman JOYCE BEATTY and Members of the CBC—ensuring that accountability is central to our efforts.

Let us also commend Progressive Caucus Chair PRAMILA JAYAPAL and Congresswoman ILHAN OMAR for their tireless efforts to advance the goal of public safety for all.

We applaud the committed leaders of the legislation before us today: Congressman JOSH GOTTHEIMER, Congresswoman KATIE PORTER, Congressman STEVEN HORSFORD, and Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS.

And thank you to Judiciary Chair JERRY NADLER and Energy & Commerce Chair FRANK PALLONE for steering this legislation to the Floor.

House Democrats believe that every American deserves to live in a safe community—where they and their family can thrive.

For us, this is a deeply held value.

And that is why our Majority has long sought—and today, continues to take—strong, commonsense action to fund our police, giving them the tools they need to prevent crime.

Let me be clear: Democrats salute our law enforcement heroes.

And we have fought to support them: securing a half-billion-dollar increase for local and state law enforcement in March's Appropriations legislation.

At the same time, we remain fully committed to improving training and accountability among the law enforcement ranks.

Our nation remains outraged at the scourge of systemic racism and brutality targeting communities of color and marginalized communities—knowing that it remains a serious threat to safety.

That is why Democrats will never stop fighting for the fundamental transformation that our culture of policing demands—which goes hand-in-hand with our unyielding commitment to public safety.

Our George Floyd Justice in Policing Act—twice passed by the House—includes strong, unprecedented reforms to save lives: from banning chokeholds; to stopping no-knock warrants; to combating racial profiling; to establishing nationwide standards against misconduct.

Sadly, this urgent and necessary legislation was blocked by Republicans.

But under the leadership of our brilliant, relentless Congresswoman KAREN BASS, we will not rest until these life-saving measures are the law of the land.

Today, with our four bills, we seek to take a strong step to build stronger, healthier relationships between law enforcement and those they serve.

And together, they will help prevent crime, save lives and advance justice.

Our Invest to Protect Act funds our police, with grants to: help small, local law enforcement agencies retain and recruit officers; require the Attorney General to evaluate and collect data on how police departments are using the funds to reduce the use of force; and invest in strong accountability measures, including: training for de-escalation, responding to substance use disorders, supporting survivors of domestic violence, and promoting a duty of care.

Our Mental Health Justice Act will help send unarmed mental health professionals to respond to mental health crises in our neighborhoods: crucial action to save lives.

Our Break the Cycle of Violence Act invests in effective, evidence-based community violence intervention initiatives—building on the lifesaving progress we forged in our American Rescue Plan.

Our VICTIM Act will bolster the ability of police forces to solve homicides, sexual assaults, shootings and other violent crimes: a necessary step to ensure justice is served and improve trust in law enforcement.

In the same spirit, House Democrats take immense pride in our work so far this Congress to keep America's families safe from harm.

Under the magnificent leadership of President Biden, we enacted an historic gun violence prevention law—which is saving lives by getting deadly weapons out of dangerous hands.

Meanwhile, the House has successfully passed legislation reinstating the Assault Weapons Ban and establishing an AMBER Alert-style warning during shootings—measures that strongly support our law enforcement.

And this Congress, our Majority has also passed legislation to: require universal background checks, promote safe storage, and ban bump stocks, high-capacity magazines and ghost guns.

Make no mistake: our colleagues across the aisle overwhelmingly voted against all of these measures.

Because they fail to realize that preventing gun crime is a crucial piece of the puzzle in building safer communities—especially for our children.

Madam Speaker. Every Member who has the special privilege of serving in these hallowed halls takes a sacred oath to the American people.

That oath—which is blind to party affiliation—is to “protect & defend.”

And with this package today, the House is honoring this foremost responsibility.

So I encourage every Member to join us in putting People Over Politics—and vote for safer communities in every corner of the country.

With that, I urge a resounding, bipartisan AYE vote on all four bills in this strong public safety package.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. 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. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1229

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 1377 on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCCARTHY (during the vote). Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is a Member that is 3 minutes out on their way with the right to vote. As you held up the others, do they have the right to hold?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

The Clerk will report the tally.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 215, answered “present” 1, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—216

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

McGovern	Porter	Speier
McNerney	Price (NC)	Stansbury
Meeks	Quigley	Stanton
Meng	Raskin	Stevens
Mfume	Rice (NY)	Strickland
Moore (WI)	Ross	Suozi
Morelle	Roybal-Allard	Swalwell
Moulton	Ruiz	Takano
Mrvan	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Ryan (NY)	Titus
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Neal	Sánchez	Torres (CA)
Neguse	Sarbanes	Torres (NY)
Newman	Scanlon	Trahan
Norcross	Schakowsky	Trone
O'Halleran	Schiff	Underwood
Omar	Schneider	Vargas
Pallone	Schrader	Veasey
Panetta	Schrier	Velázquez
Pappas	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Pascarell	Scott, David	Schultz
Payne	Sewell	Waters
Pelosi	Sherman	Watson Coleman
Peltola	Sherrill	Welch
Perlmutter	Sires	Wexton
Peters	Slotkin	Wild
Phillips	Smith (WA)	Williams (GA)
Pingree	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Pocan	Spanberger	Yarmuth

NAYS—215

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

Valadao	Waltz	Williams (TX)
Van DREW	Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Van Dreyne	Webster (FL)	Wittman
Wagner	Wenstrup	Womack
Walberg	Westerman	Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Pressley

NOT VOTING—1

Cheney

□ 1328

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Gonzales, Tony	Norman (Babin)
Barr (Guthrie)	(Fleischmann)	Palazzo
Barragan (Beyer)	Granger (Ellzey)	(Fleischmann)
Bass (Correa)	Johnson (GA)	Pascrell
Blumenauer	(Pallone)	(Pallone)
(Beyer)	Johnson (TX)	Payne (Pallone)
Bowman (Ocasio-Cortez)	(Stevens)	Perlmutter
	Keating (Correa)	(Neguse)
Brown (MD)	Kinzinger	Quigley (Kelly)
(Trone)	(Meijer)	(IL)
Burgess (Weber)	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
(TX)	(Pallone)	(Wasserman)
Bustos	Lamb (Pallone)	Schultz
(Brownley)	Long	Rice (SC)
Cawthorn	(Fleischmann)	(Meijer)
(Donalds)	Loudermilk	Ryan (OH)
Chu (Beyer)	(Fleischmann)	(Correa)
Conway	Mace (Timmons)	Sánchez
(LaMalfa)	McEachin	(Pallone)
Cuellar (Garcia)	(Beyer)	Scott, David
(TX)	Meng (Escobar)	(Correa)
DeSaulnier	Moore (WI)	Sewell (Cicilline)
(Beyer)	(Beyer)	Sires (Pallone)
DesJarlais	Moulton	Suozi (Beyer)
(Fleischmann)	(Stevens)	Swaiwell
Dingell (Stevens)	Murphy (FL)	(Correa)
Fallon (Ellzey)	Moore (WI)	Vargas (Correa)
Frankel, Lois	(Wasserman)	Welch (Pallone)
(Brownley)	Schultz	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs (Bucshon)	Napolitano	(Dunn)
Gomez (Correa)	(Correa)	Newman (Beyer)

□ 1330

MENTAL HEALTH JUSTICE ACT OF 2022

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1377, I call up the bill (H.R. 8542) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8542

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 "Mental Health Justice Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. GRANTS FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS TO ACT AS FIRST RESPONDERS.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-31 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 520N. GRANTS FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS TO ACT AS FIRST RESPONDERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary, and in consultation with the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, shall award grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to establish or expand programs—

"(1) to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies in which—

"(A) an individual calling 911, 988, or another emergency hotline states that a person—

"(i) is in a mental health crisis; or

"(ii) may have a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability;

"(B) a law enforcement officer or other first responder identifies a person as having (or possibly having) a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability; or

"(C) a law enforcement officer or other first responder identifies a person as being (or possibly being) under the influence of a legal or illegal substance;

"(2) to include in the training for mental health professionals pursuant to paragraph (1) training in—

"(A) the principles of deescalation; and

"(B) developmentally appropriate techniques;

"(3) to ensure that such mental health professionals link persons described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) with voluntary community-based services where appropriate;

"(4) to train the staff of dispatch centers regarding the proper handling of a report of an emergency described in paragraph (1), including training in the principles and techniques referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2); and

"(5) to coordinate with law enforcement agencies, which may include operating independently from but in collaboration with a law enforcement agency, or operating within such an agency.

"(b) ADDITIONAL AWARDS.—The Secretary shall make an additional award of funds under this section each fiscal year to grantees that—

"(1) are in compliance with all conditions of their awards under this section, including the conditions specified in subsections (a) and (d); and

"(2) demonstrate that their programs under this section resulted in—

"(A) a notable reduction in the incarceration and death of persons with mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability; or

"(B) a notable reduction in the use of force by police and a notable increase in referrals of persons with a mental illness or intellectual disability to community-based, voluntary support services (other than institutionalization or carceral support services).

"(c) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof that—

"(1) have high rates of arrests and incarceration of persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability;

"(2) commit to increasing resources for mental health and community-based support services or solutions for such persons; or

"(3) include peer support specialists in their current first responder model.

"(d) REPORTING.—

"(1) BY GRANTEEES.—A recipient of a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary—

"(A) a quarterly report on—

"(i) the number and percentage of emergencies where mental health professionals were dispatched in lieu of law enforcement officers pursuant to assistance under this section;

"(ii) such other matters as the Secretary may require for determining whether the recipient should receive an additional award under subsection (b); and

"(iii) any increase or decrease, compared to any previous quarter, in incarceration or institutionalization as a result of dispatching mental health professionals pursuant to assistance under this section, disaggregated to include data specific to persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities and mental illnesses where available and permitted to be disclosed under applicable privacy law, so as—

"(I) to provide a critical baseline analysis; and

"(II) to ensure that mental health practitioners are not simply funneling individuals into other institutionalized settings; and

"(B) a final report on the use of such grant.

"(2) BY SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after awarding the first grant under this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the grant program under this section.

"(3) DISAGGREGATION OF DATA.—The reporting pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, to the extent determined by the Secretary to be applicable, be disaggregated by age, sex, gender, race, and ethnicity.

"(e) REVOCATION OF GRANT.—If the Secretary finds, based on reporting under subsection (d) or other information, that activities funded through a grant under this section are leading to a significant increase in incarceration or institutionalization—

"(1) the Secretary shall revoke the grant; and

"(2) the grantee shall repay to the Federal Government any amounts that the grantee—

"(A) received through the grant; and

"(B) has not obligated or expended.

"(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary, and in consultation with the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, shall provide technical assistance to grantees under this section (or other Federal law), and to other States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers, as described in subsection (a).

"(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'Indian Tribe', 'Tribal organization', and 'Urban Indian organization' have the meanings given to the terms 'Indian tribe', 'tribal organization', and 'Urban Indian organization', respectively, in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

"(h) FUNDING.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$250,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2023 through 2027."

SEC. 3. STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall conduct a study on the effectiveness of programs and

activities under section 520N of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 2.

(b) QUALITATIVE AND LONGITUDINAL EXAMINATION.—The study under subsection (a) shall include a qualitative and longitudinal study of—

(1) the number of persons diverted from arrests; and

(2) short- and long-term outcomes for those persons, including reduced recidivism, reduced incidences of use of force, and reduced utilization of resources.

(c) COMPLETION; REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall—

(1) complete the study under subsection (a);

(2) submit a report to the Congress on the results of such study; and

(3) publish such report.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) HIRING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to remove, supplant, alter, or limit the authority of States, public agencies, or municipalities from hiring or recruiting career law enforcement officers (as defined in section 1709 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389)) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of violations of criminal laws when appropriate.

(b) CIRCUMSTANCES OF IMMINENT OR IMMEDIATE DANGER.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impede, supplant, alter, or limit the use of career law enforcement officers during emergencies which career law enforcement officers may be best suited to handle, including circumstances that are urgent, sudden, serious, or necessitate immediate action to remedy harm or avert imminent danger to life, health, or property.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 8542, the Mental Health Justice Act of 2022.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 8542, the Mental Health Justice Act of 2022, sponsored by Congresswoman KATIE PORTER of California.

As my colleagues well know, the Nation is facing a mental health crisis. One in five adults experience a mental health illness in their life, and 1 in 20 experience a serious mental illness.

The Mental Health Justice Act creates a grant program for local governments to hire, train, and dispatch men-

tal health professionals when 911 is called because someone is experiencing a mental health crisis.

Mr. Speaker, we must ensure people have access to the support they need, especially in moments of crisis when emergency responders are called.

This legislation would help support connecting those experiencing a mental health crisis with the appropriate responders, resources, and care. The appropriate responder here is crucial. In an effort to balance the needs of individuals and communities, this bill still maintains States' and public entities' hiring and recruiting authority for law enforcement officers and in no way limits their ability to intervene in dangerous circumstances.

It is through such coordination and collaboration with law enforcement and the community that we make our communities safer.

By ensuring that a mental health professional is the responder in situations where a person is experiencing a mental health or disability-related crisis, this bill will help keep some of the most vulnerable members of our community safe.

This is a good bill that will help strengthen the communities we serve, and I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 8542 today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8542, the Mental Health Justice Act of 2022.

"In lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies." I am going to say it again, because that is the exact language used repeatedly in the bill. "In lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies."

Mr. Speaker, this bill is dangerous. This legislation gives Federal grants to States, Tribes, and localities to hire mental health providers to respond to certain emergencies involving an individual with an intellectual disability or developmental disability; an individual experiencing a mental health crisis; or an individual under the influence.

There is nothing wrong with mental health professionals assisting law enforcement in appropriate circumstances. Communities around the country are adopting these models with law enforcement, mental health providers, and prosecutors.

I would be open to supporting legislation limited to training mental health providers to assist law enforcement in appropriate situations, but that is not what this bill does.

A sentence in the bill begins by stating that "mental health providers may coordinate with law enforcement." Sounds acceptable, but it continues to read, "which may include operating independently" from law enforcement.

Let's be clear. The purpose of this legislation is to provide financial in-

centives to deploy mental health providers in lieu of law enforcement and operating independently of law enforcement. That is a policy that will endanger the mental health professional, the suspect, the person experiencing the mental health crisis, and the person who called 911.

A crime scene or a home experiencing a domestic violence dispute is not the setting to provide mental health care.

In the first half of 2022, the leading circumstance of law enforcement officers killed with firearms was in response to domestic violence calls.

Nobody can confidently tell us they know in advance which domestic violence call should get a mental health response instead of a law enforcement response.

Mental health professionals are not trained for the inevitable physical confrontations that occur in these situations. The priority in an emergency situation is to secure the scene and all individuals involved, which is a law enforcement function. Once the scene is secure, I will be the first person calling for mental health services, whether it is addiction-related, trauma, or mental illness.

There is a time and a place for mental health care, but it is not rolling up to a scene without the training and tools to defend yourself and at-risk civilians. A first responder typically does not have the time and information to know when it is appropriate to provide mental health services.

Who are we expecting to make the distinction on mental health? The 911 dispatcher? An elected official inserted into the emergency dispatch process?

Every additional second layer of bureaucracy will cost lives. The risks are even greater in rural parts of the country, like my home State of North Dakota, where backup is often measured in hours, not minutes.

Ask a mental health provider if they want to be deployed without law enforcement at 1 a.m. on the side of Highway 85 between Dickinson and Watford City.

As if the public safety concerns aren't enough, the bill provides additional financial incentives for the actions that may not be in the best interest of the individual, the community, or comply with established laws of the jurisdiction.

The bill provides additional awards for referrals to community-based, voluntary support services without consideration of the specific needs and circumstances.

Community-based care could be the appropriate setting, but there are circumstances where inpatient care or incarceration are simply more appropriate.

The bill also provides incentives for decarceration rates of certain groups of individuals. Again, decarceration may make sense at times. I have advocated for it in lots of circumstances, but it is

case specific. I have seen it before. Police arrest on a domestic violence charge, release, and respond to a murder 2 hours later.

These decisions should be made at the local level based on specific circumstances with State and local input.

This bill attempts to treat the subject of the 911 call with fairness and dignity. That is something we should all strive toward. The flip side is that this bill does not account for the person who made the 911 call.

These policies will not work in the real world. It will only make dangerous situations more dangerous. The unintended consequences of this bill are extensive, and emergency situations will become more dangerous than they already are.

This is why we need committee process to work through these challenging issues. Criminal justice reform is hard. There are lots and lots of unintended consequences. I have legitimately worked on it my entire adult life. But my Democratic colleagues skipped that process because their focus is on front-line elections in the House, not front-line communities battling rising crime rates.

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

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

Make no mistake, this bill is a Trojan horse to advance the radical defund the police movement and will hurt people who need help the most.

This bill would not only keep our dedicated law enforcement officers off the streets at a time when crime is rising and illicit drugs are flooding communities but, also, could significantly reduce access to care for individuals with severe mental illness or substance use disorder. This bill would penalize organizations that have higher rates of institutionalization.

To be clear, we need to promote access to all types of behavioral healthcare and substance use disorder services. However, this bill does not take into account that sometimes these organizations provide the safest, most effective care for individuals with serious mental illness.

If Democrats' goal is to provide effective care for individuals with disabilities, severe mental illness, and substance use disorder, then we already have legislative solutions which this very body overwhelmingly passed in June of this year.

□ 1345

In June of this year, the Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act was passed, and it would bolster behavioral health and substance use disorder treatment and recovery services for millions of Americans, most notably our children.

Democrats need to work with Republicans on addressing some of the root causes of crime, such as our border crisis that the Vice President insists is secure despite record numbers of border encounters and illicit drugs being trafficked into our country.

We have a solution in the Energy and Commerce Committee to provide law enforcement officers the tools they need to get drugs off our streets and break the cycle of addiction. The HALT Fentanyl Act would permanently schedule fentanyl-related substances as schedule I drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to work with Republicans on passing this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I only have one speaker, so I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), my good friend.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 8542.

Plain and simple, this legislation would only amplify the violent crime wave we are currently seeing under Democratic leadership. Turn on the TV, watch the news. Night after night, we have to hear about the innocent lives taken from us because of the violence we are seeing in our streets. Just like other communities across the country, communities in Indiana aren't immune. Our hardworking law enforcement heroes alone are already struggling to keep up with this spike in crime.

This legislation does absolutely nothing to help. In fact, it will make the situation worse, making good on Democrats' promise to dismantle and defund the police.

These aren't policing bills. This is a way for the Democrats to just check a box in this election year. It is disrespectful to our law enforcement community and an insult to those struggling with mental health and substance abuse issues.

I have heard from countless county sheriffs and police chiefs back in my district who want to be a partner with mental health providers, not be replaced by them.

I implore my Democratic colleagues to end their war on law enforcement and come together to work with Republicans who want to make our communities safer.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), the sponsor of this legislation, someone who has worked so hard in her time here on mental health and behavioral health issues.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support getting Americans the help that they need.

More than one in five 911 calls involve mental health or substance use crises. That amounts to millions of calls per year.

To keep these Americans safe, we need to connect them to healthcare. It is wasteful, hurtful, and a travesty of

justice to criminalize people in mental health crises rather than deliver care.

One in four fatal law enforcement encounters ends the life of someone with mental illness. We cannot improve public safety without giving our communities a better response system for mental health crises.

My bill, the Mental Health Justice Act, funds local communities to create specialized mental health response units. Made up of trained health professionals, these units can be dispatched to respond to emergency calls for mental health. That way, people in crisis can get the care they need; police officers can focus on crime, including stopping violent crime and other core law enforcement duties; and our communities get another tool to address our mental health crisis.

The Mental Health Justice Act has widespread support from advocacy organizations fighting for mental health and civil rights because this approach works. In cities that already have these programs across the country, we see incredible, positive results and support from local law enforcement.

In Orange County, our law enforcement officials support this bill because their job is already difficult enough. They know their sworn duty is to prevent and solve crime and hold criminals accountable. Sending police to mental health situations diverts their attention from crime fighting. I have heard firsthand from officers who want specialized mental health response units. This bill empowers police to stay where they are needed, fighting crime.

At the same time, entangling people in mental health crises in the criminal justice system or holding them in jail wastes taxpayer dollars and doesn't deliver on public safety.

When we send police to people in crisis, we fail to get those people desperately needed healthcare, and we take law enforcement away from tackling the violent crime that they are trained to take on. This hurts everyone in our community.

The Mental Health Justice Act is supported by a broad bipartisan coalition, co-led by my colleague from Orange County, Republican MICHELLE STEEL, and my colleagues AYANNA PRESSLEY, TONY CÁRDENAS, and MARY GAY SCANLON.

Keeping Americans safe and healthy is not a partisan issue. I am proud to champion the Mental Health Justice Act, a tested, effective solution to promote public safety and well-being for every American.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

The crime rates that we have seen skyrocket across the United States can be traced directly back to calls from far-left Members of Congress to defund the police.

In my own district, we have seen more violent crimes than ever before. In the city of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, a community of just 20,000 people, we have already seen 10 murders so far this year.

Instead of confronting this issue head-on, this legislative package spends out over \$2 billion to far-left programs while only funding \$60 million worth of grants for police officers, and that \$60 million would be spread out over 50 States.

This bill is deeply misguided and will not address the root issues of the crisis that we are facing. Instead, it spends Federal tax dollars funding social workers under the guise of supporting law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on these bills, and I myself will vote “no.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the National District Attorneys Association in opposition to this legislation.

NATIONAL DISTRICT
ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2022.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: I am reaching out on behalf of the National District Attorneys Association (NDAA), the oldest and largest national organization representing state and local prosecutors in the country. With more than 5,500 members nationwide, NDAA is recognized as the leading source of national expertise on the prosecution function and is a valuable resource for the media, academia, government, and community leaders. Today, I write with concern about H.R. 8542, the Mental Health Justice Act, as part of the policing package moving through Congress.

NDAA is strongly supportive of increasing funding for our partner law enforcement agencies, implementing new grants focused on reducing community violence, and assisting investigators in solving cold cases to better support victims of violent crime. However, prosecutors have significant concerns about the fourth legislative proposal which would establish new grants to “hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies.”

Currently, law enforcement, prosecutors, and mental health professionals across the country are proactively and organically forming multidisciplinary teams and engaging in the co-responder model to better handle incidents involving individuals suffering from mental health crises. For example, jurisdictions have paired law enforcement officers, mental health clinicians, and community advocates together when responding to an individual’s mental health emergency called into a 911 dispatcher. This partnership is the first line of response and is then followed by coordination on the back end between additional health professionals and prosecutors to ensure a plan can be enacted

to provide the individual in crisis with a plan of rehabilitation that also ensures there is no public safety risk to the community. The language in the Mental Health Justice Act would undermine these collaborative efforts which have been shown to reduce violent crime, limit harm to responding law enforcement officers, and improve community trust in the criminal justice system.

Further, the legislation takes unprecedented steps to impose new grant conditions that require mental health professionals and community grantees to decrease incarceration and restrict partnership with law enforcement agencies. NDAA has long stated that any diversion or rehabilitation program, such as those led by co-responder teams, must include tools to ensure consequences are imposed if there are incidents of re-offending by the individual receiving treatment. Local communities are best suited to decide which models work best and these onerous new requirements could restrict or discourage programs from forming that serve the dual purpose of rehabilitation and community safety. These new conditions would undermine this principal and require our mental health partners to create new barriers between law enforcement and the clinical professionals working together to improve our Nation’s response to ongoing mental health emergencies.

For these reasons, NDAA urges the House of Representatives to strongly reconsider including the Mental Health Justice Act as part of the important police funding package moving through the chamber. We thank you for your tireless efforts to improve the criminal justice system and look forward to working alongside you and your staff to ensure law enforcement and the mental health community have the tools needed to keep our communities safe.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. FLYNN,
NDAA President.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close. The only time you know a traffic stop is routine is when it is over. The only time you know it is only a mental health service call is after the scene is secure.

Far too often, and more complicated, are addiction-related issues and mental health-related issues, but none of those preclude the fact that a weapon is there or domestic violence has occurred.

When you continue to coordinate this stuff for cash-strapped departments across the country with decarceration, you will have real consequences.

For well over 25 years, victims’ rights groups have fought all across this country to get domestic violence offenders held for the weekend on misdemeanor charges, and there are reasons for that. You need them to sober up; you need everybody to cool off; and victims need the opportunity to get out of the house.

These bills do nothing to do any of those things. These bills will make communities more dangerous from one end of the country to the other.

This bill sounds really good. Cooperation, coordination, all of those words sound fantastic. I will be the first one championing mental health and addiction services to anybody in lieu of custody, in lieu of prison, in lieu of jail time, but I want to do it after the

scene is secure and we know there is no weapon onsite and nobody is in danger, when we know the victim is not in danger, the community is not in danger, and the person who is experiencing addiction, mental health, whatever crisis it is, is not in danger.

This bill doesn’t do that. This bill does the opposite of that. We should reject it and get back to work on the hard work of passing reasonable, real, strong criminal justice reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for constantly coming up with innovative approaches to the mental health and the opioid crises. I see this over and over again on her part.

Look, the bottom line is local governments need support for these types of specialized mental health response units that she has put together as part of this bill with grant funding. This isn’t going to happen unless the Federal Government provides this kind of funding and authorization for these programs. I know locally in New Jersey, it will not happen unless we do something and provide these types of grants.

It does disturb me that the Republicans keep trying to politicize this because I know that on our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee—and most of the speakers on the other side are on our committee—we have worked hard to come together in a bipartisan way to try to come up with innovative approaches to the behavioral health crisis.

We did a bill that passed the House 404-20 just a few months ago that provides help for mental health and well-being that has ways of trying to deal with this crisis. I think that KATIE PORTER should be commended for coming up with another creative and innovative approach for trying to deal with this.

Every day, we know that the crisis is there, and we have to, at a Federal level, respond to it. This bill will go very far, in my opinion, toward responding to that crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support this bill on both sides of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 6899. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from engaging in transactions involving the exchange of Special Drawing Rights issued by the International Monetary Fund that are held by the Russian Federation of Belarus.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 516) "An Act to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes."

□ 1400

INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1377, I call up the bill (H.R. 6448) to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-65 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 6448

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Invest to Protect Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—*In this Act:*

(1) DE-ESCALATION TRAINING.—*The term "de-escalation training" means training relating to taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to minimize the need for the use of force and increase the likelihood of voluntary compliance, including persuasion, warnings, creating space, use of physical barriers, slowing down the pace of an incident, and requesting additional resources.*

(2) DIRECTOR.—*The term "Director" means the Director of the Office.*

(3) ELIGIBLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—*The term "eligible local government" means—*

(A) a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general

government below the State level that employs fewer than 125 law enforcement officers; or

(B) a Tribal government that employs fewer than 125 law enforcement officers.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—*The term "law enforcement officer" has the meaning given the term "career law enforcement officer" in section 1709 of title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389).*

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

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

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

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

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

(d) APPLICATIONS.—

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

(2) REPORT.—

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

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

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

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

(3) APPLICATIONS.—*In selecting eligible local governments to receive grants under this section, the Director shall use the streamlined application process described in paragraph (2)(A).*

(4) PREFERENCE.—*The Attorney General may give preference to applicants who specify in their applications that grant amounts will be used for the eligible activities set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (9), and (10) of subsection (e).*

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

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

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

(3) evidence-based law enforcement safety training for response to calls for service involving—

(A) persons with substance use disorders;

(B) persons with mental health needs;

(C) veterans;

(D) persons with disabilities;

(E) vulnerable youth;

(F) persons who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or trafficking; and

(G) persons experiencing homelessness or living in poverty;

(4) the offsetting of overtime costs associated with scheduling issues relating to the participation of a law enforcement officer in the training described in paragraphs (1) through (3), (9) and (10);

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

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

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

(B) who—

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

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

(iii) commits to remain with the law enforcement agency for a minimum 3 years from the time of receipt of the bonus;

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

(A) \$10,000; or

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

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

(9) implementation of evidence-based best practices and training on the use of lethal and nonlethal force;

(10) implementation of evidence-based best practices and training on the duty of care and the duty to intervene; and

(11) data collection for police practices regarding officer and community safety.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANT RECIPIENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—*The Director shall establish reporting requirements for eligible local government that receive a grant under this section in order to assist with the evaluation by the Office of the program established under this section.*

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—*In establishing any requirements under paragraph (1), the Director shall consider the capacity of law enforcement agencies with fewer than 125 officers to collect and report information.*

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

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

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

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

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

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

(B) AUDITS.—*Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants*

under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be awarded each year.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 3 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an eligible local government is awarded grant funds under this section during the 3-fiscal-year period during which the eligible local government is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

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

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

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

(A) indicating whether—

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

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

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

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

(i) **PROGRAM EVALUATION.**—The Attorney General shall, on an annual basis, conduct analyses of the information provided by grant recipients pursuant to subsection (f) to evaluate the efficacy of training programs funded through the grant program established by this Act in reducing the incidence of use of force by the law enforcement agency.

(j) **PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.**—

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

(2) **REPORT.**—If the Attorney General awards grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose, whether through the grant program established by this Act or other grant programs provided by the Department of Justice, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

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

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

(k) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out the grant program under this section.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—In carrying out this section for a fiscal year, if the amounts made available in appropriations Acts for that fiscal year is not less than the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1), the Director shall use not less than 20 percent of such amounts in

that fiscal year for grants under this section to eligible local governments that will use the grants to carry out one or more of the eligible activities set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (9), and (10) of subsection (e).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. 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. 6448.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6448, the Invest to Protect Act, is bipartisan legislation to bolster law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and mental health resources.

Let me be clear, Democrats have always stood for equitable funding for law enforcement. Contrary to what some of my colleagues might say, the issue of violent crime is not a red State or blue State issue. The rise in violent crime affects every community across the country.

Democrats also know that public safety and respect for civil rights can coexist. Building healthy and strong communities does not require us to choose between our rights and our safety.

This legislation would establish a grant program focused on improving recruitment and retention of officers and providing additional training and access to mental health resources for small law enforcement agencies.

When police departments are unable to recruit, retain, and adequately resource qualified officers, communities suffer a clear threat to public safety. These officer staffing shortages can cause longer wait times for emergency calls, fewer crimes cleared, and more overworked officers, which can threaten both officer health and the quality of life in our communities.

This bill seeks to address these challenges by providing additional Federal resources to small agencies to recruit and retain qualified officers, as well as provide additional training and support for these agencies.

I thank Representative JOSH GOTTHEIMER for his leadership on this issue and for introducing this important legislation along with his bipartisan cosponsors.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman just said that the Democrats have always been for—I think the direct quote was: “equitable funding for law enforcement.” That is interesting because, just 2 years ago, here is what the chairman said in June 2020:

There should be substantial cuts to police budgets.

I don't know how you can say you have always been for something when 2 years ago you said that you weren't, but that just seems what Democrats are up to today.

Let's call this package of bills before us today exactly what it is: It is an election year ploy from Democrats to look like they care about funding law enforcement.

In the wake of radical leftwing efforts to defund the police, it is no surprise that violent crime is on the rise in America. Every major urban area has seen a huge uptick in violent crime. It should also be no surprise that Democrats are now trying to run and hide from their radical ideas and dangerous rhetoric.

For more than 2 years, we have seen violent crime surge all across the country, particularly in Democrat-run cities while many of those same Democrats not only advocated for defunding police departments, but they did it. They cut them.

Now, the Democrats want to use Federal tax dollars to paper over the problems they created in their local Democrat-run cities.

These bills do nothing to solve the underlying problem. They simply create more grant programs within the bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

Under current law, there are already grants available to law enforcement to hire personnel. In fact, last year, the Justice Department awarded more than \$139 million in grant dollars through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. That money provided funds to 183 law enforcement agencies and allowed them to hire more than 1,000 additional officers.

We don't need more Federal grants so Democrat-run cities can then divert taxpayer money to fund their woke agenda. What we need are prosecutors who are willing to prosecute crimes and jurisdictions with laws that actually keep violent criminals in prison.

Nothing in these bills prevents jurisdictions that choose to defund their police from receiving these grant funds. In fact, when Judiciary Republicans offered an amendment to preclude jurisdictions that defunded their police from receiving grant funds, the Democrats rejected it, and they rejected it unanimously.

Faced with an election just over a month away, House Democrats now want to pretend they actually support law enforcement. The timing of this bill should tell you all you need to know about where Democrat priorities are.

Democrats who are in full control of this body have had 2 years to show their support for law enforcement. Only now, when faced with an impending election, are Democrats beginning to feign support for our men and women in blue.

Democrats could have shown their support for law enforcement. Instead, Democrats passed bills to infringe on Americans' Second Amendment rights, legalize marijuana, and further empower the Biden Justice Department to spy on concerned parents.

These bills are just another admission by Democrats that the defund the police movement is wrong and irresponsible. Perhaps, if the Democrats weren't in a cleanup mode after their irresponsible embrace of defund the police rhetoric, the Judiciary Committee could have had an opportunity to consider and improve most of these bills before they came to the floor. But we didn't. Instead, Democrats are rushing to consider these bills to give themselves some pretense that they support funding the police.

No one is fooled. Americans know where Democrats really stand. Americans aren't buying the Democrats' revisionist history. They have seen years of Democrats embracing and supporting the radical defund the police movement. Americans know that the Democrats are the party of soaring crime and defunding the police.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan, bicameral legislation, the Invest to Protect Act, to invest in good policing, to fight crime, and to protect our families and officers.

We must ensure that local police departments across our country have what they need to recruit and retain the finest officers, provide necessary training, and invest in providing mental health resources for our officers.

Across our country, we have seen a rise in crime, and this is at a time when it is harder than ever to hire, recruit, and retain officers. In fact, last year, public reports found a 44 percent increase in retirements and an 18 percent increase in resignations of law enforcement.

It is clear: If you want to make something better, you don't get there by cutting or defunding. You need to make smart, targeted investments. We must fund, not defund, law enforcement.

That is why I introduced the bipartisan Invest to Protect Act to make critical investments in local police departments and protect our communities.

Work on Invest to Protect started more than a year ago through bipartisan police reform talks with Demo-

crats and Republicans in the House, the Senate, and the States, including with members of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, who have overwhelmingly endorsed this legislation.

I helped craft the bipartisan Invest to Protect Act with Republican Congressman, former sheriff, and my friend, JOHN RUTHERFORD, and it was developed through conversations with both sides in both Chambers, and with a broad spectrum of stakeholders. I, again, thank the sheriff for his work and leadership.

I am appreciative of the support and input from the National Association of Police Organizations; the Fraternal Order of Police; our New Jersey law enforcement organizations and departments, including the New Jersey State PBA and the New Jersey State Fraternal Order of Police; and my Senate colleagues.

This bill would not be where it is today without the support of Congressional Black Caucus Chairwoman JOYCE BEATTY, whose leadership and friendship have been critical. I also thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus for their constructive engagement in this process. I thank Caucus Chairman JEFFRIES and Speaker PELOSI for their work, as well.

The Invest to Protect Act will invest in small and mid-sized police departments with fewer than 125 sworn officers, which make up more than 96 percent of local departments.

First, it will invest in officer safety, de-escalation, and domestic violence response training, and it will offset overtime pay for officers who are training.

Second, it will provide grants for departments to recruit new officers. It will also provide retention bonuses to help them keep their best officers on the job.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Finally, it will help departments provide mental health resources for their officers and include strong accountability measures.

These are critical steps we must take.

Going forward, I will continue to fight for additional equipment and training our officers need to protect our communities.

The bottom line: You can't cut or defund your way to safer communities and better police departments. It is about investing to protect. We must always get the backs of those who risk their lives every day to protect us.

Again, I thank Sheriff Rutherford for his leadership, law enforcement unions for working so hard on this legislation, and all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for putting country first and getting this legislation to the floor.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

I was very fortunate during my 40-year law enforcement career to work for a large and growing law enforcement agency. We had the resources to go after Federal grants to help keep our community safe, to bring those Federal dollars back home to protect my community.

I know that many agencies that I worked with did not have that benefit, and that is why, on many of the projects that came from Federal participation, we often partnered with much smaller agencies to help them out.

This bill is all about helping those agencies with 125 officers or less to be able to access those Federal grants that they cannot access right now for training, retention, and hiring. That is what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker.

That is why I worked with my good friend across the aisle, JOSH GOTTHEIMER. I appreciate him working on this, getting to the language that we could all agree with. It has been back and forth quite a bit, but we got it here to the floor, and I congratulate him on that.

This is a bipartisan issue. This is for our law enforcement men and women. These are for those small agencies. We need to be able to help them out.

I can tell you the last 2½ years have left law enforcement demoralized like never before. I have seen it. They need this assistance as they have officers that are leaving in droves.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and vote for this bill, which is going to help small law enforcement agencies join with the National Fraternal Order of Police, which supports this bill, and other law enforcement organizations. NAPO is another.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to vote "yes" on this bill. I believe these small law enforcement agencies absolutely need our assistance.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that this bill, H.R. 6448, the Invest to Protect Act of 2022, is bipartisan legislation that would bolster small law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and other resources.

It was Democrats who spent 2 years negotiating and working with law enforcement to introduce and pass the comprehensive George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which recognized the necessity of balancing the needs and safety of community in which law enforcement interests engage. I worked on that.

□ 1415

I worked on that. That is why I tried to make this bill better by adding

three additional purposes for grant funding which include issues dealing with use of lethal force, excessive force, and duty of care.

I am glad that they were added, and grantees who choose these activities will be required to do this under this particular provision.

We can do this together. And let me be very clear: this is not a last-ditch effort by Democrats to distance ourselves from efforts to defund the police.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act of 2022,"—bipartisan legislation that would bolster small law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and other resources.

First, let's be clear—This is not a last-ditch effort by Democrats to distance ourselves from efforts to defund the police. Democrats have always been supportive of law enforcement.

We have been accused of spending the last two years bashing the police. Yet, it was Democrats who spent two years negotiating and working with law enforcement to introduce and pass the comprehensive "George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021"—which recognized the necessity of balancing the needs and safety of the community with law enforcement interests.

H.R. 6448 would establish a grant program within the Department of Justice's Community Oriented Policing Services, or COPS, program focused on improving recruitment and retention of officers and providing additional training and access to mental health resources for small law enforcement agencies.

When police departments are unable to recruit, retain or provide suitable resources to qualified officers, communities suffer a clear threat to public safety. A June 2021 national survey by the Police Executive Research Forum found that, on average, police departments around the country were filling only 93 percent of their available budgeted positions.

These officer staffing shortages can cause longer wait times for emergency calls, fewer crimes cleared, and more overworked officers, which can threaten both officer health and the quality of life in our communities.

This bill seeks to address these challenges by providing additional federal resources to small agencies—that often have the most trouble accessing federal grant funding—to recruit and retain qualified officers as well as provide additional training and support.

A 2016 study by the Department of Justice (DOJ) found that of the 12,261 local police departments in the country, 11,638 of them had less than 100 full-time sworn officers. That is 11,638 police departments that would be eligible to access much-needed funding as authorized by H.R. 6448.

Importantly, H.R. 6448 includes limitations on the use of grant funds for hiring and retention to ensure that the funds are not misused, and gives preference to applicants that plan to use grant funds for certain training purposes, including:

de-escalation; the use of lethal and non-lethal force; the duty of care and the duty to intervene—as well as—

victim-centered training on handling domestic violence situations; and

safety training for officers responding to calls involving persons with substance use dis-

orders, mental health needs, disabilities, and vulnerable youth.

This bill would also allow departments to use funds to provide mental health services and treatment to officers and collect data on policing practices that focus on officer and community safety.

In its totality, H.R. 6448 provides critical funding to law enforcement agencies that need it while encouraging improvement among their ranks. This bill makes clear that Democrats will continue to uplift and support law enforcement—as we always have—and we will do so in a manner that ensures officers are well-trained to keep themselves safe as well as the people and communities they serve.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Democrats have always been supportive of law enforcement along with our civil rights friends, and we have put in firewalls to insist that we work together with law enforcement and large and small entities and that we work with on behalf of justice for our constituents and for providing wellness to our police officers, providing intervention of violence, and as well to ensure that we assist in cases that are backlogged. Democrats have been at the forefront. I am very glad to say that we don't ask to defund the FBI, we ask to be supportive of our community.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to be clear. The Democrats want to go from COPS to community organizers, and they want the American taxpayer to pay for it. That is what they want to do in Democrat-run cities.

Mr. Speaker, read the bill. It talks about stipends to be used for graduate education or social work. That is what the bill is for. It is not about putting cops on the street. It is about transferring wealth from the people who funded their police and communities around the country, who funded their police, and giving American tax dollars to cities who didn't fund their police so they can use it for community organizers.

That is what this bill is about. That is why we are against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with Mr. JORDAN's sentiments, and I might even take an even stronger and more critical opposition to these so-called law enforcement bills. I certainly don't want to impugn the motive of every colleague on the other side of the aisle, but here are my strong views, and this is my position on behalf of west Texas:

Since the riots of 2020, I have been warning my Democratic colleagues that we get what we tolerate. After 2 years of Democrats' amplifying defund the police rhetoric, failing to hold

criminals accountable, and refusing to condemn the lawlessness that is running rampant in our cities across the country, crime is absolutely out of control.

Last year, a record number of police officers were killed. Seventy-three American heroes lost their lives. Law enforcement has experienced a staggering 115 percent increase in ambush-style attacks. Further evidence of the left's war on law enforcement is that police have seen a 45 percent increase in retirements and a 20 percent increase in resignations, leaving the most vulnerable Americans even more susceptible to being victimized by criminals.

Now the party of defund the police wants to push through some face-saving bills just ahead of the election in November. Call me cynical, but that is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation would expand the Federal bureaucracy unnecessarily, take over the responsibility of local governments, and add even more strings to Federal funding for the Biden administration or future administrations to impose their woke agenda and unrelated progressive policies on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, these are not real solutions to the crime epidemic in America. These are political machinations to give the appearance of being supportive of law enforcement. These are a Texas-sized fig leaf to cover the Democrat left's reckless policies and dangerous rhetoric that have encouraged crime, have only coddled criminals, and have created a culture of lawlessness in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn all of that, and I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote "no" on this bill and the whole lot of these bills that are really just political window dressing.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, in follow-up to my colleague from Texas' comment, I would also say that we get what we pay for, which is why I rise to support the bipartisan Invest to Protect Act which is legislation I was proud to cosponsor. This legislation follows our prior increases of funding to the community-oriented policing program through the appropriations process.

The Invest to Protect Act would help get the job done of ensuring that police departments—particularly those like I represent in smaller and rural communities—have the ability to recruit and retain officers.

This legislation invests in officer safety, it invests in domestic violence response training, and it invests in funding the police departments like those I represent.

Throughout Virginia's Seventh District, I hear directly from local police departments about the need for stronger investments in training, equipment, recruitment, and retention. And as a

former law enforcement officer, I greatly admire and am thankful for the dedication of the men and women who work every day to keep our communities safe.

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

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman GOTTHEIMER and Congressman RUTHERFORD, for their leadership on this legislation. I thank CBC Chair BEATTY for her partnership on these important issues of public safety and public trust. And I appreciate that this bill has the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Association of Police Officers.

This is a smart investment, smart policy, and at this moment we should have the common commitment to keeping America's communities safe.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6448, the so-called Invest to Protect Act.

All of the bills that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rushed to the floor today are nothing more than kind of last-minute political items, obviously, a few weeks out from election day. They will use these bills to claim that they support funding the police.

However, the American people are not fooled. They saw Democrats across the country call for defunding of the police. There is video that continues to run ad nauseam with examples of that, and it was all in the wake of George Floyd's death.

We only need to look at the House Judiciary Committee Democrats' refusal to take up these bills in regular order. For further evidence that these bills are a political stunt, just this week, Judiciary Committee Democrats postponed a hearing on organized retail theft until after the election.

The simple truth is Democrats have no interest in putting forth a serious effort to reduce crime. All the money in these grant programs don't mean a thing if leftwing prosecutors continue to let violent criminals out with little or no bail.

That is why yesterday my colleagues and I introduced the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act after last year's horrific attack in my district at the Waukesha Christmas parade.

This bill takes three steps to push back on radical leftwing bail laws. It conditions the Byrne grant program funding on meeting the Federal pretrial release factors as a floor. It reduces grant funding by 75 percent unless State and local jurisdictions develop and maintain a public safety report.

The problem in Waukesha was that later on the DA said, boy, we didn't know what was going on in other

States. We didn't know that there were any other crimes committed there. And then judges did not have enough information prior to setting bail.

We can't let people off the hook just by saying that we just didn't have enough information. Six people died in the Waukesha Christmas parade because no one took the time to figure out that this individual who was before them was absolutely one of the most dangerous people living in Wisconsin.

States would be further incentivized to report this information to the National Crime Information Center. It would bring transparency, and it would change the bail system.

Mr. Speaker, there are solutions to these issues; but, unfortunately, there is a faction of the Democratic Party that simply continues to run the opposite way. I don't know if it is to assure their constituencies that they are with them, but that time is over.

Unfortunately, as we are in the middle of September right before the November elections, the Democrats finally woke up.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished that Mr. FITZGERALD would admit that the Republicans want to defund the police by 75 percent. That is what he just said. After all the Republican rhetoric about the Democrats wanting to defund the police—which, of course, is not true—Mr. FITZGERALD just got up and told us the Republicans want to defund the police by 75 percent.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what my distinguished colleague and chairman of the committee was referring to there, but I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, I would just add this: One of the phrases we heard from the Democrats over the last couple of years is "reimagined policing."

Well, now we know what they mean. Now we get it. They want to take money from communities who funded their police and give it to communities who didn't, so they can get past this whole defund the police that has been their mantra for the last couple years.

In fact, as I said before, I am surprised by some of the statements I have heard from the chairman of the committee, because as I said, in June of 2020—and it is a direct quote—"There should be substantial cuts to the police budget. . . ."—by Mr. NADLER.

Now he has got a bill that supposedly, they are saying, funds the police, but we know it doesn't. It takes money from communities I get the privilege of representing in west central Ohio who never, never defunded their police. They made sure the men and women in blue got the resources they needed to protect their communities.

And now the Democrats are saying: We want to take taxpayer dollars from

those communities and set up these grant programs so we can give it to social workers. This is straight from the bill, so we can give "a stipend to be used for graduate education in the area of mental health, public health, or social work. . . ."

That is what they want the money to be used for, not for the people who are stopping the crime that is happening in every major urban area around the country.

That is why we are opposed to this legislation. I hope it goes down.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would bolster law enforcement across the country and improve public safety. I think it is telling that people like Mr. RUTHERFORD on the Republican side of the aisle helped craft this bill with people like Mr. GOTTHEIMER on this side of the aisle.

On the other hand, there are, obviously, a lot of Republicans like Mr. JORDAN who want to defund the police or at least defund small town America police by opposing this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support small town America and to support policing in small town America by supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act of 2022,"—bipartisan legislation that would bolster small law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and other resources.

It was Democrats who spent two years negotiating and working with law enforcement to introduce and pass the comprehensive "George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021"—which recognized the necessity of balancing the needs and safety of the community with law enforcement interests.

That is why I tried to make this bill better by adding three additional purposes for the use of grant funding.

Development and implementation of best practices and training on the use of lethal and nonlethal force;

Development and implementation of best practices and training to eliminate the use of excessive force;

Development and implementation of best practices and training on the duty of care and the duty to intervene.

I am glad those provisions were added where grantees who choose to implement those activities will be given preference.

This bill seeks to address these challenges by providing additional federal resources to small agencies—that often have the most trouble accessing federal grant funding—to recruit and retain qualified officers as well as provide additional training and support.

A 2016 study by the Department of Justice (DOJ) found that of the 12,261 local police departments in the country, 11,638 of them had less than 100 full-time sworn officers. That is 11,638 police departments that would be eligible to access much-needed funding as authorized by H.R. 6448.

Importantly, H.R. 6448 includes limitations on the use of grant funds for hiring and retention to ensure that the funds are not misused, and gives preference to applicants that plan to use grant funds for certain training purposes, including:

de-escalation; the use of lethal and non-lethal force; the duty of care and the duty to intervene—as well as—

victim-centered training on handling domestic violence situations; and

safety training for officers responding to calls involving persons with substance use disorders, mental health needs, disabilities, and vulnerable youth.

This bill would also allow departments to use funds to provide mental health services and treatment to officers and collect data on policing practices that focus on officer and community safety.

In its totality, H.R. 6448 provides critical funding to law enforcement agencies that need it while encouraging improvement among their ranks. This bill makes clear that Democrats will continue to uplift and support law enforcement—as we always have—and we will do so in a manner that ensures officers are well-trained to keep themselves safe as well as the people and communities they serve.

Let's be clear—This is not a last-ditch effort by Democrats to distance ourselves from efforts to defund the police. Democrats have always been supportive of law enforcement.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter of support of H.R. 6448, Invest to Protect Act, from the Fraternal Order of Police.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2022.

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

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEPHEN J. SCALISE,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, HOYER AND SCALISE: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to urge the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage of H.R. 5768, the "Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods (VICTIM) Act," and H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act," which could be considered on the floor of the House as early as today.

Homicide cases can be very difficult to clear—especially those committed via firearm—and non-fatal shootings even more so. Closing these types of crimes requires diligence, manpower, and a sustained investigative effort. Given the limited resources of law enforcement agencies, it's important to provide the significant, dedicated resources that clearing these crimes requires, especially given their oftentimes heinous nature, and the need to get justice for the victims and their families.

The "VICTIM Act" would establish a grant program to help State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies improve their clearance rates for homicides, non-fatal shootings and other violent crimes. Agencies can use these grant funds to train, hire, or retain additional detectives, investigators, or other police personnel to investigate, solve, and respond to these crimes. The grants can also be

used to improve training for agency personnel to address the needs of victims and family members impacted by these crimes. By providing those important resources to law enforcement agencies across the country, we can improve the chances that murders, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings get cleared. This means ensuring punishment for the perpetrators, securing justice for the victims and their families, and providing peace of mind for the communities our members work so hard to protect.

The FOP also urges Members of the House to support H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act." Over the last few years, law enforcement officers have faced many challenges and threats to their well-being that have created a dangerous environment for those sworn to protect the public. These challenges have ranged from violence against officers, an increase in violent rhetoric against them, lagging technology, recruitment and retention issues, and mental health concerns. Smaller municipalities are experiencing increased strain on the men and women in blue. We believe that the "Invest to Protect Act" can help our nation's smaller agencies and departments combat these issues that plague law enforcement officers in smaller municipalities.

This legislation would establish a grant program that would be used for training of officers from police departments and municipalities that employ less than 125 law enforcement officers. The funding appropriated would be \$60 million over a five-year period. These trainings would include de-escalation, domestic violence response, and response calls to vulnerable populations like those involving persons with disabilities, mental health issues, or substance abuse disorders.

This legislation is also designed to help these smaller agencies recruit new officers and to help address the retention issue of current officers. The funding could also be used by officers from eligible departments who are pursuing further education in mental health, public health, or social work. These officers could receive up to \$10,000 in aid towards their tuition. Lastly, the funding could also be used for mental health services, treatments, and therapies for active police officers.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I urge the Members of the House to pass these two bills to support our nation's small departments and the communities they serve. If I can provide any additional information about this bill, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in our Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1377, I call up the bill (H.R. 4118) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Resolution 1377, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4118

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Break the Cycle of Violence Act".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Sec. 101. Community-based violence intervention program grants.

Sec. 102. Office of Community Violence Intervention.

Sec. 103. Community Violence Intervention Advisory Committee.

Sec. 104. Creation of a National Community Violence Response Center.

Sec. 105. Sense of Congress regarding services for victims of violent crime.

Sec. 106. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Sec. 201. Improving approaches for communities to thrive (IMPACT) grants.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Community violence is a significant public health, public safety, and community infrastructure concern nationwide and is a leading cause of death, injury, and trauma for people in the United States that disrupts employment and hinders a community's social and economic development.

(2) From 2010 to 2019, over 175,000 people were murdered in the United States. Hundreds of thousands more were hospitalized or treated in emergency departments after surviving life-changing gunshot injuries and other violent assaults.

(3) In 2020, the Nation suffered the largest single-year spike in homicides on record, driven largely by record spikes in fatal shootings. Nationwide, 75 percent of all homicides are committed with a gun.

(4) Communities across the Nation experience enormous disparities in safety that are driven by inequitable social and structural determinants of health. Interpersonal shootings are disproportionately concentrated in neighborhoods harmed by past and present racial discrimination, segregation, redlining, disinvestment, mass incarceration, and concentrated poverty, and this violence's toll falls overwhelmingly on people of color, especially young Black and brown men and boys and their loved ones. From 2015 to 2019, Black children and teens were 14 times as

likely to be shot to death as their White peers. Hispanic children and teens and Native American children and teens were both about 3 times as likely to be shot to death as their White peers. Over this period, 72 percent of children murdered before their 18th birthday were people of color, and 50 percent were Black.

(5) Black boys and men make up less than 7 percent of the population in the United States, but account for more than 50 percent of all gun homicide victims each year. Violence is responsible for nearly half of all deaths among Black boys and young men, ages 15 through 24, meaning the parents of a Black son in this age group are as likely to lose their child to homicide as nearly every other cause of death combined.

(6) This violence imposes enormous human, social, and economic costs. The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Division of Violence Prevention presented research to Congress demonstrating that "youth living in inner cities show a higher prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder than soldiers" in the Nation's wartime military. While the vast majority of these young people resiliently persevere, people who have been victims of violence are at substantially higher risk of being violently re-attacked or killed. Additionally, both direct and indirect violence exposure have been associated with a host of poor health outcomes, including chronic illness, anxiety, depression, and substance misuse.

(7) When properly implemented and consistently funded, coordinated, community-based strategies that utilize trauma-responsive care and interrupt cycles of violence can produce lifesaving and cost-saving results in a short period of time without contributing to mass incarceration. These strategies identify those at the highest risk, coordinate individualized wraparound resources, provide pathways to healing and stability, and monitor and support long-term success. Many cities have substantially reduced community violence in recent years by implementing various combinations of these strategies, which include the following:

(A) Community outreach programs, which hire violence intervention and prevention specialists who have established relationships, relatable lived experiences, and credibility with individuals in their communities at high risk of violence and connect them with intensive counseling, mediation, peer support, and social services in order to reduce their risk. Evaluations have found that these programs, particularly when integrated into wider networks of supportive services, are frequently associated with significant reductions in gun violence.

(B) Hospital-based violence intervention programs (referred to in this section as "HVIP"), which work to break cycles of violence by leveraging credible violence intervention and prevention specialists to provide intensive counseling, peer support, case management, mediation, and social services to patients recovering from gunshot wounds and other violent injuries. Research has shown that violently injured patients are at high risk of retaliating with violence themselves or being revictimized by violence in the near future. Evaluations of HVIPs have found that patients who received HVIP services were often less likely to be convicted of a violent crime and less likely to be subsequently reinjured by violence than patients who did not receive HVIP services.

(C) Group violence interventions provide tailored social services and support to group-involved individuals at highest risk for involvement in community violence. This intervention, which must be trauma informed, culturally responsive, and community driven to be most successful, includes a

process for community members to voice a clear demand for the violence to stop and narrowly focused enforcement actions against those who continue to engage in acts of serious violence. The approach coordinates law enforcement, service providers, and community engagement efforts to reduce violence in ways that do not contribute to mass incarceration.

(D) Violence interruption and crisis management, which respond to potentially violent incidents to mediate conflicts or to scenes where violence has occurred to offer trauma-informed services and community supports to survivors and others exposed to violence. These strategies help to prevent retaliatory violence and promote healing and well-being. Programs that include these components have reported deescalating dozens of disputes that were highly likely to end in lethal violence.

(8) Access to job and entrepreneurship training, apprenticeship, and technological and digital literacy programs are effective tools in reducing community violence. A 2012 University of Pennsylvania study of 13 high-violence schools in the Chicago area found "well-targeted, low-cost employment policies can make a substantial difference", and the city's most violent neighborhoods saw a 43 percent drop in violent-crime arrests of participants in a youth job program.

(9) Individualized wraparound services and opportunities include, but are not limited to, housing support, financial assistance, re-entry services, legal assistance, therapeutic services, grief counseling or targeted victim services, and skill building based on the needs of survivors or individuals at the highest risk of community violence. Leveraging the relationships of violence intervention and prevention specialists, these services are used in the context of structured, person-centered peer mentorship that facilitates personal transformation by meeting people where they are and offering to help participants change the trajectories of their lives.

(10) The past year has had a disproportionate impact on youth unemployment, with 2.9 million more unemployed youth in mid-2020 compared with pre-2020 levels. Simultaneously, the 2020 recession accelerated an already increasingly digital and automated workforce, and youth must attain the digital, technological, and other technical skills necessary to thrive in the future of work. While jobs in the customer service and food industry could fall by 4.3 million between 2018 and 2030, health care and STEM occupations could grow more now than ever.

(11) Intentional and sustained investments in community-based violence reduction strategies can reverse recent increases in homicides, help to heal impacted communities, and reduce the enormous human and economic costs of community violence, without contributing to mass incarceration.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COMMUNITY VIOLENCE.**—The term "community violence"—

(A) means nonfatal firearm injuries, aggravated assaults, homicides, and other acts of life-threatening interpersonal violence committed outside the context of a familial or romantic relationship; and

(B) does not include acts of violence motivated by political beliefs.

(2) **ELIGIBLE UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term "eligible unit of local government" means a municipality or other local government that—

(A) for not less than 2 out of the 3 calendar years preceding the date on which an application for a grant is submitted under section 101—

(i) experienced 35 or more homicides per year; or

(ii) experienced 20 or more homicides per year and had a homicide rate that was not less than double the national average; or

(B) has a compelling need to address community violence, as determined by the Secretary, based on high levels of homicide relative to other localities within the same State.

(3) **OPPORTUNITY YOUTH.**—The term "opportunity youth" means individuals who—

(A) have attained 16 years of age but not yet attained 25 years of age; and

(B) are not—

(i) enrolled in education or training on a full-time or part-time basis; or

(ii) employed on a full-time or part-time basis.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SEC. 101. COMMUNITY-BASED VIOLENCE INTERVENTION PROGRAM GRANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this title referred to as the "Secretary") shall award grants to eligible entities to support, enhance, and replicate coordinated community violence intervention.

(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to seek a grant under this section, an entity shall be—

(1) a community-based, nonprofit organization that—

(A) serves the residents served by an eligible unit of local government; and

(B) has a track record of providing community-related activities or support program innovation in communities of color; or

(2) an eligible unit of local government.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Of the amount made available to carry out this title for a fiscal year, not more than 15 percent of such amount shall be made available to eligible units of local government.

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A grant awarded under this section shall be used to implement coordinated community violence intervention initiatives, through coordinated, community-based strategies.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A community violence intervention initiative implemented using grant funds awarded under this section shall—

(A) be primarily focused on providing culturally competent, community-based violence intervention services to the portion of a grantee's community who are, regardless of age, identified as being at high risk of being victimized by, or engaging in, community violence; and

(B) use strategies that—

(i) are evidence-informed and have demonstrated promise at reducing community violence without contributing to mass incarceration;

(ii) utilize trauma-responsive care and interrupt cycles of violence;

(iii) expand economic opportunity through new jobs, educational opportunities, or training programs; and

(iv) are primarily focused on individuals at high risk of being victimized by, or engaging in, community violence.

(3) **COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.**—

(A) **ELIGIBLE UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—Each eligible unit of local government awarded a grant under this section shall distribute not less than 75 percent of such grant funds to one or more of the following:

(i) A community-based organization or nonprofit organization.

(ii) A public agency or department that is primarily dedicated to the prevention of violence or to community safety, but is not a law enforcement agency.

(B) HOSPITALS.—Each hospital awarded a grant under this section in the hospital's capacity as a community-based, nonprofit organization described in subsection (b)(1) shall distribute not less than 90 percent of such grant funds to one or more of the following:

(i) A community-based organization or nonprofit organization that provides direct services to individuals who have been victimized by community violence.

(ii) Direct program staff.

(iii) Individual subcontractors who provide direct program-related services.

(e) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each applicant for a grant under this section shall submit a grant proposal, which shall, at a minimum—

(1) describe how the applicant proposes to use the grant to implement a coordinated community violence intervention initiative in accordance with this section;

(2) describe how the applicant proposes to use the grant to promote or improve coordination between relevant agencies and community organizations in order to minimize duplication of services, complement other community violence intervention efforts, and achieve maximum impact;

(3) provide evidence indicating that the proposed community violence intervention initiative would likely reduce community violence or address the trauma and collateral consequences for individuals at high risk of being victimized by, or engaging in, community violence;

(4) describe how the applicant plans to ensure the community violence intervention initiative is implemented in a manner that is—

(A) evidence-informed; and

(B) coordinated with the programs and activities of other entities for addressing community violence; and

(5) in the case of a unit of local government applicant, demonstrate strong support from community partners with experience engaging individuals at high risk of being victimized by, or engaging in, community violence, as demonstrated by—

(A) the development of a community steering committee that—

(i) provides advice and assistance to the locality in administering grants awarded under this section; and

(ii) is composed of individuals who substantially reflect local populations impacted by community violence, including survivors of community violence and individuals with expertise in culturally competent and trauma-informed approaches to reducing community violence; and

(B) letters of support from individuals, such as—

(i) the mayor or chief executive officer of the unit of local government; and

(ii) the director of one or more community-based organizations that provide services to individuals at high risk of being victimized by, or engaging in, community violence.

(f) PRIORITIZATION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to applicants whose grant proposals demonstrate the greatest likelihood of reducing community violence in the target area without contributing to mass incarceration.

(g) GRANT DURATION.—A grant awarded under this section shall be for a 4-year period.

(h) GRANT AWARD.—The amount awarded to an applicant under this section shall be commensurate with—

(1) the scope of the proposal; and

(2) the demonstrated need for additional resources to effectively reduce community violence in the applicant's community.

(i) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the Federal share of each grant awarded under this section shall be 90 percent of the eligible costs incurred by the grant recipient.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a grant awarded to a community-based organization described in subsection (b)(1).

(3) WAIVER.—The Federal share of a grant awarded to a unit of local government (that is an eligible entity under subsection (b)(2)) may be up to 100 percent if the Secretary determines there is good cause to waive the Federal share requirement under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(j) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the first 4-year grant period under this section ends, the Secretary shall publish a report identifying best practices for grantees under this section to implement community-based violence intervention initiatives.

(k) REWARDING SUCCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title for supplemental incentive funds to be distributed to grantees outside the competitive grant process in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) DISTRIBUTION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—The Secretary may distribute amounts reserved under paragraph (1), in the discretion of the Secretary, to grantees under subsection (a) that have—

(A) implemented the grant for not less than 2 years;

(B) demonstrated exceptional commitment and progress toward implementing the grantee's community violence reduction initiative; and

(C) shown that the grantee would likely achieve more substantial reductions in community violence with additional Federal funding.

(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—Subsection (i) shall not apply to any amounts distributed to a grantee under this subsection.

(4) EXPLANATION OF DISTRIBUTION.—Upon distributing supplemental incentive funds to a grantee, the Secretary shall publish a statement on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services that clearly explains the basis for the decision to award such funds to a particular grantee.

(1) EVALUATION AND INTENSIVE SITE IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 8 percent of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title for the purpose of—

(1) contracting with or hiring intensive site implementation providers with experience implementing community violence intervention strategies;

(2) providing grants to applicants under subsection (a) that provide training and certification to community violence intervention and prevention professionals in order to expand the field and build capacity of front-line workers and other providers; and

(3) contracting with independent researchers to evaluate the implementation, performance, and impact of selected initiatives supported by the grants made under this section, which evaluations shall be made publicly available on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(m) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—A grantee receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant to supplement, and not supplant, the amount of funds the grantee would otherwise dedicate to a community violence intervention initiative.

SEC. 102. OFFICE OF COMMUNITY VIOLENCE INTERVENTION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish within the Department of Health and Human Services, the Office of Community Violence Intervention (in this title referred to as the "Office"), to be headed by a director.

(b) DUTIES.—The Secretary shall delegate to the Director of the Office responsibility for implementing the provisions of this title.

(c) RESERVATION.—Of the amount made available to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not more than 5 percent for the administrative expenses of the Office.

SEC. 103. COMMUNITY VIOLENCE INTERVENTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Community Violence Intervention Advisory Committee (in this title referred to as the "Advisory Committee") to provide advice and assistance to the Secretary and Office in carrying out this title, including—

(1) development of grant solicitations;

(2) raising awareness about grant solicitations among potentially eligible units of government and organizations;

(3) selection of grant proposals;

(4) selection of grantees to receive supplemental funds in accordance with section 101(1); and

(5) formation of the National Community Violence Response Center under section 104.

(b) MEMBERS.—In appointing members of the Advisory Committee, the Secretary shall—

(1) appoint the members from among individuals with expertise implementing or evaluating community violence intervention initiatives;

(2) include a representative with expertise in workforce development selected by the Secretary of Labor;

(3) ensure the membership of the Advisory Committee reflects a commitment to culturally competent and trauma-informed approaches to preventing violence among individuals at high risk of violence; and

(4) ensure that the members of the Advisory Committee include substantial representation of communities of color disproportionately impacted by community violence.

SEC. 104. CREATION OF A NATIONAL COMMUNITY VIOLENCE RESPONSE CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and operate a National Community Violence Response Center (referred to in this section as the "Center").

(b) DUTIES.—The Center shall have the following roles and responsibilities:

(1) ASSESSMENT; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Office and the Center, with the advice of the Advisory Committee, shall—

(A) develop a four-tier taxonomy to assess the maturity of community violence infrastructure among grantees under section 101; and

(B) provide technical assistance to grantees under section 101 in the implementation of coordinated community violence intervention funded through the grant.

(2) INTENSIVE SITE IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT.—The Center shall—

(A) develop intensive site implementation support for each of the four tiers to maximize the effectiveness of the development of community violence initiatives;

(B) develop intensive site implementation support for each eligible unit of local government that is a grant recipient to assess the contours of the community violence within the jurisdiction and identify relevant community-based interventions that may be successful at preventing future community violence; and

(C) provide ongoing support to community-based organizations to facilitate site infrastructure building, program implementation and operation, and quality improvement assistance.

(3) DATA COLLECTION.—

(A) POLICIES.—The Office and the Center shall develop data collection policies for grant recipients that measure safety, community health, opportunity youth engagement, economic development, and recidivism.

(B) ASSISTANCE.—The Center shall assist grant recipients in establishing data collection systems and practices, and collect data from the grant recipients.

(4) RESEARCH COORDINATION.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The Center, in consultation with nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations and researchers whose primary expertise is in community violence, shall establish a Community Violence Research Advisory Council (in this paragraph referred to as the “Research Advisory Council”)—

(i) to coordinate research on community violence; and

(ii) to report to the Congress on any gaps on issues related to community violence.

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The Research Advisory Council shall include representatives from—

(i) all Federal agencies that fund research on community violence; and

(ii) the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(C) DUTIES.—The Research Advisory Council shall provide advice and assistance to the Center to—

(i) develop a coordinated strategy to strengthen research focused on community violence education, prevention, and intervention strategies;

(ii) track and report all Federal research and expenditures related to community violence; and

(iii) identify gaps in community violence research, governmental expenditures on community violence issues, and promising strategies that have not yet been rigorously evaluated.

(5) CONFERRAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall establish a biennial conference to include—

(i) grantees and providers of intensive site implementation support in the community violence field that receive funding under this title or title II; and

(ii) other key stakeholders.

(B) TOPICS.—The topics to be addressed at the biennial conference shall include—

(i) the administration of grants;

(ii) challenges and gaps in community violence intervention initiatives;

(iii) strategies for overcoming such challenges and gaps;

(iv) promising practices in the field; and

(v) emerging trends.

(C) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the conclusion of each biennial conference, the Center shall publish a comprehensive report that—

(i) summarizes the issues presented during the conference and what, if any, policies the Center intends to implement to address those issues; and

(ii) is made available to the public on the Center’s website and submitted to the Congress.

(6) CAPACITY BUILDING AND FOSTERING INNOVATION.—The Center shall—

(A) promote expansion and development of the field of community violence intervention and prevention, including fostering collaboration, information sharing, and dissemination of best practices among practitioners, providers of intensive site implementation support, and programs and individuals working in the same regions or States, including the identification and dissemination to the

public of best practices for addressing community violence;

(B) develop a plan for expanding providers of intensive site implementation support in the field of community violence intervention and prevention;

(C) develop a plan for identifying innovative community violence intervention and prevention strategies that are in need of further research and evaluation; and

(D) develop a plan for providing ongoing intensive site support to organizations implementing community violence intervention and prevention strategies.

(7) REPORTING.—The Center shall annually provide a report to the Congress addressing topics to include—

(A) national trends in community violence statistics;

(B) a summary of the activities of the Center and the Office under this title; and

(C) recommendations for improving the national response to community violence.

SEC. 105. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIME.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) community-based violence intervention programs have shown effective results as a strategy in reducing the risk of reinjury of, or retaliation by, victims of community violence, and promoting victims’ recovery and well-being;

(2) young men, boys, girls, and women of color are disproportionately victimized by community violence, but are frequently underserved by victim service providers; and

(3) States and territories should consider using funding provided through the Crime Victims Fund to support community-based violence intervention initiatives that provide services for direct and secondary victims of community violence at high risk for reinjury and involvement in community violence.

SEC. 106. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health and Human Services to carry out this title, in addition to any amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated or made available to the Department of Health and Human Services for such purpose—

(1) \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 2022;

(2) \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2023; and

(3) \$700,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2029.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SEC. 201. IMPROVING APPROACHES FOR COMMUNITIES TO THRIVE (IMPACT) GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall award grants to eligible entities for year-round job training and workforce programs authorized under section 129(c)(1) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3164(c)), with the elements described in section 129(c)(2)(C) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3164(c)(2)(C)), for opportunity youth in communities disproportionately affected by gun violence for the purposes of connecting opportunity youth to in-demand occupations.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to seek a grant under subsection (a), an entity shall be—

(1) a community-based, nonprofit organization that—

(A) serves the residents served by an eligible unit of local government;

(B) has a track record of providing community-related activities or support program innovation in communities of color;

(C) focuses on training technical skills to prepare opportunity youth for in-demand occupations; and

(D) provides—

(i) training for opportunity youth who are basic skills deficient; and

(ii) soft skills training that enables opportunity youth to engage successfully in work culture;

(2) an Indian Tribe or an agency primarily serving Native Americans;

(3) an entity that carries out activities authorized under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) that has a focus on opportunity youth;

(4) a federally or State recognized apprenticeship program;

(5) an accredited community college; or

(6) an eligible unit of local government.

(c) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall require grantees under this section to report to the Secretary on primary measures funded under this section for—

(1) entry into job training, education, apprenticeship, skilled trades training, or other paid and unpaid work experiences that have as a component academic and occupational education programs; and

(2) changes in overall school enrollment, unemployment, or weekly earnings for opportunity youth participating in activities of the respective grantee.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BASIC SKILLS DEFICIENT.—The term “basic skills deficient” means an individual who—

(A) is a youth and has English reading, writing, or computing skills at or below the 8th grade level on a generally accepted standardized test; or

(B) is unable to compute or solve problems, or read, write, or speak English, at a level necessary to function on the job, in the individual’s family, or in society.

(2) IN-DEMAND OCCUPATION.—The term “in-demand occupation” means an occupation described in section 3(23)(A)(i) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102(23)(A)(ii)).

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2022, to remain available through fiscal year 2029.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

□ 1430

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4118.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is experiencing an epidemic of violence, particularly gun violence, that is ravaging communities large and small across the United States. Research shows that

violence begets more violence. It is a vicious cycle.

H.R. 4118, the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, would provide grant funding for community violence intervention programs and youth workforce development programs to help prevent gun violence and other violent crimes, and to provide critical support services to people and communities who are in dire need of help.

In addition to saving countless lives, it would also save billions of dollars. It is estimated that gun violence costs this Nation a staggering \$280 billion every single year.

This legislation would help establish evidence-based community violence intervention, or CVI programs, staffed by specialists with ties to their communities. These programs connect people at risk of committing violence, and those at risk of being victimized by violence, with intensive counseling and support services.

Because we know that access to job training, apprenticeship, and other workforce development programs are effective tools in reducing community violence, the bill would also support workforce development programs for youth in communities that are disproportionately impacted by violence.

Experience tells us that these programs work, reducing rates of homicide and other gun violence by as much as 50 percent. We must invest in these remarkably effective programs so that we can finally break the cycle of violence, which has shattered so many communities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative STEVE HORSFORD for introducing this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), my friend and colleague, a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is head-spinning that House Democrats either want to defund the police, as Judiciary member CORI BUSH does, or they want to Federalize the police, as Judiciary Chairman JERRY NADLER does. I am against both, here is why.

In my community, the voters in one of the reddest counties in Florida voted to raise their own taxes to fund school resource officers. Protecting our schools was that important, and we understood that that was the responsibility of our community.

Now, as places like Detroit, Chicago, almost every major metropolitan area in California, defund their police as some virtue signal, as some way to sacrifice the safety of their constituents on the altar of wokeism, now they want my Florida constituents to subsidize the bad decisions that they make at the State and local level, both constitutionally and practically.

The police power is not a power of the Federal Government, it is a power

of our State and local governments. When we excessively entangle ourselves in that, we do to law enforcement what we shamefully did to education.

In our schools all across this land there was innovation, creativity, school projects, different ways to learn. Then the Republicans and Democrats joined with President Bush in passing the No Child Left Behind Act, and we got Common Core, in this theory that we had to have every kid on the same page, in the same book, on the same day, and we lost what was so special about it. We don't want to do that now to law enforcement. You see, this entire package of legislation today is intended to do just that.

They don't want to fund the police. They want to edict the police to the Federal dollar. That comes with a more efficient way to ensure centralized decisionmaking, not the localized decisionmaking that our Constitution promises, and that has offered great promise to this country for generations.

Do not buy this theory that this legislation is intended to help law enforcement. The best thing we could do for law enforcement is get out of their way, have their back, and call out the politicians like those in Congress who keep trying to defund the police and devalue the commitment they make to our communities.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that the Federal Government funding police was against the Republican Party position.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, today, we have the opportunity to pass landmark legislation to make our communities across America safe, to reduce crime and save lives.

I am elated that the legislation I authored, the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, is receiving a floor vote today and will pass.

I give special thanks to my colleagues, Representatives ROBIN KELLY, LUCY MCBATH, LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, and JOE NEGUSE for working around the clock with me on this legislation, and Chairwoman BEATTY for her strong leadership.

Crime and violence don't happen in a vacuum. It happens when people lose hope and don't see opportunity in their lives or readily available in their communities. For decades, politicians in this Chamber have stoked fear about urban crime to divide us, while refusing to invest in real solutions.

Let me be clear, my father was shot and killed when I was a teenager. So this is not about politics for me; it is personal. That is why we have to focus on preventing crime before it ever starts. That is what the Break the Cycle of Violence Act will do.

It invests \$5 billion in funding for anti-violence programs and \$1.5 billion

to provide workforce training and job opportunities for youth ages 16 to 24. This money will invest in proven, community-based violence intervention programs to build safer communities. This is about saving lives and preventing crime, and our constituents are counting on us to get it done.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as I prepare to cast a vote in favor of the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, historic legislation that will reduce crime and save lives so that so many people in our community don't have to experience the pain that I have.

Every day, 110 Americans are killed with guns and over 200 are shot and wounded.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Today, gun violence remains the leading cause of premature death for Black men as well as the number two cause of premature death for Latino men and Black women.

Mr. Speaker, I am casting my vote for my father; for my constituent, Sean Jerrion Coleman, a youth leader in Las Vegas; and so many other Americans throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Greg Jackson at Community Justice Action Fund; Pastor Troy Martinez in Las Vegas; Erica Ford; Giffords: Courage to Fight Gun Violence—some many other groups—Everytown for Gun Safety; Brady: United Against Gun Violence; and Moms Demand Action.

Let's pass H.R. 4118 and break the cycle of violence. This is about supporting and funding the communities that need law enforcement.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I find myself pretty upset today. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to deceive the American people. Democrats are only bringing up these bills today because 46 days from a midterm election they want the American people to suddenly and miraculously believe that they care about the crime crisis plaguing our Nation.

There were 219 Democrats who voted to defund the police and take away resources from law enforcement, including qualified immunity. There were 219 Democrats who voted for legislation that effectively destroyed the profession that I love so much. You can laugh, Mr. Chair, I wore the uniform of local law enforcement, and that smirk upsets me.

Make no mistake, Democrats are the reason recruitment, retention, and morale of law enforcement officers is at an all-time low and crime is at an all-time high. The timing of these bills is an insult to the law enforcement community and the American people.

To my Democrat colleagues: Where were you when the protesters came to my State of Minnesota and set up

GoFundMe pages to raise money and bail out violent criminals who assaulted and beat innocent people?

Where were you when a Member of the California delegation came to Minnesota to stir up aggression and hatred toward my brothers and sisters in the blue and brown?

Where were you when officers were being violently assaulted and killed each day across this country?

Where were you when America's police officers and their families were begging for support and needed elected officials to have their backs? Where were you?

I will tell you where you were. They were here in this Chamber pushing police departments to be defunded. They wanted to defund, dismantle, and disarm the police.

Regardless of how I vote today, I have to tell you that I am furious that days before an election, and for political purposes only, these bills are being brought up by my colleagues. The American people have suffered enough, and at the end of the day the American people and our law enforcement community do not appreciate being used as pawns for political gain.

To the American people, I know the crime crisis you and your families are facing is very real. I will not stop my work to reinvigorate the law enforcement profession, to hold lax prosecutors accountable, and to put violent criminals away.

Mr. Speaker, my time in uniform may be over, but my watch will never end.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, if you could ever be fed up—I am fed up. Fed up, and fed up with the babbling that we are hearing from Republicans on the other side.

You know, the question should be: Where were you on January 6 when law enforcement were bleeding on the steps of the United States Capitol, passing out, and dying? Where were you? This is not a political circumstance. These are people who are standing here because STEVE HORSFORD had a personal experience.

The Judiciary Committee has consistently supported intervention programs dealing with countering violence. This bill, Break the Cycle of Violence Act, is needed in America. Stand up with us, Republicans. A bill that takes a vital step toward reducing community violence and improving public safety by investing in people, their communities, and establish evidence-based programs proven to help reduce violence. Our law enforcement are begging for this.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has a crisis of violence, particularly gun violence, and it is tearing at our communities.

I have a husband and a baby shot dead, the mother calling: Where is my husband and baby? The baby is found dead.

The cause of gun violence, \$280 billion, \$700 annually for every American, \$488,000 for shootings dealing with medical and criminal expenses.

My brothers and sisters, where are we in standing for America and law enforcement and families and children?

Support H.R. 4118 so that we can divert children away from violence and move toward opportunities. I don't know what you are saying. I am fed up. Do something about it so that we can fight for justice in this country and stand for people who want to be safe in their community.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4118, the "Break the Cycle of Violence Act," a bill that takes a vital step towards reducing community violence and improving public safety by investing in people, their communities, and established, evidence-based programs proven to help reduce violence.

Our nation has a crisis of violence, particularly gun violence, that is tearing our communities apart. Violent crime is not a blue or red state problem—it ravages large cities, small towns, and even rural communities. It causes unspeakable pain to its victims and their families—regardless of party affiliation.

The bill would provide \$1.5 billion in workforce development grants for youth in communities that are disproportionately impacted by violence; and \$5 billion in grants over 8 years for evidence-based, community violence intervention programs likely to succeed—to develop and support:

community outreach programs, staffed by violence intervention specialists with ties to their communities;

hospital-based violence intervention programs to provide intensive counseling, peer support, and social services;

group violence intervention strategies that provide culturally responsive support and services; and

violence interruption and crisis management initiatives that respond to and mediate potentially violent conflicts and provide support services where violence has already occurred.

While the human cost of gun violence is at times overwhelming, the economic costs for communities and taxpayers is also stunning. The total cost of gun violence is \$280 billion—every year—with every American bearing \$700 of the cost annually as well.

Because a single gun homicide costs taxpayers \$448,000 in medical and criminal justice expenses and we know that community violence intervention programs have been shown to dramatically reduce rates of homicide and other gun violence by as much as 50 percent—and sometimes more—this bill will save lives and taxpayer dollars.

Many violence intervention programs work side-by-side with law enforcement to stop violence before it starts and engage in targeted enforcement actions. Trained violence interrupters and crisis management specialists do the same, while also providing trauma-informed grief counseling.

We know these programs work. In communities across the country, from New Jersey to Nebraska, from Massachusetts to Missouri, community violence intervention programs have reduced incidences of homicide and other gun violence by as much as 50 percent, sometimes more.

Recognizing the critical role that education, training, and viable employment play in unlocking economic mobility, long-term stability, thereby preventing violence, H.R. 4118 would divert young people away from the circumstances that foster gun violence toward opportunities to gain useful skills to obtain good jobs that pay a living-wage.

If we are truly going to break the cycle of violence—we must acknowledge that violence is neither red nor blue—support programs that address the root causes of violence, and give aid to those who need it most—through the community members and leaders who know them best.

I commend Representative STEVEN HORSFORD for his work on this important bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would say, if this bill was so important—we have had over 20 markups in the Judiciary Committee—why didn't this bill come up? We have had markups in the last 2 days on one occasion, so I don't know why this bill didn't come up.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is about giving dollars to community organizers. This bill is most definitely—\$5 billion goes to Health and Human Services, \$1.5 billion goes to the Department of Labor, zero money goes to law enforcement.

In the last bill, they could at least make that case somewhat. This bill you can't. It doesn't give one penny to law enforcement. In fact, the legislation explicitly says it can't go to police officers and it can't go to police departments.

But what it does do is this: sets up an Office of Community Violence Intervention to administer programs or activities related to violence intervention; it sets up a Community Violence Intervention Advisory Committee; it sets up a National Community Violence Response Center. Three new bureaucracies in the Department of HHS. I mean, wow.

□ 1445

This is all about taking money, taking American tax dollars from communities who did fund their police and setting up three new bureaucracies, \$5 billion for community organizers.

If that is what you are for, vote for it, but I sure ain't. I know the folks I represent and, I would guess, most Americans aren't for that.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. JORDAN apparently isn't listening. This is a package of bills. The last bill, which

he opposed, appropriated money for police. This bill complements it by appropriating money for antiviolenence intervention.

Mr. Speaker, our communities have seen enough violence and bloodshed. The Break the Cycle of Violence Act gives us the opportunity to prevent violence before it starts and to provide critical support to our most impacted communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this crucial legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1377, I call up the bill (H.R. 5768) to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program to establish, create, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 117-62, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 117-483, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5768

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 “Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act of 2022” or “VICTIM Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Research indicates that law enforcement agencies can increase clearance rates by improv-

(A) investigative processes;

(B) detective capacities; and

(C) organizational oversight and supervision of investigations.

(2) When a law enforcement agency expends additional investigative effort, the law enforcement agency improves its success in gaining cooperation of key witnesses and increases the amount of forensic evidence collected.

(3) Effective investigation of shootings can prevent subsequent related violence by—

(A) deterring retaliation; and

(B) providing interventions to individuals who may continue to commit crimes or become victims of retaliatory violence.

(4) Law enforcement agencies that demonstrate higher rates of clearance for violent crimes committed against a person—

(A) have more structured oversight and formal interactions between investigative units and agency leadership;

(B) are more likely to have investigative units that have collaborative relationships and robust information sharing with other units of the law enforcement agency;

(C) have investigative units that have specific goals and performance metrics for both the unit and for investigators within the unit;

(D) have investigators who more frequently respond to the initial crime scene shortly after crimes have been reported to collect evidence and interview witnesses;

(E) have investigators who either have specialized experience before joining investigative units or are trained in investigations once they join those units;

(F) often have standard operating procedures for investigations that establish policies and evidence-based best practices for conducting and completing homicide investigations; and

(G) have better relationships with the communities they serve, even if no specific community-oriented campaign or initiative exists between investigative units and community groups.

(5) Criminal justice agencies should collaborate with each other and share best practices for solving violent crimes committed against a person.

(6) A comprehensive community engagement strategy concerning gun violence is essential to improving clearance rates for violent crimes committed against a person.

SEC. 3. GRANT PROGRAM WITH RESPECT TO VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLEARANCE BY ARREST.—The term “clearance by arrest”, with respect to an offense reported to a law enforcement agency, means the law enforcement agency—

(A) has—

(i) arrested not less than 1 person for the offense;

(ii) charged the person described in subparagraph (A) with the commission of the offense; and

(iii) referred the person described in subparagraph (A) for prosecution for the offense; or

(B) has cited an individual under the age of 18 to appear in juvenile court or before another juvenile authority with respect to the offense, regardless of whether a physical arrest occurred.

(2) CLEARANCE BY EXCEPTION.—The term “clearance by exception”, with respect to an offense reported to a law enforcement agency, means the law enforcement agency—

(A) has identified not less than 1 person suspected of the offense; and

(B) with respect to the suspect described in subparagraph (A), has—

(i) gathered enough evidence to—

(I) support an arrest of the suspect;

(II) make a charge against the suspect; and

(III) refer the suspect for prosecution;

(ii) identified the exact location of the suspect so that the suspect could be taken into custody immediately; and

(iii) encountered a circumstance outside the control of the law enforcement agency that prohibits the agency from arresting the suspect,

charging the suspect, or referring the suspect for prosecution, including—

(I) the death of the suspect;

(II) the refusal of the victim to cooperate with the prosecution after the suspect has been identified; or

(III) the denial of extradition because the suspect committed an offense in another jurisdiction and is being prosecuted for that offense.

(3) CLEARANCE RATE.—The term “clearance rate”, with respect to a law enforcement agency, means—

(A) the number of offenses cleared by the law enforcement agency, including through clearance by arrest and clearance by exception, divided by

(B) the total number of offenses reported to the law enforcement agency.

(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means a State, Tribal, or local law enforcement agency or prosecuting office, or a group of Tribal law enforcement agencies or Tribal prosecuting offices.

(5) GRANT RECIPIENT.—The term “grant recipient” means a recipient of a grant under the Program.

(6) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term “law enforcement agency” means a public agency charged with policing functions, including any component bureau of the agency (such as a governmental victim services program or village public safety officer program), including an agency composed of officers or persons referred to in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 2(10) of the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act (25 U.S.C. 2801(10)).

(7) PROGRAM.—The term “Program” means the grant program established under subsection (b)(1).

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a grant program within the Office of Justice Programs under which the Attorney General awards grants to eligible entities to establish, implement, and administer violent incident clearance and technological investigative methods.

(2) APPLICATIONS.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under the Program shall submit to the Attorney General an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by—

(A) such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require; and

(B) a description of each eligible project under paragraph (4) that the grant will fund.

(3) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—The Attorney General, in selecting a recipient of a grant under the Program, shall consider the specific plan and activities proposed by the applicant to improve clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings.

(4) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—A grant recipient shall use the grant for activities with the specific objective of improving clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings, including—

(A) ensuring the retention of detectives who are assigned to investigate homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings as of the date of receipt of the grant;

(B) hiring and training additional detectives who will be dedicated to investigating homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings;

(C) developing policies, procedures, and training to improve the ability of detectives to effectively investigate and solve homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings, including implementing best practices relating to—

(i) improving internal agency cooperation, organizational oversight and accountability, and supervision of investigations;

(ii) developing specific goals and performance metrics for both investigators and investigative units;

(iii) establishing or improving relationships with the communities the agency serves; and

(iv) collaboration with and among other law enforcement agencies and criminal justice organizations;

(D) training personnel to address the needs of victims and family members of victims of homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, or non-fatal shootings or collaborating with trained victim advocates and specialists to better meet victims' needs;

(E) acquiring, upgrading, or replacing investigative, evidence processing, or forensic testing technology or equipment;

(F) development and implementation of policies that safeguard civil rights and civil liberties during the collection, processing, and forensic testing of evidence;

(G) hiring or training personnel for collection, processing, and forensic testing of evidence;

(H) hiring and training of personnel to analyze violent crime and the temporal and geographic trends among homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and nonfatal shootings;

(I) retaining experts to conduct a detailed analysis of homicides and shootings using Gun Violence Problem Analysis (commonly known as "GVPA") or a similar research methodology;

(J) ensuring victims have appropriate access to emergency food, housing, clothing, travel, and transportation;

(K) developing competitive and evidence-based programs to improve homicide and non-fatal shooting clearance rates;

(L) developing best practices for improving access to and acceptance of victim services, including victim services that promote medical and psychological wellness, ongoing counseling, legal advice, and financial compensation;

(M) training investigators and detectives in trauma-informed interview techniques;

(N) establishing programs to support officers who experience stress or trauma as a result of responding to or investigating shootings or other violent crime incidents; or

(O) ensuring language and disability access supports are provided to victims, survivors, and their families so that victims can exercise their rights and participate in the criminal justice process.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program shall not exceed—

(A) 100 percent if the grant is awarded on or before December 31, 2032; or

(B) subject to paragraph (2), 50 percent if the grant is awarded after December 31, 2032.

(2) WAIVER.—With respect to a grant awarded under the Program after December 31, 2032, the Attorney General may determine that the Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with the grant shall not exceed 100 percent.

(d) REPORT BY GRANT RECIPIENT.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a grant under the Program, and each year thereafter, a grant recipient shall submit to the Attorney General a report on the activities carried out using the grant, including, if applicable—

(1) the number of homicide and non-fatal shooting detectives hired by the grant recipient;

(2) the number of evidence processing personnel hired by the grant recipient;

(3) a description of any training that is—

(A) provided to existing (as of the date on which the grant was awarded) or newly hired homicide and non-fatal shooting detectives; and

(B) designed to assist in the solving of crimes and improve clearance rates;

(4) any new evidence processing technology or equipment purchased or any upgrades made to existing (as of the date on which the grant was awarded) evidence technology or equipment, and the associated cost;

(5) any assessments of evidence processing technology or equipment purchased with grant funds to determine whether such technology or equipment satisfies the objectives of the use of

the technology or equipment in increasing clearance rates, and any policies in place to govern the use of the technology or equipment;

(6) the internal policies and oversight used to ensure that any technology purchased through the grant for the purposes of improving clearance rates does not violate the civil rights and civil liberties of individuals;

(7) data regarding clearance rates for homicides, rapes, other aggravated felonies, and non-fatal shootings, including the rate of clearances by arrest and clearances by exception, and crime trends from within each jurisdiction in which the grant recipient carried out activities supported by the grant;

(8) whether the grant recipient has provided grant funds to any victim services organizations, and if so, which organizations;

(9) the demographic information for victims of homicides, rapes, other aggravated felonies, and non-fatal shootings, and the length and outcomes of each investigation, including whether the investigation was cleared by arrest or exception;

(10) the demographic information for each victim or family member of a victim who received victim-related services provided by the grant recipient; and

(11) identification of the services most used by victims and their families and identification of additional services needed.

(e) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE EVALUATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall conduct an evaluation of—

(A) the practices deployed by grant recipients to identify policies and procedures that have successfully improved clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings; and

(B) the efficacy of any services provided to victims and family members of victims of homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after completion of an evaluation by the National Institute of Justice under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report including—

(A) the results of the evaluation; and

(B) information reported by each grant recipient under subsection (d).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2032.

(2) PERCENT FOR CERTAIN ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Attorney General shall use 10 percent of the amount made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year to award grants under the Program to Tribal law enforcement agencies or prosecuting offices, or groups of such agencies or offices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. 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. 5768.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5768, the VICTIM Act of 2022, is bipartisan legislation that would help law enforcement improve clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and nonfatal shootings.

As communities continue to face increased gun violence and violent crime, this bill is a vital step toward improving public safety.

Again, let me be clear: Democrats have always stood for equitable funding for law enforcement. In fact, Democratic-led cities and States have consistently funded law enforcement at much higher per capita rates than Republican-led cities, while also recognizing the need for law enforcement accountability and improving public trust.

To address the challenges our law enforcement agencies are facing, this bill would provide funding and support for agencies to hire and train detectives and investigators to improve case clearance rates.

Low clearance rates not only prevent victims from accessing justice, but they also damage the public's trust in law enforcement. By investing in the personnel and technology needed to solve cases of homicide and other serious crimes, agencies can help build public confidence and improve community safety.

In providing State, local, and Tribal agencies with additional resources, the VICTIM Act will equip agencies to better respond to and investigate these serious crimes, bringing justice for victims and keeping our communities safe.

I thank Representative VAL DEMINGS and her bipartisan cosponsors for their leadership on this issue and for introducing this important legislation.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, for reasons we have articulated on the previous bills, we oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), the sponsor of this legislation and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, real life is quite different from television or political buffoonery. Half of gun murders in the United States go unsolved. Victims are too often left with no justice and their families with little support.

Who amongst us believes that murderers or violent criminals should not be arrested and prosecuted to the full extent of the law? I pray, Mr. Speaker, that no one in this Chamber really believes that.

But, today, we will witness with our own eyes who actually wants to fund the police. I learned a long time ago, don't just listen to what they say but watch what they do.

As a former law enforcement officer, I vividly recall being on the scene of young people dead as a result of violence, knowing that their families would soon receive devastating news. We all know that there will be more families who receive those calls. I want to make sure that there are experts, trained and ready, who can help them through those horrible moments.

Mr. Speaker, I saw as a detective, a detective sergeant, and a chief of police that violent crimes require a coordinated and professional response to ensure a word that we really need to get familiar with in this Chamber, and that word is "justice."

We know that far too many police departments just do not have the resources they need to solve these heinous crimes. That is why I introduced the VICTIM Act.

I have even heard one of my former law enforcement colleagues suggest that the Department of Justice has already provided enough resources.

Let me be clear about what this bill does. This legislation provides additional Federal resources for State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies to make sure that our men and women in blue—remember, back the blue—have the support they need to do their jobs, that survivors of violent crime have the support they need to try, Mr. Speaker, to rebuild.

But this is not a blank check. This funding must specifically be used for the hiring and training of detectives and victim support specialists.

Further, recipients would be required to regularly report how the money was spent and how it affected clearance rates for homicides and nonfatal shootings.

The National Institute of Justice will evaluate these reports and see what works and see what did not work. We are demanding results, or at least we should be because our communities are demanding results.

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

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. As the chief of police in Orlando, we were laser-focused on reducing violent crimes. I ask my colleagues who like to talk about violent crime to join us in reducing violent crime. We were able to do so because we had the resources to do so.

This legislation is supported by the FOP, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the National Policing Institute, and the National Association of Police Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in backing the blue.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 2020, mobs of radical leftists burned our cities, preyed on innocent citizens, attacked our police officers, and occupied business districts during what one leftist Democrat mayor called the summer of love. At least 25 people were killed.

Republicans called for law and order. Democrats called for defunding our police departments and releasing dangerous criminals onto our streets, often within hours of their arrests. In the cities they controlled, they did just that.

In those cities, crime has skyrocketed, including the fastest increase in homicides ever recorded in our Nation. Ironically, the greatest victims are their own constituents, who are now turning on them.

Crime doesn't concern House Democrats, but losing political support before an election, that scares them to death, so we have these bills brought hurriedly to the floor today.

Let me point out the obvious. Republican communities have backed their police departments with the local funds and the moral support they need to do their jobs. Democratic cities have defunded and demonized their police departments.

The Democrats' response is to take the taxes paid by the citizens who fully funded their police departments and give them to those Democratic cities that have cut them, and still virtually none of the money they propose to spend is for actual law enforcement. It is, rather, for intervention, de-escalation, training, public health, and social work training, all administered by the increasingly corrupt and politicized Department of Justice.

We have watched the Democrats utterly destroy the cities that they have dominated for decades. Do we really want to let them do the same thing to our country?

Americans need to ask themselves how much farther down this dismal road they are willing to go. We can restore safety to all of our communities the moment we summon the political will to do so.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a victims' act. So many of us have worked with our law enforcement and victims.

The VICTIM Act would provide \$100 million annually in grant funding to law enforcement agencies and prosecuting officers to bolster their ability to investigate and clear cases of homicide, rape, sexual assault, kidnapping, and nonfatal shootings. All have family members that are left wondering and in pain. This VICTIM Act, as someone who has always worked with victims, ensures that they are not left empty.

Homicide clearance rates, in particular, have dropped consistently since the 1960s, leaving many unsolved cases and many victims and their families still searching. I want my colleagues to have a heart. They are still searching for justice.

This legislation by Congresswoman DEMINGS addresses the challenges our law enforcement agencies are facing in solving homicides and other violent crimes in red States and blue States. This critical funding would help agencies improve their clearance rates through various means. It helps retain detectives. It helps in training personnel.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It provides for low clearance rates, which disproportionately affect victims and families of victims of marginalized communities. Not only do they prevent victims from accessing justice, but they also damage the public's trust.

I have given money to help victims, and victims say: "Do you know what? We are left alone," the victims or families. "We are left alone to address this disparity."

This bill will help not leave them alone, keep pressure on finding that culprit, that individual who violated them, that criminal who has violated them, and also by providing agencies with additional resources.

This \$100 million is to help victims. Is there anybody on the floor that wants to join in a bipartisan manner to help victims or to work with law enforcement who are on the job, who are saying: We need help because victims need help, and we certainly need to solve the crimes for these families who are longing to understand about their loved ones who have been raped, assaulted, and those who have lost their lives.

I remind my colleagues of the father and baby in my community who were found dead. They need help.

Support the VICTIM Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5768, Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act of 2022" or the "VICTIM Act," that would provide \$100 million annually in grant funding to law enforcement agencies and prosecuting offices to bolster their ability to investigate and clear cases of homicide, rape, sexual assault, kidnapping, and non-fatal shootings.

As someone who has always supported law enforcement, let me state plainly—this bill is about funding law enforcement agencies—not defunding them.

Homicide clearance rates, in particular, have dropped consistently since the 1960's leaving many unsolved cases and many victims and their families still searching for justice. In 2020, the clearance rate for homicides fell to roughly 50 percent while pressure on law enforcement officials increased—leading to calls for more funding for overburdened departments with sizable caseloads and depleted resources.

To address the challenges our law enforcement agencies are facing in solving homicides and other violent crime—in red states and blue states—this critical funding would help agencies improve their clearance rates through various means, including:

ensuring retention of detectives assigned to violent crimes;

hiring and training additional detectives and investigators dedicated specifically to investigating homicides and other violent crimes;

hiring and training personnel for collecting, processing, and testing forensic evidence; and hiring and training personnel to analyze violent crime trends.

Low clearance rates—which disproportionately affect victims and families of victims of marginalized communities—not only prevent victims from accessing justice, but they also damage the public's trust in law enforcement.

To address this disparity, funding in the bill could be used to train personnel to address the needs of victims and family members and develop competitive and evidence-based programs and practices to improve both clearance rates and victim services—thereby rebuilding public confidence and improving community safety.

The bill would also ensure victim services programs are funded, staffed, and trained, and that they provide restorative support to victims and their families.

Investing in personnel as well as the technology needed to solve cases of homicide and other violent crime, also helps build public confidence and improve community safety.

That is why H.R. 5768's funding can be used to acquire, upgrade, or replace investigative or evidence processing technology or equipment.

By providing agencies with additional resources—drawing from an authorized amount of \$100 million dollars—the VICTIM Act would equip agencies to better respond to and investigate serious crimes—delivering justice to victims and making our communities safer.

I commend Representative Val Demings for championing this thoughtful, bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter dated November 1, 2021, from the Major Cities Chiefs Association and an article from Third Way titled “The Red City Defund Police Problem.”

MAJOR CITIES CHIEFS ASSOCIATION,
November 1, 2021.

Hon. VAL DEMINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. DEMINGS: I write on behalf of the Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA) to register our strong support for H.R. 5768, the VICTIM Act. The MCCA is a professional organization of police executives representing the largest cities in the United States and Canada.

Nearly every major city in the United States is contending with a rise in violent crime. According to the MCCA's most recent Violent Crime Survey, comparing midyear 2020 with midyear 2021, homicides are up roughly 20 percent in major cities. In addition, most MCCA members have reported significant increases in gun violence, evidenced by the uptick in aggravated assaults.

The grants authorized in the VICTIM Act will help law enforcement agencies overcome some of the challenges associated with responding to the current increase in violent crime. More specifically, this bill will provide law enforcement with critical resources

to address staffing challenges, enhance their forensics capabilities, further deploy investigative technologies, and provide services to victims of violent crime and their families.

Thank you for your continued leadership and support for our brave law enforcement officers. The MCCA stands ready to help advance this legislation.

Sincerely,
JERI WILLIAMS,
Chief, Phoenix Police Department,
President, Major Cities Chiefs Association.

[From Third Way, June 8, 2022]

THE RED CITY DEFUND POLICE PROBLEM

(By Jim Kessler, Executive Vice President for Policy, and Kylie Murdock, Executive Coordinator)

In recent years, Republicans have tagged Democrats as the party of “defund the police.” This political charge has at its roots an unfortunate choice of sloganeering and policy from a small number of progressive activists frustrated and fed up with long-standing police violence and abuse directed toward minorities. However intentioned, the defund charge proved damaging to Democrats. Republicans ran myriad attack ads in 2020 and the attack was credited with Republican upsets in swing districts that narrowed Democratic majorities in the House. This attack was so successful that during his 2022 State of the Union address, President Biden felt compelled to say, “We should all agree: The answer is not to defund the police. The answer is to fund the police. Fund them. Fund them. The President also dedicated \$10 billion from the American Rescue Plan for public safety, including \$6.5 billion in crime-fighting aid to state and local communities.

But is the Republican charge even remotely true? It has been taken as a given by much of the media just as Democrats have been pigeon-holed as soft on crime and being responsible for rampant crime across the country. Yet as our March 2022 report showed, the 25 states that voted for Donald Trump had a murder rate 40% higher than the 25 states that voted for Joe Biden. And 8 of the 10 states with the highest murder rates not only voted for Donald Trump, they voted Republican in every presidential election this century. Is the Democrats, defund the police portrait as inaccurate as its soft on crime portrait?

To answer this question, we compared the police budgets of the 25 largest Democrat-run cities and the 25 largest Republican-run cities. We pulled FY2021 and FY2022 funding data directly from city operating budgets, as well as police force data from a mixture of police department websites, city budgets, and local news sources. Using this, we calculated several key metrics—the number of police officers, police officers per capita, police funding per capita, and percent change in police budgets from FY2021 to FY2022. Per capita data allows us to control for population and compare cities like New York City and Fort Worth.

We found that despite conventional wisdom to the contrary, Democrat-run cities employ far more police officers and spend far more money on policing per capita than Republican-run cities. In fact, police forces in Dem cities are 75 percent larger than police forces in GOP cities. And Democrats spend about 38 percent more per person on policing than Republicans do. On average, Democrat- and Republican-run cities all saw an increase in police funding in 2022, with Democrats actually increasing police budgets by slightly more.

The data make clear—Republicans may talk about funding the police, but they trail badly as compared to Democrats.

DEM CITIES EMPLOY MORE POLICE OFFICERS PER CAPITA THAN GOP CITIES

The size of a city's police force is often seen as indicative of its support for law enforcement. Democrats have been accused of defunding the police and cutting police funding and staff. We compared the 25 most populous cities run by each party as defined by the political affiliation of its mayor to see if this potent political charge is true.

The 25 most populous Democratic cities run from New York City with 8,177,025 inhabitants to Memphis with 650,980. The 25 most populous Republican cities run from Jacksonville with a population of 949,611 to Glendale in Arizona with 248,325 residents. In total, the 25 most populous Democratic cities are home to 37,470,584 people, while the commensurate 25 Republican cities have a combined total of 10,415,763.

We found that in the aggregate:

Democrat-run cities employ 288.2 officers per 100,000 residents, compared to Republican-run cities with only 164.6 officers per 100,000 residents.

Police forces in cities with Democratic mayors are 75.1% larger than police forces in GOP cities.

Of the ten cities with the largest per capita police forces, nine are run by Democrats—Washington DC, Chicago, Las Vegas, New York City, Detroit, Philadelphia, Memphis, Boston, and Los Angeles. Miami, coming in at ninth, is the only Republican-run city in the top ten.

We also compared the median per capita police force average since larger cities like New York and Los Angeles can skew results. Among these same cities, those with Democratic mayors had a median of 195.3 officers per 100,000 residents, or 23.1 percent more than the 158.7 median for Republican run cities.

The size of a city didn't seem to be a determining factor in the per capita rate of police officers. For example, Phoenix, San Antonio, and San Diego ranked 5th, 6th, and 8th in population, but ranked 34th, 40th, and 42nd in police per capita. Meanwhile, Las Vegas, Detroit, Memphis, and Miami ranked 25th, 27th, 28th and 33rd in population, but ranked 3rd, 5th, 7th, and 9th in police per capita. Oklahoma City and Las Vegas have nearly identical populations (676,492 versus 675,592), but Republican-led Oklahoma City had a police force roughly one-third the size of Las Vegas with its Democratic mayor (162.6 officers compared to 444.1 per 100,000 residents).

DEM CITIES SPEND MORE MONEY ON POLICING THAN GOP CITIES

Republicans have decried Democrats, attempts to cut police budgets in liberal cities across the country. But we found that Democrats spend more on policing than Republicans do.

Republican-run cities spend \$361 per resident on police. Democrat-run cities spend \$498 per resident, about 38 percent more than Republicans. Because aggregate police budgets can be skewed by larger cities, we also looked at the median per capita police budgets for these sets of 25 cities. Once again, Democrat-run cities had median police budgets 31 percent greater than Republican-run cities, \$423.55 to \$323.40 per resident.

Of the ten cities that spent the most on policing per capita, six of them are Democrat-run and four are Republican-run. Cities often criticized by Republicans for being “soft-on-crime”—New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, Detroit, Seattle—are all in the top 15 on police funding per person. Republican strongholds like Bakersfield and Oklahoma City spend less than half of what New York City and Chicago spend on their police.

DEM CITIES SAW SLIGHTLY LARGER POLICE BUDGET INCREASES THAN GOP CITIES IN 2022

Defund the police may exist as a slogan, but it does not exist as a policy—at least in

the 50 cities that we reviewed. Between FY2021 to FY2022, Democrat-run cities saw a 4.34 percent increase in police funding—from \$17.89 billion to \$18.67 billion, or about 775 million in the aggregate. Republican-run cities saw a 4.11 percent increase—from \$3.62 billion to \$3.76 billion, \$148 million in the aggregate.

Twenty-one of 25 Democratic cities and 21 of 25 Republican cities showed budget increases in FY2022. Cities like New York and Los Angeles are often mentioned in defund the police attacks—both cities increased their police budgets in 2022. In fact, the ten largest Democrat-run cities increased their police budgets in 2022, though Philadelphia's held fairly constant with a 0.28 percent increase. New York City's increase of 3.75 percent added \$196 million. Chicago, Portland, and Seattle—cities often accused of defunding the police—all saw increases in their 2022 police budgets. Paradoxically, Washington DC had the largest budget cut of 3.98 percent but also the largest police budget per resident at \$751.62.

CONCLUSION

Democrats have been accused of defunding the police as a larger “soft on crime” message from Republican officeholders and conservative media. In a previous report, we found that homicide rates were significantly higher in the 25 states that voted for Trump compared to the 25 states that voted for Biden.

In this report, we find that police funding and police personnel levels are far higher in the 25 largest Democrat-run cities compared to the 25 largest Republican-run cities. In the most recent funding cycle, these same Democratic cities increased their police budgets to a greater degree than cities with Republican mayors.

Our conclusion is that the defund the police charge against Democrats may be politically damaging, but it is factually inaccurate. If anything, Republican mayors have a defund problem.

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

□ 1500

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman, and the whole time I have been here I have been talking about crime and the rise in crime and how the Republican Party has supported the police.

Down South, we use a lot of common sense sometimes to solve issues, and the biggest issue we have right now in the country is the border. So what happens is that the drugs and the human trafficking follow through and goes to these cities. That is why we are seeing a rise in fentanyl.

One of the things I have observed is they use backpacks for the heroin and cocaine and fentanyl to pay their passage to the drug cartel.

So now the Democrats are panicked because we have an open border. We also have a rise in crime. It is just curious to me that now, all of sudden, we want to address these issues.

If you just look at the record across the country, Republican cities seem to manage crime so much better. So I don't think that more money is always a solution. Very often it is more management and local control.

I encourage a “no” on this, and I am honored to speak on this.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the VICTIM Act is bipartisan legislation that would increase public safety and improve law enforcement practices. The rise in violent crime affects every community across the country, not just Democratic communities.

But we also know that public safety and respect for civil rights can coexist. Building healthy and strong communities does not require us to choose between our rights and our safety.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for introducing this important legislation, which is supported by a wide range of law enforcement associations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 6448;

H.R. 8542;

H.R. 4118; and

H.R. 5768.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 6448) to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law

enforcement officers, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 64, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—360

Adams	DeGette	Johnson (TX)
Aderholt	DeLauro	Jones
Aguilar	DelBene	Joyce (OH)
Allred	Demings	Joyce (PA)
Amodei	DeSaulnier	Kahele
Armstrong	Deutch	Kaptur
Auchincloss	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Axne	Dingell	Keating
Bacon	Doggett	Keller
Baird	Doyle, Michael	Kelly (IL)
Balderson	F.	Kelly (MS)
Banks	Dunn	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Ellzey	Khanna
Barragán	Emmer	Kildee
Bass	Escobar	Kilmer
Beatty	Eshoo	Kim (CA)
Bentz	Espallat	Kim (NJ)
Bera	Evans	Kind
Bergman	Feenstra	Kinzinger
Beyer	Ferguson	Kirkpatrick
Bice (OK)	Finstad	Krishnamoorthi
Bilirakis	Fischbach	Kuster
Bishop (GA)	Fitzgerald	Kustoff
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Blunt Rochester	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Bonamici	Fletcher	Lamb
Bost	Flood	Lamborn
Bourdeaux	Flores	Larsen (WA)
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Larson (CT)
F.	Fox	Latta
Brady	Frankel, Lois	LaTurner
Brown (MD)	Franklin, C.	Lawrence
Brown (OH)	Scott	Lawson (FL)
Brownley	Fulcher	Lee (CA)
Buchanan	Gallagher	Lee (NV)
Bucshon	Gallego	Leger Fernandez
Budd	Garamendi	Lesko
Burgess	Garbarino	Letlow
Bustos	Garcia (CA)	Levin (CA)
Butterfield	Garcia (TX)	Lieu
Calvert	Gibbs	Lofgren
Carbajal	Gimenez	Long
Cárdenas	Golden	Lowenthal
Carey	Gonzales, Tony	Lucas
Carl	Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer
Carson	Gonzalez,	Luria
Carter (LA)	Vicente	Lynch
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	Mace
Cartwright	Granger	Malinowski
Case	Graves (LA)	Malliotakis
Casten	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.
Castro (TX)	Griffith	Maloney, Sean
Chabot	Grijalva	Mann
Cheney	Guest	Manning
Cherfilus-	Guthrie	Matsui
McCormick	Harder (CA)	McBath
Chu	Harris	McCaul
Ciilline	Harshbarger	McCollum
Clark (MA)	Hartzler	McEachin
Clarke (NY)	Hayes	McGovern
Cleaver	Herrell	McHenry
Cline	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	McNerney
Cohen	Hill	Meeks
Cole	Himes	Meijer
Comer	Hinson	Meng
Connolly	Hollingsworth	Meuser
Conway	Horsford	Mfume
Cooper	Houlihan	Miller (WV)
Correa	Hoyer	Miller-Meeks
Costa	Hudson	Moolenaar
Courtney	Huffman	Mooney
Craig	Huizenga	Moore (UT)
Crawford	Issa	Moore (WI)
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Morelle
Crow	Jacobs (CA)	Moulton
Cuellar	Jacobs (NY)	Mrvan
Curtis	Jayapal	Mullin
Davids (KS)	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)
Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (NC)
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)	Nadler
Dean	Johnson (OH)	Napolitano
DeFazio	Johnson (SD)	Neal

Neguse Newhouse Newman Norcross O'Halleran Obermolte Omar Palazzo Pallone Panetta Pappas Pascrell Payne Pelosi Peltola Pence Perlmutter Perry Peters Phillips Pingree Porter Posey Price (NC) Quigley Raskin Reschenthaler Rice (NY) Rodgers (WA) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Ross Rouzer Roybal-Allard Ruiz Ruppersberger Rush Rutherford Ryan (NY)	Ryan (OH) Salazar Sánchez Sarbanes Scanlon Schakowsky Schiff Schneider Schradler Schrier Scott (VA) Scott, Austin Scott, David Sempolinski Sewell Sherman Sherrill Simpson Sires Slotkin Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smucker Soto Spanberger Spartz Speier Stansbury Stanton Stauber Steel Stefanik Steil Steube Stevens Strickland Suozzi Swalwell	Takano Tenney Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS) Thompson (PA) Timmons Titus Tonko Torres (NY) Trahan Trone Turner Underwood Upton Valadao Van Duyn Vargas Veasey Wagner Walberg Waltz Wasserman Schultz Watson Coleman Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Welch Wenstrup Westerman Wexton Wild Williams (GA) Wilson (FL) Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Yarmuth	Crenshaw (Ellzey) Cuellar (Garcia (TX)) DeFazio (Pallone) DeGette (Blunt Rochester) DeSaulnier (Beyer) DesJarlais (Fleischmann) Dingell (Stevens) Doggett (Beyer) Donalds (Timmons) Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly) Duncan (Weber (TX)) Fallon (Ellzey) Frankel, Lois (Brownley) Gibbs (Bucshon) Gimenez (Mast) Gomez (Correa) Gonzales, Tony (Fleischmann) Granger (Ellzey) Graves (LA) (Moore UT)) Greene (GA) (Gosar) Herrera Beutler (Moore UT)) Huffman (Brownley) Issa (Garcia (CA)) Jackson (Ellzey) Jacobs (NY) (Sempolinski) Johnson (GA) (Pallone) Johnson (LA) (Fleischmann) Johnson (TX) (Stevens) Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)	Katko (Upton) Keating (Correa) Khanna (Garcia (TX)) Kind (Conolly) Kinzinger (Upton) Kirkpatrick (Pallone) LaHood (Kustoff) Lamb (Pallone) Larson (CT) (Stevens) LaTurner (Garbarino) Lawrence (Stevens) Lawson (FL) (Evans) Letlow (Moore (UT)) Levin (MI) (Correa) Loudermilk (Fleischmann) Mace (Timmons) McCaul (Pfluger) McClain (Fleischmann) McEachin (Beyer) Meijer (Upton) Meng (Escobar) Meuser (Weber (TX)) Miller (WV) (Murphy NC)) Miller-Meeks (Keller) Moore (WI) (Beyer) Moulton (Stevens) Murphy (FL) (Wasserman Schultz) Napolitano (Correa) Neal (Kildee) Nehls (Taylor)	Newman (Beyer) Norman (Babin) Palazzo (Fleischmann) Pascrell (Pallone) Perlmutter (Neguse) Quigley (Kelly (IL)) Reschenthaler (Keller) Rice (NY) (Wasserman Schultz) Rodgers (WA) (Moore UT)) Rush (Foster) Ryan (OH) (Correa) Salazar (Dunn) Sánchez (Pallone) Scott, David (Correa) Sewell (Cicilline) Sires (Pallone) Soto (Wasserman Schultz) Spartz (Banks) Steel (Obermolte) Steube (Franklin, C. Scott) Suozzi (Beyer) Swalwell (Correa) Thompson (CA) (Matsui) Tiffany (Gosar) Vargas (Correa) Waltz (Mast) Welch (Pallone) Wenstrup (Latta) Wilson (SC) (Dunn)	Casten Castor (FL) Castro (TX) Cherfilus- McCormick Chu Cicilline Clark (MA) Clarke (NY) Cleave Clyburn Cohen Connolly Cooper Correa Costa Courtney Craig Crow Cuellar Davids (KS) Davis, Danny K. Dean DeFazio DeGette DeLauro DelBene Demings DeSaulnier Deutch Dingell Doggett Doyle, Michael F. Escobar Eshoo Scott) Espallat Evans Fitzpatrick Fletcher Frankel, Lois Gallego Garamendi Garcia (IL) Garcia (TX) Golden Gomez Gonzalez, Vicente Gottheimer Green, Al (TX) Grijalva Harder (CA) Hayes Herrera Beutler Higgins (NY) Himes Horsford Houlihan Hoyer Huffman Jackson Lee Jacobs (CA) Jayapal Jeffries Johnson (GA)	Johnson (TX) Jones Kahele Kaptur Keating Kelly (IL) Khanna Kildee Kilmer Kim (NJ) Kind Kirkpatrick Krishnamoorthi Kuster Lamb Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Lawrence Lawson (FL) Lee (CA) Lee (NV) Leger Fernandez Levin (CA) Levin (MI) Lieu Lofgren Lowenthal Luria Lynch Malinowski Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Manning Scott) Matsui McBath McCollum McEachin McGovern McNerney Meeks Meng Mfume Moore (WI) Morelle Moulton Mrvan Murphy (FL) Nadler Napolitano Neal Neguse Newman Norcross O'Halleran Ocasio-Cortez Omar Pallone Panetta Pappas Pascrell Payne Peltola Perlmutter Peters Phillips	Pingree Pocan Porter Pressley Price (NC) Quigley Raskin Rice (NY) Ross Roybal-Allard Ruiz Ruppersberger Rush Ryan (NY) Lamb Ryan (OH) Sánchez Sarbanes Scanlon Schakowsky Schiff Schneider Schradler Schrier Scott (VA) Scott, David Sewell Sherman Sherrill Sires Slotkin Smith (WA) Soto Spanberger Speier Stansbury Stanton Steel Stevens Strickland Suozzi Swalwell
--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

NAYS—64

Allen Arrington Babin Biggs Bishop (NC) Boebert Bowman Brooks Buck Burchett Bush Cammack Carter (GA) Cawthorn Cloud Clyde Davidson DesJarlais Donalds Duncan Estes Fallon	Gaetz Gohmert Gomez Good (VA) Gooden (TX) Gosar Green (TN) Greene (GA) Grothman Hern Hice (GA) Higgins (LA) Jackson Jordan Levin (MI) Loudermilk Massie Mast McClain McClintock Miller (IL) Moore (AL)	Nehls Norman Ocasio-Cortez Palmer Pfluger Pocan Pressley Rice (SC) Rose Rosendale Roy Schweikert Sessions Stewart Taylor Tiffany Tlaib Van Drew Waters Williams (TX)
--	---	---

NOT VOTING—9

García (IL) Langevin McCarthy	Owens Scalise Smith (WA)	Torres (CA) Velázquez Zeldin
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------

□ 1550

Messrs. ADERHOLT, COHEN, HARRIS, LONG, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. CLINE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BABIN changed his 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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon) Barr (Guthrie) Barragán (Beyer) Bass (Correa) Blumenauer (Beyer) Bowman (Ocasio- Cortez) Brown (MD) (Trone)	Buchanan (Franklin, C. Scott) Burgess (Weber (TX)) Bustos (Brownley) Calvert (Garcia (CA)) Cárdenas (Correa)	Carter (GA) (Fleischmann) Cawthorn (Timmons) Chu (Beyer) Comer (Guthrie) Conway (LaMalfa) Crawford (Fleischmann)
--	--	---

MENTAL HEALTH JUSTICE ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CRAIG). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 8542) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 206, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—223

Adams Aguilar Alfred Auchincloss Axne Barragán Bass Beatty Bera Beyer	Bishop (GA) Blumenauer Blunt Rochester Bonamici Bourdeaux Bowman Boyle, Brendan F. Brown (MD) Brown (OH)	Brownley Bush Bustos Butterfield Carbajal Cárdenas Carson Carter (LA) Cartwright Case
--	---	--

Aderholt Allen Amodei Armstrong Arrington Babin Bacon Baird Balderson Banks Barr Bentz Bergman Bice (OK) Biggs Billirakis Bishop (NC) Boebert Bost Brady Brooks Buchanan Buck Bucshon Budd Burchett Burgess Calvert Cammack Carey	Carl Carter (GA) Carter (TX) Cawthorn Chabot Cheney Cline Cloud Clyde Cole Comer Conway Crawford Crenshaw Curtis Davidson Davis, Rodney DesJarlais Diaz-Balart Donalds Duncan Dunn Ellzey Emmer Estes Fallon Feenstra Ferguson Finstad Fischbach	Fitzgerald Fleischmann Flood Flores Foxx Franklin, C. Scott Fulcher Gaetz Gallagher Garbarino Garcia (CA) Gibbs Gimenez Gohmert Gonzales, Tony Gonzalez (OH) Good (VA) Gooden (TX) Gosar Granger Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Green (TN) Greene (GA) Griffith Grothman Guest Guthrie Harris
--	---	---

NAYS—206

Harshbarger Malliotakis
 Hartzler Mann
 Hern Massie
 Herrell Mast
 Hice (GA) McCaul
 Higgins (LA) McClain
 Hill McClintock
 Hinson McHenry
 Hollingsworth McKinley
 Hudson Meijer
 Huizenga Meuser
 Issa Miller (IL)
 Jackson Miller (WV)
 Jacobs (NY) Miller-Meeks
 Johnson (LA) Moolenaar
 Johnson (OH) Mooney
 Johnson (SD) Moore (AL)
 Jordan Moore (UT)
 Joyce (OH) Mullin
 Joyce (PA) Murphy (NC)
 Katko Nehls
 Keller Newhouse
 Kelly (MS) Norman
 Kelly (PA) Obernolte
 Kim (CA) Owens
 Kinzinger Palazzo
 Kustoff Palmer
 LaHood Pence
 LaMalfa Perry
 Lamborn Pfluger
 Latta Posey
 LaTurner Reschenthaler
 Lesko Rice (SC)
 Letlow Rodgers (WA)
 Long Rogers (AL)
 Loudermilk Rogers (KY)
 Lucas Rose
 Luetkemeyer Rosendale
 Mace Rouzer

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy Scalise Zeldin

□ 1608

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon) Donalds
 Barr (Guthrie) (Timmons)
 Barragán (Beyer) Doyle, Michael
 Bass (Correa) F. (Connolly)
 Blumenauer Duncan (Weber
 (Beyer) (TX))
 Bowman (Ocasio- Fallon (Ellzey)
 Cortez) Frankel, Lois
 Brown (MD) (Brownley)
 (Trone) Garcia (IL)
 Buchanan (Garcia (TX))
 (Franklin, C. Gibbs (Bucshon)
 Scott) Gimenez (Mast)
 Burgess (Weber Gomez (Correa)
 (TX)) Gonzales, Tony
 Bustos (Fleischmann)
 (Brownley) Granger (Ellzey)
 Calvert (Garcia Graves (LA)
 (CA)) (Moore (UT))
 Cárdenas Greene (GA)
 (Correa) (Gosar)
 Carter (GA) Herrera Beutler
 (Fleischmann) (Moore (UT))
 Cawthorn Huffman
 (Timmons) (Brownley)
 Chu (Beyer) Issa (Garcia
 (CA))
 Comer (Guthrie) (CA)
 Conway Jackson (Ellzey)
 (LaMalfa) Jacobs (NY)
 Crawford (Sempolinski)
 (Fleischmann) Johnson (GA)
 Crenshaw (Pallone)
 (Ellzey) Johnson (LA)
 Cuellar (Garcia (Fleischmann)
 (TX)) Johnson (TX)
 DeFazio (Stevens)
 (Pallone) Joyce (OH)
 DeGette (Blunt (Garbarino)
 Rochester) Katko (Upton)
 DeSaulnier Keating (Correa)
 (Beyer) Khanna (Garcia
 (TX))
 DesJarlais (Fleischmann) Kind (Connolly)
 Dingell (Stevens) Kinzinger
 Doggett (Beyer) (Upton)

Neal (Kildee) Rush (Foster)
 Nehls (Taylor) Ryan (OH)
 Newman (Beyer) (Correa)
 Norman (Babin) Salazar (Dunn)
 Owens (Stewart) Sánchez
 Palazzo (Pallone)
 Sessions (Fleischmann)
 Pascrell Scott, David
 (Pallone) (Correa)
 Perlmutter Sewell (Cicilline)
 (Neguse) Sires (Pallone)
 Quigley (Kelly Smith (WA)
 (IL)) (Beyer)
 Reschenthaler Soto (Wasserman
 (Keller) Schultz)
 Rice (NY) Spartz (Banks)
 (Wasserman) Stansbury (Kelly
 Schultz) (IL))
 Rodgers (WA) Steel (Obernolte)
 (Moore (UT)) (Dunn)

Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)
 Suozzi (Beyer) Swallowell
 (Correa)
 Thompson (CA) Thompson (PA)
 (Matsui) (Keller)
 Tiffany (Gosar) Vargas (Correa)
 Velázquez Velázquez
 (Clarke (NY)) Waltz (Mast)
 Welch (Pallone) Wenstrup (Latta)
 Wilson (SC) (Dunn)

Moulton Ross
 Mrvan Roybal-Allard
 Murphy (FL) Ruiz
 Nadler Ruppertsberger
 Napolitano Rush
 Neal Ryan (NY)
 Neguse Ryan (OH)
 Newman Sánchez
 Norcross Sarbanes
 O'Halleran Scanlon
 Ocasio-Cortez Schakowsky
 Omar Schiff
 Pallone Schneider
 Panetta Schrader
 Pappas Schriber
 Pascrell Scott (VA)
 Payne Scott, David
 Peltola Sewell
 Perlmutter Sherman
 Peters Sherrill
 Phillips Sires
 Pingree Slotkin
 Pocan Smith (WA)
 Porter Soto
 Pressley Spanberger
 Price (NC) Speier
 Quigley Stansbury
 Raskin Stanton
 Rice (NY) Stevens

NAYS—207

Aderholt Gallagher
 Allen Garbarino
 Amodei Garcia (CA)
 Armstrong Gibbs
 Arrington Gimenez
 Babin Gohmert
 Bacon Gonzales, Tony
 Baird Gonzalez (OH)
 Balderson Good (VA)
 Banks Gooden (TX)
 Barr Gosar
 Bentz Granger
 Bergman Graves (LA)
 Bice (OK) Graves (MO)
 Biggs Green (TN)
 Bilirakis Greene (GA)
 Bishop (NC) Griffith
 Boebert Grothman
 Bost Guest
 Brady Guthrie
 Brooks Harris
 Buchanan Harshbarger
 Buck Hartzler
 Bucshon Hern
 Budd Herrell
 Burchett Herrera Beutler
 Burgess Hice (GA)
 Calvert Higgins (LA)
 Cammack Hill
 Carey Hinson
 Carl Hollingsworth
 Carter (GA) Hudson
 Carter (TX) Huizenga
 Cawthorn Issa
 Chabot Jackson
 Cheney Jacobs (NY)
 Cline Johnson (LA)
 Cloud Johnson (OH)
 Clyde Johnson (SD)
 Cole Jordan
 Comer Joyce (OH)
 Conway Joyce (PA)
 Crawford Katko
 Crenshaw Keller
 Curtis Kelly (MS)
 Davidson Kelly (PA)
 Davis, Rodney Kim (CA)
 DesJarlais Kinzinger
 Diaz-Balart Kustoff
 Donalds LaHood
 Duncan LaMalfa
 Dunn Lamborn
 Ellzey Latta
 Emmer LaTurner
 Estes Lesko
 Fallon Letlow
 Feenstra Long
 Ferguson Loudermilk
 Finstad Lucas
 Fischbach Luetkemeyer
 Fitzgerald Mace
 Fleischmann Malliotakis
 Flood Mann
 Flores Massie
 Franklin, C. Mast
 Scott McCaul
 Fulcher McClain
 Gaetz McClintock

BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 4118) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 207, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]
 YEAS—220

Adams Crow
 Aguilar Cuellar
 Alford Davids (KS)
 Auchincloss Davis, Danny K.
 Axne Dean
 Barragán DeFazio
 Bass DeGette
 Beatty DeLauro
 Bera DelBene
 Beyer Demings
 Bishop (GA) DeSaulnier
 Blumenauer Deutsch
 Blunt Rochester Dingell
 Bonamici Doggett
 Bourdeaux Doyle, Michael
 Bowman F.
 Boyle, Brendan Escobar
 F.
 Brown (MD) Eshoo
 Brown (OH) Espallat
 Brownley Evans
 Bush Fitzpatrick
 Bustos Fletcher
 Butterfield Foster
 Carbajal Frankel, Lois
 Cárdenas Gallego
 Carson Garamendi
 Carter (LA) Garcia (IL)
 Cartwright Carter (TX)
 Case Golden
 Casten Gomez
 Castor (FL) Gonzalez,
 Castro (TX) Vicente
 Cherfilus-Gottheimer
 (McCormick) Green, Al (TX)
 Chu Grijalva
 Cicilline Harder (CA)
 Clark (MA) Hayes
 Clarke (NY) Higgins (NY)
 Cleaver Himes
 Clyburn Horsford
 Connolly Houlahan
 Cooper Hoyer
 Correa Huffman
 Costa Jackson Lee
 Courtney Jacobs (CA)
 Craig Jeffries

McHenry
 McKinley
 Meijer
 Meuser
 Miller (IL)
 Miller (WV)
 Miller-Meeks
 Moolenaar
 Mooney
 Moore (AL)
 Moore (UT)
 Mullin
 Murphy (NC)
 Nehls
 Newhouse
 Norman
 Obernolte
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Pfluger
 Posey
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Salazar
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sempolinski
 Sessions
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Spartz
 Stauber
 Steel
 Steffanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiffany
 Timmons
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Drew
 Van Duyne
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Waltz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)

Wenstrup Williams (TX) Wittman
Westerman Wilson (SC) Womack

NOT VOTING—5

Cohen McCarthy Zeldin
Foxx Scalise

□ 1626

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon) Greene (GA) Moulton
Barr (Guthrie) (Gosar) (Stevens)
Barragan (Beyer) Herrera Beutler Murphy (FL)
Bass (Correa) (Moore (UT)) (Wasserman)
Blumenauer Huffman Schultz
(Beyer) (Brownley) Napolitano
Bowman (Ocasio- Issa (Garcia) (Correa)
Cortez) (CA)) Neal (Kildee)
Brown (MD) Jackson (Ellzey)
(Trone) Jacobs (NY) Newman (Beyer)
Buchanan (Sempolinski) Norman (Babin)
(Franklin, C. Johnson (GA) Owens (Stewart)
Scott) (Pallone) Palazzo
Burgess (Weber) Johnson (LA) (Fleischmann)
(TX) (Fleischmann) Pascrell
Bustos Johnson (TX) (Pallone)
(Brownley) (Stevens) Perlmutter
Calvert (Garcia) Joyce (OH)
(CA) (Garbarino) (Neguse)
Cardenas Katko (Upton)
(Correa) Keating (Correa) Reschenthaler
Carter (GA) Khanna (Garcia) (Keller)
(Fleischmann) (TX)) Rice (NY)
Cawthorn Kind (Conolly) (Wasserman)
(Timmons) Kinzinger Schultz
Chu (Beyer) Kirkpatrick Rodgers (WA)
Clyburn (Pallone) Rush (Foster)
(Panetta) LaHood (Kustoff) Ryan (OH)
Comer (Guthrie) Lamb (Pallone) (Correa)
Conway Langevin Salazar (Dunn)
(LaMalfa) (Lynch) Sanchez
Crawford Larson (CT) (Pallone)
(Fleischmann) (Stevens) Scott, David
Crenshaw LaTurner (Correa)
(Ellzey) (Garbarino) Sewell (Cicilline)
Cuellar (Garcia) Lawrence Sires (Pallone)
(TX) (Stevens) Smith (WA)
DeFazio (Pallone) Lawson (FL) (Beyer)
DeGette (Blunt) (Evans) Soto (Wasserman)
Rochester Letlow (Moore) Schultz
DeSaulnier (UT)) Clark (MA)
(Beyer) Levin (MI) Spartz (Banks)
DesJarlais (Correa) Speier (Escobar)
(Fleischmann) Lofgren (Boyle, Stansbury (Kelly)
Ellzey) Brendan F.) (IL)
Dingell (Stevens) Loudermilk Steel (Obernolte)
Doggett (Beyer) (Fleischmann) Steube
Donalds Mace (Timmons) (Franklin, C.
(Timmons) Malinowski Scott)
Doyle, Michael (Kelly (IL)) Suozzi (Beyer)
F. (Connolly) McCaul (Pfluger) Swalwell
Duncan (Weber) McClain (Correa)
(TX) McClain (Correa)
Fallon (Ellzey) (Fleischmann) Thompson (CA)
Frankel, Lois McEachin (Matsui)
(Brownley) (Beyer) Thompson (PA)
Garcia (IL) Meijer (Upton) (Keller)
(Garcia (TX)) Meng (Escobar) Tiffany (Gosar)
Gibbs (Bucshon) Meuser (Weber) Vargas (Correa)
Gimenez (Mast) (TX)) Velazquez
Gomez (Correa) Miller (WV) (Clarke (NY))
Gonzales, Tony (Murphy (NC)) Waltz (Mast)
(Fleischmann) Miller-Meeks Welch (Pallone)
Granger (Ellzey) (Keller) Wenstrup (Latta)
Graves (LA) Moore (WI) Wilson (SC)
(Moore (UT)) (Beyer) (Dunn)

VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE
AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished
business is the vote on passage of
the bill (H.R. 5768) to direct the Attorney
General to establish a grant program
to establish, create, and administer
the violent incident clearance and

technology investigative method, and
for other purposes, on which the yeas
and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device,
and there were—yeas 250, nays
178, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]
YEAS—250

Adams Garamendi Mrvan
Aguliar Garbarino Murphy (FL)
Allred Garcia (CA) Nadler
Armstrong Garcia (IL) Napolitano
Auchincloss Garcia (TX) Neal
Axne Golden Neguse
Bacon Gomez Newhouse
Barragan Gonzalez, Newman
Bass Vicente Norcross
Beatty Gottheimer O'Halleran
Bera Green, Al (TX) Obernolte
Beyer Grijalva Ocasio-Cortez
Bishop (GA) Harder (CA) Omar
Blumenauer Hayes Pallone
Blunt Rochester Herrera Beutler Pappas
Bonamici Higgins (NY) Pascrell
Bourdeaux Himes Pascrell
Bowman Hinson Payne
Boyle, Brendan Horsford Peltola
F. Houlihan Perlmutter
Brown (MD) Hoyer Peters
Brown (OH) Huffman Phillips
Brownley Jackson Lee Pingree
Budd Jacobs (CA) Rogers (KY)
Bush Jacobs (NY) Ross
Bustos Jayapal Roybal-Allard
Butterfield Jeffries Price (NC)
Calvert Johnson (GA) Quigley
Carbajal Johnson (SD) Raskin
Cardenas Johnson (TX) Rice (NY)
Carson Jones Rogers (KY)
Carter (LA) Joyce (OH)
Cartwright Kabele
Case Kaptur Ruiz
Casten Katko Ruppertsberger
Castor (FL) Keating Rush
Castro (TX) Kelly (IL) Ryan (NY)
Chabot Khanna Ryan (OH)
Cherflus-Kildee Sanchez
Smith (WA) Kilmer Sarbanes
McCormick Kim (CA) Scanlon
Chu Kim (NJ) Schakowsky
Cicilline Clark (MA) Schiff
Kind Kinzinger Schneider
Kirkpatrick Cleaver Schrader
Krishnamoorthi Kuster Schrier
Kuster Scott (VA)
Lamb Scott, David Scott (VA)
Langevin Lamb Scott, David
Larsen (WA) Langevin Sewell
Larson (CT) Larsen Sherman
Lawrence Larson (CT) Sherrill
Lawson (FL) Lawrence Sires
Lee (CA) Lawson (FL) Slotkin
Lee (NV) Lee (CA) Smith (WA)
Lee (NV) Lee (NV) Soto
Leger Fernandez Spanberger
Levin (CA) Levin (CA) Speier
Levin (MI) Levin (MI) Stansbury
Lieu Stanton
Lofgren Staubert
Lowenthal Stevens
Luria Strickland
Lynch Suozzi
Malinowski Swalwell
Malliotakis Takano
Maloney Thompson (CA)
Carolyn B. Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean Titus
Manning Tlaib
Matsui Tonko
McBath Torres (CA)
McCollum Torres (NY)
McEachin Trahan
Espaillat Trone
Evans McGovern Underwood
Finstad Meeks Underwood
Fischbach Meijer Upton
Fitzpatrick Meng Valadao
Fletcher Mfume Vargas
Flores Miller-Meeks Veasey
Foster Moore (WI) Velazquez
Frankel, Lois Morelle Wasserman
Gallego Moulton Schultz
Waters

Watson Coleman Wild
Welch Williams (GA)
Wexton Wilson (FL)

NAYS—178

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

NOT VOTING—4

Foxx Scalise
McCarthy Zeldin
□ 1650

Ms. STEFANIK changed her vote
from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so
as to read: "A bill to direct the Attorney
General to establish a grant program
to establish, implement, and administer
the violent incident clearance
and technology investigative method,
and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon) Bowman (Ocasio- Burgess (Weber)
Barr (Guthrie) Cortez) (TX))
Barragan (Beyer) Brown (MD) Bustos
Bass (Correa) (Trone) (Brownley)
Blumenauer Buchanan Calvert (Garcia)
(Beyer) (Franklin, C. (CA))
Scott)

Cárdenas (Correa)	Johnson (LA) (Fleischmann)	Neal (Kildee) (Fleischmann)
Carter (GA) (Fleischmann)	Johnson (TX) (Stevens)	Nehls (Taylor) (Fleischmann)
Cawthorn (Timmons)	Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)	Newman (Beyer) (Fleischmann)
Chu (Beyer)	Katko (Upton) (Garbarino)	Norman (Babin) (Fleischmann)
Clyburn (Panetta)	Keating (Correa) (TX)	Owens (Stewart) (Fleischmann)
Comer (Guthrie)	Khanna (Garcia) (TX)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Conway (LaMalfa)	Kind (Conolly) (TX)	Pascrell (Pallone)
Crawford (Fleischmann)	Kinzinger (Upton)	Perlmutter (Neguse)
Crenshaw (Pallone)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Quigley (Kelly) (IL)
Ellzey (Ellzey)	LaHood (Kustoff) (Pallone)	Reschenthaler (Keller)
Cuellar (Garcia) (TX)	Langevin (Lynch)	Rice (NY) (Wasserman Schultz)
DeFazio (Pallone)	Larson (CT) (Stevens)	Rodgers (WA) (Moore) (UT)
DeGette (Blunt) (Rochester)	LaTurner (Garbarino)	Rush (Foster) (Keller)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)	Lawrence (Stevens)	Ryan (OH) (Correa)
DesJarlais (Fleischmann)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Salazar (Dunn) (Pallone)
Dingell (Stevens)	Letlow (Moore) (UT)	Sánchez (Pallone)
Doggett (Beyer)	Levin (MI) (Correa)	Scott, David (Correa) (UT)
Donalds (Timmons)	Loyle, Michael F. (Connolly)	Sewell (Cicilline) (Pallone)
Duncan (Weber) (TX)	Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.) (Upton)	Smith (WA) (Beyer)
Fallon (Ellzey)	Loudermilk (Fleischmann)	Soto (Wasserman Schultz)
Frankel, Lois (Brownley)	Mace (Timmons)	Spartz (Banks) (Escobar)
Garcia (IL) (Garcia) (TX)	Malinowski (Kelly) (IL)	Speier (Escobar) (IL)
Gibbs (Bucshon)	McCaul (Pfluger) (McClain) (Fleischmann)	Stansbury (Kelly) (Steube) (Franklin, C. Scott)
Gimenez (Mast)	McEachin (Beyer)	Suzozzi (Beyer) (Swalwell) (Correa)
Gomez (Correa)	Meijer (Upton)	Thompson (CA) (Matsui)
Gonzales, Tony (Fleischmann)	Meng (Escobar) (Meuser) (Weber) (TX)	Thompson (PA) (Keller)
Granger (Ellzey)	Miller (WV) (Murphy) (NC)	Tiffany (Gosar) (Vargas) (Correa)
Graves (LA) (Moore) (UT)	Miller-Meeks (Keller)	Velázquez (Clarke) (NY)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Waltz (Mast) (Welch) (Pallone)
Herrera Beutler (Moore) (UT)	Moulton (Stevens)	Wenstrup (Latta) (Wilson) (SC) (Dunn)
Huffman (Brownley)	Murphy (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)	
Issa (Garcia) (CA)	Napolitano (Correa)	
Jackson (Ellzey)		
Jacobs (NY) (Sempolinski)		
Johnson (GA) (Pallone)		

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the Democratic Caucus chair the schedule for the week to come. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

The schedule next week: On Wednesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour; 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Thursday, we will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Next week, we will be considering a continuing resolution, very important, to fund the government. We know the fiscal year concludes on September 30. It is something that we have to get done.

It is also our expectation that we may consider legislation to reform the STOCK Act. And then we will also consider bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

Of course, additional legislative items are possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, we have seen movement in the Senate. I understand that there is activity over there. Does the gentleman have an update on when we might see that legislation in the House? But more importantly when we might see legislative text?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The Senate has apparently moved for cloture on Tuesday. So, one, it is our expectation that we are going to have an opportunity to vote to make sure that we fund the government beyond September 30.

In terms of legislative text, the negotiations are ongoing. I think everyone is working in good faith. I am thankful for the leadership on our side of Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO.

We have a responsibility to make sure that we keep the government open, and we intend to keep that responsibility.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague if he is aware of any other additional authorizing text that may be attached to the continuing resolution.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, there are ongoing negotiations in good faith. There have been several exigencies that have arisen; but I don't have visibility into the actual, precise nature of the negotiations right now.

As I mentioned, on our end, certainly they are being handled by Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO; but I know those negotiations are progressing. We expect that an agreement is going to be reached, hopefully, in the next few days. Then, of course, the gentleman will have an opportunity, as will all Members, to review the legislative text.

Mr. FERGUSON. One final thing. Leader HOYER made an announcement this summer that we were going to try to close votes in a timely fashion. As we have just seen, it is virtually impossible to do it with proxy voting because these four votes took almost 2 hours to complete.

Given that the business community is getting back to normal, we are seeing workers return to work. We are seeing businesses return to normal operations, and given that the President proclaimed that the pandemic is over, does the gentleman also expect to end proxy voting next week when the current covered period ends?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, that is a decision that ultimately will be made by the Speaker, in consultation with other members of leadership, but being guided by the public health professionals. The Capitol Physician has guided the decision up until this point in terms of the public health emer-

gency that we have been under and what the appropriate protocols are to make sure that we are being responsible.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I think America expects Congress to lead, and we are seeing, again, across the Nation, people get back to their lives, get back to normal. Certainly, there are many safe precautions that have been taken.

But clearly, showing up to work is something that Americans expect Congress to do, and I just cannot think of a reason why Members of this body—while we get on airplanes and fly back and forth to our districts every week. I see so many of our Members on both sides of the aisle attending events and speaking at various functions and, certainly, they are not campaigning remotely. I can't think of a reason why we wouldn't do away with proxy voting and show up here in the people's House in person.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to see if my colleague from New York has any insight into that.

□ 1700

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, I think the gentleman raises a very important observation that the American people expect us to lead. I think during the 117th Congress, that is absolutely what has been done.

We have led by passing the American Rescue Plan; saved the economy from perhaps collapsing into a recession, if not worse; put shots in arms, money in pockets, kids back in school. We have led by passing the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, creating millions of good-paying jobs, fixing our crumbling bridges, roads, and tunnels.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked the question. I am just responding.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

We are failing miserably in American energy independence, with the rise of home heating costs and fuel. We see what has happened to our neighbors in the European Union. We see the rising costs. Certainly, Americans are worried about that, the rising cost of rent, the out-of-control inflation, the excessive government spending. I mean, we have that.

But more importantly, we have our communities that are less safe because of the crisis at the border. The fentanyl crisis that is hitting every single community.

I don't know that we have been leading.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, go back to the specifics of the question that was asked here in terms of leading by showing up to work. I want to see if there is any kind of rational reason why we shouldn't show up in person to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I think, one, we have been operating under a public health emergency. But in the constraints of that, again, following

the guidance of the public health professionals, that is how we have been operating.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I think he has yielded the time to me, so I can yield it back to him at the appropriate time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

The President ended the pandemic, declared that it was over. If that is the case, shouldn't we be going back to normal, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, again, we are going to follow the public health guidance.

Out of courtesy, we are having this colloquy, but we can't have a colloquy if the gentleman is dissatisfied with my answers and such that he is consistently not permitting me to respond. I will be happy to respond to any questions if we are going to have a colloquy.

I think what is clear, if the point is, are we leading, correct, we are leading. As I mentioned, we are leading on the American Rescue Plan. We are leading on infrastructure investment. We are leading on standing up for our veterans, leading on public safety, leading on passing gun safety legislation, leading on—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Clearly, we see some of these important issues differently. Just sticking to the main question of proxy voting and why Members of Congress should not show up to do their job. American businesses are. We can campaign in person. Certainly voting in person seems reasonable to me.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the caucus chair, for his time today and for setting the schedule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CONDITION OF THE FREIGHT RAIL INDUSTRY

(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 highlight the urgent need to address freight rail delays.

Across the Nation, manufacturers and farmers are finding it impossible to get their goods to market via rail. Rail service delays cause disruptions to flour and feed mills, livestock producers, power companies, and many other industries.

To make freight rail a truly competitive and stable industry, we need to make sure that shippers can address these service disruptions without government intervention.

I have introduced the Freight Rail Shipping Fair Market Act to establish a level playing field for freight rail. My subcommittee solicited feedback from

shippers, the freight rail industry, and railway workers.

Mr. Speaker, I am committed to working with Members from both parties, and I encourage all Members to work with us to pass this bipartisan bill that will help freight railroads, their customers, and the American consumers.

COMMEMORATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE HISTORIC RESPONSE TO THE SHOOTING IN COLLIERVILLE, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 1-year anniversary of a tragedy that stunned our community in Collierville, Tennessee.

On September 23, 2021, a gunman opened fire at the Kroger in Collierville, shooting 15 people and killing one woman, Olivia King.

We will never forget the courage of the law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders who sprang into action.

One example: In an extraordinary act, Collierville firefighters wore bulletproof vests and rushed into the grocery store along with police officers to save lives before the active shooter was neutralized.

The quick response of our heroic first responders truly exemplifies the strength and resilience of the town of Collierville.

We will forever be grateful for the men and women who protect and serve our communities each and every day. I am proud to say that today and always we are Collierville strong.

CONGRATULATING THE HONOLULU LITTLE LEAGUE

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

Mr. KAHELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Honolulu Little League on winning the 2022 Little League World Series.

This is Hawaii's fourth Little League World Series, and it is a true privilege to represent the team, their coaches, families, and fans.

The Honolulu Little League played their first season in 1954 and is one of the oldest Little League teams in the State. This particular team's character and sportsmanship will be remembered long after their victory this year. Their enthusiasm and love for baseball is contagious, and all of Hawaii couldn't stop watching as they hit home runs, struck out batters, and invoked the mercy rule over their opponents.

I extend special commendations to Coach Gerald Oda, the team's manager and coach. I also congratulate the families of the players who have undoubtedly made their own sacrifices to pro-

vide this team with the opportunity to succeed.

This team represents Hawaii's values of unity, teamwork, and resilience. These Little Leaguers have become role models to our larger community, and I am sure the next generation of Little League World Champions in Hawaii watched this team and will be inspired by them. I know I speak for all of Hawaii, Mr. Speaker, when I say how so very proud we are.

RECOGNIZING THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF CORONA

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the First Baptist Church of Corona on its 100th anniversary.

First Baptist is the bedrock of Corona, Queens. It provides a food pantry, tax preparation, summer youth employment, and more. The church's service extends well beyond its congregation to all of Corona, one of the most diverse immigrant communities in the world.

First Baptist is led by Pastor Patrick H. Young. Pastor Young's commitment to service is unending. When Corona became the epicenter of the pandemic in early 2020, he and First Baptist community members stepped up the church's food distribution, serving hundreds of families each week. He also hosted multiple mobile testing and vaccination sites. Now, the church seeks to start a medical clinic to help their community recover and thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing the First Baptist Church of Corona. In their century of service, they have modeled the true values of welcoming the stranger and loving thy neighbor. It is my privilege to represent them.

PROTECTING MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here today, there are women approaching doctors and nurses with a medical condition. Through no fault of their own, they need OB/GYN services.

In the State of Texas, with horrific and antiquated and really vicious legislation, the doctors and nurses and medical professionals are made criminals.

I have introduced H.R. 8838, the SHIELD Act, to protect doctors and nurses and medical personnel from frivolous and dangerous litigation so the medical industry can do their job. They can do a procedure that a woman may need. They can help if a woman is in the midst of aborting because of the issue of health. They can help women who, to save their life, have to have a medical procedure if they are pregnant.

They can do their job and the oath they have taken.

I am sad to stand on the floor today in 2022 to note we live in a Nation that would condemn the healers of our land, the ones who helped us in the pandemic.

Support H.R. 8838. Sign on, cosponsor it, and let's protect the medical professionals.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

BRAIN ANEURYSM AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Trinity Love Hoblit and the Hoblit family. I rise today to recognize and bring to the attention of our country a horrible condition.

Trinity Love Hoblit was born with a rare form of primordial dwarfism and at age 9 was diagnosed with multiple brain aneurysms. Despite undergoing numerous surgeries to treat and prevent future symptoms, Trinity suffered a fatal aneurysm on June 30, 2015, at only 14 years of age.

Throughout her young life, Trinity underwent a variety of medical treatments, leading to several hospital visits. Her mother remembers that during those long hospital stays, Trinity would always think of the other children first. It was her love for others and her desire to make a difference within her community that now lives on through the foundation in her name.

In 2016, Olivia and Phil Hoblit established the Trinity Love Hoblit Foundation, located in Amelia Island, Florida. It is for the purpose of raising awareness, support, and funding for neurological research, training, and treatment for those like Trinity who suffer from brain aneurysms and other cerebrovascular conditions.

Most recently, the foundation began research on determining if medical history and genetic markers increase a person's risk of developing these brain aneurysms.

□ 1715

Brain aneurysms affect an estimated 30,000 Americans each year and can occur at any age and without any pre-existing conditions.

Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month, this month, is a time to raise awareness for the signs and symptoms that can help with early detection, like:

- Severe headaches,
- Pain above one or both eyes,
- Blurred or double vision,
- Difficulty speaking or swallowing,

A numbness or weakness on one side of the body, and

Painful seizures.

These are all signs that can be symptoms and help with early detection.

Thanks to higher levels of awareness and research developments, we are one step closer to finding a cure.

On behalf of Florida's Fourth Congressional District, I thank Olivia and Phil Hoblit and the Trinity Love Hoblit Foundation for their lifesaving work in northeast Florida and across the country.

MAKING HOMEOWNERSHIP MORE ACCESSIBLE TO HEROES

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, as inflation takes a toll on families throughout our Nation and housing costs soar, many of our first responders and educators struggle to find affordable homes in the communities that they serve.

For this reason, I introduced H.R. 3172, the HELPER Act, which would establish a new one-time-use home loan program for law enforcement officers, firefighters, EMTs, paramedics, and pre-K-12 teachers.

Modeled after the successful VA home loan program, the HELPER Act would make homeownership more accessible to our local heroes by removing the downpayment and mortgage insurance premium requirements that can put homeownership just out of reach.

The HELPER Act has strong bipartisan, bicameral support from over 90 Members in both Houses of Congress and more than 225 different organizations across the country, including 108 mayors from different cities around the country.

As we all know, everything is more expensive these days, and the HELPER Act would prevent our first responders and educators from being priced out of home buying in the very communities they are sworn to protect.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for those words and comfort that they will hopefully bring.

I think most Americans, especially those that knew anybody who fought for our country in Afghanistan, are aware of how poorly things went a year ago when the Biden administration, it appeared, tried to emulate the disastrous leaving of Vietnam when so much was left behind, including our allies.

Like in Vietnam, allies were left there, many of whom were killed. Of course, 13 of our servicemen were killed that never should have been and did not need to be if we had left properly, as some of our Northern Alliance allies, a part of the Afghan people who fought for us and with us beginning in October 2001, about a month after 9/11—many died fighting for us and with us.

We helped provide them weapons, and we had about 300 or so Special Operations people who were embedded with them, and they took the fight to the Taliban. Within 6 months, there was no organized Taliban left in Afghanistan.

Some of them fled to Pakistan or other surrounding countries, but they had been defeated with the great help of General Dostum, who was the commander who was the overall commander of the Afghan forces fighting against the Taliban.

President Biden and his advisers, for whatever reason, decided it was better to leave tens of billions of dollars of equipment and weapons for our enemies to use against our allies and probably one day use against the United States itself.

We saw this kind of disastrous exit from Vietnam. An estimated 2 million or so people who helped us and were sympathetic to us were killed in Southeast Asia. I just thought surely we would never be that stupid and that callous to allow allies to be harmed like that.

I met with some of our Northern Alliance allies, along with a few other Members of Congress, numerous times. Of course, there was the great Afghan hero of the war between Afghanistan and Russia. Unfortunately, our intelligence agencies here in the U.S. did not pick up on the importance of Shah Massoud, Lion of Panjshir, being assassinated by the Taliban within a day, day-and-a-half or so of 9/11 about to occur. Had they been awake and not asleep at what was going on, they would have anticipated the Taliban was about to do something to cause great harm to the United States.

They knew once we realized that the attack originated from Afghanistan that we would be coming and looking for allies, and we would certainly want Massoud and his brother and all those others who wanted the Taliban gone, we would be using them and working with them to eliminate the Taliban. So, the Taliban eliminated that great Afghan hero before 9/11.

In numerous meetings with our Afghan allies for a decade or more, going back to the Obama administration days, they were telling a few of us: Look, we know you have to leave at some point. We know that. But what we are begging is that you help us amend the Constitution that you forced on us. We like it; it is based on sharia law. But this is a country that is perfectly suited for the federalist system where you have so much power in your country in the States and our country, they said, in the provinces. But right now, the Constitution that you gave us, forced on us, the President appoints the governors, the mayors, the chiefs of police, and it is a system made for corruption.

It sounded to me like the way things were going over there, the times I went to Afghanistan, and you are hearing the reports of what was going on, whether it was Karzai or Ghani, that they may well have taken a great deal of money, like the old Roman days, and whoever gave the most money would get the best governorship.

They were appointing governors that didn't even live in the province that

they were going to be governor over. They were not allowed to have militias like they wanted, as Zia Massoud told me more than once in trips to meet with them.

In fact, the Obama administration did not want me meeting with our allies. They did what they could to keep me from meeting with our allies, even though the Obama administration basically threw them to the curb and was anxious to work deals with the Taliban.

In fact, the colonel there at the Embassy in Afghanistan, I told him that I have a meeting with Massoud, Dostum, numerous of our allies, and he said: We can't let you do that.

I said: I am not asking you for a ride. Massoud is sending a vehicle, and they will make sure that I am protected. They are not going to let me be killed because they want to protect the relationship.

The colonel said: Well, we are not authorized to let you do that.

I said: You see the gate over there? When the car gets here, I am going to get in that car, and I am going to go meet with our allies. I know the Obama administration has rejected any type of relationship with those people that fought for us and with us, who lost family members, but I am going to go meet with the allies that have sacrificed so much to help us, help both of us.

Well, they ended up getting a car, and I was told before the vehicle that Massoud was sending: Will you let Massoud know we are going to bring you there?

Michele Bachmann went out there with me. She had not met them before. MIKE BURGESS went out there.

But all they wanted was for us to help them fix the Constitution we forced on them. They needed a federalist form of government, and that is what they said: If you will help us get that, we can elect our own governors, and we can elect our own mayors, pick our own police chiefs. Then, each province will have a militia because when you leave, the Taliban is going to try to take back over, and then they will eventually want to hit you again. But if we are allowed to elect our own governors and mayors, we will be able to have a militia in each province. So, when you leave, then we will be able to band together and whip the Taliban again. But if you leave it like it is and keep negotiating with the Taliban—which the Obama administration had been doing basically the whole administration—then we are all going to be killed. Then they will hit you again, and then you will want to come back to Afghanistan and try to find allies, but we will all be dead, and no one will be crazy enough to help you again. So, just help us elect our own governors.

I said: What makes you think we can help you get your Constitution amended? It is your Constitution now.

He said: You are paying most of our government's annual budget, so if you

say the Constitution needs to be amended or we are not going to pay this year's budget for you, then it will be amended, and we will be able to protect ourselves from the Taliban whenever it is that you leave.

I know Secretary Pompeo also negotiated with the Taliban, but there is no way President Trump would have ever allowed our troops to leave and leave tens of billions of dollars' worth of equipment for our enemy to someday use against us. He wouldn't do that.

□ 1730

And on the other hand, the Taliban knew that if they did anything to our folks during a projected move of coming back to the United States that President Trump would bomb them back to the Stone Age so they would not have done what they did. They perceived America to be weak under this administration, and we lost 13 soldiers, military members that should never have been lost.

So as if that wasn't enough damage, I see this article, I just saw it today, it is dated September 12 by Daniel Greenfield. It says: "White House Democrats have a history of fighting against terror victims suing Islamic terrorists. The Obama administration battled American terror victims suing the PLO. In 2015, after they won a \$218 million judgment against the terror group, Blinken, then only a Deputy Secretary of State, intervened claiming that the lawsuit threatened 'several decades of U.S. foreign policy.'

"But now Biden is fighting 9/11 victims"—that is American victims—"on behalf of the Taliban."

We have this administration helping the Taliban fight in court against 9/11 victims. The rhetorical question arises to the Biden administration: Whose side are you on? You are helping the Taliban.

The article goes on: "At stake are billions" of dollars "being held by the Afghan central bank fund in the United States.

"A decade ago, 9/11 families sued the Taliban, al-Qaida, and Iran. The court found that the Islamic terrorists were responsible and a judgment of \$6 billion was handed down." That is for the 9/11 families.

"The verdict was described as 'symbolic' at the time. CBS News commented that 'it would be near impossible to collect any damages, especially from the Taliban or al-Qaida.' But that was before Biden turned over Afghanistan to the Taliban. Since Afghanistan has assets in this country"—in the U.S.—"including \$7 billion in bank funds, it's now entirely possible to collect that . . . '\$7 billion, or it would be if the guy who let the Taliban take over wasn't also in the White House.

"Biden officially announced that he was splitting the \$7 billion between the families of the victims and a 'trust fund' to provide 'humanitarian aid' for the people of Afghanistan."

In other words, we are going to help the Taliban out to make the people of

Afghanistan feel better about the Taliban being in charge. That is what is going on here.

Biden officially announced that he was going to make that split.

"The \$3.5 billion was placed in a separate trust that would be 'separate and distinct' from the around \$800 million the Biden administration has already spent on aid to Afghanistan. Officials admitted that the money could actually be used for matters other than 'humanitarian aid.'"

In other words, it could be used to help the Taliban itself, the people that killed 3,000 or so Americans on 9/11, the worst attack on American soil in American history, and this administration is making sure they get billions of dollars.

The article goes on: "The media headlined it as, 'Biden frees frozen Afghan billions for relief, 9/11 victims.' But a Biden official admitted that it was done to stop 9/11 families from getting access to the money."

"As a Lawfare blog post noted, 'the administration's . . . —talking about the Biden administration's—' . . . plan would insulate nearly half of the Afghan assets at issue from these attachment efforts.

"What Biden actually did was take the money off the table for the 9/11 victims. And it got worse.

"Secretary of State Blinken claimed that the administration 'will continue to support these victims and their families, recognizing the enduring pain they have suffered at the hands of terrorists, including those who operated from Afghanistan prior to the September 11 attacks. These victims and their families should have a full opportunity to set forth their arguments in court.'" This article says: "Blinken, like his boss, lied."

"While the 9/11 families would have their claims 'heard in court,' neither Biden nor Blinken mentioned that the administration would be advocating against . . . " these 9/11 victims.

"On the same day as Biden's executive order reserving \$3.5 billion for the terrorists, his Justice Department filed a statement of interest in court arguing that the judgment for the victims of terrorism was too large and that actually turning over the money"—the \$3.5 billion—"to them"—or all \$7 billion to them—"would interfere with the Biden administration's foreign policy in Afghanistan."

Like we have a policy in Afghanistan? No. All the rare Earth minerals, the things that could have paid us back for ridding the Afghan people of the Taliban, well, not only were they allowed to come back and take over, but they made deals with China to let them have the rare Earth minerals. In other words, this administration just exponentially magnified the loss in life, assets, and money that they lost for America.

"Now a magistrate judge has repeated back most of the DOJ's arguments, ruling against the 9/11 families

who were laying claim to the other half of the money. Judge Sarah Netburn's arguments closely mirror the contradictory positions of Biden and the DOJ. And they reveal the underlying corruption behind the ambiguous status of Afghanistan's central bank.

"Netburn, like the Biden administration, contends that the Afghanistan bank enjoys 'sovereign immunity' because the country itself was not sanctioned as a terrorist state, only the Taliban were. And that the Taliban once again control Afghanistan is irrelevant, according to the judge, because Biden hasn't recognized the reality that this is actually the case.

"Banks don't enjoy 'sovereign immunity' and neither do the Taliban. Netburn and Biden act as if there were some entity representing Afghanistan that is not the Taliban. That position might make sense if they were backing a resistance movement to the Taliban. But they are not."

It was sad enough that this administration's mishandling of negotiating—we should have been negotiating with our allies to leave the country in their hands with an amended constitution. Instead, we left it in the hands of our enemies.

As some of our allies there have said, the day will come when the Taliban will hit America again. Next time it will be harder. They have got more money. They have got tens of billions of American assets to utilize or sell and use the money, but the difference will be this time after America loses thousands of lives at the hands of the Taliban and America comes to Afghanistan seeking allies to help them defeat the Taliban, as we did in 2001 and 2002, we will all be dead, those of us who were America's allies, and no one will be stupid enough to trust the United States again. What a tragic, horrific blunder by this administration.

Now, the exit was the blunder, but turning against the 9/11 victims' families, that is not a blunder. That is very intentional by this administration. Being much more helpful and sympathetic to the Taliban, who were terrorists that hit this country, and have never apologized and will never apologize, instead of standing against them and making sure they never commit terrorist acts again, this administration wants to be sure they get billions of dollars; like the Obama administration was ensuring that Iran got the largest state sponsor of terrorism. So I guess at least we can say that is a good thing. This administration, the Biden administration, is at least being consistent with the Obama administration.

The Obama administration helped the Taliban. The Obama administration did not help the 9/11 families. Now, the Biden administration is working against the 9/11 families, and they are actually helping the Taliban with more money than the Taliban has ever had. An amazing development.

If things don't get turned around soon where we have a wiser administra-

tion next time with Republicans in the majority come January that helps get back to using more common sense, then this will be a horrific chapter in the book rise and fall of the United States of America and how we helped our enemy ultimately destroy ourselves because of some misguided, hair-brained idea that you can give your enemy billions of dollars, give them tens of billions of dollars of military equipment and weapons and think you were going to come out just fine on the other side.

I want to address some energy issues. This article from NPR, August 25, reports that "California is poised to set a 2035 deadline for all new cars, trucks, and SUVs sold in the State to be powered by electricity or hydrogen, an ambitious step that will reshape the U.S. car market by speeding the transition to more climate-friendly vehicles."

□ 1745

It is a long article, but it does not deal with the reality that we are already seeing take place as this administration and people in some States are demanding to get rid of all fossil fuel immediately and quickly, but China will continue to own hundreds of coal-powered plants. Unfortunately, China doesn't utilize the scrubbers and things that allow American coal plants to have much more clean operation in producing electricity.

In fact, I have heard experts and people with whom we have consulted say there will be so much pollution coming from China that even if the U.S. totally eliminated every single coal plant, the air would not be improved because of all of the pollution that will be coming our way from China.

My good friend, THOMAS MASSIE, has more patents than anybody in the House or Senate. Even though he got an MIT education, he is a brilliant guy. THOMAS MASSIE has pointed out that actually plugging in one electric vehicle is about the equivalent of plugging in 17 refrigerators, and this administration wants everybody to start buying electric vehicles, so everybody has electric vehicles and the sooner the better.

But the fact is that even if half of the cars that run on fossil fuel now were replaced immediately with electric vehicles, then first of all, we would end up causing no telling how many children around the world to be used as slave labor more than are being used right now in order to gather and mine the lithium and the things that are needed to produce electric cars.

And we won't even bother to talk about right now the massive problem in dealing with that many batteries with all that lithium and what will be done with all of that. We don't know. We are just going headlong into trying to have all electric vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, you can't make an electric vehicle right now—not one that is any good—unless you use fossil fuel. And you have to have natural gas as

feedstock to make so many of the products that are used in the vehicles. I guess you could do like Fred Flintstone and have one made out of stone and wood.

Why would this administration want to take us back to the Stone Age?

It seems some of these policies are determined to do that.

In fact, here is an article from *The Epoch Times*: "States to Ban Gas-Powered Cars Despite EVs' Human, Environmental Costs".

It was written by Katie Spence on September 12.

She points out some of these hidden costs that I have been alluding to, she says, "According to politicians like Newsom and President Joe Biden, electric vehicles, or EVs, are 'zero emission' because they use lithium-ion batteries—consisting of lithium, cobalt, graphite, and other materials—instead of gas.

"Thus, starting in 2035, California will ban gas-powered vehicle sales, while several other States plan to follow suit, citing that as a goal and 'critical milestone in our climate fight'.

"Additionally, according to a statement from Biden, banning gas-powered vehicles will 'save consumers money, cut pollution, boost public health, advance environmental justice, and tackle the climate crisis'.

"John Hadder, director of the Great Basin Resource Watch, disagrees, pointing out to *The Epoch Times* that 'industrial' nations might benefit from the transition to EVs, but it's at the expense of all others.

"This expansion of [lithium] mining will have immediate consequences for front-line communities that are taking the 'hit'".

"For example, Copiapo, the capital of Chile's Atacama region, is the location of one of the world's largest known lithium reserves.

"We used to have a river before, that now doesn't exist. There isn't a drop of water,' Elena Rivera Cardoso, president of the Indigenous Colla community of the Copiapo commune, told the National Resources Defense Council.

"She added that all of Chile's water is disappearing because of the local lithium mine.

"In all of Chile, there are rivers and lakes that have disappeared—all because a company has a lot more right to water than we do as human beings or citizens of Chile.'

"In collaboration with Cardoso's statement, the Institute for Energy Research reports that 65 percent of the area's limited water resources are consumed by mining activities.

"That's displacing indigenous communities who have called Atacama home for more than 6,000 years, because farmers and ranchers have cracked, dry soil, and no choice but to abandon their ancestral settlements, according to the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development."

Now that is so interesting.

But where is the compassion?

We are so determined to have electric vehicles so that we can say to the world that we are cleaning up the world when we are not cleaning up the world. We are making the world a disastrous place so that woke liberals here in America can think that all is right with the world when actually they have put children into slave labor by creating this market causing countries to dry up like Chile.

It is rather tragic, and people who mean well and think they are doing great need to understand the damage they are doing to the planet and to people who don't live in Martha's Vineyard.

Another issue that is particularly troublesome, Mr. Speaker, we have had a bipartisan effort in this body to work and to fight to stop genital mutilation. Yet now, after years of working together and trying to stop such a horrendous practice, we now have people who claim to be exceedingly liberal and caring, and they are pushing to have little children's genitalia mutilated, cut off, and eliminated and have those children take puberty blockers that will likely stunt their growth, make them infertile, and destroy the wonder that would have been their lives without the so-called caring people pushing them to destroy their bodies.

According to the most extensive study ever done by people who have been through sex change surgery, the Swedish Institute followed people who had been through sex change surgery for 30 years. And what was the most disturbing to me of the result of that 30-year study was that if you have sex change surgery, Mr. Speaker, you are 20 times more likely to kill yourself, to take your own life.

We had a press conference.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE has a bill that would stop this kind of outrageous abuse of children.

You see, Mr. Speaker, my background, I have been a prosecutor, and I have been a litigator. I have been a felony judge and a chief justice before coming to Congress. I am quite familiar with the laws of Texas and Federal laws. Most States have very similar laws because we have advanced so as a people that we have understood that children need to grow up in innocence. It is so much more productive.

Some have felt that it may well be that Americans have been the most ingenious and most productive in creating new inventions and that our patent system before it got screwed up in recent years by Congress encouraged individual inventors to come up with new things. But I have read indications that some people believe it is because we encourage children to use their imagination in growing up, and they have developed more imagination.

Now we have got some people who think they are do-gooders, but they encourage genital mutilation of a child that can never be fixed. Oh, Mr. Speaker, you can do a transition back, but it is so devastating. It is horrific.

That is supposed to be an advanced civilization doing this to children?

The studies, and Dr. PAUL McHugh—who was the head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins, which is the first hospital in America to do sex change surgeries back in the sixties—points out that it is child abuse to give puberty blockers because of the adverse effects on the body to then do gender mutilation.

Mr. Speaker, I presided over criminal felony trials. Even if someone underage, a child, or a minor consents, the laws have made clear we recognize they are not mentally and judgmentally mature enough to give consent for anybody to do anything with their private areas.

I have sent lots of people to prison. So if an adult takes advantage of their immaturity, people have been sent to prison for that all over America. And the huge majority of Americans agree that it was the right thing to do when they sexually abuse a child, even if the child consented, because we know they are not mature enough to give legitimate consent.

Yet we have adults who should be mature enough to say, you are not going to touch this child's body.

They have to come of age, the age of majority, and make their own informed decision and give their own informed consent.

No one else should ever be able to do that in their place because these kids are the ones who have to live with their bodies for the rest of their lives, even though they are 20 times more likely to kill themselves because of what the adult gave consent for them to do.

I am hoping at some point there will be laws in every State and through Congress that we will do, as we have done with sexual assault of a child laws, where most States, if not all, that I am aware of, say we are going to extend the statute of limitations to a certain number of years past the time when they would become adults.

□ 1800

So that if any adult gave permission for someone to have perfectly functioning organs removed, changed, puberty blockers, and the child later feels that was an assault, then let them sue within those extra years of statute of limitations. I think it would be a good idea to do something like that.

Adults should not have the right to consent to destroying or harming a child's body, and especially when it makes it 20 times more likely they will take their own life because of what some adult did on behalf of the child.

Well, we had a young lady named Chloe Cole, a beautiful person, she is 18. Actually, this article by Christine Buttons from The Daily Wire, September 20, talked about the press conference we had.

It says: "An 18-year-old detransitioned woman gave a powerful testimony on Tuesday against the 'gen-

der affirming' model of care that led to her irreversible medical transition as an adolescent.

"Chloe Cole spoke at a press conference in front of the"—it was in front of the Capitol—"in support of Representative MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE's new bill, the Protect Children's Innocence Act, that aims to shield minors from assessing the permanent body- and life-altering medical treatments that they may later come to regret."

Chloe said: "How did we get to the point where nearly every pediatric institution in the country considers it best practice to remove the healthy breast tissue of children while administering drugs typically used to chemically castrate high-risk sex offenders?" Cole said of the widespread acceptance of radical gender theory in medicine driving 'gender-affirming care,' which effectively puts children in the driver's seat to dictate the terms of their own sex change.

"I believe Americans deserve to know the truth about this radical and perverse ideology, marketed as necessary and 'live-saving' healthcare," said Cole. Cole opened her speech with a chilling statistic."

She said, "Over the past decade, there has been as high as a 4,000 percent increase in children being referred to so-called 'gender clinics' across the United States. I was one of these children.' A recent UCLA survey found that the number of trans-identified teens has doubled in the last 5 years to about 300,000 in the United States, while the rates of adults identifying as transgender have remained the same. According to the Gender Mapping Project, only a handful of pediatric gender clinics existed in the United States a decade ago. Now over 200 have spawned to meet the growing demand of adolescents who identify as transgender seeking medical transition."

I read an article that the former head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins had written, pointing out that 80 percent of children, boys and girls, who identify or seem to have gender dysphoria—is what it is now called in the Diagnostic Statistical Manual-V.

Dysphoria—if you look it up—it means confusion, sort of an antonym to euphoria. People are encouraging people to become more and more gender-confused.

Dr. McHugh pointed out about 80 percent of those who have confusion about their gender growing up, if they never have counseling, they never have some do-gooder adult encouraging them to have their genitalia mutilated and their life shortened, and perhaps most likely a good chance of infertility, that if they are just left alone, go through childhood, 80 percent transition into exactly what they are biologically without any problems whatsoever.

Yet, we have people in this country that want to create laws against anybody allowing a child to go through

childhood and then adjust, and not have the physical horrors that these surgeries cause.

I was deeply moved by Chloe Cole. She is a beautiful person. She was very unfortunate in having people think they knew better and encouraging her to take steps that she should not have taken, as she will tell you now.

We are supposed to be the ones that are mature and help children avoid going through horrors, and, yet, we have even got States passing laws—don't you dare help this child. Let's help the child go through genital mutilation, even though it will be his or her body.

As Dr. McHugh has pointed out and studies have pointed out, you can go through sex change surgery or gender reassignment surgery—whatever you want to call it—DNA-wise, biologically, you are still the same gender you were before the surgery, and your DNA will remain the same.

Now, who knows, I read a Swedish study this year about the mRNA vaccines. It was interesting, it says there is radiation at the point of the injection, and more radiation found in the liver after the vaccination with the mRNA vaccines. But the study documented that they found that the mRNA ends up going to the liver and rewriting the body's DNA for them. We don't know where all that is going to end up, but it certainly doesn't appear to be going a good direction.

I have got no problem with people continuing to get the vaccinations and the boosters, I think that is fine, so long as the wonderful doctrine that we developed making healthcare better than it has been in the history of the world, called informed consent.

That doctrine that requires that a physician or healthcare provider advise the patient of all the potential risks of a vaccination, treatment, surgery, whatever, and then letting them talk to their doctor and making their own mind up about whether or not to go through with it.

If we could do that, and I would submit, also allow the healthcare providers and the pharmaceuticals to be liable for any damage that they cause if they don't allow informed consent and allow the individual to make up his or her mind, unless it is a minor. We don't allow minors to make decisions normally unless it is in the sick area of genital mutilation that I was just talking about.

If pharmaceuticals are that excited about continuing to make tens of billions of dollars providing vaccinations, vaccines, great, just stand good for whatever damages you cause. It sure seems like that would be the right thing to do.

I won't have time to get to it, but this article from Jennifer Margulis and Joe Wang, *The Epoch Times*, September 10, the headline is, "Unethical' and up to 98 Times Worse Than the Disease: Top Scientists Publish Paradigm-Shifting Study About COVID-19 Vaccines."

It points out the boosters for young people may cause 18 to 98 actual serious adverse events for each COVID-19 infection-related hospitalization theoretically prevented. So for each hospitalization prevented, they are saying 18 to 98 actual serious consequences to the body will result.

It is going to be an interesting week next week. I look forward to seeing what more damage that Congress can do to our economy, to our country. I hope that people, Mr. Speaker, will let their Members of Congress know what they agree with and what they disagree with.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lisa P. Grant, Deputy Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

Kevin F. McCumber, Deputy Clerk of the House, further reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker

H.R. 6899. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from engaging in transactions involving the exchange of Special Drawing issued by the International Monetary Fund that are held by the Russian Federation or Belarus.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3895.—An act to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2024.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1 of House Resolution 1230, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m., Monday, September 26, 2022.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 26, 2022, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-5288. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Rescinding Requirement for Negative Pre-Departure COVID-19 Test Result or Documentation of Recovery from COVID-19 for All Airline or Other Aircraft Passengers Arriving Into the

United States From Any Foreign Country received June 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5289. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Final Determination of Miscellaneous Gas Products as a Covered Consumer Product [EERE-2021-BT-DET-0034] (RIN: 1904-AF30) received September 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5290. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for General Service Fluorescent Lamps, Incandescent Reflector Lamps, and General Service Incandescent Lamps [EERE-2017-BT-TP-0011] (RIN: 1904-AD85) received September 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5291. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Resilient Networks [PS Docket No.: 21-346] Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications [PS Docket No.: 15-80] New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications [ET Docket No.: 04-35] received September 13, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5292. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's guide — Insider Mitigation Program, Regulatory Guide 5.77, Revision 1 received September 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5293. A letter from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Facility License Notifications (RIN: 3141-AA76) received September 13, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-5294. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's notice — Adoption of Recommendations received September 13, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5295. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenwood, SC [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0432; Airspace Docket No. 22-ASO-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5296. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to United States Area Navigation Route (RNAV) T-227; Fairbanks, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0811;

Airspace Docket No. 19-AAL-60] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5297. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fort Dodge, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1006; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ACE-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5298. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Columbia, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0694; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ACE-12] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5299. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Assistance Program's Simplified Procedures Large Project Threshold [Docket ID: FEMA-2022-0020] (RIN: 1660-AB10) received September 13, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5300. A letter from the Chairman, Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — URCS Data Reporting [Docket No.: EP 769] received September 13, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5301. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Harmonization With International Standards; Correction [Docket No.: PHMSA-2019-0030 (HM-215P)](RIN: 2137-AF46) received September 9, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5302. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission Pipelines: Repair Criteria, Integrity Management Improvements, Cathodic Protection, Management of Change, and Other Related Amendments [Docket No.: PHMSA-2011-0023; Amdt. No. 192-132] (RIN: 2137-AF39) received September 9, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7780. A bill to support the behavioral needs of students and youth, invest in the school-based behavioral health workforce, and ensure access to mental

health and substance use disorder benefits; with an amendment (Rept. 117-484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1239. Resolution of inquiry directing the Attorney General to provide certain documents in his possession to the House of Representatives relating to the October 4, 2021 memorandum issued by the Attorney General entitled "Partnership Among Federal, State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Law Enforcement to Address Threats Against School Administrators, Board Members, Teachers, and Staff", with amendments; adversely (Rept. 117-485). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1238. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the October 4, 2021 memorandum issued by the Attorney General entitled "Partnership Among Federal, State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Law Enforcement to Address Threats Against School Administrators, Board Members, Teachers, and Staff", with amendments; adversely (Rept. 117-486). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1241. Resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide certain documents in his possession to the House of Representatives relating to immigration enforcement and border security, with an amendment; adversely (Rept. 117-487). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1249. Resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the impact of illegal immigration on federal or tribal lands, with an amendment; adversely (Rept. 117-488). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1250. Resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the impact of illegal immigration on Federal or Tribal lands, with an amendment; adversely (Rept. 117-489). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1257. Resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide certain documents in the Secretary's possession to the House of Representatives relating to the establishment of an Emergency Intake Site in Erie, Pennsylvania, at the Pennsylvania International Academy, to house the influx of unaccompanied migrant children, with an amendment; adversely (Rept. 117-490). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1325. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing Attorney General Merrick B. Garland to transmit, respectively, a copy of the affidavit to the House of Representatives related to the raid on the former President, with amendments; adversely (Rept. 117-491). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4374. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than November 14, 2022.

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. NADLER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 8949. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to extend counter-unmanned aircraft systems authorities, to improve transparency, safety, and accountability related to such authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Homeland Security, 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. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 8950. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide the Commodity Futures Trading Commission jurisdiction to oversee the spot digital commodity market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CLOUD, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 8951. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the parole or release of an asylum applicant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. BABIN, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 8952. A bill to give the Secretary of Homeland Security the authority to contain migration surges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 8953. A bill to allow the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to extend the participation period for covered small business concerns in the 8(a) small business program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. BACON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. COLE, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 8954. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to comply with Federal standards established under the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 8955. A bill to counter Russian influence and aggression in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 8956. A bill to amend chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, to improve the cybersecurity of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr.

EVANS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DEAN, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 8957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase certain taxes related to firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 8958. A bill to amend certain authorities relating to human rights violations and abuses in Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. STEEL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 8959. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at N4805 State Highway 32 in Krakow, Wisconsin, as the "Romuald "Bud" Brzezinski Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGGO (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 8960. A bill to require Federal law enforcement agencies to report on cases of missing or murdered Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, 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. GOHMERT (for himself and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 8961. A bill to abolish the Department of Education and to provide funding directly to States for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.R. 8962. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the publication of personal information of public servants on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 8963. A bill to transfer venue of certain criminal prosecutions of offenses committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 8964. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue to Federal agencies guidelines for developing procedures and requirements relating to certain primary care Federal health professionals completing continuing medical education on nutrition and to require Federal agencies to submit annual reports relating to such guidelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 8965. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to improve provisions relating to invasive species management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8966. A bill to clarify regulatory certainty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, 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 and Ms. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 8967. A bill to take certain land in the State of Washington into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 8968. A bill to allow States and local educational agencies to use unspent COVID-19 elementary and secondary school emergency relief funds to purchase life-saving opioid antagonists and to provide related training and education to students and teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 8969. A bill to develop a comprehensive, strategic plan for Federal electric vehicle fleet battery management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN (for herself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 8970. A bill to provide funding to strengthen cybersecurity defenses and capabilities by expanding community colleges programs leading to the award of cybersecurity credentials that are in demand in government, critical infrastructure, nonprofit, and private sectors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Appropriations, 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. MFUME (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Ms. BASS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 8971. A bill to establish a National Council on African American History and Culture within the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 8972. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow a surviving spouse of a Medal of Honor recipient to receive a special pension concurrently with dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 8973. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of the special pension payable to Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 8974. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to require that funds deposited be available for withdrawal in real-time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H.R. 8975. A bill to provide States with the authority to name post offices located in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8976. A bill to preempt State restrictions on dispensing mifepristone or misoprostol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. PORTER, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 8977. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to establish a grant program to fund youth fishing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. DEAN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 8978. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to members of the Red Cross Supplemental Recreational Activities Overseas (SRAO) program, also known as the "Donut Dollies", who served honorably during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 8979. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants for the purpose of establishing, operating, or expanding one-stop crisis facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and 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. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MAST, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 8980. A bill to establish a moratorium on energy development in certain areas of

the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 8981. A bill to streamline hardrock mine permitting on Federal lands, support technological and scientific advancements for mineral development, expand the mining workforce, track global supply chains, strengthen domestic refining and processing capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Appropriations, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity in wages paid to men and to Black women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. MANNING, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H. Res. 1383. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2022 as "National Workforce Development Month"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. BACON, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 1384. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2022 as "National Kinship Care Month"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA:

H. Res. 1385. A resolution recognizing September 22nd, 2022, as the Order of the Sons and Daughters of Italy in America, Colombo-Stella Lodge 1149 Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KATKO, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. MACE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. SHERILL, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TRONE,

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. STELL, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H. Res. 1386. A resolution supporting the designation of the week of September 26 through September 30, 2022, as "National Clean Energy Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DUNN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUDD, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CLINE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. STAUBER):

H. Res. 1387. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of National Hunting and Fishing Day; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LURIA (for herself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GARCIA of California, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H. Res. 1388. A resolution acknowledging and commemorating the World War II women in the Navy who served in the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service ("WAVES"); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CARSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 1389. A resolution welcoming His Holiness, Hadhrat Mirza Masroor Ahmad, the worldwide spiritual head of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, to the United States, including Illinois, Texas and Maryland, and recognizing his commitment to world peace, absolute justice, global unity among nations, non-violence, rejection of extremism, eradication of poverty, economic equity, service to humanity, universal human rights, international religious freedom, and democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Ms. LEE of California, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H. Res. 1390. A resolution expressing support for the protection of Medicare part D's six protected classes; 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. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H. Res. 1391. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2022 as Peripheral Artery Disease Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 1392. A resolution recognizing "Banned Books Week" and the sweeping attacks on books in the United States today, acknowledging the central role books play in promoting democratic and civil discourse, and urging recognition of the illegitimate tactics being used to ban books in K-12 classrooms, universities, prisons, and libraries; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H. Res. 1393. A resolution calling for the Secretary of State to direct that the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations and other International Organizations in Geneva and the United States Permanent Representative to the Human Rights Council sponsor the strongest possible resolution by September 28, 2022 to ensure that the United Nations Human Rights Council takes up the findings of United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in its "Assessment of human rights concerns in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, People's Republic of China," and for other actions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARSON, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MENG, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. KHANNA):

H. Res. 1394. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2022 as "National Voting Rights Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Oversight and Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Ethics, Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NADLER:
H.R. 8949.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 8950.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 8951.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. CAMMACK:
H.R. 8952.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana:
H.R. 8953.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Ms. CHU:
H.R. 8954.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. CONNOLLY:
H.R. 8955.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. CONNOLLY:
H.R. 8956.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 8957.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. FALLON:
H.R. 8958.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. GALLAGHER:
H.R. 8959.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. GALLEGRO:
H.R. 8960.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. GOHMERT:
H.R. 8961.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 1 of the 10th Amendment to the Constitution
By Mr. GOHMERT:
H.R. 8962.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. GOHMERT:
H.R. 8963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 8964.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.
By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:
H.R. 8965.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 8966.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. KILMER:
H.R. 8967.
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. LAMBORN:
H.R. 8968.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, impost and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 8969.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section I, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)
By Mrs. McCLAIN:
H.R. 8970.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. MFUME:
H.R. 8971.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
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. MORELLE:
H.R. 8972.
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 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. NEHLS:
H.R. 8973.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 8974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. ROSENDALE:
H.R. 8975.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. RYAN of New York:
H.R. 8976.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. SALAZAR:
H.R. 8977.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. SHERRILL:
H.R. 8978.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, clause 16 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 8979.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. WALTZ:
H.R. 8980.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. WESTERMAN:
H.R. 8981.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the powers granted under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 962: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1123: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 1219: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1284: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1504: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1551: Ms. TLAI and Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1587: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 1611: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 1661: Mr. LEVIN of California and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1746: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 1791: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1948: Mr. CORREA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2050: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2252: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 2356: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 2565: Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 2759: Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 2953: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

- H.R. 2965: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 2974: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3087: Mr. FEENSTRA.
H.R. 3109: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3321: Mr. FLOOD and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 3783: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3865: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. NEWMAN, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 4066: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4141: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 4146: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4282: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 4402: Mr. BOWMAN and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4410: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 4436: Ms. JAYAPAL and Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 4437: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 4624: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 4816: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5089: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 5365: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5444: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 5502: Ms. WILD, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. TRONE, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5536: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 5726: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 5750: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 6394: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 6584: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 6592: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 6644: Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 6852: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6860: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 6889: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 6938: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 6985: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 7050: Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 7053: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 7223: Mr. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 7236: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 7345: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. JONES, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 7394: Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 7395: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 7482: Ms. Barragán and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 7506: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 7630: Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 7644: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 7651: Mr. LATURNER, Mr. EMMER, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 7744: Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 7756: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 7757: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 7773: Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 7925: Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 8018: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 8019: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 8104: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 8111: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 8153: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 8171: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 8185: Mr. COLE and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 8233: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 8265: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 8384: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 8387: Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 8391: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 8393: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 8524: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 8528: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 8589: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 8594: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 8611: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 8616: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 8624: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 8637: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 8639: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 8650: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 8659: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. MCFERNEY, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 8685: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 8699: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 8736: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. WILD, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. BUCK, and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 8747: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 8753: Mrs. FLORES.
H.R. 8762: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 8770: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 8800: Mr. COHEN, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 8814: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COMER, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 8821: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 8826: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 8829: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 8863: Mr. SEMPOLINSKI.
H.R. 8867: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 8868: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 8876: Mrs. HINSON and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 8909: Mr. GUEST and Mr. CALVERT.
H.J. Res. 53: Ms. MACE.
H.J. Res. 94: Mr. GARCIA of California.
H.J. Res. 98: Mr. RASKIN.
H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. WILD, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 404: Mr. SOTO.
H. Res. 616: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Res. 703: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 1030: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H. Res. 1136: Mr. HUDSON.
H. Res. 1156: Mr. GUEST and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 1190: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H. Res. 1196: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H. Res. 1220: Mr. AGUILAR.
H. Res. 1303: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 1334: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H. Res. 1336: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. BACON.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 12 by Mr. GOSAR on House Joint Resolution 46: Mr. Timmons, Mr. Barr, Ms. Van Duyne, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Luetkemeyer.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022

No. 153

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal and blessed God, in a dangerous and unstable world, we find solace from Your presence. We praise You that even when wrong seems so strong, Your providence continues to prevail.

Today, as our lawmakers grapple with pressing issues, give them the wisdom to seek Your guidance. Respond to their petitions by undergirding our Senators with Your enabling might, empowering them to exercise responsible stewardship of their influence by striving to be lights in a dark world.

Lord, open their ears and hearts this day to hear and obey Your voice.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, DC, September 22, 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

DEMOCRACY IS STRENGTHENED BY CASTING LIGHT ON SPENDING IN ELECTIONS ACT OF 2022—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 4822, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 4822, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. SCHUMER. When five conservative Justices handed down their opinion in *Citizens United* 12 years ago, the dissenters warned:

The Court's ruling threatens to undermine the integrity of elected institutions across the Nation.

Sadly, they turned out to be right. By giving massive corporations the same rights as individual citizens—multibillionaires being able to have their voices shouted out, drowning out the views of citizens—and by casting aside decades of campaign finance law and by paving the way for powerful elites to anonymously pump endless cash into elections, *Citizens United* has disfigured our democracy almost beyond recognition.

Today, the Senate will vote to begin curing our Nation of this cancer when we take the first procedural vote on the DISCLOSE Act. Democrats are ready to move forward. Republicans today must face the music: either vote to bring transparency and fairness back to our elections—as the vast majority of Americans want—or block this measure and cast their lot with the forces of dark money.

So today is a very important day that would not be possible without the work of my friend and colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE. More than anyone in this Chamber, Senator WHITEHOUSE has labored relentlessly to shine a light on the link between dark money and so many of the ills that plague our politics, from the radicalization of our courts to the rise of climate deniers and more.

I thank him for his work. Our entire caucus does. We stand with him, strongly, fervently, in supporting this bill. The need for the DISCLOSE Act is great. The past decade has been the most expensive in the history of American elections. Billions have been raised and spent in super PAC and dark money. Because of *Citizens United*, a person's ability to affect the democratic process has largely become a function of their net worth in gross violation—gross violation—of what the Framers intended when they believed in one person, one vote.

The DISCLOSE Act will remedy these ills with a very simple notion

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4941

that sunlight is the greatest of disinfectants. It will require super PACs and other dark money groups to support anyone contributing \$10,000 or more during an election cycle.

The same goes for any group spending money in support or in opposition to judicial nominees. In other words, it would apply familiar forms of transparency that traditional campaigns and candidates already face when accepting political contributions.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes—all of us should vote yes; every single one of us should vote yes—because so many of the ills in our democracy are rooted in the primacy of dark money. We must rid ourselves of this foulness before it is too late, and our democracy could well become beyond saving.

Over the past few days, the Republican leader has come to the floor and repeated the same timeworn, misleading arguments he has used for years when trying to discredit campaign finance reform. I mean, part of his arguments just get to the point of absurdity. Without a shred of irony, the Republican leader, for instance, has claimed that the DISCLOSE Act is equivalent to threatening the privacy of individuals who want to make political contributions.

I would ask the Republican leader: What about the privacy of tens of millions of women across the country? Those rights are now gone because radical Justices were put on the Court because of dark money in the first place.

Does the Republican leader really think the supposed privacy of the billionaire donor class trumps the rights of women who have suffered the consequences of dark money spending?

He would also have us think that transparency requirements would add a burden to average Americans who want nothing more than to simply exercise their political opinions.

That is bunkum. Those with the power to cut \$10,000 or million-dollar checks can tilt the tide of an entire election with a single donation. These are individuals with outsized influence that average Americans simply don't have.

And when the Supreme Court extended the First Amendment to absurd lengths in *Citizens United*, they went way beyond what the Founding Fathers would have intended and what most Americans—the vast overwhelming majority of Americans—believe.

At a bare minimum, the public has a right to know—simply to know—who is behind these massive donations because at the end of the day, it is their rights that are on the line.

And all of these arguments are really just done to obscure the issue. I mean, it is hard to believe. It is hard to believe that people will be—multibillionaires will be intimidated if they have to disclose their attempts to influence elections. It is just incredible that someone could argue that.

But all these arguments are made for one purpose by the Republican leader

and others, in my judgment, and that is to obscure what is really at issue: The Republican Party for years has been built on a foundation of dark money.

It is how they have hijacked our courts. It is how they have promoted groups that push for voter suppression. It is how they have killed climate policies for years before Democrats finally pushed through our climate investments earlier this year.

In a healthy democracy, American voters alone should have the power to determine the Nation's leaders without fear that their voices will be drowned out by powerful elites or special interests. Whether you are rich or poor, young or old, well connected or otherwise, it shouldn't matter. We should all be equal in our exercise of the franchise. That doesn't happen now. We all know that. The American people know it. Over 80 percent despise dark money.

The DISCLOSE Act will help us restore that norm back into our politics by instilling transparency that we desperately need. Americans are tired of the corrosive power of dark money in our politics. They know something has been deeply amiss for a long time and that we need reforms to bring democracy back into balance.

So I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I urge my Republican colleagues to work with us to break the stranglehold that dark money has in our elections. This bill would be a very important and much needed start.

Democracy can't prosper without transparency. I strongly support passing this legislation so we can safeguard our electoral process and keep the dream of our Founders alive in this century.

GOP AGENDA

Madam President, now on another issue, tomorrow, a cohort of House Republicans will travel to western Pennsylvania to roll out what they claim is their GOP agenda.

I want to skip right to the punch line. The GOP has made its agenda perfectly clear for months: a nationwide ban on abortion, Medicare and Social Security on the chopping block, raising taxes on working families.

While Democrats continue to fight to defend a woman's right to choose, a central feature of the Republican agenda is eliminating abortions once and for all. Many of them will deny it, but, not 2 weeks ago, the Senator from South Carolina introduced a nationwide abortion ban here in the Senate. And the American people should not forget that nearly every Senate Republican is on record as sponsoring and voting for nationwide abortion bans.

So if Americans want to know what the GOP agenda is, look no further.

Also, while Democrats passed legislation to lower prescription drug costs and extend affordable healthcare, every single Republican voted against legislation that would lower insulin costs for seniors on Medicare and have openly called for putting Medicare and Social Security on the chopping block.

They seem to think tax cuts for the rich is good policy, but argue that Medicare and Social Security should no longer be guaranteed.

And let's not forget, when they had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, their major, major accomplishment was cutting taxes on the rich—cutting taxes on the rich. Is that what the American people want? Well, if you do, elect these Republicans.

Finally, while Democrats want to keep taxes down for the middle class and working families and we want to help Americans save on their electric bills and healthcare, the Senator from Florida, who chairs the Republican Senate campaign arm, has already released a GOP agenda that calls for raising taxes on working people.

It is amazing that the election is around the corner, and Republicans are still struggling to show a united front that appeals to the American people. Their fundamental problem is that the GOP is now the party of MAGA extremism, and there aren't enough press conferences in the world to change that fact.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117-1

Madam President, finally, on Kigali, yesterday was truly a high point for the U.S. Senate. After years of bipartisan work, the Chamber ratified one of the most significant pro-climate, pro-job measures that has ever come to the floor, the Kigali Amendment.

I thank the Senators from Delaware and New Jersey and Senators from so many other States who worked so hard to make this happen.

Ratifying the Kigali Amendment, along with passing the Inflation Reduction Act, is the strongest one-two punch against climate change any Congress has ever taken. Thanks to our commitment to phase out HFCs, we will put ourselves in a position to lower global temperatures by half a degree Celsius by the end of the decade. So many people have overlooked this, but it is truly a significant milestone. Half a degree will have an enormous—an enormous—impact on the global scale.

And the Kigali Amendment will also help American businesses secure an edge against China in the emerging industry of next-generation refrigerants. This market will see most of its growth outside the United States, and Kigali will make sure that U.S. businesses will be able to take advantage of new opportunities that will yield billions in investments and, best of all, will create tens of thousands of good-paying jobs along the way.

So, once again, ratifying Kigali is a win-win-win—a win for U.S. jobs, a win for U.S. investment, and a win for U.S. leadership to protect the planet.

I thank my colleagues for their excellent work in pushing Kigali finally over the finish line.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

REMEMBERING U.S. CAPITOL POLICE OFFICER
WILLIAM THOMAS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, first this morning, I was deeply saddened to learn we lost a dedicated and long-serving member of the Senate family this week.

Officer William Thomas of the United States Capitol Police passed away after a battle with cancer. He was only 38 years young.

Officer Thomas joined the force nearly 14 years ago. He quickly became a familiar face to many of the Senators and staff serving on this side of the Capitol. By all accounts, his dedication, his professionalism, and his service in the Senate Division and most recently in the Communications Division were a credit to the entire Department and to our institution.

The loss of Officer Thomas leaves a hole in the close-knit community of brave men and women who keep us safe here at the Capitol.

The entire Senate joins Officer Thomas's brother Vincent, as well as his brothers and sisters here in uniform, in mourning this tragic loss.

INFLATION

Madam President, now on an entirely different matter, the painful story of Washington Democrats' runaway inflation is playing out in hard-working communities all across our country. We learned last week that food inflation is now at its highest level since 1979.

For folks in the Phoenix metro area, where inflation already outpaces the national average, that has meant a 3-percent inflation tax on food in just the last 2 months. According to one Arizona shopper:

It's all almost \$300. I used to get the same groceries like around \$150 before.

Across the border in Nevada, the Las Vegas Review Journal reported recently how local coffee shops are caught between eating higher costs for supplies and chasing their customers away with higher prices. The owner of one shop says that as everything from coffee beans to cups gets more expensive, they have had to raise prices by about 10 percent:

We've done our best not to pass this on to our customers, because we do understand that we are all in the same boat together.

The Colorado Sun spoke with one new resident of Westminster who said he had moved to town to "lower the impact of an 18-percent rent increase." He has cut back on cable, driving, and buying meat at the grocery store.

In Washington State, the Seattle Times is reporting that 4 in 10 area

renters are now spending more than 30 percent of their paychecks on rent. When one resident learned her rent would be increasing by nearly 10 percent, she said:

I just wanted to cry. I'm barely making it. I'm just a senior citizen.

In Georgia, the Augusta Press reports that local small businesses are still facing a rocky road. According to the owner of one power-washing business in Evans: "Materials are getting more expensive," and potential clients are "more hesitant to get any work done right now."

And further north, with winter cold fast approaching, one resident of Manchester, NH, told the local news that heating oil subsidies were appreciated, but "I feel like it's a Band-Aid after they've stabbed you."

So these are the real-world consequences—real-world consequences—of Washington Democrats' inflation. Every corner of every State is writing its own painful story. But the ones I just mentioned have something unfortunate in common. Every resident of Arizona, Washington, Nevada, New Hampshire, Colorado, and Georgia is represented by two Senators each who cast the deciding vote to set this inflation in motion. If just one single Senator—just one—from Georgia, Arizona, Colorado, New Hampshire, or Washington had refused to give their vote to President Biden's reckless spending, the working families and small business owners of these States would not be dealing with this much inflation, period. But every one of those States' Senators cast tie-breaking votes to bring on the worst inflation in four decades, and now every American is paying the price.

DISCLOSE ACT

Madam President, now on one final matter, Democrats' reckless policies have stuck the American people with an inflation crisis, a border crisis, a violent crime crisis, and an energy crisis.

Today, this Democrat Senate majority is spending time on legislation that tackles none of these things. They aren't addressing any of the problems that keep moms and dads up at night. They aren't tackling any of the issues that are leaving small business owners unable to pay their bills or unsafe in inner-city locations, or both. They aren't spending 10 seconds of the Senate's time exploring the disconnect between Vice President HARRIS who says "we have a secure border" and the illegal immigrant who told a reporter last week:

Everybody believes the border is open . . . we see it on the news that everybody comes in illegally, so we do the same.

So, the Democrats don't want to spend time on the people's business today. They would rather spend time on their business—something we have seen time and time again over the last 2 years.

Today's liberal pet priority is a piece of legislation designed to give

unelected Federal bureaucrats vastly more power over private citizens' First Amendment rights and political activism and to strip privacy away from Americans who speak out about politics in their private lives.

More power for Washington, DC, censors; less privacy for private citizens; and throw some ice on the First Amendment. That is what our colleagues across the aisle have made their top priority for the day.

So I have to state, it is a novel response to flagging poll numbers and public outcry. Instead of trying to clean up the border mess, the crime mess, or the inflation mess, my Democratic colleagues decided it would be easier just to erode the American people's right to complain about it in the first place.

The legislation I am speaking about itself is an insult to the First Amendment, and the notion that it gets Senate floor time today above everything else is truly an insult to the working people of this country.

So I would urge my colleagues on both sides to stand with the Constitution, stand with our citizens who deserve better, and vote no.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Does the name "Barre Seid" ring a bell? Barre Seid, of Chicago, a businessman—a successful businessman. He was born in 1932, and he owned a company called Tripp Lite that made electronic products.

He was very successful in the course of his life, but he decided to donate the value of this company to something known as the Marble Freedom Trust. Does that ring a bell? Barre Seid, Marble Freedom Trust?

The reason I bring this up on the floor of the United States Senate is, Mr. Seid, with this gift of \$1.6 billion to Marble Freedom Trust is setting out to change America.

Wait a minute. A 90-year-old individual, who has been charitable in many ways, gives money away and it changes America? Yes. I stand by my comment, because the Marble Freedom Trust is now becoming the largest dark money—secret money—contributor to American political campaigns in the history of the United States. And if you think I am overreacting, the go-to leader of the Marble Freedom Trust is a man named Leonard Leo.

I am sure none of these names register with most Americans—Barre Seid of Chicago, Marble Freedom Trust, Leonard Leo. What does this have to do with what my family is worried about? Well, let me get to the bottom line because the leader from the Republican side just alluded to it.

This \$1.6 billion is going to be invested in political campaigns on the right for conservative Republican candidates, period.

Leonard Leo has a pedigree and well-known background of involvement in politics in Washington, and he has been very successful.

I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, currently chairman; but over the years I have watched, over the Trump years, every judicial nominee approved by the Republicans had to pass one litmus test: They had to be cleared by the Federalist Society. Now, that is another name which the average American family won't recognize, but let me tell you what the Federalist Society is. The Federalist Society is a clearinghouse for lawyers who want to be judges. You have got to join it. You have got to pay your dues. You have got to show up. Most importantly, you have to pass the checklist of required positions on issues before you can become a judge on the Republican side.

That happened over and over and over again in the hearings we had for nominees for lifetime appointments to the Federal court during the Trump administration.

I would ask these lawyers sitting before us, when you could question them: Tell me about the Federalist Society.

Oh, we just got together for lunch once in a while. It is not that big a deal.

But what a coincidence that every nominee had to be approved by the Federalist Society, and it didn't end there. When former President Trump put out his list of potential Supreme Court nominees, which included the three whom he ended up choosing, all of them were provided by the Federalist Society—the Federalist Society and Leonard Leo.

Sadly, they got the job done. Senator MCCONNELL was complicit in that. When there was a vacancy on the Supreme Court with the untimely death of Antonin Scalia, it was Senator MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans who blocked President Obama in his last year in office from filling that vacancy. In fact, they refused—they said to their Members: Don't even meet with the man.

Here is Merrick Garland, a respected jurist on the DC Circuit, nominated to the highest Court in the land, can't even get an appointment with a Republican Senator to plead his case that he would be a good nominee. And the reason? Senator MCCONNELL was bound and determined to make sure that a Federalist Society nominee eventually made it to the Court, and he got his way.

So now we have Leonard Leo in a new role. God only knows how much they are paying him. But this man is now set up on a new political agenda. It is the largest dark money, secret money effort in the history of the United States. How did we learn about Barre Seid giving \$1.6 billion to this Marble Freedom Trust? Someone leaked it to the newspapers. Otherwise, it would have gone unnoticed because this is, in fact, the world of dark and secret money.

Senator MCCONNELL made a passing reference to the fact that we are about to vote on something called the DISCLOSE Act. The DISCLOSE Act—and I

want to salute Senator WHITEHOUSE, who is not on the floor at the moment. The DISCLOSE Act is really pretty basic. We are going to vote today on this provision which would be added to our campaign law—protecting American democracy from foreign interference and requiring super PACs and special interest groups to disclose anyone contributing \$10,000 or more to their cause. That is it. We don't prohibit the actual contribution; we just require disclosure. Where is it coming from?

The reason we ask for this is that you go State by State with the heated campaigns of the day, and you will find all sorts of ads online and on television, and you have to race to the TV set to get close enough to read the small print at the end of the ad that explains who pays for it. If you knew who really paid for it, it would explain a lot of things to you.

I have been, for example, at war with the major credit card companies, Visa and MasterCard. They have a duopoly. And I believe they overcharge consumers across America, and they are a contributor to inflation. In fact, they admit that much. So, as a result, I passed an amendment 8 or 10 years ago which they have branded the “Durbin amendment” which limits debit card swipe fees, interchange fees—I get into the world of finance here—and they hate it.

Visa and MasterCard hated my amendment like the Devil hates holy water. Why? Because it costs them \$8 billion a year. It reduces the add-on charges that retailers—restaurants and shops—have to charge when people use a Visa and MasterCard. So, every once in a while, they work up the courage to come at me again and try to undo this amendment, and they buy television ads. Do the television ads say that they are paid for by Visa and MasterCard? No. They say they are paid for by the Committee for a Better America or something.

What we are trying to do with the DISCLOSE Act is give to the voters of this country more information and, in so doing, protect the whole process from corruption by foreign money being spent or by individuals like Mr. Seid, who puts \$1.6 billion into the treasury of the Republican side.

Now, if they came to the floor to debate this—and I don't think they will—they are likely to say: Well, you do the same thing. You use dark money and such.

It is true that the campaign system is set up for organizations not to disclose, but we are authoring the solution to the problem for both political parties. We are standing by a reform and a change—Senator WHITEHOUSE has led the way—that would literally say to America: You have the right to know. Who is paying for this candidate's ads? Who is putting all those ads on TV? What special interest group is behind this cause?

Now, Senator MCCONNELL says we should be dealing with serious issues.

There is no more serious issue than the integrity of our campaign process. And I know, as a person who has been a candidate over many years, that it has changed dramatically. I can remember not that long ago when the first super PAC effort on the Democratic Senate side raised something in the range of \$4 million to \$10 million. Well, I can tell you that has been increasing by multiples every year, and on the other side, it is the same story.

Do we need to sit down both political parties and put an end to this madness? Do we need to tell Mr. Seid and his family: Take your \$1.6 billion and spend it for something that is really wholesome and of value to your community and your Nation, rather than to get into the hunt to be the biggest spender.

Mr. Seid became the biggest spender of campaign funds in the history of the United States with his \$1.6 billion contribution to Leonard Leo, the Marble Trust, and the Republican cause. That is a fact. I think we ought to change it. This system we have in America is one we need to protect and not exploit.

When the U.S. Supreme Court in Citizens United decided that money was speech and that corporations had a right to speak, it really corrupted the system in ways unimaginable. We are living with the results today. Citizens United was a terrible decision. Search the Constitution all day and night for the word “corporations,” and you won't even find it. This is no constitutional protection. And the idea that if you are rich, you can speak more loudly and more often in America is a corruption of the basic rights we all should protect and enjoy.

So I am going to vote in favor of the DISCLOSE Act. I don't think it is as insignificant as the Senator from Kentucky does. I think it gets to the heart of the issue about the future of our democracy.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this Senate is facing an important deadline. Eight days from today, September 30, is the end of the fiscal year. That leaves us just a handful of legislative days to pass a continuing resolution that will keep the government operating while Congress negotiates a Federal budget for the next fiscal year.

It is critical that we come to agreement as quickly as possible on a responsible Federal budget for next year. While we continue our negotiations, it is also critical that we not lose momentum on two life-and-death battles in which we are now seeing hard-won progress.

I am speaking about our efforts to finally end the COVID pandemic—as well as our Nation's efforts to help Ukraine repel Russia's immoral and illegal war on that small democracy.

Finally, we can help our fellow Americans who are suffering in the wake of a catastrophic Hurricane Fiona in Puerto Rico, recent devastating floods in Kentucky, and other natural disasters.

Because, when disasters overwhelm the ability of communities and even States to respond, we don't abandon our fellow citizens to suffer alone. We reach out our hand to help.

I want to take a few minutes to speak about each of these priorities that must be included in the continuing resolution. In recent weeks, the world has seen a stunning contrast in courage, leadership, and decency play out on the world stage. In Ukraine, we have witnessed the Ukrainian military retake thousands of square miles of territory in the Kharkiv region in a lightning counter-offensive against the Soviet occupiers. We have seen weeping men and women able to return to their communities. Others have come out of their homes and basements for the first times in months, overwhelmed with emotion at what they hope is the end of their nightmare. Still other Ukrainians are beginning the heartbreaking work of exhuming bodies from discovered mass graves and documenting Russian war crimes and atrocities.

This is Ukrainian President, Volodymyr Zelenskyy last week in the newly liberated city of Lyzum. President Zelenskyy is singing the Ukrainian national anthem during a Ukrainian flag-raising ceremony with members of the country's armed forces who drove out the Russian occupiers. He resolutely proclaimed, that while Russia may still occupy parts of Ukraine, for now "[i]t is definitely impossible to occupy our people, the Ukrainian people."

And what was happening in Moscow as Ukrainian communities were being liberated—and neglected and demoralized Russian troops were fleeing in haste? Vladimir Putin, who has never visited the Russian soldiers he so cynically uses for his disastrous war in Ukraine, was opening a giant Ferris wheel at an amusement park, trying to give a facade of normalcy. Putin is terrified that the Russian people will learn the truth about his failed and grotesque war—a war fueled by lies, war crimes, and Putin's warped nostalgia for a Soviet dystopia. Why else would he censor the news and jail anyone who criticizes the war? Why else would he imprison brave Russian patriots such as Alexei Navalny and Vladimir Kara-Murza who respect the Russian people by speaking the truth and offering real debate? Just 1 day after Putin opened the Ferris wheel in Moscow, the ride broke down, leaving some people dangling high off the ground. It was a pathetic and apt metaphor for Putin's disastrous war against Ukraine. Putin vowed that Russia would take Ukraine in days, maybe in hours. That was nearly 7 months ago. Today, Russia is losing its war against Ukraine.

From the earliest days of this war, when Ukrainian forces repelled Russian forces trying to seize Kiev and set up a puppet government, U.S. and allied support has been critical to Ukraine's

military success. The successful counter-offensive we are seeing today is due, first and foremost, to the heroism of President Zelenskyy and the Ukrainian people. But it's also a reflection of President Biden's foresight and leadership in rallying our allies and providing timely and formidable assistance to Ukraine.

Yet we cannot assume that Ukraine's victory is inevitable. A wounded beast is dangerous. Russia still occupies large swathes of Ukraine and is threatening to unleash even more powerful weapons in a desperate attempt to avoid complete defeat. In fact, over the last 24 hours alone, Putin has made a number of desperate and increasingly unhinged announcements: calling for a partial mobilization of more Russian reservists despite mounting losses; making further veiled threats of using nuclear weapons; and pursuing sham referendums across eastern Ukraine, beginning as early as this Friday, echoing his past illegitimate actions in Crimea. Let me be clear that the U.S. never recognized the annexation of Crimea.

Today, Senator RUBIO and I will introduce legislation making clear the U.S. will never recognize Russia's annexation of any other part of Ukraine. All this is a reminder of why we must pass additional aid to Ukraine as part of the continuing resolution without delay.

This war is not simply a war between Russia and Ukraine. It is a battle between democracy and autocracy. It is cheaper for us, and it is unquestionably in our national security interest, to win this war while it is still contained within Ukraine.

Madam President, ending the COVID pandemic once and for all is another battle that we are winning and can't afford to give up on now. When President Biden took office, he set an ambitious goal: to vaccinate 70 percent of American adults. We have done that—and more. Today, almost 80 percent of all Americans—more than 260 million people—are well on their way to being fully vaccinated. Experts tell us those vaccinations have helped prevent more than 60 million infections in the United States, 17 million hospitalizations, and more than 2 million deaths. That is a modern medical miracle. But we are not out of danger completely. The virus is still circulating, still mutating, and still sickening and killing people. America is still seeing 57,000 new COVID infections daily, with more than 30,000 people hospitalized and more than 400 people dying each day.

In March, President Biden asked for additional funding and resources to continue the fight against COVID. For months, our Republican colleagues have blocked that request. Their obstruction has had serious costs. With another COVID surge likely on its way this fall, the administration is running out of funds to purchase and distribute COVID vaccines. And it has been forced to pause part of its free testing pro-

gram. President Biden is right; we have made huge progress against COVID. But history shows us what happens when we declare a pandemic to be over prematurely. The flu pandemic of 1918, which killed at least 50 million people worldwide, had at least 4 waves over about 2 years. In some cities, the fourth wave killed even more people than the second wave. Why was the fourth wave so much deadlier? Because, by then, people had grown tired of precautions and given up on them. We can't repeat that deadly mistake.

We need to pass the administration's request for additional funds for public and global health so that we can end the COVID pandemic once and for all, and we must also dedicate more funds to helping stop the spread of monkeypox. I also strongly support the administration's request for additional funding for the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, as well as Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, to control the spread of the pandemic amid potential new variants.

Finally, as I said, Madam President, we must include in the continuing resolution disaster relief funds to help our fellow Americans who are suffering in the wake of natural disasters in Puerto Rico, Kentucky, California, and many other States. The entire island of Puerto Rico—more than 1 million people—lost power this weekend as it was battered by Hurricane Fiona, almost exactly 5 years after the devastation of Hurricane Maria. Roughly 70 percent of residents and businesses lost access to clean water, with massive flooding still ongoing. I stand ready to do all I can to provide Federal support to the island and other communities recovering from disasters this year. They need our help now. I hope my Republican colleagues will join Democrats in providing it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I understand that Senator THUNE is next in order on the floor, but not seeing him on the floor, I thought I would take the time before he arrives to echo the terrific remarks of my Judiciary chairman, DICK DURBIN.

As I think people know, a lot of money has been spent in this effort to control the Court by special interests. Indeed, the last count is that it cost \$580 million in dark money to achieve that purpose. I don't know anybody who spends nearly \$600 million—more than half a billion dollars—without having a purpose in mind. And when you see the undoing of women's right to determine their own reproductive choice, when you see new weaponry rolled out against pollution regulations, when you see 100-year-old gun laws being taken down, when you see the agenda of the big-money rightwing being implemented by the Court, it begins to look like, in fact, they got their money's worth, and they didn't mind spending big.

One of the ways they did this was to make sure that all of the Trump selections of nominees went through the Federalist Society. Never in our history has that happened, with a private organization stepping in and deciding who would be on the Supreme Court.

I see that Senator THUNE has arrived. The floor is his. I will interrupt my remarks because I was just filling time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. I appreciate his kindness. I know he has got a lot to say on the subject, and hopefully he will be able to get back to it.

ENERGY

Madam President, I want to speak just a minute about the issue of high energy prices and high grocery prices that have become a distinguishing feature of the Biden economy.

Electricity prices increased 15.8 percent in August, the largest year-over-year increase since 1981—1981. I wasn't even married the last time we saw electricity increases like this, and now I have grandkids.

Utility gas service was up 33 percent from a year ago in August—33 percent increase year over year from August.

The price of home heating oil, which many households in places like New Hampshire rely on to keep their homes warm in the winter, has soared. All told, the National Energy Assistance Directors Association estimates that home heating costs for the winter heating season will average \$1,202—a 17.2-percent increase from last season.

I haven't even mentioned gas prices. Gas prices may have decreased from their \$5 high this summer—partly as a result of President Biden's problematic decision to draw down our Nation's emergency petroleum reserves to their lowest point since 1985, with no plan to refill them—but customers are still paying \$1.30 more per gallon than they were when President Biden took office. The average price for a gallon of gas has increased this week, ending a streak of diminishing, although still high, gas prices.

Madam President, if there is one thing we should be doing about high energy prices, it is increasing our domestic energy supply, including our supply of conventional energy—namely, oil and natural gas. I am a longtime supporter of alternative energy, and I come from a State that derives a substantial portion of its electricity generation from wind. In fact, in 2021, over 50 percent of our State's power generation came from wind and 30 percent came from hydroelectric on the Missouri River. But if it weren't for traditional fossil fuels backing up that generation, especially on days when the wind is still, we would be left in the dark.

The fact of the matter is, no matter how much Democrats might wish it were otherwise, alternative energy

technology has simply not advanced to the point where our country can rely exclusively on alternative energy. Attempting to pretend we have advanced further than we have or have solved all the requisite supply chain hurdles will lead to nothing but economic pain for American families.

Just look at California, whose overreliance on alternative energy technology has resulted in an electricity grid that cannot sustain the demands being placed on it. Californians were recently asked to ration their energy usage and refrain from charging electric cars during certain hours to reduce strain on the grid. Yet the State has issued a final regulation that will require all new cars sold in the State to be electric or otherwise zero emission by 2035. I don't see this ending well for Californians. This is the kind of unrealistic thinking that has permeated pretty much the entire Democratic Party.

I am all for advancing clean energy technologies. I have done a lot of work here in Congress to advance clean energy, from renewable fuels to wind energy. But until clean energy technology has advanced to the point where it can truly, reliably, and affordably supply America's energy needs, we need to continue to invest in responsible conventional energy production as part of the "all of the above" energy strategy that we need for this country. Otherwise, the high energy prices Americans are struggling with right now could get even worse and persist long into the future.

President Biden, of course, has been discouraging conventional energy production since day one, which is one reason why high energy prices have become a defining feature of the Biden administration. From canceling the Keystone XL Pipeline, to discouraging investment in conventional energy with a targeted ESG agenda, to making it more difficult for oil and gas companies to develop leases, President Biden has shown a distinct hostility to conventional energy.

Last month, the President signed into law the so-called Inflation Reduction Act, the partisan tax-and-spending spree the Democrats jammed through Congress in August. Now, I have mentioned the high energy prices Americans have been experiencing. Well, apparently, Democrats think that the best solution is to pass a bunch of new fees and tax hikes that will drive up energy prices further.

Their so-called Inflation Reduction Act includes a slate of taxes on conventional energy production at the worst possible time. The methane fee in their bill alone has the potential to drive Americans' natural gas bills by 17 percent—17 percent—just what Americans need while they are paying 15.8 percent more for electricity and 33 percent more for utility gas service and \$1.30 more for every gallon of gasoline.

But at least Americans can feel good about the fact that their tax dollars will be going to fund Democrats' Green

New Deal fantasies, like tax credits for wealthy Americans to purchase electric vehicles. That is right. The so-called Inflation Reduction Act—which, by the way, even the Democrat chairman of the Senate Budget Committee admits will do nothing to fix inflation—pours hundreds of billions of dollars—taxpayer dollars—into Green New Deal priorities.

In addition to tax credits for wealthy Americans, the Inflation Reduction Act also includes funding for things like expensive electric vehicles for the U.S. Postal Service, mitigating urban heat island hotspots and monitoring gaps in tree canopy coverage, and climate-related political activity. That is right—climate-related political activity.

Democrats succeeded in pushing through the Inflation Reduction Act—and its tax hikes on conventional energy—by promising one of their Members a vote on permitting reform legislation.

Real permitting reform is something I heartily endorse. Too many energy permits spend years mired in bureaucracy, leading to completely needless delays in energy development. Cleaning up the permitting process would help advance both conventional and renewable energy production.

Unfortunately, it is not clear that the permitting reform deal that was released last night will do anything to meaningfully address permitting delays and, in some cases, could make things worse.

For one, it would expand FERC's authority to override State jurisdiction for projects the President designates as "national interest facilities," which is why the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission is opposed to it. And it would give States wide latitude to kill the very infrastructure projects the bill purports to expedite by expanding the State Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

In other sections where this proposal seeks to shorten deadlines for various stages of permitting, which is a goal I support, the consequences for not meeting a deadline are merely notifying the Office of Management and Budget and the lead Department Secretary. It is hard to see this actually moving the chains.

On top of that, it is starting to seem extremely doubtful that Democrats actually have the votes in their conference to pass permitting reform legislation.

Republicans, thanks to the efforts of Senator CAPITO, have a meaningful, substantive permitting reform bill ready to go. It is supported by every Member of our conference. It would need the support of just 10 Democrat Senators to pass. It would be nice to think that there are 10 moderate Democrat Senators—if the words "Democrat" and "moderate" can still go together in this time of the Democratic Party's rapid push to the extreme

left—who would be willing to join Republicans to pass our legislation and finally take a real step to ease the burden of high energy prices on American families.

But given the President's and the Democratic Party's hostility to any measure that would genuinely start addressing high energy prices, I am not holding my breath.

High prices—for energy and just about everything else—have become the distinguishing feature of the Biden economy, and if Democrats continue to take steps to discourage conventional energy production, high energy prices will be a Democrat legacy that lasts long into the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Rhode Island.

S. 4822

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the place where I left off, when Senator THUNE came to the floor, was discussing the extent to which huge floods of dark money had taken control of our Supreme Court. I will just dig into that a little bit further while we have a moment, because one of the vehicles for this effort was the Federalist Society.

It is extremely unusual in any modern democracy that the selection of who got onto the Supreme Court would be parceled out to a private organization. It is even more peculiar when that private organization has a very distinct political and ideological bent, and it is worse still when that private organization, while acting as the gatekeeper to Supreme Court appointments, was receiving massive dark money infusions.

Before it got that role, the Federalist Society did not get loads of dark money. Back in 2002, their anonymous donations summed to a grand total of \$5,000. But once it became clear that they were the gatekeeper to the Supreme Court for the Republican Party, by 2019, they were up to \$7 million pouring in in dark money.

We don't know how those names were picked for Donald Trump's Federalist Society list. There was no public process. There was no disclosure. There was some back room someplace where those lists were assembled. And who got a voice controlling who got on that list, I suspect, has a lot to do with that \$7 million.

Again, when you are spending \$7 million, you are not kidding around. You want results, and they have got them.

The other piece of the pie here is one of Leonard Leo's little nodes of phony front groups funded by dark money. He has got an 85 Fund and a Concord Fund, a 501(c)(3) and a 501(c)(4). That is the state of the art in dark money political manipulation: You do a 501(c)(3). You do a 501(c)(4). You put them in the same office with the same staff, with the same oversight and the same funders, but you pretend that they are different. Then, to make it even more complicated, you file under Virginia

corporate law fictitious names—that is what it is actually called under Virginia corporate law—fictitious names for other front groups. So in this dark money Court capture machine, even the front groups have front groups.

One of them is right here. It is called the Judicial Crisis Network. The Judicial Crisis Network was the one that took in the dark money from anonymous big donors to push out the television ads to capture the Court: ads for Gorsuch, ads for Kavanaugh, and ads for Barrett. They put out some pretty good money to do that. For Gorsuch, they spent \$21 million. For Kavanaugh, they spent \$17 million. For Barrett, as far as we know so far, they spent \$14 million. These came in not from grassroots donations. The checks were as big as \$15 million. The checks were as big as \$17 million. And if the same person was writing those \$15 million and \$17 million checks, our count is that it is \$60 million or more. And if one person has paid \$60 million or more to influence who gets on the Supreme Court and we don't know what business they have before the Court, that is an open avenue and prescription for corruption.

Right now, after all that money got spent by the Judicial Crisis Network to push all those rightwing FedSoc Justices onto the Court, the Honest Elections Project, another fictitious-name leg of this dark money critter, is in the Supreme Court right now pushing the argument developed by John Eastman—the Big Lie argument that in Georgia and other States the State legislature should be able to throw out the outcome of a Federal election and replace the winner of it with the person they want.

The theory is so extreme that it even posits that the State court system can't control the State legislature. The principle of judicial review of legislative acts is undone by this. It is wildly extreme.

But there is the Honest Elections Project—so-called—showing up in Court as an amicus, pushing the Big Lie theory to the very judges who the Judicial Crisis Network paid to get on the Court.

And guess what. Do you think they disclosed to anybody that that was the connection? No, I have got to come to the floor of the Senate to point that out because the Supreme Court, which is behind so much of this—the unlimited money, the failure to enforce the transparency requirement, the gobs of dark money that are going through—also won't enforce the rule that requires amicus curiae, the people who file the briefs, to tell the Court and the other parties who is really behind them. So they are getting away with it from the judges who got put on the Court.

This whole dark money problem goes well beyond just dirty dark money flooding into our elections. It goes beyond the cause of the slime of the dirty, noxious TV ads that come pouring out of our television screens, pour-

ing through our devices with a phony-balance name behind the advertisement.

The good Senator is from New Jersey. Perhaps it could be "New Jerseyans for Peace and Puppies and Prosperity."

Anybody watching the ad knows that that is not a real organization. And what does it tell you, as a citizen, when slimily, lying, dirty smear ads are being pushed through to you, through your TV screen, through your device by a group that you know is a phony? How do you have confidence in that?

I will close because Senator HIRONO is here, and I want to have her speak. But I will say that I am not alone in thinking that requiring people to stand up and identify who they are when they are trying to influence our politics is a distinctly American quality.

In fact, I quote:

Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed. For my part, I do not look forward to a society which, thanks to the Supreme Court, campaigns anonymously . . . and even exercises the direct democracy of initiative and referendum hidden from public scrutiny and protected from the accountability of criticism. This does not resemble the Home of the Brave.

The author of that: Justice Antonin Scalia.

I will continue later, but I want to defer to the busy schedule of my friend Senator HIRONO.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE, for his long and strong advocacy for cleaning up the scourge of dark money in our country.

Our country was built on the founding principles of democracy, where every person has a say—a democracy where the American people can make their voices heard in free and fair elections and we the people can decide the direction of our country. But in 2010, the Roberts Court, in an obvious act of judicial activism, struck down corporate campaign contribution restrictions found in the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. Suddenly, the Supreme Court said that corporations are people who have First Amendment constitutional rights to make campaign contributions.

This decision opened the floodgates to billions of dollars of dark money to influence our elections, our Courts, and our thinking on issues from gun safety to abortion.

When the Supreme Court held that political speech by a corporation is protected by the First Amendment, it left for Congress just the narrow authority to take action to require disclosure of donor names.

After knocked-down, dragged-out negotiations in the U.S. House in 2010—I was there—the House passed a disclosure bill, only to see it fail in the Senate very narrowly without the support of a single Republican.

Back then, we had the chance to require political spending disclosures so that the American people could see who was contributing millions to influence election outcomes.

So here we are, more than a decade later, and now it is not millions but billions of dollars flowing undisclosed into races across the country. Our country is awash in undisclosed money that is subverting the will of the American people.

When 85 percent of the American people support reproductive freedom, 65 percent of the American people support gun safety, and 63 percent of the American people support protecting the right to vote and Senate Republicans are preventing us from even having a legislative debate on the floor on these issues, what does that tell you? It tells you that too many elected officials are no longer answering to the people but, instead, to the secret donors and corporations who are funding their campaigns.

But it is not just elected officials that have been influenced. Mega-corporations and the ultrawealthy have spent millions to stack our courts. One dark money group already spent more than \$30 million in total on the nominations of Neil Gorsuch, Brett Kavanaugh, and Amy Coney Barrett to the U.S. Supreme Court, where they sit, in my view, busily overturning precedents such as *Roe v. Wade*.

For the sake of our democracy, we need to get rid of the anonymous spending influencing our elections and our courts. That is a goal that everyone should be able to get behind regardless of whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. In fact, many of my Republican colleagues agree. The senior Senator from Iowa said dark money is “attacking the independence of the judiciary.” Another said dark money is “sowing public distrust in the legitimacy of the Supreme Court.”

There is bipartisan agreement to limit dark money, but, sadly, we know Republicans too often say one thing and then do another because not a single one of them so far has voiced support for even considering the DISCLOSE Act, which we will be voting to advance today, a bill that would increase transparency and accountability in political spending, a bill that would do the very thing that some leading Republicans have called for.

When given the chance, I hope my Republican colleagues will step up for the American people and not their special interest donors. We shall see.

We cannot accept a country where billionaires and corporations can secretly buy our elections, choose our leaders, and determine the fate of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Hawaii, who has been such an ardent and effective ally in this fight, for coming to the

floor today and for all of our work in the Judiciary Committee and also through briefs that we file in the Supreme Court trying to wake up the Court to what is happening around them.

I would add an additional point to my description of this little node of the dark money apparatus that has controlled the makeup of the Supreme Court and works very hard to control the decisions of the Supreme Court—and too often does—because you have heard Senator DURBIN and others speak on the floor today about the biggest dark money contribution ever made, \$1.6 billion, given to an organization run by this same individual.

And you see it going in but only because some whistleblower told the press what had happened. But even knowing that \$1.6 billion went in, you don't know where it goes next because this complicated apparatus and others like it enable the money to be sluiced through underground, subterranean, clandestine channels and pop out in political races through unknown, phony front groups with preposterously sweet names.

And nobody who is a citizen is allowed to understand what is happening. You can bet the word gets to the candidate about who is behind “New Jerseyans for Peace and Puppies and Prosperity,” and you can bet the big donors know. And if it is a House race, you can bet the House leaders know; and if it is a Senate race, you can bet the Senate leaders know. And you can bet that gives immense clout at stopping things in this building.

And, sure enough, that \$1.6 billion went into Marble Freedom Trust. And one of the first things it did was give money to the Concord Fund, one of the other Leonard Leo groups. You will recognize that as this chart behind me, and you add to it the Marble Freedom Trust that was the vehicle into which the \$1.6 billion got dumped, and then—zip—here came money straight to the Concord Fund, among other uses of it. So this thing is sort of a creature of multiple fronts.

And I was struck today when I read a news article about the resignation in Iraq of the finance minister, who is largely regarded as being the voice of integrity and decency and honesty in that government. And he quit, and he said one of the reasons was that he felt that there was around him a “vast octopus of corruption and deceit.”

This is just one piece of a vast octopus of corruption and deceit whose target is the American people and whose desire is to control government from behind the scenes without even showing up and showing who they are. If you want to see some of this mischief in action and in relation to what I have said about how this captured Court, with its FedSoc Justices, has delivered for the big-donor interests, the biggest thing that they have done so far in terms of affecting the trajectory of honesty and decency and public ac-

countability in this country has been in a case called *Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta*.

What did the judges who dark money put onto the Court that dark money built do? They built a brandnew constitutional right to dark money—unprecedented. And when they did it, when the case came up to them—interestingly, as part of this octopus of deceit are innumerable front groups that file amicus briefs.

I talked about how they don't disclose, and the Court lets them get away with it. Let me give you an idea of the number at the certiorari stage, which, for those not familiar with Supreme Court practice, is the point where the Supreme Court decides whether or not they will take up the case. And then there is the merits decision later on, on how they decide the case. But on the question of whether they take up the case, we counted about 50–5–0, 50—of these phony, dark money-funded front groups coming in and saying: You have got to take up this case. You have got to take up this case. You have got to take up this case.

It was signaling; it was flares; it was semaphore telling FedSoc Justices: We put you there. This is what we want you to do.

So let's take a quick look at a little bit about the Americans for Prosperity Foundation because it is related—remember what I said about 501(c)(3)s and 501(c)(4)s twinning together and having basic identity? Well, the Americans for Prosperity Foundation is the 501(c)(3) twin to a 501(c)(4) called Americans for Prosperity.

And guess what Americans for Prosperity is? It is the biggest battleship in the Koch brothers' political influence operation. It is the mother ship. It is as political as you get. It goes directly into elections and spends dark money.

And here are the big differences between Americans for Prosperity and the Americans for Prosperity Foundation. Well, the CEO and director of Americans for Prosperity is, amazingly enough, the CEO and director of the Americans for Prosperity Foundation. And the secretary of the Americans for Prosperity group happens also to be the corporate secretary of the Americans for Prosperity Foundation. How about that? Oh, here is a big difference. The senior vice president of grassroots operations for Americans for Prosperity is the senior vice president of state operations for Americans for Prosperity Foundation. There is a difference. The treasurer and vice president of Americans for Prosperity is the same as the treasurer and vice president of finance for the Americans for Prosperity Foundation, and the director of Americans for Prosperity is the chair of the Americans for Prosperity Foundation.

There is a thing in law called piercing the corporate veil. This is a corporate veil you could pierce with a banana. This is the kind of phony fun and games that dark money allows to intrude into our democracy. And in this

terrible death loop, dark money puts Justices on the Supreme Court who get told by dark money amici what they want, in flotillas of 50, and then deliver for dark money to a nominal plaintiff who is the indistinguishable twin of the Koch brothers' political battleship, letting that money loose into our politics with now constitutional imprimatur.

And they show up in droves. Here is just one case: Seila Law. This was the one about the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You know the dark money people hate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. In fact, they hate regulation. That is why they are trying to undo American government as best they can.

So here are some of the amici that showed up in Seila Law. I actually put this in my brief to the Supreme Court in that case as an appendix so they could see what was going on around them. A lot of good it did. So here are some of the front groups, all of whom take dark money, and here are some of the dark money sources we were able to trace them having taken: Donors Trust, widely described as the ATM of the far right. It has no purpose. Donors Trust doesn't make a product. You can't buy a Donors Trust car or bicycle or tire or pedal. It doesn't provide services. You can't go to Donors Trust and get your taxes done. You can't go to Donors Trust and get your shoes polished.

It does one thing and one thing only: It takes money in; it scrubs off the identity of the person who gave it the money; and then it sends the money where that person wants, as Donors Trust. That is it. It is an identity laundering machine for the dark money operation that we have running for this vast octopus of deceit.

And here are other foundations: Bradley, Scaife, Searle. Look at how much of this is in common. That was not described to the Court.

My time is running out. I will say two things as I go. One is, until the Supreme Court opened the floodgates of unlimited money, Republicans wanted disclosure. Republicans wanted disclosure. MITCH MCCONNELL, the leader:

We need to have real disclosure. Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?

He was in favor of a lot of disclosure on "Meet the Press."

"I think disclosure is the best disinfectant," he wrote.

We could do disclosure more frequently. I think disclosure is the best disinfectant.

MITCH MCCONNELL.

But then along came the Supreme Court in 2010; they opened the floodgates of unlimited money. And particularly the fossil fuel industry, which wanted to stop climate legislation, knew that if it showed up as Exxon, as Marathon, as Chevron, as Shell, the public would get the joke; their unlimited money would be useless because everybody would see the self-interest and the corruption behind all of that.

So they immediately went to work through phony front groups, 501(c)(4)s, Donors Trust, shell corporations.

And the Supreme Court let them do it despite the fact that, 8 to 1, the Supreme Court in Citizens United has said:

Without transparency, this unlimited money is corrupting. Without transparency, this unlimited money is corrupting.

Despite having said that, for 12 years, they have done nothing but let the dark money flow—over a billion dollars now into any single election.

It is intensely frustrating to see our country head down this filthy road, where huge special interests, defined by just a few characteristics—one, they have unlimited money to spend; two, they can win in politics by spending it; and, three, they want to hide—is that group of people the ones we want controlling our country? I don't think so. How about regular voters? How about regular people? How about farmers and doctors and business owners, nurses? No.

I know the leader wants to come to the floor, and I will yield as soon as he comes to the floor. Before he does, I want to thank him for bringing this measure here, for the strength of his statements, for the strength of his commitment, for his help to organize all of this. This began originally as his bill years ago, after Citizens United. So I want to yield to him when he gets here.

But I want to go back to this departure of Minister Allawi, who talks about the Iraqi state having become degraded and become a play thing of special interests. That is the choice we face in this vote: Is this going to be America the beautiful or is this going to be America the degraded placing of special interests? This vote will determine it.

I yield to the leader for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak prior to the vote.

Mr. BOOKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me just give as many kudo—because he taught me the word was "kudo," not "kudos"—as I can, to our wonderful Senator from Rhode Island.

There is no one—I don't think in America, let alone just in the Senate—who has done more to highlight the evil scourge of dark money that just plagues our Republic. It degrades our democracy. One of the reasons that people are so upset with what is going on in this country is because of the dark money. And no one has shined that spotlight on it like Senator WHITEHOUSE. Hats off to him.

Now, the choice before the Senate is simple: Will Members vote today to cure our democracy of the cancer of dark money or will they stand in the way and let this disease metastasize beyond control?

Members must pick a side. Which side are you on—the side of American voters and one person, one vote or the side of super PACs and the billionaire donor class rigging the game in their favor?

Sometimes the contrast is really that simple. Today is about standing either with the American people or the dark money donor class.

And the DISCLOSE Act itself is simple to its core. It says that a healthy democracy is a transparent democracy—a healthy democracy is a transparent democracy—one where all of us can exercise our right to the franchise on an equal playing field, without regard to our wealth or our connections or lot in life. It is a quintessentially American ideal.

In the 12 years since the conservatives on the Supreme Court ruled in Citizens United, our elections have become rank with the stench of dark money. You can smell it in every corner of this country—and particularly in Washington. We must fix that. In free and fair elections—one person, one vote—American voters should have the power to determine our Nation's leaders without fear that their voices will be drowned out by powerful elites or special interests. That is simply what the DISCLOSE Act would do.

For the sake of our democracy, for the sake of transparency in elections, for the sake of breaking the wretched stranglehold that dark money has on our country, I urge my colleagues, plead with my colleagues, to rise to this occasion to protect our democracy and vote yes.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 484, S. 4822, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie Hirono, Martin Heinrich, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Patty Murray, Michael F. Bennet, Jacky Rosen, Alex Padilla, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Edward J. Markey, Angus S. King, Jr., Tim Kaine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 4822, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 346 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NAYS—49

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeben	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	
Graham	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Baldwin
Crapo

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 49.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media.

VOTE ON BENNETT NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bennett nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 347 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Barrasso	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Risch
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Kaine	Rounds
Brown	Kelly	Sanders
Burr	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cornyn	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warnock
Durbin	Ossoff	Warren
Feinstein	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Graham	Portman	Young

NAYS—36

Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Sullivan
Daines	Lummis	Thune
Ernst	Marshall	Tillis
Fischer	McConnell	Toomey
Grassley	Moran	Tuberville
Hagerty	Murkowski	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin
Booker
Crapo
Lee

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, new data from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection shows that the crisis at the border isn't going away even if that may be the wish of the Biden administration. In the last year, Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 2.3 million migrants at the southern border, which is an all-time high.

I know some people think, well, these are economic migrants or people fleeing violence and persecution. Some of them are asylum seekers who might potentially qualify, although the data indicates that, if in fact they end up showing up for their immigration court hearing years after they claim asylum, because of the backlogs, only about 10 percent qualify for asylum. Then you have the economic migrants. You have criminals. You have drug smugglers. It is a hodgepodge. And while many people turn themselves in in order to invoke our asylum system, which is broken and results in many people being given a notice to appear for a future court hearing that they never show up for, the situation at the border remains a public safety threat and a humanitarian crisis.

Customs and Border Protection is the first line of defense against dangerous threats to the country. Over the last 11 months, the hard-working men and women of CBP have arrested nearly 700 criminal gang members and have stopped more than 140 people on the terrorist watch list from crossing the southern border. They have interdicted more than 645 pounds of illegal drugs, including 13,600 pounds of the deadly synthetic opioid fentanyl. I think it takes roughly the point of a pencil lead, a couple of milliliters, of fentanyl to kill a person. So you can imagine what 13,600 pounds would do, and these are only the drugs that we have caught. Nobody believes that we catch even the majority of the drugs coming across.

CBP seized illegal currency, weapons, ammunition, counterfeit goods, and other products that could hurt the American people or our economy.

I want to just take a moment to thank the Border Patrol agents and Customs officers who take on this challenging and important work every day. Sometimes they are met with nothing more than derision or ridicule or a lack of support for their important work. These men and women put their own health and safety at risk to keep our borders and keep the American people safe, and they don't receive nearly the level of thanks that they deserve.

Coming from a border State, as you might imagine, I have visited the border many, many times. I always enjoy talking to these men and women because they are, frankly, the experts about what we need to do in order to fix what is wrong about the borders. They are true professionals, and they know more than just about anybody else I have talked to about what the problem is and what the solutions are.

Many of these officers and agents have worked for Customs and Border Protection for years, some even since its founding in 2003. They have seen migration surges over the years, but as they have told me many times, they have never seen anything quite like we are seeing today.

An average of 6,600 migrants are coming across the southern border every

day. They will tell you: We simply don't have the capacity to manage that sort of tsunami of humanity. We don't have the facilities or the resources, and we certainly don't have the personnel. The only way we are able to respond to the urgent humanitarian needs is to divert law enforcement officers from their other important mission.

Frankly, that is part of these transnational criminal organizations' plans: They overwhelm the Border Patrol, divert their attention, and then, in the hole that is created in border security, here come the drugs.

Agents who would normally be on the frontlines, stopping cartels from smuggling drugs, are now serving meals and changing diapers.

When you consider all of those stats that I mentioned—hundreds of thousands of pounds of illegal drugs, 700 criminal gang members, 141 people on the terrorist watch list—there is an important qualifier to remember: Those are just the ones we know about. With law enforcement being shifted from patrol to caretaking duties, we are leaving major security gaps that are being exploited by the cartels and criminal organizations.

There is a whole category of migrant that comes across the border known as the got-aways. The asylum seekers will typically show up and turn themselves in, but, frankly, I think it is the got-aways—hundreds of thousands of people—that you have to worry about because they don't want to encounter law enforcement because they either don't have any legal basis to enter the United States or they happen to be transporting illegal drugs or have a criminal record on their own right.

There is no question that our security mission is taking a hit. Every day, cartel and gang members are trafficking and moving guns, drugs, illegal currency, and just about any other commodity that you can think about. And when they succeed, border communities aren't the only ones that see the impact.

As you can see, cartels and transnational criminal organizations have a presence in cities across the United States. Once cartels make it across the border, they head to places as diverse as Chicago, Detroit, Atlanta, New York, San Diego, or just about any other city where they can do business, including Bangor, ME, and other places in Maine.

These aren't the only people who are coming to the United States. These are not people coming to build a better life. They are coming here to prey on innocent Americans for their own gain.

Last year, the Special Agent in Charge of the DEA's Chicago Field Division spoke about what happens once these drugs and criminals reach his backyard.

He said:

Cartels use every possible means to get drugs from Mexico into the United States and then into the local markets. And in Chi-

For example—

that means predominantly to the gangs that control the drug markets in Chicago.

If you are concerned, as most Americans are, about the spike in crime that we have seen recently, well, a whole lot of that crime is caused by criminal street gangs committing various crimes, including selling illegal drugs and using guns to kill one another as part of their way to protect their market share and their territory. Those are the same gangs that fuel the overdose epidemic, the same gangs that perpetuate crime and gun violence, the same gangs that engage in deadly conflicts over territory. That is the cruel reality here.

It is a self-perpetuating cycle, and it starts at the border. So even though you may not be a border State, at least a southern border State, you are affected because, as you can see, the network of distribution of illicit drugs coming across the border affects almost every major American city. And it is not just cities. A lot of our rural areas in Texas and elsewhere are affected as well.

And we are reading increasingly about young people, unknown to them, consuming fentanyl in a fatal dose and dying, and it is happening every day, in every community around the United States. And 71,000 Americans died of fentanyl overdoses last year alone. This is where it comes from; this is how it is distributed; and those are the consequences. So no community in America has been spared the pain and suffering from this pandemic of drugs. In 2021, as I mentioned, 108,000 Americans died from drug overdoses; 71,000 of those 108,000 died from fentanyl.

You know, I remember on September 11, 2001, when terrorists diverted aircraft and killed about 3,000 Americans. We declared a war against terrorism when 3,000 Americans were killed here in the homeland. Yet 108,000 Americans died last year as a result of these open borders and our broken policy, and it doesn't seem to get the attention it deserves.

Of course, being a border State, communities in Texas are dealing with the consequences of this humanitarian crisis and these drugs on a daily basis. Last weekend, three people in Wichita Falls died from suspected fentanyl overdoses. The oldest victim was 21; the youngest was 13. In the last couple of months, four students from the Hays County Consolidated Independent School District, right outside of Austin, died from a fentanyl overdose. All four were between the ages of 15 and 17.

Across the State—indeed, across the Nation—families are mourning the loss of loved ones who have died from an overdose of these drugs, many of whom had no idea what they were consuming; they thought they were taking something else and ended up finding that it was laced with fentanyl—because the amount of fentanyl it takes to kill you is microscopic. The alarming increase in supply across our borders fore-

casts even more devastation in the months and years to come.

Here is my point. The Biden administration needs to start taking this problem seriously. Cartels and criminal organizations are exploiting the security gaps at the border and sending these drugs and the criminals along with them to communities not just in Texas, not just in Arizona, not just in California or New Mexico, but all across the United States.

Addressing this security breakdown at our border has got to be a priority. We can't ignore it because it is not going to get any better. This is not just about migrants and immigration. It is about that, but it is not just about that. It is about security. It is about public safety. It is about knowing who is crossing our border and reaching into our local communities.

Cartels are sociopaths. They don't really care about people, including the migrants that they smuggle into the United States. If you go to Falfurrias, TX, which is in South Texas at a border checkpoint about 70 miles from the border—which is where, once migrants are stuffed into a car or a van or some other vehicle, they are then driven up the highway to these Border Patrol checkpoints; then they are told by the coyotes, which is the colloquial name for these human smugglers: Get out of the car and walk around the checkpoint because we can't risk going through the checkpoint with you there where we might be discovered. And so they do.

And so you go to Brooks County, TX, which is where the Falfurrias checkpoint is located, and they have asked the Federal Government for help to bury the bodies of migrants who die from exposure walking around that checkpoint in Falfurrias, TX, because it gets hot in Texas, particularly during the summer, and many of these migrants have come from far, far away and are suffering already from dehydration and other exposure.

But my point is the cartels don't care anything about them. They will leave them to die. They are just another way to make a buck. But the cartels terrorize more than just the migrants themselves; they terrorize communities across our country. And they seized on the Biden administration's weak policies to grow their foothold in the United States.

These transnational criminal organizations are getting rich smuggling migrants and smuggling drugs into the United States and killing Americans in the process. It is past time to do something. The Biden administration is being outmaneuvered by the cartels, and until we see leadership from the President, communities all across this country will continue to pay the price.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4924

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, the No. 1 job of our Commander in Chief is to

protect the homeland. The constitutional oath we all take as Members of Congress, similar to the one I swore when I joined the military, is to protect our citizens against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I want everyone in this Chamber, the American people, our allies, and our adversaries to all hear me today. Iran, the world's most deadly state sponsor of terrorism, announced its intentions to track, target, and kill American citizens here on our shores. The radical Islamists of Iran and their terrorist proxies across the Middle East are seeking to destroy America, and they are coming here to our soil.

As you can see, the Iranian regime promises to "bring the orchestrators and perpetrators to justice." This is an undeniable death threat, one that they have already attempted to follow through on.

Iran isn't making this threat from Tehran, over 6,000 miles away. They made it here, for example, in New York City. Yesterday, at U.N. headquarters, the Butcher of Tehran, Ebrahim Raisi, was flanked by his personal security force, IRGC terrorists, tagged by our Justice Department as the entity responsible for attempting to kill Mike Pompeo, John Bolton, Brian Hook, and others who ordered and executed the strike on Qassem Suleimani.

This President's obligation is to safeguard and protect the life, liberty, and prosperity of our people and to deter, defeat, and, when necessary, destroy our enemies.

The Biden administration's desire to bring the 2015 Iran nuclear agreement back to life is delusional. Continued renegotiation with Russia as our proxy—no joke—ignores our men and women in uniform, the Iranian dissident community, our allies and partners in the Persian Gulf, and American citizens on the homeland who have bounties on their heads today.

Our Middle Eastern partners, in particular, are begging the Biden administration not to reenter this so-called nuclear agreement. They plead with us not to give Iran access to \$1 trillion in capital by 2030. Don't fund their military support of Russia's aggression against Ukraine, and don't fund their acts of terrorism against our own people, they ask.

I am demanding that America does not fund or support a regime trying to kill our own people. The President's ongoing negotiations pacify rather than hold Iran accountable for targeting American citizens. The Biden administration's foolish pursuit of peace through appeasement must be stopped, and we can start today. Yesterday, with 26 of my colleagues, I introduced the PUNISH Act, or the Preventing Underhanded and Nefarious Iranian Supported Homicides Act. My bill would enforce U.S. sanctions on Iran until the Secretary of State certifies to Congress that Iran has not supported any attempt or activity to kill a U.S. citizen, former or current

U.S. official, or Iranian living within the United States. Specifically, it would codify the Trump administration's "maximum pressure" sanctions as well as preserve sanctions put in place by the Obama and Carter administrations.

It is hard to believe that, after countless attacks on Americans and multiple confirmed—confirmed—plots against U.S. officials, the Biden administration continues with these negotiations. President Biden should not provide a dime of sanctions relief to the largest state sponsor of terrorism which is actively trying to kill U.S. officials and citizens at home and abroad. I will remain committed to protecting the homeland, our troops, and officials abroad from the violent Islamic regime in Iran.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4924, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. First, this is a pretty long piece of legislation and impactful in the policy it makes. It was introduced yesterday.

It is probably not a great idea for the Senate to short circuit any process of reviewing this legislation and speed to its passage today, but Senator ERNST is a serious thinker on matters of national security, and so I do want to engage for 2 minutes on the merits because I think it is important to have this conversation.

Senator ERNST is right. At the heart, at the center of U.S. foreign policy has to be the protection of our citizens. We have to be coldblooded about making sure that our policy keeps our people safe, both here in the United States and abroad.

The good news, when it comes to Iran policy, is that we have tried both a policy of engagement and diplomacy and a policy of escalating sanction, and we can judge from those two periods of time which one better protected American security and the specific security of Americans here and in the region.

During the period of time that the United States and Iran were in an agreement regarding nuclear weapons together, there were not credible plots being hatched against U.S. persons inside the United States. There were not Iranian proxies firing at U.S. forces inside the Middle East. But as soon as the United States removed itself from that agreement and started this process of escalating sanction, all of a sudden, Americans and American assets were at risk all over the world. The plots started against U.S. persons here. The Iranians and their proxies started regularly shooting at Americans in the region.

And so the facts are the facts—less threat to the United States when we were in a diplomatic agreement and more threats to the United States when we weren't in a diplomatic agreement. I think that speaks to the question of whether engagement or maximum pressure actually—actually—in the end protects Americans best.

But, second, I want to make this point, and I think it is an important one. This is called the PUNISH Act. And I understand why. It speaks to a view of sanctions as simply a mechanism of punishment. And there is an element of sanctions that is sending a moral message, a moral signal, about our values and how they differ from the values of those that we are sanctioning. But sanctions are also used to influence. In fact, most of the sanctions that we are passing are not just merely punitive. They are actually designed to try to change the behavior of a regime.

So that is why, if we entered into a nuclear agreement, the only sanctions that I think we should remove are the sanctions that were specifically put in place to influence the Iranians to give up their nuclear weapons program.

In fact, I would argue—and I think President Biden would argue; I am sure President Biden would argue—that we should keep in place the sanctions that have been levied against Iran to try to influence their ballistic missile program or their support for terrorists.

And so I think it is just important for us all to come to the conclusion that, although there is a punishment element of sanctions, if we don't use sanctions to influence behavior, then I am not sure that the policy of sanctions matters as effectively as it should.

And, lastly, this: Iran, they are malevolent actors. They are not good people. But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't enter into negotiations when we can take steps to protect our interests, the security of our people.

The nuclear bombs that we dropped on Japan were 15-kiloton weapons. Modern nuclear weapons range from 100 to 800 kilotons. So, yes, unapologetically, we should have a policy as a component of our national security to do whatever is possible to make sure that more countries—especially, more wildly irresponsible regimes—don't get their hands on nuclear weapons. And, yes, that should be more important than many of our other priorities.

Yes, in fact, we should elevate the conversation about stopping a regime like Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. They are bad actors. They are targeting U.S. forces. They are targeting U.S. persons. They are supporting terrorism. That, to me, is the reason, is the rationale why we should make sure that that regime—so dangerous, so destructive, so malevolent—doesn't get its hands on a nuclear weapon.

Their bad action in the region is a reason to engage in diplomacy to stop

them from getting a nuclear weapon, not a reason not to engage in that diplomacy. And so I understand that it is sometimes incredibly hard and distasteful to get your arms wrapped around engagement with an enemy.

But I will leave you with this. The Soviet Union, through their proxies, killed tens of thousands of Americans during the Cold War. There was no doubt that they possessed on a daily basis the existential ability to wipe out the United States. But we did, at the very least, four bilateral nuclear deals with the Soviet Union, seven multilateral nuclear deals with the Soviet Union, not because we misunderstood their aims and desires but because we thought it was so important to limit the scope of their nuclear program given their intentions to wipe out democracy all around the world.

I agree that it is apples to oranges comparing the Soviet Union to Iran, but the same principle applies. We need to elevate our work when it comes to nonproliferation. That just needs to matter more, and we shouldn't be afraid to engage with enemies and adversaries, especially on this question of making sure that their bad behavior doesn't end up having, amongst its tools, a nuclear weapon that could kill hundreds of thousands of Americans.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, blocking the passage of the bill today, it is not just disappointing, but it is endangering. We do have to act now. I mean, you can read the tweet. It is right here. They are seeking justice. They are looking for retribution and revenge.

Again, it was sent from U.S. soil—this tweet was. If that doesn't constitute a clear and present danger demanding immediate attention, then I honestly don't know what does.

If a nuclear agreement is reached, folks, it is not going to change. Iran's aggression was not curbed by the Obama-Biden administration's failures. In fact, it invigorated Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon. Their mythical deal effectively financed the world's best organized, most capable terror group to rain down attacks on the United States, Israel, and even the Arab Gulf States.

After the deal was signed, Iran went on the offensive, and I can give you some statistics to actually show that activities increased. Attacks against the United States and our partners increased from roughly 8 incidents per every 100 days in 2015 to 28 incidents in 100 days during the 3.5 years that the JCPOA was in effect.

So arguing that the nuclear deal is a credible deterrent against Iranian terror doesn't actually hold water. Thousands of folks have died fighting the global war on terrorism, including 600 U.S. servicemembers. They have been killed at the hands of Iranian proxies in Iraq and in Syria.

I was there on the ground in 2003, in Operation Iraqi Freedom. The leader of that initial surge was a name whom we all know well, Gen. Jim Mattis. The men and women in uniform, then and today, know that Iran is an enemy. We have no common cause with the ayatollahs or anyone who chants "Death to America." Jim Mattis told our enemies, and I will quote the good general:

I come in peace. I didn't bring artillery. But I am pleading with you, with tears in my eyes: if you [screw] with me—

And he used a different word—

I'll kill you all.

Folks, Iran is killing our people overseas, and they are trying to kill our people right here, right here in the United States of America. We cannot appease, and we cannot back down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we are now several weeks on from the passage of the Inflation Reduction Act.

The IRA is transformational legislation that will improve the lives of millions and millions of Americans: more affordable prescription drugs, cheaper energy bills, the largest investment in the climate in history, a serious commitment to cracking down on tax cheats who rip off the American people for billions of dollars every year, and ensuring that corporations pay a fair share.

I am proud to say that the vast majority of the Inflation Reduction Act came from the Finance Committee majority.

It is no exaggeration to say that the team on the committee and in my personal office collectively spent thousands and thousands of hours developing these proposals, building support for them under zero margin for error, and guaranteeing that they would pass under challenging Senate rules.

Senate Democrats spent more than a year debating what would go into this bill before it finally came together, but the staff of the Finance Committee began its work long before that. Some of the components of the IRA go back more than a decade.

So before the Senate goes out in the coming days, I wanted to come down to the floor to thank my committee and personal office staff, as well as the brilliant teams at the Joint Committee on Tax, Congressional Budget Office, and legislative counsel who made this achievement possible.

I will shout out a few specifics as I thank the staff, but understand that legislation this significant is always a collaborative effort. And furthermore, there are major priorities that did not make it into the final version of the IRA, and the staff who worked on those issues deserve credit, too.

I will start out with Tiffany Smith, who leads the best and hardest working tax policy team there is.

Bobby Andres has honcho'd the Clean Energy for America Act for 7-plus years. He tweaked and edited and improved that bill so many times, he can probably recite the text in his sleep.

Chris Arneson, Jon Goldman, and Sarah Schaefer have been instrumental in going after the tax loopholes that allow massive, profitable corporations to get away with paying little to nothing. Their work on those issues is going to continue to find its way into law.

Adam Carasso and Eric LoPresti helped to make sure the IRS has the resources it needs to go after wealthy tax cheats who skip out on paying what they owe.

And proof positive that Finance Teams support one another: Drew Crouch contributed tax policy help to the prescription drug reforms.

Rachael Kauss has put a ton of work into developing the billionaire's income tax, and although that proposal didn't make it in the final bill, there is more support than ever for making sure that those at the very top pay a fair share like everybody else.

Grace Enda assisted on the clean energy tax policies and more. Ursula Clausing supported the tax team and also made sure that our team and Senate Democrats were ready and organized for a tough floor debate. Arthur Shemitz and Melanie Jonas also supported the tax team's hard work.

One other point about the Finance Committee majority's tax team—and this applies across the board, not just to the Inflation Reduction Act. If anybody out there mistakenly believes it is easy to offset the legislation passed here in the Senate, it is only because our tax team, time and time again, makes it look effortless. The truth is, it takes a ton of hard work, but they get it done.

Patricio Gonzalez, a member of the committee's investigations team, has been digging into the tax practices of some of the biggest drug companies out there. His work went a long way to convincing key Senators that our corporate tax laws needed reform. Ryder Tobin, another member of the investigations team, contributed to that work and also helped us survive the grueling floor debate, as did Madison Moskowitz, Claire Kaliban, and Bonnie Million.

Next up: healthcare. When it comes to drug prices, Big Pharma has had a stranglehold on the U.S. Senate for a long, long time. A lot of people have gone up against Big Pharma and lost. Shawn Bishop and the Finance Committee health team took on Big Pharma and won.

Anna Kaltenboeck played a key role in our efforts on finally allowing Medicare to negotiate on behalf of seniors for a better deal on prescription drugs. She also worked with Raghav Aggarwal on crafting the Senate version of drug price negotiation, as well as key protections for seniors in Medicare Part D. That includes a \$2,000 annual out-of-pocket cap on their medications and a

price-gouging penalty for drug companies that hike prices faster than inflation.

At a time when families in Oregon and across the country are getting hit by rising prices, Eva DuGoff worked on extending subsidies for ACA health insurance coverage. It will save people hundreds of dollars a year and a family of four up to \$2,400 a year.

Peter Fise worked on capping the out-of-pocket cost of insulin for seniors at \$35 per month—another huge savings for many Americans. Liz Dervan expanded Medicaid's coverage of vaccines for adults.

There is a long list of people who pitched in on the vital process of making sure the bill was compliant with the rules of the Senate known as the Byrd Rules. It includes Liz Dervan, whose legal acumen was invaluable to supporting the committee's efforts to navigate the Byrd rule, as well as major efforts by Peter Fise, Kristen Lunde, Kimberly Lattimore, Mary Ellis and Daniel Whittam from the health team. It also includes Sally Laing and Virginia Lenahan from our trade team, who contributed to the clean energy provisions.

When it comes to Byrd rules, the point man on the Finance Committee is our chief counsel, Mike Evans. For all the months of work that goes into writing legislation like the Inflation Reduction Act, the whole thing can come crashing down if it doesn't comply with the Byrd rules. Nobody is more skilled or experienced than Mike at making sure legislation is Byrd-compliant from the start and protecting it in Byrd rule arguments before the Senate Parliamentarian. Opposing counsels weep when they see Mike Evans and his stacks of papers enter the room. Reconciliation under the Byrd rule is arduous work, yet Mike approaches it with humor and grace along with great skill.

Mike is a valued member of my senior leadership team, who have directed years of effort that made the IRA possible. I want to thank him, Jeff Michels, Joshua Sheinkman, Sarah Bittleman, John Dickas, and Isaiah Akin for guiding the team through setbacks and struggles to get this bill done.

The Finance Committee's communications leads on the IRA were Ashley Schapitl on tax and investigations; Taylor Harvey on healthcare; Ryan Carey, speechwriter; and Emily Zahnle-Hostetler, digital director. The IRA dealt with some incredibly complicated policy issues, and it challenged a lot of powerful special interests. But our team got the word out and stood up to withering attacks in the press and here in the Senate.

The Finance Committee works with many, many skilled and dedicated staff at the Joint Committee on Taxation on a daily basis. Suffice it to say, we would be out in the cold without Tom Barthold and the team of all-stars at JCT:

Rob Harvey
Chris Giosa
Tim Dowd
Cecily Rock
Natalie Tucker
Ross Margelefsky
Jeff Arbeit
Jared Hermann
Carol Wang
Kristine Roth
Harold Hirsch
Sanjay Misra
Clare Diefenbach
Rhonda Migdail
Andrew Lai
David Lenter
Vivek Chandrasekhar
Chia Chang
Lin Xu
James Elwell
Kelly Scanlon
Sally Kwak
Chris Overend
Kashi Way
Bert Lue
Deirdre James
Connor Dowd
Nick Bull
Melani Houser
Tanya Butler

The same goes for the highly skilled and dedicated team at the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office under Director Phil Swagel. They do a difficult job to keep Congress informed of what proposed changes to our Federal programs will cost and always come through under extremely tight deadlines:

Terri Gullo
Leo Lex
Paul Masi
Chad Chirico
Lara Robillard
Asha Saavoss
Stuart Hammond
Carrie Colla
Tamara Hayford
Christopher Adams
Evan Herrnstadt
Colin Baker
Scott Laughery
and other CBO staff who analyzed drug pricing in the U.S. over the last decade.

And finally I want to thank the talented legal team at the Senate legislative counsel's office who help committee staff write the law—on tax policies, Mark McGunagle, Jim Fransen, Allison Otto, and Vince Gaiani; on health policies, John Goetcheus, Kelly Thornburg, Ruth Ernst and Phil Lynch.

Whether you are talking about JCT, CBO or legislative counsel, the Congress grinds to a halt without their work.

Finally, I would like to commend the work of the Senate Parliamentarian and her assistants. A reconciliation bill turns up a lot of highly complex procedural questions, and the Parliamentarian has to make the calls. I was not happy with all of the decisions, but the Parliamentarians worked tirelessly, skillfully, and with an even hand. Also, I would like to thank the clerks and floor staff for their work and endurance during the vote-a-rama.

The debate the American people read about and watched on TV is just a small portion of all the work that went

into the Inflation Reduction Act. It can be awfully frustrating to spend years developing legislation when Congress is this polarized. We dealt with a lot of setbacks. At certain points, we thought it was over. And there is still a lot more to get done.

But the IRA truly is an accomplishment that will improve life for the American people: more affordable medications, more affordable health insurance, cheaper energy, the biggest ever investment in the fight against climate change, major progress cracking down on tax cheats and improving tax fairness—that is progress to be proud of. I thank the Finance Committee majority staff, my personal office staff, and all the other teams who contributed to this effort.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON PRABHAKAR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Prabhakar nomination?

Mr. BROWN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 348 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Burr	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Lujan	Sinema
Carper	Lummis	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Cassidy	Menendez	Tester
Collins	Merkley	Tillis
Coons	Moran	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Ossoff	Warren
Feinstein	Padilla	Peters
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Portman	Wyden

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Hagerty	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	Young
Graham	Paul	
Grassley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin
Crapo

Heinrich
Murray

The nomination was confirmed.

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.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT—
MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 389, H.R. 6833.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.R. 6833, a bill 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 389, H.R. 6833, a bill 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.

Charles E. Schumer, Raphael G. Warnock, Tim Kaine, Sherrod Brown, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Angus S. King, Jr., John W. Hickenlooper, Michael F. Bennet, Cory A. Booker, Christopher Murphy, Amy Klobuchar, Gary C. Peters, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Alex Padilla, Catherine Cortez Masto.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, Thursday, September 22, be waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be

in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING U.S. CAPITOL POLICE OFFICER WILLIAM THOMAS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I yield, I want to join the Senate in offering condolences to the family of Officer William Thomas of the U.S. Capitol Police. Officer Thomas had been battling cancer and died in his home on Tuesday, September 20. It breaks my heart. He was only 38 years old.

My thoughts go out to his entire extended family, especially because I understand, this week, Officer Thomas's father also passed away. May they find some comfort in knowing Officer Thomas devoted himself to serving others for nearly 14 years. He was a member of the Capitol Police Force, a beloved presence here in the Capitol Complex. Staff and Members alike saw him every day. He dedicated his life to protecting this great institution, and all of us in the Senate mourn his loss today.

May he rest in peace. May his father rest in peace as well.

To all members of the U.S. Capitol Police Force struggling with this awful loss, we are with you in this difficult time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise to address three different topics, if I might.

First, this week, the Senate of the United States did something important, something that is genuinely a big deal. We ratified a treaty. This is something we don't do often enough, and it bears repeating what this Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol is.

By a vote of 69 to 27, a big bipartisan vote, this Senate ratified a treaty that will reduce global warming by a full degree Fahrenheit—something critical to the future of the planet—and we do it in a way that is a win for American manufacturing, a win for American exports, and a win for our planet and creation.

Some of you may remember, a long time ago, we discovered a problem—a growing hole in the ozone layer that was being caused by propellants, by CFCs. So the world came together to eliminate CFCs and replace them with a new generation of artificial propellants and refrigerants known as HFCs.

That was good news. The hole in the ozone layer had largely been addressed, and the threat of skin cancer and being bombarded by radiation that that posed was largely resolved. Yet, this next generation of chemicals, HFCs, had an unexpected additional problem.

They are 1,000 times worse for global warming, for climate change, than carbon dioxide, so much so—and they are so broadly used in every industrial setting—that it has led to a rapid increase in global warming.

Well, the solution was actually invented in Delaware. It is the next generation of chemicals that is much less harmful to the climate and to the environment, effective as a refrigerant, being manufactured now in places across the United States, and that, if exported to the rest of the world, can grow thousands of manufacturing jobs.

I just wanted to take a moment and celebrate. The projections are there will be as many as 33,000 new manufacturing jobs in the United States, some in my home State of Delaware but spread across the country; over \$1 billion in new exports that will impact just this year the American economy because of this; and a 25-percent increase in the exports of American-made refrigerators and air-conditioners and so forth.

This was a rare moment of bipartisan consensus where we were able to come together and address a global challenge and create more opportunity here at home, and I thought it bore some celebration as we conclude this week.

Mr. President, earlier this week, our President, Joe Biden, stood before the world at the United Nations General Assembly and continued his forceful, clear, and strong effort to call on the world to enforce the U.N. Charter and to push back on Russia's brutal invasion of Ukraine.

Since February, when Putin's forces swept into Ukraine and threatened to overrun the entire country, the West has pulled together, and allies and supporters of the Ukrainian people from around the world have imposed sanctions on Russia and Russian oligarchs; have provided funding and support and assistance to millions of Ukrainian refugees who have flooded throughout the rest of the world; and, critically, have provided financial support for the men and women of the Ukrainian Armed Forces, who just in recent days made a dramatic breakout in northern Ukraine, recapturing an area the size of Delaware—more than 3,000 square miles—in a rapid advance east of Kharkiv.

President Biden has asked this body, in a bill we will take up in just a few days, to provide \$11.7 billion in additional support for Ukraine. The Presiding Officer and I are appropriators, and we know how precious the resources of the American people are. And I am grateful that, on a broad bipartisan basis, we have provided tens of billions of dollars in humanitarian relief for refugees, in support for the Government of Ukraine, and in critically needed military support for the Ukrainian Armed Forces.

It is because the Biden administration has delivered the most advanced and targeted long-range artillery systems we have, called HIMARS, that

suddenly the Ukrainians are making real advances on the battlefield. We must continue this critical support.

President Zelenskyy has pulled together and mobilized the Ukrainian people in a remarkable show of determination, a fierce resistance. Despite being badly outnumbered by a much greater military force with advanced and sophisticated weaponry, Ukrainians have fought bravely and with enormous determination. They deserve our continued support.

In just recent weeks, there have been some real signs of progress in opening the Black Sea ports of Ukraine so that grain can be exported to a dozen hungry countries, in making progress on prisoner-of-war exchanges between the Russians and the Ukrainians, and in protests in Russia.

In an act of desperation, President Putin has called up hundreds of thousands of reservists in a mobilization to try to push back against Ukrainian forces. Russia is losing this fight. They are losing on the ground in Ukraine; they are losing in the court of public opinion; and they are losing strategically.

My entire life, we had thought it was unlikely that Sweden or Finland would ever join NATO—the most successful multilateral security arrangement we have ever engaged in as a nation—but because of Russia's aggression against Ukraine now, both Sweden and Finland are seeking admission to NATO. This body acted quickly to ratify their admission to NATO, and we are down to just a few countries.

In New York, I had a chance to meet with President Erdogan of Turkey to convey to him both our appreciation of his help in getting the grain out of the Black Sea ports of Ukraine but the urgency of expanding NATO to secure it against further Russian aggression.

It is my hope that we will move quickly as a united NATO alliance and that we here in this body will act quickly to provide the additional assistance to the Ukrainian people, government, and armed forces that our President has sought.

Earlier today, we took up a vote on the DISCLOSE Act. Since 2010, when the Supreme Court of the United States issued an ill-conceived opinion in the case of Citizens United, we have seen a flood of dark money steadily become more and more pernicious in its impact on our politics and our policies.

Here in Washington and now around the country, wealthy individuals, corporations, and shadowy special interest groups have contributed hundreds of millions—now billions of dollars across several election cycles that have undermined the integrity and fairness of our elections that are at the very heart of our democracy.

This bill would do a simple thing. It would require full disclosure of all corporations, trade associations, non-profits engaging in electioneering. They would have to disclose any donors of \$10,000 or more over any 2-year pe-

riod. It wouldn't solve all the problems created by Citizens United, but sunshine is the best disinfectant, and it would allow the American people to know who is truly behind the dark money-funded ads that now bombard citizens in competitive elections around our country.

Tragically, it was a straight party-line vote today, and we were not able to proceed to take up and vote on the DISCLOSE Act. In the end, one party continues to defend the practice of dark money flooding our elections, while another is seeking to open up clarity for the general public and our electorate on who is giving money to whom. We should have had a vote on the DISCLOSE Act. Instead we failed to get to that bill because we could not get in this Chamber 60 votes to move ahead.

It is my hope that the American people are paying attention and realize on whose side we are on in this fight over transparency in our elections.

With that, Mr. President, I offer my thanks.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I first want to echo Senator COONS' comments on the DISCLOSE Act and how unfortunate it was we could not get just 10 Republicans to join us to be able to end dark money and foreign—the potential of foreign dollars going into elections. So I want to thank you, Mr. President, for your leadership both in the House and in the Senate on this real important issue.

MANUFACTURING

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, as everybody in the Chamber knows, I am extremely proud to be from Michigan. Our State leads the world in innovation. We created and built the automobile, the automotive assembly line, and the American middle class along with it.

And today, our workers are still putting the world on four wheels—and really amazing wheels right now.

I got to show one of our Nation's foremost car guys, President Biden, some of Michigan's latest and greatest creations during last week's Detroit Auto Show. He was so happy behind the wheel of Chevy's new Corvette that I was a little worried he was going to put on his aviators and drive right out of the exhibition center. It took a lot to get him out of that car, he was so into it.

He was inspired, and we all were. Of course, the auto show is always inspiring, but this year it was even more, and that is because our Nation is in the middle of a manufacturing renaissance. And I don't say that lightly. We are in the middle of a manufacturing renaissance.

Democrats in Congress, along with President Biden and Vice President

HARRIS, are helping to revitalize American manufacturing. With tiny House and Senate majorities and the car guy in the White House, Democrats have done more to advance manufacturing in America than at any point in the past 70 years. We are not just bringing back the jobs lost during the pandemic; we are going far beyond that. Already, nearly 700,000 new manufacturing jobs have been created under the Biden administration. This represents the strongest manufacturing job growth since the 1950s—in our lifetime. In 2021 alone, more manufacturing jobs were created. Just last year, more manufacturing jobs were created than in any single year, any 1 year in nearly 30 years, which is extraordinary, and it is exciting.

And over the past year, the construction of new manufacturing facilities in the United States has grown by over 100 percent—116 percent. Meanwhile, 80 percent of our CEOs in a recent survey were either in the process of moving manufacturing operations from China or were seriously considering doing so. So we are seeing a real shift about bringing jobs home, and we have been providing the incentives and the support to do that. So that is really great news because we know if you are going to have an economy, somebody has to make something—somebody has to make something. And, frankly, that is what we do in Michigan. We make things. We innovate. And then we make things even better and then we do it over and over again.

Of course, we can't make much of anything if we don't have the semiconducting chips—these little microchips the size of a nail. Whoever thought that not having microchips would shut down a whole plant, and that is what has happened in Michigan, unfortunately, during the height of the supply chain breakdowns.

A lack of chips means that auto manufacturers have to idle plants. Assembly lines shut down, and workers get sent home. Parking lots at plants fill up with cars that can't be sold because of these missing chips. And I see many of them not very far from my home in Lansing, MI.

Car lots that normally are full of different makes and models sit empty, and the price of new and used cars goes up and up without these chips—all because of a tiny piece of technology no bigger than a thumbnail.

That is why the legislation that we passed, the CHIPS and Science Act—this legislation that was signed into law is really a big deal. This law is bringing semiconductor manufacturing back to the United States where it belongs. Instead of the majority of what we need being overseas, it is now going to be coming home and creating millions of jobs in the process, and that is, frankly, great news. Currently, U.S. manufacturers only have 12 percent of the world's semiconductor manufacturing—12 percent. And it actually was down from 37 percent in the nineties.

And now we are going to reverse that and bring those jobs home.

We are already seeing it make a difference. Intel is building new semiconductor fabricator plants in Ohio and Arizona. This year, Micron Technologies is breaking ground for a new \$15 billion factory in Idaho, and we would love to see them come our way. It is a great beginning, and we are just getting started.

The American manufacturing boom goes far beyond semiconductors, though. The investments we have made in research and development will ensure that the next generation of clean energy of telecommunications and transportation technologies will be developed and manufactured right here in America as well.

President Biden got a taste of what that was like in the auto show when he got behind the wheel of an all-electric Cadillac Lyriq and drove it across the floor. Again, we were hoping he was going to restrain himself from driving it off the exhibition floor.

Democrats provided a huge boost to manufacturing, including clean energy manufacturing, through the Inflation Reduction Act, which unfortunately none of our Republican colleagues voted for. It created new and expanded tax incentives for the next generation of clean energy technologies. I have constantly been talking about the importance of battery production tax credits—production tax credits, meaning you don't get the credit unless it is actually produced in the United States. We have done that now. That is now law.

And the new solar manufacturing tax credit is going to help American manufacturers like Hemlock Semiconductor create new products and good jobs as well. They create one-third of all the polysilicon materials for solar panels, but the production has been in other countries, primarily, China. Now, with the production tax credit, the incentive will be to build them, to make them here in America.

The CHIPS and Science Act also provided \$11 billion to develop cutting-edge technologies, including up to three new Manufacturing USA initiatives. We are proud to have two Manufacturing USA initiatives already in place from the Obama administration. There is the Lightweight Innovations for Tomorrow, or LIFT, and Michigan State University's Scale-Up Research Facility, or SURF. Both are located in the same facility in Detroit, and LIFT projects include research into better welding processes for Navy ships and an anti-rollover system for military humvees. SURF is partnering with the Department of Energy and Ford and GM to make sure that America is a leader in advanced technologies—advanced vehicle technologies.

And the CHIPS and Science package also more than doubled funding to develop technologies that are crucial to our national and economic security. That includes cyber security and bio-

technology and artificial intelligence and quantum computing, advanced materials science, and 6G communications.

Now, if we are going to be inventing all of this new stuff, we also need workers. You hear that all the time. We need workers who are skilled to produce these things, and that is something that we as Democrats have been laser-focused on also. In everything that we have done, there has been a workforce development piece of it, which is so critical. The CHIPS and Science Act includes dedicated funding for the development of semiconductor workforce opportunities.

The Inflation Reduction Act includes incentives for clean energy manufacturers to create high-paying jobs and apprenticeship programs, which we know are so successful and so needed. And we have also invested in workforce development programs in regions all around the country.

The Build Back Better regional challenge awarded \$1 billion to 120 projects across 24 States to help people get the skills that they need for these great new jobs. These projects are building a sustainable mariculture workforce in Alaska, training aerospace workers in Kansas, and ensuring that Michigan has the highly skilled workers needed to build the advanced vehicles on display at the Detroit Auto Show.

One thing I am also particularly proud of in all that we have been doing around manufacturing as well is that we have worked to ensure that our tax dollars are spent on American products made by American workers and American companies. Now, that sounds like a no-brainer. I know, Mr. President, you agree with that, but we have had laws on the books for a long time that have not been enforced. There has not been transparency about what was going on, and now they are going to have to be accountable and transparent.

“Buy American” needs to be more than a slogan on a bumper sticker, and now it is. We have ushered in the most significant expansion of “Buy American” policies in decades, including a new Made in America office at the Department of Commerce that is working with each Agency to make sure that they are exhausting all the possibilities to buy American before they are allowed to have a waiver to that provision, which is very important.

Decades from now, people are going to look back at the past 2 years as a real turning point. I really believe that. It is the point when we really truly stopped talking and started acting to rebuild American manufacturing. It is the point when we created hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs, the kind of jobs that support families. And it is the point when we started to really bring jobs home.

Democrats are standing on the side of American manufacturing. We are standing on the side of good-paying American union jobs. We are standing

on the side of the American worker and our American middle class. And we are building things in America again—building things in America again—and that is really good news.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

NDAAs

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, over the years, many historians have studied how exactly the United States was able to rapidly mobilize during World War II. It was truly a remarkable thing.

One book, “Freedom’s Forge” by Arthur Herman, summarizes the feat well. American manufacturers produced “two-thirds of all Allied military equipment used in World War II. That included 86,000 tanks, 2.5 million trucks and a half a million jeeps, 286,000 warplanes, 8,800 naval vessels, 5,600 naval merchant ships, 434 million tons of steel, 2.6 million machine guns, and 41 billion rounds of ammunition—not to mention the greatest super bomber of the war, the B-29, and the atomic bomb.”

In the blink of an eye, entire manufacturing industries retooled their factories, and they began pumping out everything from fighter planes to ships to critical munitions. There is no doubt that our immense production capacity was a critical factor behind why the Allies won the war.

The threat environment that we face today is much different. There are a wide range of scenarios that our Nation has to be prepared for. And, of course, the way our economy is structured is also much different.

This raises an important question: Are we prepared to respond to the changing threat environment of the 21st century?

Repeating that incredible moment in American history would not be easy. What we can and what we should do is identify which investments we can make to effectively meet these threats and deter any adversary.

For years, we have underinvested in our munitions production capacity. We can start to reverse that by expanding already hot production lines, which would have an immediate positive effect on readiness.

If we don't make these investments now, it will be harder for us to surge munitions production in a time of emergency or global instability, and that is a concern we must take seriously.

During a crisis, surge capacity is one lever the Department of Defense must be able to pull to ensure that decision-makers have a range of options at their disposal. In fact, the ability to surge production of munitions is going to be vital to respond to most types of modern conflicts.

How do we know this? Let's just look at Ukraine and Russia and how quickly they are running through munitions.

According to the Royal United Services Institute, or RUSI, Ukraine needs approximately 500 Javelin missiles every single day. Well, Lockheed Martin only produces around 2,100 missiles a year. When the report was published in June, RUSI also estimated that Russia had used between 1,100 and 2,100 missiles during their invasion of Ukraine. That means “in three months of combat, Russia has burned through four times the US annual missile production” for those cruise missiles. These examples are important benchmarks.

You can do the math, and you can pretty quickly come up with future scenarios where demand starts to strain supply.

Another important factor is the People’s Republic of China, which both the Biden administration and the Trump administration identified as America’s pacing threat. China has spent the last two decades dramatically building up its military. According to the DOD’s 2019 Missile Defense Review, “a key component of China’s military modernization is its conventional ballistic missile arsenal designed to prevent [the] U.S. military access to support regional allies and partners.”

Since then, China’s arsenal has only continued to rapidly grow—again, another important reference point that our Nation will have to navigate.

This should not be interpreted as fearmongering. I want to be clear that I have every confidence in our military’s ability to defend this Nation and to defend our allies.

Army Assistant Secretary for Acquisitions, Logistics, and Technology Doug Bush recently told reporters, for example, that he was “not uncomfortable” with our stockpile levels. However, as Assistant Secretary Bush noted, the Army is “doggedly working with industry . . . to boost the production of certain weapon systems to keep Kyiv armed and the US well stocked.”

In August, the Wall Street Journal reported that “in the [United States], it takes 13 to 18 months from the time orders are placed for munitions to be manufactured, [and that is] according to an industry official. Replenishing stockpiles of more sophisticated weaponry such as missiles and drones can take much longer.”

The United States, our allies, and our partners need those munitions. The challenge is that years of underinvestment has reduced our production capacities and speed at which we can respond to that increased demand.

Clearly, there are significant benefits to expanding that capacity. Again, we have to be able to meet the changing threat environment and the rise of our near-peer competitors, like China. Congress, I believe, needs to take a few actions to address this challenge.

First, invest more in our munitions production capacity. Second, pass a clean national defense authorization act without delay.

I secured an amendment in this year’s Senate NDAA to require the

Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to produce an annual report on our industrial base and the potential constraints for our munitions production. This type of reporting should help to further identify gaps in our production capacity so that we can further refine future investments. Overall, these actions would be an important step in the right direction.

We know that our adversaries will continue—continue—to threaten our global security. We know, as shown by Russia’s horrific invasion of Ukraine—that our allies and partners will continue—they will continue—to need munitions. And we know the United States needs to be prepared for any scenario that threatens our national security.

The best response to those stark and immediate realities is to expand our ability to produce the things that we need to defend ourselves. If we do that, the greater our capacity is to project strength, react to any scenario, and better support allies and partners.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Alabama.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, sometimes setting records is a good thing. Forty years being a college football coach in this country, you try to set records. But the records this current administration has been breaking aren’t exactly worth celebrating.

For example, we are seeing record crime and record price increases. President Biden even threw a big party last week at the White House to celebrate record-high prices, the same day there were record market losses in the market.

But even those stats pale in comparison to the record-shattering crisis at our southern border, another thing that they declared victory on without attempting to solve the problem. We could solve it, but Democrats don’t want to solve this problem.

I guess they would rather listen to James Taylor on the White House lawn, but the people of Alabama haven’t forgotten what is going on at the southern border because we are seeing the same influx in our State.

Let’s look back into the 2 years of recordbreaking that we have seen since the Biden border crisis began and the solutions that Democrats refuse to use to fix the problem.

When President Biden took office, he rolled back as many policies as possible that secured our southern border. This immediate reversal in security measures was something he had promised on the campaign trail, so we expected it. Migrants from around the world were prepared to take advantage of the new administration’s soft-on-security approach at our border. Since then, the border crisis has set record after record.

In this fiscal year alone, we have surpassed 2 million apprehensions of illegal immigrants at our southern border for the first time ever in the history of our country. Last year, that number was over 1.7 million—showing the crisis at our border is accelerating, not slowing, under this administration.

This is after almost 2 years of the Vice President’s work to address what they call the “root causes” of migration. It has been a disaster. Some will try to twist those numbers to use as proof that enforcement is working, but that is obviously a red herring.

The staggering—staggering—encounters and arrests only highlight that even more shocking number of illegal immigrants we never see—those who get away, what we call the got-aways. Those are whom we release into the United States and they never come back. The truth is, we will probably never, ever get a true number of those who have entered our country illegally. We are a country of immigrants—we like immigration—but come here legally.

But we do know that this surge was stretched, and the resources have been thin ever since the border has been open. We cannot follow up with the illegal immigrants we do encounter to properly screen them and begin immigration proceedings. You can’t have proceedings on people whom you do not recognize and know where they have gone.

Almost one-third of illegal immigrants processed in the time immediately after Biden took office—one-third—have never returned for their check-in with officials, as called for by law; meaning, we have no idea where these people are, and they have no intention of coming back and checking in.

Meanwhile, Secretary Mayorkas has repeatedly told Congress—repeatedly—that the border is secure. While bureaucrats in DC may be sticking to that ridiculous spin, our own agents at the border know the truth.

The head of the Border Patrol has admitted advising his agents to release illegal immigrants into the country—who would typically be apprehended—because they do not have the resources to handle the influx of the people coming into the country. We just turn them loose. In fact, the Border Patrol Chief said he has never seen anything like this current situation in his 31 years of working for the Agency.

This position we are putting our law enforcement officials in is unacceptable, but this administration does nothing—does nothing—to stop anything that is happening. Instead, they just tell us the border is secure when our President has not even visited the border in his 19 months in office.

However, we know people aren’t the only thing flooding across the borders and into our communities. Unthinkable amounts of deadly fentanyl and other drugs are being smuggled into this country every single day. Drug

cartels are more emboldened than ever to send as many deadly drugs as possible to the border because they know they can take advantage of the crisis that has been unfolding here for 2 years. Just in the past week, officers have seized \$211,000 worth of cocaine and \$2.3 million worth of meth coming across the Texas border—and 187 pounds of fentanyl pills hidden in a vehicle in one single bust in Arizona. To put that in perspective, that is enough fentanyl to kill more than 42 million people, nearly 10 times the population of my State of Alabama.

And that is what our Border Patrol agents have stopped. Imagine what has gone undetected through this new open-border policy. More than 71,000 Americans died so far this year of fentanyl overdoses—71,000. That is 195 people a day in this country who are dying because we refuse to stop the fentanyl from coming into our country.

And, along with that, the drug cartels are becoming more and more rich and more and more compelled to do exactly what they want to do. It is yet another problem Democrats refuse to discuss or address out of fear of backlash from the radical, open-bordered ideologues running this administration and its immigration policy. Somebody has got to control this. One day we will find out.

But Democrats are quick to call out the problem when it ends up on their front porch. Mayors in New York, Chicago, and right here in DC have cried foul and even declared an emergency when the border crisis was delivered here to this city and others. They have no problem ignoring, excusing, and misrepresenting the facts of the crisis when it is hitting small towns far away in Texas, Arizona, and their southern neighbors, but when those illegal immigrants streaming across the border become problems of theirs, they suddenly see an emergency. But whom do they blame? Obviously, it is the Republicans, not the leader of their party.

President Biden has created this mess. They blame local and State leaders who are drowning in a humanitarian crisis that the Democrats are making every day and refusing to stop. Even as news reports how his own DHS planned to ship illegal immigrants to sanctuary cities across the country, President Biden condemns Republican leaders for doing the same. It is hypocrisy at its highest degree.

What is worse is their refusal to fix the problem, even though they are well aware of the steps that could be taken to secure the border. First and foremost, finish the wall that they have stopped building. Although the wall itself will not solve everything, it could certainly help address the number of people who get away—a number averaging 1,000 per week in some locations.

Secondly, fully reinstate the wildly successful migrant protection protocols which require individuals awaiting asylum proceedings to wait in Mexico—

not come over into the United States and wait; wait in Mexico, and let's go through your process. If people know they will not be allowed into the United States, they will not make the journey to our border knowing that they will have to wait. As of last week, we had accepted into this country people from 180 different countries. That is a long travel if you know that you may not get in.

And, lastly, Democrats could do a much better job of supporting law enforcement to address human smuggling and trafficking efforts at the border. As long as the border is wide open, cartels will take advantage of the situation. They are making billions of dollars a year by moving people and drugs into the United States, and it is getting worse every day.

Americans are dying. Cities are being overrun. Criminals are getting rich. Those are the consequences of President Biden's border crisis. Those are the problems that our Democratic colleagues have to fix.

While President Biden and Democrats celebrate the White House with celebrities, Americans are suffering because of these failures—most notably, their inability and unwillingness to keep our country safe.

So here is to the Democrats' record-breaking year: record inflation, record crime, record drugs, record-shattering illegal immigration. We can only hope they run out of things to celebrate in the very near future.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, we have a 50-50 Senate, with 50 Republicans and 50 Democrats. Vice President HARRIS provides the Democrats with our majority. The House of Representatives has a very slim Democratic majority: currently, 221 to 212, with 2 vacancies.

When the 117th Congress began, I think most Americans were doubtful that we would be able to pass legislation to help them, their families, their communities, and our Nation. I am happy to report that, despite the odds, the 117th Congress has been a historically productive Congress. This is not a statement I make lightly, nor did I predict this many legislative accomplishments when we began the 117th Congress in January of 2021.

I knew America's doubts, but I also shared their fervent hope that Congress would somehow find a way to beat the odds. And we have, sending numerous major bills to President Biden to be signed into law. Some of our accomplishments have been genuinely bipartisan, especially the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the so-called CHIPS and Science bill. That is gratifying because I believe that Congress, especially the Senate, is at its best when it works in a bipartisan fashion.

Some of our accomplishments have been solely Democratic victories; notably, the American Rescue Plan and the Inflation Reduction Act. I regret that we were unable to convince our Republican colleagues to join us on those bills because they advanced public policies and enjoyed broad bipartisan support among the American people. Democrats will always reach across the aisle to pass legislation that enhances our national and economic security, but we are prepared to work alone, if necessary.

Our most recent accomplishment is the Inflation Reduction Act. The Senate passed this legislation just before the August recess on a party-line vote. That legislation will make it easier for American families to afford health insurance and help seniors with prescription drug costs. Extending the Affordable Care Act enhanced health insurance premium subsidies through 2025—just this one provision of this bill—and will save medium-income Marylander families about \$2,200 annually.

For tens of thousands of Marylanders on Medicare who use insulin, the Inflation Reduction Act caps their insulin costs at \$35 per month. We tried to extend that cap to Americans with private insurance. Our Republican colleagues blocked this effort, but Democrats will continue working to make that a reality.

For the more than 1 million Marylanders and all other Americans covered by Medicare, the Secretary of Health and Human Services finally will have the authority to negotiate lower drug prices for the Medicare Program. This will help ensure that Medicare patients get the best deal possible on high-priced drugs, saving taxpayers approximately \$100 billion.

The healthcare provisions in the Inflation Reduction Act are significant, but they are only part of the bill. The legislation makes a historic investment to shift our economy from fossil fuels to clean energy. This will help us cut our carbon emissions 40 percent by 2030. The Inflation Reduction Act will lower electricity costs and emissions and will create up to 9 million good-paying jobs here in America in the growing clean energy sector.

I authored a provision in the legislation to provide production tax credits to our existing fleet of nuclear powerplants. They produce 20 percent of the Nation's electricity and over 50 percent of its carbon-free electricity.

A new analysis estimates that this legislation will lower the average household electricity bill by approximately \$170 to \$220 annually over the next decade. Maryland homeowners will be eligible for tax credits for residential solar, wind, geothermal, and biomass fuel improvements now through 2034. They also will be eligible for a larger tax credit for energy efficiency home improvements through 2032, as well as tax credits for the purchase of new and used clean energy vehicles, including electric vehicles.

Maryland farmers will see tangible benefits from the more than \$20 billion of funds included for climate-smart agricultural practices through existing farm bill conservation programs, including the Regional Conservation Partnership Program and Natural Resources Conservation Service technical assistance for reducers. These are very valuable programs for Maryland farmers who are meeting their obligations in regard to the Chesapeake Bay Program.

The Inflation Reduction Act also bolsters resilience programs to help Maryland communities prepare for extreme storms and other changing climate conditions. We live in a coastal State so Marylanders fully understand the need to address climate change, cut greenhouse gas pollution, and protect the Chesapeake Bay. Our State and local governments will be eligible for new and expanded grant programs to improve public health, decrease pollution, increase climate resiliency, and promote environmental equity.

The legislation pays for these smart investments while reducing the deficit and without raising taxes on working families and small businesses. In fact, according to a nonpartisan analysis, many working families may actually see lower taxes on a net basis over the next couple of years as a result of the legislation.

This legislation and its targeted investments aimed at lowering costs for American families is only one of a string of positive accomplishments that we have been able to do in this Congress, coordinating with President Biden. Other major legislation in the 117th Congress includes the bipartisan CHIPS and Science Act, which will make America more competitive by bringing home domestic production of semiconductors and investing in innovation and science; the bipartisan Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring Our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act, known as the PACT Act, which provides healthcare benefits for all generations of toxic-exposed veterans for the first time in our Nation's history and will improve access to care for all our veterans—promises made, promises kept; the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which is the first major gun safety legislation Congress has approved in decades; the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, one of the biggest, most comprehensive Federal commitments to repairing and modernizing our Nation's infrastructure in modern history; the Keep Kids Fed Act, which the Senate passed unanimously, that extended essential funding for schools, daycare providers, and communities to ensure healthy meals for children throughout the school year and summer; and the American Rescue Plan Act, which Democrats passed in March of 2021 to provide billions of dollars in relief to help Americans recover from the COVID-19 pandemic.

We have done all this, and we are reducing the deficit by \$2 trillion.

Let me talk a little bit about the CHIPS and Science Act. Semiconductors are crucial to nearly every sector of our economy. They are in our cars, our trucks, medical devices, 5G telecommunications equipment, and the list goes on and on and on. America created the semiconductor industry in the 1960s. We ceded the global leadership in the seventies. We regained it, to an extent, in the nineties but have lost it again. In 1990, the U.S. share of semiconductor manufacturing was 37 percent. By 2020, that share had declined to 12 percent.

The CHIPS and Science Act gets the United States back on track with respect to domestic semiconductor manufacturing, which is crucial for our national and economic security. This is a national security issue that provides \$54 billion in grants to domestic manufacturers and another \$24 billion in tax credits through the Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors for America Fund.

The substitute amendment also authorizes \$102 billion over the next 5 years for the National Science Foundation, the Department of Commerce, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology—a \$52 billion increase over the Congressional Budget Office baseline.

These funds will be a shot in the arm for domestic manufacturing. Here is a list of some firms that plan to use the funding to expand or establish manufacturing facilities right here in the United States: Intel and TSMC plan to build factories in Ohio and Arizona; GlobalFoundries wants to expand a facility in Upstate New York; SkyWater Technology and Purdue University want to collaborate on a new \$1.8 billion factory and research facility in West Lafayette, IN; IBM and State University of New York at Albany want to establish a semiconductor research center in Albany. And the list goes on and on and on. We are preparing for America to continue to lead in manufacturing, particularly high-tech manufacturing.

I also want to highlight the science provisions in the bill. It authorizes \$20 billion to the first-of-its-kind NSF Directorate of Technology, Innovation and Partnerships, which will accelerate domestic development of critical national and economic security technologies such as artificial intelligence, quantum computing, advanced manufacturing, 6G communications, energy, and material science. We are going to be the leaders in these areas. We should be.

It authorizes \$9 billion—\$4 billion over CBO baseline for several National Institutes of Science and Technology programs, including tripling of funding for the Manufacturing Extension Program, leveraging that program to create a National Supply Chain Database, which will assist businesses with supplier scouting and minimize supply chain disruptions; and with NASA, the Artemis Program to return Americans

to the Moon as a prelude to sending humans to Mars is fully authorized and funded.

The science provisions in this bill also extend the International Space Station through 2030 and support a balanced science portfolio, including Earth science observations and continued development of the Nancy Grace Roman Space Telescope. We are the leaders of the space telescope. I am proud of all the work that is done in my State of Maryland and the images that we see from outer space.

The provisions codify the Planetary Defense Coordination Office and requires NASA to continue efforts to protect Earth from asteroids and comets. In this regard, this Monday, the Double Asteroid Redirection Test—a Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Lab mission—will deliberately crash a probe into a “moon” of a double asteroid to shift its orbit.

It is amazing that we can do this. We are the leaders in science, and we are making sure we are going to be the leaders in science and in space moving forward.

I introduced the Cleaner, Quieter Airplanes Act in the previous Congress and again in this Congress, and I am pleased the CHIPS and Science bill directs NASA to continue research in aeronautics, including the use of experimental aircraft to advance aircraft efficiency and supersonic flight.

The PACT Act, in addition to providing the historic relief to toxic-exposed veterans, boosts claims processing; bolsters the Veterans' Administration's workforce; and invests in VA healthcare facilities nationwide to ensure the Agency can meet the immediate and future needs of every veteran it serves, including the 300,000-plus veterans who live in the State of Maryland. I will tell you, it provides for improvements to the community health centers in Prince George's and Baltimore City for our veterans.

The Safer Communities Act closes loopholes that allowed convicted domestic violence abusers to buy firearms legally. It boosts funding for community violence intervention and prevention initiatives, and it provides hundreds of millions of dollars in funding to improve and expand mental healthcare.

On the bipartisan infrastructure package, funding is flowing right now to improve Maryland's transit, ports, roads, and bridges; expand broadband availability; and fix our aging drinking water and wastewater system. The bill provides \$17 billion in port infrastructure and waterways. Congestion in American ports was a key factor in the disruption of the global supply chain. Expanding and modernizing port infrastructure will help ensure that American manufacturers and producers can move their goods to markets around the world. The bill also invests \$25 billion in our airports. Modernizing our airport infrastructure will help keep people and products moving around the country and the world.

I am particularly pleased the legislation includes \$238 million for the Chesapeake Bay Program. The bill also includes my bipartisan legislation to make permanent and expand the Minority Business Development Agency, which is the only Federal Agency dedicated to supporting minority-owned businesses.

The American Rescue Plan provides tens of billions of dollars to support vaccination and COVID-19 testing, driving down the death rate from the virus by 90 percent. The bill also invested in hard-hit communities and brought concrete relief to the Nation at a time of great need. I was especially proud of the investments we made to help save so many small businesses throughout Maryland and the Nation.

From the American Rescue Plan to the Inflation Reduction Act, and everything in between, these and other legislative accomplishments have helped address important needs across Maryland and our Nation.

At the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic, over 20 million Americans had lost their jobs. And the unemployment rate rose to 14.7 percent in April of 2020. The number of employed Americans now exceeds the prepandemic high—the second fastest job market recovery since 1981. The number of Americans working is at an alltime high. And the unemployment rate has dropped a half-century low of 3.5 percent.

Since President Biden assumed office, the economy added nearly 700,000 new manufacturing jobs. This represents the strongest manufacturing job growth since the 1950s. Manufacturing job growth in 2021 alone exceeded any other single year going back nearly 30 years.

Over the past year, the construction and new manufacturing facilities in the United States has grown by an estimated 116 percent. In recent surveys, the CEOs, 80 percent were either in the process of moving manufacturing operations back to the United States from China or were considering doing just that.

While unemployment continues at historic lows and gas prices are declining rapidly, we are still facing challenges. Food prices, rent, and other costs are still too high. The Federal Reserve has had to raise interest rates, which is painful for families and businesses alike. Most mainstream economists believe that we can avoid a recession and the economy will have a soft landing despite the supply chain challenges we continue to face because of COVID and Russia's war in Ukraine. This would be a truly historic accomplishment.

President Kennedy said:

Our responsibility is one of decision, for to govern is to choose.

Our legislative achievements over the last 20 months demonstrate that Congress can be productive and the Federal Government is a powerful force for good.

I hope we choose to remain on that path—Democrats and Republicans alike—because there is still so much we can do and need to do to help the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to talk about a piece of legislation that was announced last night by a very close friend of mine, Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia—the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2022. Senator MANCHIN and I were Governors together, and we sit next to each other on the Senate floor. And we are often in agreement. And on this particular bill—it is 91 pages long, and there are 24 sections—we are in agreement on 23 of the 24 sections and 86 of the 91 pages.

I want to talk about the permitting reform provisions in the bill that I support, but then I want to point out significant concerns with section 24 of the bill that is sort of an anti-permitting reform bill. It would take one project that is in my State, the Mountain Valley Pipeline, out of permitting processes, out of judicial review, and have Congress put our thumb on the scale, advancing the project immune from the normal permitting process and judicial review.

I would like to start by saying I am a strong supporter of American energy independence, and I applaud the efforts of my colleague Senator MANCHIN to do the same.

I voted with a number of Senators a few years ago to end the ban on export of crude oil from the United States. And I have strongly supported liquefied natural gas exports to help nations around the world wean themselves off of energy dependence on dictators like Vladimir Putin.

I also firmly believe in the need for permitting reform. The heart of the Energy Independence and Security Act is a recognition that permitting for energy transmission and other projects in this country is essentially broken; that it takes too long. It is too inconsistent.

I filed my first permitting reform bill in 2017 as a recognition of the fact that natural gas pipelines proposed in Virginia were running into very significant challenges, in particular. These pipeline programs require the use of eminent domain. So you are taking people's property to build these pipeline projects. And if the government is going to take people's property, we ought to have a process that is fair.

But what I heard from my constituents in Virginia is that they were being ignored; that there was inadequate public hearing. The hearings were scheduled hundreds of miles apart, far away from the landowners themselves. They would get to the public hearings and people had presigned up, often encouraged by the pipeline proponent so

that the actual landowners never got a chance to speak. And when they did get to speak, their input wasn't being taken seriously.

So, in 2017, I introduced my first permitting reform bill to deal exactly with some of the same kinds of issues that Senator MANCHIN has included in the Energy Independence and Security Act.

So I am here to say, I am all for permitting reform. I am all for permitting reform. And I believe that there is a bipartisan majority—indeed, a supermajority in this body—that were we to undertake this in regular order, we could come up with a permitting reform bill that, together with the infrastructure bill that we did and the Inflation Reduction Act that we did, will help us power forward American innovation, especially in leading the world in clean energy.

So that is 86 pages of the bill. And I strongly approve of the bill. The legislation that I introduced in 2017 isn't in it. I would like to get it added in. But even if it weren't added in, there is enough good in this bill for me to support it.

But what I want to talk about with an equal degree of passion is my strong opposition to section 24 of the bill, dealing with the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

The Mountain Valley Pipeline is a 304-mile natural gas pipeline in West Virginia and Virginia. About two-thirds of it is in West Virginia and one-third is in Virginia. The pipeline is proposed to withdraw natural gas from the Marcellus shale—one of the great American reserves of natural gas—and then transmit that gas first through West Virginia and then Virginia where it could hook up with other pipelines to be distributed around the country or to ports where it could be liquefied and potentially sold overseas.

The Mountain Valley Pipeline has had a star-crossed history in recent years. It has had multiple Federal authorizations vacated. It has accrued over 350 violations of water quality-related protections, both in Virginia and in West Virginia. And it currently lacks several necessary Federal authorizations to continue construction.

My constituents in Virginia have complained significantly about workmanship problems in the Mountain Valley Pipeline. And work on the pipeline has been stopped by State agencies because of slipshod quality that damages water and that damages people's property.

I am not opposed to the Mountain Valley Pipeline. I don't think Congress should be in the business of approving pipelines or rejecting them.

Madam President, you were an attorney general dealing with eminent domain. We generally don't let legislative bodies decide whose property is going to get taken.

Eminent domain matters are usually for courts and administrative agencies. So as the Mountain Valley Pipeline has

proceeded in recent years, I have had opponents of the pipeline come to say: Look, there have been water quality violations. You should stop the pipeline.

I have had proponents of the pipeline come and say: We need this for America's energy security. You should put your thumb on the scale and make sure it gets approved.

What I have told both the opponents and proponents of the Mountain Valley Pipeline is: You tell me how to fix the process—the permitting process—to make it fair, and I will do that. But then you should have to put your project through a fair permitting process and, if you can earn approval on the merits, then you can build the pipeline. But if you do poor work and can't, then you are not going to be able to build it.

I deeply believe this is not Congress's job to make this determination. It is our job to make sure that permitting is fair.

Section 24 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2022 would basically say that after 86 pages of improving permitting in this country, we will take one project in two States and take it completely out of all permitting. We will order the Biden administration to grant four permits that are currently in midstream. The company hasn't yet demonstrated that it should get these four permits.

There is a Clean Water Act permit. There is a permit to cross the Jefferson National Forest. There is a permit to certify that this project will not harm endangered species. And, finally, there is a permit from FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The company is attempting to get these permits, but they haven't yet demonstrated that they are able to do it.

But what section 24 of the bill would do, after doing this great work to establish this great permitting process, is that it would say: Forget all of that. The Biden administration must give these four permits to the Mountain Valley Pipeline owners right now, and, further, no one can seek any judicial review of these permits—highly unusual.

These administrative permits are issued by administrative agencies with a capacity for judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act. But in this case, we would be forced to issue the permit, and then we would also immunize the permit from any person, landowner, effective party, or environmental group being able to challenge it in judicial review. In my view, that is highly inappropriate and virtually unprecedented.

But to make matters worse, section 24 of the bill also does something that I believe is unprecedented and that would create a very, very dangerous precedent in this body. It would strip jurisdiction of any litigation in the future in this project from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, headquartered in Richmond, my hometown.

Why? The owners of the Mountain Valley Pipeline have lost a case or two in the Fourth Circuit.

I used to try cases, as did the Presiding Officer. I lost some cases, and I lost cases in the Fourth Circuit. If I represented a civil rights litigant and we lost a case in the Fourth Circuit, I had remedies. The first remedy was to try to get an en banc court to possibly reconsider the ruling of the panel. It is difficult to do, but that is a remedy you have.

The second remedy you have is to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. I tried that too. Once, I got a case that I had lost in the Fourth Circuit taken by the U.S. Supreme Court, and I was able to be successful there in getting it reversed.

But if you are a party that is unhappy, that is what your remedy is, to appeal. Whether you are rich or you are poor, whether you are a corporation or an individual, whether it is a criminal case or a civil case, if you don't like the ruling of a district court, you appeal to an appellate court. If you don't like the ruling of an appellate court, you try to take it en banc or go to the Supreme Court. And that is a rule that should apply to all litigants.

In this case, what the Mountain Valley Pipeline is asking is, in my view, an egregious and dramatic overreach. They don't like the rulings of the Fourth Circuit. They haven't been able to get the Fourth Circuit to take the case en banc. They haven't been able to convince the U.S. Supreme Court that the Fourth Circuit was wrong.

So what the Mountain Valley Pipeline owners are asking the Senate to do and what this bill proposes is that we would take jurisdiction away from the Fourth Circuit and mandate that any future case not go to the Fourth Circuit but instead come to the DC Court of Appeals.

What ground would there be for such a historic rebuke of my hometown Federal circuit court, to say that just because they ruled against a powerful energy corporation, we will, in an unprecedented way, strip jurisdiction away from them in a pending case that is midstream and not allow them to hear it?

The Fourth Circuit is my hometown circuit court. I tried cases in the district courts there. I had appeals in that court. I won some; I lost some. I was often unhappy with the ruling, but never would I have believed, if a ruling went against me, that the resolution was to punish the court by stripping jurisdiction away from them. Yet that is what the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2022 would do. It would force the issuance of permits that have not yet been justified, deny the possibility of judicial review of those permits and, in particular, in an unprecedented way, strip jurisdiction away from one circuit court in the middle of a case by taking it away from them. Why? Because the big energy company that wants these permits is unhappy that they have lost a case there.

As I conclude, I just want to point out, if we go down this path, in my view, it could open the door to serious abuse and even corruption. Imagine if the Senate of the United States starts stripping jurisdiction away from courts because we don't like their ruling. So midstream, we will take it away.

A corporation is unhappy that they are getting sued in shareholder derivative suits in the Second Circuit, for example, and somebody comes to the Senate and says: Let's just take jurisdiction away from the Second Circuit dealing with this particular company.

Somebody in a complicated criminal case doesn't like the rulings of a circuit court on procedural matters and tries to get this body, the Senate of the United States, to strip jurisdiction away from the court.

I am proud of the Fourth Circuit—the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. I have been involved with my colleague Senator WARNER in recommending to Presidents and then advocating for people to be nominated and eventually confirmed in this court. The Fourth Circuit is no more perfect than any court is.

I can tell you, as somebody who has practiced in this court for my entire professional career, they do not deserve to be rebuked in a historic way and have jurisdiction stripped away from them in a case like this just because they have had the temerity to rule against an energy company on a pipeline project.

We can do a permitting reform bill that will advance the goals of the first 86 pages of the Energy Independence and Security Act. We can do a bill that will include 23 of the 24 sections of the Energy Independence and Security Act and have a much better permitting process that the Mountain Valley Pipeline and anyone else wanting to do a project can then go through.

If they demonstrate on the merits that they should be entitled to build a pipeline or an electricity transmission, then build it, by all means. But don't embrace the need for permitting reform and then choose one project in the entire United States, affecting my State, and pull it out of permitting reform, insulating it from the normal processes of administrative permitting issuance and insulating it from judicial review.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Kansas.

INFLATION

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, last week, we received what might have been the worst economic news I have ever seen in 1 day in my lifetime.

In Joe Biden's America, it costs more to feed your family. In Joe Biden's America, your commute to work is more expensive. In Joe Biden's America, it is a struggle to pay the bills that power your home. In Joe Biden's America, farmers and ranchers are facing

such high input costs that they are struggling to grow the food that feeds our Nation and those around the globe. In Joe Biden's America, just as kids are heading back to school, the price of school supplies has increased by over 9 percent.

This President continues to preside over the worst economy that most Kansans have ever seen in their lifetime. This is all thanks to the Democrats' massive, hyperpartisan, tax-and-spending bills and, of course, their business-crushing Federal regulations.

As you can see on this chart, inflation was just 1 percent in January 2021—1.4 percent. Today, it is over a staggering 8 percent, almost 6 times higher than when Joe Biden took the reins and his woke inflationary policies wrecked our economy.

Look, energy, groceries, and shelter account for two-thirds of inflation, and they always lead inflation. Inflation is not going away unless this administration does an about-face on its policies, and we know that is not going to happen.

Let's take a look at what Joe Biden has done.

Energy—energy is up 23 percent; groceries, up 13 percent; shelter, up 6 percent. You might ask: Why? Why has shelter gone up 6 percent? Look, mortgage rates on 30-year loans have quadrupled under this President. Energy, grocery, shelter—all up across the board. All are essential to every individual's comfort and prosperity.

Finally, have you looked at your retirement accounts lately? Down, if you are lucky, maybe some 17 percent off its peak values.

Kansans are hurting. Main Street merchants are hurting. Americans are hurting. Instead of helping, this administration continues to pour gas on the fire with another massive spending bill. Then they had the gall to publicly celebrate last week on the south lawn of the White House—the very day the stock market went into a spiral after the CPI came in showing the highest inflation rate in nearly 40 years.

What is more, Sunday night on "60 Minutes," the President said inflation was up "just an inch, hardly at all."

Are you kidding me? I can't imagine an administration more out of touch, more apathetic to the pain of the people who elected him than this one. An 8.3 percent increase in inflation over last year is not just an inch. This kind of minimization infuriates everyone. I have heard it at every one of my 100 townhall meetings.

Let's not forget, since Joe Biden took his oath, inflation has increased over 13 percent. When you live paycheck to paycheck, 13 percent is not just an inch. Americans are much smarter than you think.

Inflation is going to be Joe Biden's legacy to the American people. In our history books, the texts my grandchildren—two of whom are sitting in the Gallery today—will study, they will see a graphic like the one behind me.

If anyone was hoping that the Federal Reserve would be able to slow down interest hikes, you can think again. This month's numbers made it clear to the Fed that their job is far from done, forcing them to raise interest rates by another 75 basis points.

Interest is only going to keep increasing unless they reverse their policies.

Look, life will continue to get more expensive under Joe Biden. Why? Because this President will not reverse his woke inflationary policies. Even now, President Biden and the Democrats want to continue to tax and spend us further into recession.

Make no mistake about it. After almost a year and a half of financial anxiety and paychecks that are not going as far, Americans have had enough of the failing economic agenda of Joe Biden and this Democratic majority in Congress.

November can't come soon enough. Come January, the tax-and-spend agenda will come to an immediate end. We will not allow this administration to further damage this country with their failed economic agenda.

Before COVID, we had the greatest economy in generations. We accomplished this by slashing taxes and getting out of the way of industry and letting American producers produce. This is what the American people want. This is what the American people deserve. This is what will lead America back to prosperity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Minnesota.

NOMINATION OF ROBIN MEREDITH COHN HUTCHESON

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I rise today in support of the nomination of Robin Hutcheson to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

As the Presiding Officer knows, her experience as Deputy Administrator and, currently, as Acting Administrator will serve her well. I am proud to say that she used to call Minnesota home, where she served as Director of Public Works for the City of Minneapolis for many years.

Ms. Hutcheson brings much experience with her to this job. She has served in three roles at the U.S. Department of Transportation: Deputy Assistant Secretary for Safety Policy, FMCSA Deputy Administrator, and currently, as Acting Administrator. She has a strong track record on safety.

As the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Safety Policy for U.S. DOT, she was instrumental in developing the National Roadway Safety Strategy and the new Safe Streets and Roads for All program.

She also has local experience managing transportation systems in three States across the country: Minnesota, as we discussed, Utah, and Montana. In

her role as Director of Public Works for the City of Minneapolis, she oversaw a 1,100-person team across nine divisions, including all transportation functions.

During a time when our supply chains are being tested to their limits, I believe that her public and private experience, as well as her experience at both the local and Federal level, will bring a unique perspective to the role and improve the safety of our transportation networks.

I will address her unanimous consent proposal in a minute.

DISCLOSE ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I am now going to turn to the next item on my agenda before we all adjourn, and that is a speech in support of the DISCLOSE Act and the need to take action to get secret money out of our elections.

I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on this legislation and testimony at the Committee on Rules and Administration hearing I held on it this summer.

Senator WHITEHOUSE has championed this bill since 2012, and I have been proud to support it alongside him in every Congress.

I also want to thank Leader SCHUMER for holding a vote to advance this bill today. While the vote was ultimately unsuccessful, it is important that the people of this country understand that Senate Democrats—and only Senate Democrats, it appears—remain committed to addressing secret money in our election.

This vote could not have come at a more important time, as we are seeing an unprecedented flood of money into our elections. Over \$14 billion was spent during the 2020 election, the most expensive in our country's history.

As we approach the general election in November with 48 days left, this is already—and we still have 48 days left—the most expensive midterm election ever. One estimate expects that nearly \$10 billion will be spent just on political advertising this election cycle, more than double the \$4 billion in the 2018 midterm elections.

As spending on elections increases, the sources of the spending are less accountable than ever before. One investigation found that more than \$1 billion was spent on the 2020 elections by groups that do not disclose their donors at all.

I want people to think about this. One billion was spent on the 2020 election, one billion—not million—\$1 billion, by groups that do not disclose their donors at all. No one likes that; I don't care if you are Democrat, Republican, or Independent, you at least want to know what money is being spent and who is paying for these negative ads that you see all over TV.

As spending on election increases, the sources of that spending are less accountable than ever before. Americans know there is way too much

money in our elections, and for our democracy to work, we need to know where the money is coming from. It is that simple.

But since the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United* opened up the flood of outside money, overturned so much of the bipartisan work that had been done by our former colleague Senator McCain—who we miss dearly—as well as Senator Feingold, our neighbor in Wisconsin, but since that time and the overturning of those requirements of the McCain-Feingold campaign restrictions, there have been no significant improvements made to disclosure laws or regulations.

Unlimited, anonymous spending in our elections doesn't encourage free speech; it drowns out the voices of you. It drowns out the voices of the American people who want to participate and be treated like everyone else. They have one vote just like a billionaire has a vote. Yet, what do we see? The billionaire gets to have undue influence, and we don't even know who he is because it is shrouded in secrecy because there is no requirement that the name be disclosed.

This unrelenting secret spending will continue unless we take action to address it. That is why we need to pass the DISCLOSE Act.

The DISCLOSE Act would address this tidal wave of secret money by requiring outside groups that spend in our elections to disclose their large donors—those that contribute more than \$10,000.

How could anyone be opposed to this? We are not talking about a lot of paperwork. We are talking about people who give more than \$10,000. Looking around the Gallery, looking at the pages, I just find it hard to believe there are people right here that are going to give over \$10,000 and then hide behind some kind of curtain of non-disclosure. That is what is happening. We just want to know who they are.

Importantly, the bill also makes it harder for wealthy special interests to hide their contributions to cloak the identity of donors, and it cracks down on the use of shell companies to conceal the donations of foreign nationals.

Let me repeat that. Who could be against trying to figure out whether shell companies are hiding the donations of foreign nationals, of people who don't even live in America who are trying to influence our elections?

I held a hearing on the bill in the Committee on Rules and Administration on the DISCLOSE Act this summer, where we heard about the effects that secret money is having on our democracy and why we need to pass this legislation.

Senator WHITEHOUSE testified at the hearing, and he spoke powerfully about the impact that secret money is having on our government, affecting all aspects of our lives, from the makeup of our courts to people's healthcare decisions to addressing climate change.

We also heard from Montana's Commissioner of Political Practices Jeff

Mangan, who told us how his State's version of the DISCLOSE Act passed in 2015 with bipartisan support. Let me repeat that. In Montana, red and blue worked together and got this passed. I couldn't agree more that transparency in our democracy should not be a partisan issue, and regardless of political party, we should know who is spending on our elections.

The American people know what is at stake. So it is no surprise that campaign finance disclosure laws have overwhelming support. One recent poll found that in swing States, 91 percent of likely voters—Republicans and Democrats—those are States that go red or blue, may be considered purple—91 percent of likely voters—Republicans and Democrats—support full transparency of campaign contributions and spending in our elections.

Another poll from 2019 found that across America, 83 percent of likely voters support public disclosures of contributions. Those are people regardless of their political stripes. There is also a long history of bipartisan support for reducing the influence of money in our democracy.

In fact, the very first limits on corporate campaign contributions came in 1907, the Tillman Act, the landmark Federal Election Campaign Act then passed in 1972, and as I noted, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act in 2002 was also bipartisan, supported by Senators John McCain and Russ Feingold. They joined together to champion, to pass this really important bill. Guess what. All three of those bills I just mentioned, the one in 1907, the one in 1972, the one in 2002, they were all signed into law by Republican Presidents. This has always been a bipartisan issue in our country.

Former Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, never one to hide his opinions, was also a staunch supporter of campaign finance disclosure. In a 2010 case, *Doe v. Reed*, he wrote:

For my part, I do not look forward to a society which, thanks to the Supreme Court, campaigns anonymously . . . hidden from public scrutiny and protected from the accountability of criticism.

These are his words:

This does not resemble the Home of the Brave.

You can't get much more conservative than former Justice Scalia. This is a bipartisan issue. We ask our colleagues to change their minds. Ensuring the transparency of our elections has been and should continue to be a bipartisan value.

These issues are at the very heart of our democracy, and this commonsense bill would protect the right of voters to make informed choices and know who has been trying to influence our elections.

As we move forward, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these measures in the future as well as the measures in the Freedom to Vote Act, which the DISCLOSE Act was part of that I led in the Senate that would give

us baseline—baseline—rules of the road for the voters of this country to be able to make sure they can cast their votes regardless of whether they live in Minnesota or Texas.

With that, I would like to turn to a few other matters that will help to close the Senate that I will receive in a few minutes. I have one. I will get started. Here we go. This is very exciting, happening in real time for all those watching. See, we are all prepared.

MORNING BUSINESS

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117-1

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, today I rise to celebrate the Senate's ratification of the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocols to phase down the use of hydrofluorocarbons, also known as HFCs. Not only did this critical amendment receive resounding bipartisan support, it also marked our Nation's participation in the most significant climate treaty in 30 years.

Across the country, there have been alarming examples of extreme weather. Parts of California are blanketed in black smoke from wildfires, many Kentuckians are still without homes as a result of flooding in July, and Hurricane Fiona left millions of Puerto Ricans without power. And around the world, we have seen a devastating drought in East Africa, Greenland's ice sheet's largest September melt event on record, and flooding in Pakistan that left a third of the country underwater. It is clear that climate change isn't something that's happening 100 years in the future, it's happening now.

That is why our ratification of the Kigali Amendment is so critical. HFCs are particularly potent greenhouse gases, disproportionately responsible for rising temperatures that are linked to catastrophic weather events. By joining the effort to reduce global HFC consumption and production by 80 percent by 2047, we can help prevent 0.5 degrees C of warming by the end of this century.

In addition to helping the planet, phasing out the use of HFCs in common consumer products like refrigerators and air-conditioners will deliver clear benefits to the American people in the form of lower energy bills. It also creates huge opportunities for U.S. businesses that have developed green alternatives to HFCs to reach global markets. This is one of the many situations where what is good for our planet is also good for consumers and businesses.

The ratification of the Kigali Amendment builds on the progress our country made with the enactment of the Inflation Reduction Act, which included provisions to tackle the climate crisis. Because of this law, we are on track to reduce carbon emissions by 40 percent by 2030. It was a huge step, but we still have more work to do to become a

completely carbon neutral economy by 2050.

To keep paving the way to our clean energy future, I introduced several pieces of legislation to accelerate our energy transition, including the HEATR Act, to drive manufacturing of heat pumps and the Energy Efficiency for Affordable Housing Act to make it easier for people living in affordable housing to invest in more efficient systems.

With the ratification of the Kigali Amendment, we are asserting our global leadership in the fight to combat climate change. Working on the national and international level, we can mitigate the worst impacts of climate change while generating benefits for the American people and opportunities for American businesses.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, had there been a recorded vote, I would have voted no on the confirmations of Executive Calendar No. 1101, E. Martin Estrada, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years and No. 1102, Gregory J. Haanstad, of Wisconsin, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CENTENNIAL OF THE NEW BRITAIN LIONS CLUB

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today I rise to recognize the New Britain Lions Club as they celebrate 100 years of devoted community service and positive impact on countless families and organizations in New Britain, CT, and the surrounding area.

The New Britain Lions Club is one of the five original Lions Clubs organized in Connecticut. Since their founding in 1922, the Club's core focus has been to meet the needs of children, although they have touched the entire community over the years. As a testament to their far-reaching impact, President Herbert Hoover sent a telegram in 1930 which read: "There is hardly an institution or community effort where the New Britain Lions Club has not been involved, including the library, Salvation Army, Scouts, sports, the American School for the Deaf, community festival, and literally scores of others."

The Club has developed leadership skills in its membership and ten of the Club's members have served as District Governor, displaying extraordinary leadership ability and helping establish programs that continue to this day to serve New Britain. Among these leaders was Lion Thomas Leonard, one of the founders of the Connecticut Lions Eye Research Foundation—CLERF—Lion Howard Wry, who began the annual eyeglass collection and initiated

the New Britain Lions Emergency Food Bank in 1981, and Lion Otto Strobino, who served as President of the Lions Eye Research Foundation and initiated the planting of the Lions Memorial Forest at the University of Connecticut. The New Britain Lions Club has set the standard of excellence in Lionism through their history of exceptional leadership and commitment to public service.

Over the past 2 years, despite the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, the New Britain Lions have continued to operate their free eye clinic, oversee the local Warm-The-Children program to provide winter clothes for children in need, and facilitate vision screening services to over 5,000 school children in the New Britain Public School system.

Their most recent initiative is a collaboration with Connecticut Children's Medical Center, Yale New Haven, and the Meriden YMCA Mountain Mist Camp to create a weeklong Diabetes Camp to help children and young adults manage the disease. In addition to their local impact, the New Britain Lions Club has raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Lions Club International Foundation to reach those in need all over the world.

As the New Britain Lions Club celebrates its centennial this September, I applaud them on their extraordinary contributions—not just to the city of New Britain and State of Connecticut, but to our great Nation and the world. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the New Britain Lions Club on 100 years of committed public service.●

EL CLASICO

• Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate the duel between two titans and legends of Mexican soccer at el Super Clasico, the Club Deportivo de Guadalajara "Chivas" and Club America—a duel that will be celebrated in my home city of Atlanta, GA, on September 25, 2022.

The city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia are home to rich, vibrant, and celebrated Latino communities. I am thrilled to honor the contributions of the Hispanic community in Georgia during Hispanic Heritage Month by hosting these soccer legends in what will go down in history as one of the greatest games our continent has ever seen.

This world-renowned match has brought thousands of soccer fans in Mexico and the United States together for almost 80 years to celebrate the history and unmatched rivalry of these soccer titans, a passion that unites us.

Founded 103 years ago, Club America has won a total of 35 official national and international titles. Club Deportivo Chivas de Guadalajara has obtained a total of 26 national and international championships. In the last 5 years, the Chivas and America have played for sold-out crowds in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Dallas. And this year in Atlanta will not be different.

I join with our community to witness the legacy of this beautiful game that reminds us of the unbreakable bond we share.

May tradition, history, and legacy guide our continued commitment to celebrate what unites us.●

REMEMBERING MAURY WILLS

• Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I submit the following statement to the RECORD in memory of Maury Wills, who passed away on September 19, 2022, at the age of 89.

Before there was Lou Brock and Rickey Henderson, there was Maury Wills. When he stole 104 bases in 1962, he not only beat out Willie Mays for the National League MVP award, he broke the single season stolen base record held by Ty Cobb that had stood for 47 years. That year, he was also named the first Black captain in the history of the Dodgers organization.

A native of Washington, DC, Maury was inspired to pursue a Major League career after attending a youth baseball clinic held by Jerry Priddy of the Washington Senators.

Maury was signed by the Los Angeles Dodgers at the age of 17. He spent a decade in their Minor League system, honing his skills and working his way to the Major League.

When Maury finally made it to the big league, he quickly became a foundational part of the Dodgers teams that went to four World Series from 1959 to 1966. During that time, he won two Gold Gloves and was named to five All Star teams. Maury, and so many other Dodgers legends from the era, helped Los Angeles fall in love with professional baseball.

In the years following his playing career, Maury had stints as an announcer, manager, and even entertainer. He was also able to overcome addiction with the help of his future wife Angela George and support of the Dodgers organization. Maury was open about his challenges with addiction in hopes that others could learn from his journey to sobriety.

Maury remained a member of the Dodgers family until his death. For years, he served as a base stealing and bunting instructor. He even helped mentor a young outfielder named Dave Roberts, who would go on to have one of the most famous stolen bases in MLB history in the 2004 American League Championship Series. Maury's intensity and passion for the game was evident when I visited Dodgers Spring Training a few years ago; it was clear why they referred to his spot in the facility as Maury's Pit.

I join Dodger fans across the Nation in remembering Maury and sending our condolences to his family.●

RECOGNIZING MYLKE COFFEE COMPANY

• Mr. PAUL. Madam 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 Mylke Coffee Company of Island, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Shane Case had a vision for his home in Western Kentucky. Seeing that there was no source of freshly roasted coffee beans anywhere near his region of the State, he decided to fulfill this need, and thus in 2017, Mylke opened its doors. Shane's innovative vision led Mylke to become the first and only craft commercial coffee-roaster located within 100 miles of his hometown, and their popularity has continued to grow since its founding. Many people ask about the unique nature of the company's name. The name boils down to a sort of fusion between old and new: old in the way of Old English, a nod to Shane's Scottish heritage, and new, in the newfound rise and popularity of mylk, which typically refers to milk derived from beans, nuts, or plants rather than from an animal. Mylk has undoubtedly been on the rise in recent years as consumers have increasingly turned to dairy-free options as they search for quality coffee. Shane understood this shift in consumer demand and has responded accordingly with his forward-thinking business.

When Shane first opened his business, his intention was to provide the western half of the Bluegrass State with high-quality coffee beans and other coffee products from a source more local than the distant Louisville or Nashville, TN. However, as his company and customer base grew, he set his sights on entering into new markets beyond those of his native Western Kentucky. Since its founding in 2017, Mylke has consistently managed to break into new markets as far away as Atlanta and Indianapolis. Mylke now provides freshly roasted coffee to more than 20 independently owned coffee shops and restaurants. Not only has Shane kept an eye on the potential of emerging markets, he readily adapted to a newfound customer landscape when the COVID-19 pandemic wreaked havoc on the coffee shop and restaurant industries. Faced with government mandates forcing him to close his doors, Shane pivoted and started offering alternative products to the typical coffee that is brewed onsite, instead providing ready-to-drink options, including the very popular Sweet Mylke Cold Brew or Mylke Kups that customers can use at home in their Keurig Coffee Machine.

Throughout his venture into founding his own enterprise, Shane has maintained a keen eye for business and an awareness of the needs of his larger community. As the company has grown, Mylke has partnered with several community organizations and charities that give back to the community. The company has helped facilitate numerous fundraisers for the McLean County High School Moot Court, an organization that exposes

students to constitutional law and the work of advocates in the U.S. Supreme Court. Shane understands the importance of investing in the young minds of his community and that such investments, especially when paired with a focus on civic duty, are to the wide benefit not only for the youth involved but for the community at large. Moreover, Mylke has assisted in fundraising efforts for the Green River Area Down Syndrome Association—GRADSA—and continues to partner with them whenever possible.

Shane's charitable nature extends far beyond than what Mylke is able to do at a local level. He also pays mind to source his coffee beans from suppliers that share in his desire to give back to the community. Mylke has partnered with Legacy Farms Coffee since its founding, a coffee bean supplier working out of Honduras. Using proceeds earned through their coffee crops, Legacy Farms Coffee provides numerous services to the surrounding community, including livestock donations to hungry families, donations of books and supplies to local schools, and providing microloans to growing small businesses. This partnership, as well as those in his native Kentucky, have ensured that every pound of Mylke coffee sold benefits both the local and global community.

Mylke has seen unprecedented growth in 2022, with the christening of the Mylke Coffee Shop food truck, an asset that allows the company to grow their customer base and reach newfound customers. Moreover, the company has acquired a new commercial coffee roaster which will increase production capacity by 2,000 percent, to satisfy all those craving the high-quality coffee Mylke is known for. Given his track record for entrepreneurial wisdom it is not hard to believe that Mr. Shane Case will continue to grow Mylke at the rate he has already seen. I want to wish congratulations to Mr. Case and the entire team at Mylke Coffee Company. I look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 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 bill, without amendment:

S. 1098. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans.

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

H.R. 8873. An act to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the process for the counting of electoral votes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present the statue of Harry S. Truman from the people of Missouri.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

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".

MEASURES REFERRED

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

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 Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-234. A resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission entitled "Pertaining to Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Funds"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

POM-235. A resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission entitled "Urging the Federal Governmental to Work with States in the Spirit of Cooperative Federalism During Review of the Federal Fossil Fuel Program"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-236. A resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission entitled "Pertaining to Encouraging Carbon Capture and Technological Innovation"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-237. A resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission entitled "Pertaining to the CLEAN Future Act and Any Substantially Similar Legislation or Policies"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 4577. A bill to improve plain writing and public experience, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-159).

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Report to accompany S. 1127, a bill to require the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to make certain operational models available to the public, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-160).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Brendan Owens, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Laura Taylor-Kale, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Milancy Danielle Harris, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Army nomination of Col. Jeffrey A. Vanantwerp, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Daniel R. Fowler, to be Brigadier General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Telita Crossland, to be Lieutenant General.

*Air Force nomination of Gen. Anthony J. Cotton, to be General.

*Space Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Bradley C. Saltzman, to be General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Cary J. Cowan, Jr. and ending with Col. Katherine A. Trombley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 28, 2022.

Army nomination of Col. Sonya A. Powell, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Michael B. Siegl, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Joseph M. Lestorti, to be Major General.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. James E. Rainey, to be General.

Marine Corps nomination of Brig. Gen. Leonard F. Anderson IV, to be Major General.

*Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. James F. Glynn, to be Lieutenant General.

Space Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Gregory J. Gagnon and ending with Brig. Gen. Steven P. Whitney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2022.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Joseph O. Little, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Benjamin C. May, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of William P. Coley, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Dawnie R. Ramie, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Brian A. Harris, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Brittany M. Bayer, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Lauren A. Z. Ott, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Jeremy T. Mosselle, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Charles J. Howell, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Katie E. Grimley, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Kim E. Winter, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Kathryn J. Lynn, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with John Kwaku Appiah and ending with Philip Joel Vincent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 3, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul Obi Amaliri and ending with Meoshia A. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 3, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with James B. Anderson and ending with Charles Seligman III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 3, 2022.

Air Force nomination of Emily C. Barielle, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Christopher C. Stephenson, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Lee A. Aversano, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Adam R. Golden, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Brett W. Bartlett, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Keith E. Quick, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Eric L. Anderson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of David R. Siemion, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Willie J. Babor and ending with Maureen Schellie Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kenneth S. Egerstrom and ending with Jason S. Rabideau, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Army nomination of Shawn D. Smith, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael Perozeni, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Edward L. Arntson and ending with D012382, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Jeffrey W. Adams and ending with G010111, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with David M. Alvarez and ending with D016542, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Andrew A. Bair and ending with Brenda J. Spence, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2022.

Army nomination of Dwayne L. Wade, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christian A. Carr, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Duke G. Yim, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Brendan D. Lind, to be Major.

Army nomination of Diana M. Carl, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ryan C. Cloud, to be Major.

Army nomination of Shevez L. Freeman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christopher Gonzalez, to be Major.

Army nomination of Gabriel E. Monfiston, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jofa Mwakisege, to be Major.

Army nomination of Stephen K. Netherland, to be Major.

Army nomination of Leslie E. Pandy, to be Major.

Army nomination of Keld A. Pia, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christopher W. Odle, to be Major.

Army nomination of Matthew E. Longar, to be Major.

Army nomination of Erik C. Aderman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Darrell K. Scales, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Judith M. Logan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Gregory E. Browder, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of D016391, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brian D. Deerin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Daniel R. Henderson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Omar L. McKen, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of D012835, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of D016128, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Joshua E. Varney, to be Major.

Army nomination of Addison B. Clincy, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael A. Robertson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Arthur F. Driscoll-Miller, to be Major.

Army nomination of Quinton X. Thompson, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Alyssa M. Aarhus and ending with Peter R. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2022.

Army nomination of Alexander Quataert, to be Major.

Army nomination of Shannon V. Taylor, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael A. Knight, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael F. Ksycki, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jacqueline M. Thompson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Justo J. Caraballohernandez, to be Major.

Army nomination of G010713, to be Major.

Army nomination of Matthew A. Gaumer, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ralph I. Haney III, to be Major.

Army nomination of Lionel B. Lambert, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael Ntuny, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christopher J. Weber, to be Major.

Army nomination of Timothy B. Manton, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Peter J. Orilio, to be Major.

Army nomination of Carl L. Whitley, to be Major.

Army nomination of Lindsay E. Barnes, to be Major.

Army nomination of Joshua F. Berry, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Forrest S. Thompson, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Eric N. Jones, to be Major.

Army nomination of Lee E. Palmer, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Clarisa B. Colchado and ending with Eric B. Jackson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Angela S. Hinds and ending with Peter A. Olsen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Mary A. Crispin and ending with Michael L. Rizzo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Janele L. Graziano and ending with Jeffrey T. Shelton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Louis M. Dibernardo and ending with Robby W. Wyatt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Andrea S. Bowers and ending with Andrew G. Winslow, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Heriberto Baezmartinez and ending with Paul E. Carsen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Army nomination of Leah G. Smith, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Amy J. Denis and ending with Frances C. Woodward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Malcolm J. Murray and ending with Zachary A. Paukert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Steven A. Bondi and ending with John E. Peacock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher L. Atkins and ending with Traci A. Willie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Jesse A. Dodson and ending with Paul M. Villalongias, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Marine Corps nomination of Zachary A. Finch, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Kanella S. Hatchett, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Gregory A. Hartfelder, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Anthony J. Kozak, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Scott M. Reynolds, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Denita J. Skeet, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Lauren E. Brinker, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Benjamin J. Ingersoll, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher M. Aller and ending with Tyler L. J. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nomination of John A. French, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Geoffrey A. Leone, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Sequoia M. Youngblood, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of David J. Wright, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Jacob M. Hagan and ending with Louis F. Salazar, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Aaron M. Bell and ending with Luke E. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew D. Abbott and ending with Colin A. Zychlewicz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Clifford J. Abbott and ending with Michael D. Wojdyla, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Sammy J. Amalla and ending with Jessica D. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Lindsay S. Ainsworth and ending with Peter W. Yagel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Yusuf Abdullah and ending with Erin M. Zumwalt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Ann K. Adams and ending with Elaine Zhong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Christine A. Ancheta and ending with Minghe Zhang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Ollie C. Adcox and ending with Jaime C. Zhunepluas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Stephanie O. Ajuzie and ending with Daniel M. Zink, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 7, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel A. Guerra and ending with Mark W. Wroblewski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Darlene E. Bates and ending with Michael S. Valcke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Andrew C. Bertucci and ending with Emily A. Wilkin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nomination of Benjamin J. Robinson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with David G. Aboudaoud and ending with Dennis P. Wright, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael L. Allis and ending with Britt W. Zerbe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nomination of Edwin R. Dupont, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Jonathan V. Ahlstrom and ending with Thomas J.

Uhl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with James C. Billings III and ending with Kyla M. Zenan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Leo G. Anderle and ending with Sean E. Zetooney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Anton A. Adam and ending with Ying P. Zhong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Thomas S. Annabel and ending with Daniel H. Wedeman, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Adrienne T. Benton and ending with Gale B. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Salahudin A. Adenkhalif and ending with Victor T. F. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nomination of Eric R. Truemper, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard R. Abitria and ending with Celeste D. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Hiroya Ako and ending with David S. Yi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Adrienne M. Baldoni and ending with Jon T. Taylor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Maricar S. Aberin and ending with Cardia M. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Eleazar Aguilar and ending with Sheu O. Yusuf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Phillip A. Arias and ending with Geoffrey A. Stephens, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Kerwin K. Auguste and ending with David M. Whaley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Amos Akuokosarpong and ending with Geneveve I. Tolentino, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew G. Aiken and ending with Matthew C. Ziesmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Meredith A. Ansley and ending with Benjamin A. Ziemiński, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Alex M. Anderson and ending with Joseph M. Zeiser, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Jason F. Cano and ending with Brian P. Wadas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Craig E. Frank and ending with Daniel S. Robinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Reuben T. Joseph and ending with Eric J. Pendleton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2022.

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Thomas E. Brown, of Georgia, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Georgia for the term of four years.

Kirk M. Taylor, of Colorado, to be United States Marshal for the District of Colorado for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 4917. A bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Minority Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 4918. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use of patents, trade secrets, or other intellectual property to inhibit competition; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4919. A bill to require an interagency strategy for creating a unified posture on counter-unmanned aircraft systems (C-UAS) capabilities and protections at international borders of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. KING, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4920. A bill to provide enhanced protections for election workers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 4921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the private business use requirements for bonds issued for lead service line replacement projects; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4922. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a burial allowance for certain veterans who die at home while in receipt of hospice care furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 4923. A bill to require Federal law enforcement agencies to report on cases of missing or murdered Indians, and for other persons; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4924. A bill to continue in effect certain Executive orders imposing sanctions with respect to Iran, to prevent the waiver of certain sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to Iran until the Government of Iran ceases to attempt to assassinate United States officials, other United States citizens, and Iranian nationals residing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 4925. A bill to preserve the readiness of the Armed Forces by limiting separations based on COVID-19 vaccination status and continuing pay and benefits for members while religious and health accommodations are pending; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. COONS):

S. 4926. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, to require appropriate use of multidisciplinary teams for investigations of child sexual exploitation or abuse, the production of child sexual abuse material, or child trafficking conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 4927. A bill to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish a grant program to fund youth fishing projects; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 4928. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to expand the ways beryllium sensitivity can be established for purposes of compensation under that Act and to extend the authorization of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health of the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4929. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure the consensual donation and respectful disposition of human bodies and human body parts donated or transferred for education, research, or the advancement of medical, dental, or mortuary science and not for use in human transplantation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 4930. A bill to prohibit Federal procurement from companies operating in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 4931. A bill to require reforms to programs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4932. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide fair treatment of radio stations and artists for the use of sound recordings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 4933. A bill to take certain land in the State of Washington into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 4934. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security, or any other person, from requiring repayment, recoupment, or offset of certain antidumping duties and countervailing duties paid under section 754 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 4935. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to implement measures to better prepare for and more quickly respond to wildfires on certain public land and in certain National Forests; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 4936. A bill to establish a National Council on African American History and Culture within the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 4937. A bill to prohibit the United States Government from recognizing the Russian Federation's claim of sovereignty over any portion of the sovereign territory of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 4938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that online contributions to a political organization require a credit verification value; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 4939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent double dipping between tax credits and grants or loans for clean vehicle manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr.

BRAUN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4940. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 4941. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4942. A bill to amend the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act of 2004 to require the establishment of an additional Institute under that Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4943. A bill to establish a moratorium on energy development in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4944. A bill to provide for the operation and establishment of, and procurement of supplies for, firewood banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4945. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a pilot program for the establishment and use of a pre-fire suppression stand density index, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 4946. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to require that funds deposited be available for withdrawal in real-time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 4947. A bill to establish the Defense Exportability Transfer Account; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. RISCH):

S.J. Res. 63. A joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PADILLA,

Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. REED, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 791. A resolution designating September 2022 as "National Voting Rights Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 792. A resolution expressing support for the designation of November 2022 as "National Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 793. A resolution commending Tall Ships America for advancing character-building experiences at sea and representing the tall ships and sail training community of the United States in national and international forums; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BURR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 794. A resolution proclaiming the week of September 26 through September 30, 2022, to be "National Clean Energy Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. Res. 795. A resolution designating September 2022 as "School Bus Safety Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 796. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of the late Senator Robert "Bob" Charles Krueger; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 445

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend section 303(g) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)) to eliminate the separate registration requirement for dispensing narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V, such as buprenorphine, for maintenance or detoxification treatment, and for other purposes.

S. 456

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 618

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 618, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the deduction for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions.

S. 864

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 999

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 999, a bill to amend the title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rural health care by ensuring fairness in Medicare hospital payments.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) 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. 1521

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1521, a bill to require certain civil penalties to be transferred to a fund through which amounts are made available for the Gabriella Miller Kids First Pediatric Research Program at the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

S. 1725

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1725, a bill to grant a Federal charter to the National American Indian Veterans, Incorporated.

S. 3018

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements with respect to the use of prior authorization under Medicare Advantage plans, and for other purposes.

S. 3335

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3335, a bill to provide liability protection for the sharing of information regarding suspected fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful robocalls, illegally spoofed calls, and other illegal calls by or with the registered consortium that conducts private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls, and for the receipt of such information by the registered consortium, and for other purposes.

S. 3663

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3663, a bill to protect the safety of children on the internet.

S. 3797

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3797, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to support stillbirth prevention and research, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

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

S. 4327

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4327, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to provide hazard mitigation assistance for mitigating and preventing post-wildfire flooding and debris flow, and for other purposes.

S. 4328

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4328, a bill to modify the fire management assistance cost share, and for other purposes.

S. 4416

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4416, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students.

S. 4441

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4441, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for peer support specialists for claimants who are survivors of military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 4565

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4565, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the co-payment requirement for recipients of Department of Veterans Affairs payments or allowances for beneficiary travel, and for other purposes.

S. 4573

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4573, a bill to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the Electoral Count Act, and to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to

provide clear guidelines for when and to whom resources are provided by the Administrator of General Services for use in connection with the preparations for the assumption of official duties as President or Vice President.

S. 4605

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4605, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure stability in payments to home health agencies under the Medicare program.

S. 4672

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4672, a bill to modify the authority of the Secretary of Defense to transfer excess aircraft to other departments of the Federal Government and to authorize the Secretary to transfer excess aircraft to the Governor of a State, and for other purposes.

S. 4702

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 4702, a bill to impose limits on excepting competitive service positions from the competitive service, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4702, supra.

S. 4708

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 4708, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for wigs as durable medical equipment under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 4840

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4840, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

S. 4848

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4848, a bill to provide for the designation of the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

S. 4909

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4909, a bill to increase authorizations for the passenger ferry competitive grant program and the ferry boats and terminal facilities formula grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 4916

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4916, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 754

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 754, a resolution designating November 13, 2022, as "National Warrior Call Day" in recognition of the importance of connecting warriors in the United States to support structures necessary to transition from the battlefield.

S. RES. 771

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 771, a resolution supporting the designation of September 19, 2022, as "National Stillbirth Prevention Day", recognizing tens of thousands of American families that have endured a stillbirth, and seizing the opportunity to keep other families from experiencing the same tragedy.

S. RES. 788

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 788, a resolution designating the week of September 19 through September 23, 2022, as "Malnutrition Awareness Week".

AMENDMENT NO. 5530

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 5530 intended to be proposed to H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5531

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 5531 intended to be proposed to H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4932. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide fair treatment of radio stations and artists for the use of sound recordings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the bipartisan American Music Fairness Act, which I introduced with Senator BLACKBURN today.

Artists pour their heart and soul into the music we enjoy. Unfortunately, our current copyright laws do not adequately reflect the value of what they have produced.

Currently, the United States is the only democratic country in the world in which artists are not compensated for the use of their music on AM/FM radio.

By requiring broadcast radio corporations to pay performance royalties to creators for AM/FM radio plays, the American Music Fairness Act would close an antiquated loophole in our copyright law which has prevented artists from receiving compensation for the use of their music for far too long.

This royalty stream would be particularly meaningful for the thousands of working-class artists who are a critical part of our country's vibrant music industry, and it would also be particularly meaningful for artists who are not readily able to tour and perform, as has unfortunately been the case for artists during the COVID pandemic.

Additionally and importantly, when American-made music is played overseas, other countries collect royalties for American artists and producers but never pay those royalties to our artists because we do not reciprocate. This inequity costs the American economy and artists more than \$200 million each year. This is a serious injustice considering that America is the origin of so much of the music listened to around the world.

So it is time once and for all to create a regime that is platform neutral and which respects the hard work and dignity of our artists.

But I also want to be clear about something. I am a huge fan of and true believer in the importance of local radio to the music industry and to communities all across the United States that rely on radio to receive timely and relevant news, entertainment, and emergency response information. The American Music Fairness Act recognizes and acknowledges the important role that locally-owned radio stations play by including protections for small, college, and non-commercial stations.

I want to thank Senator BLACKBURN for introducing this bill with me, and I hope our colleagues will join us in supporting the thousands of artists across this country who create the music that contributes to the soundtrack of our lives.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 4939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent double dipping between tax credits and grants or loans for clean vehicle manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4939

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 "Ending Duplicative Subsidies for Electric Vehicles Act"

SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE CREDITS WITH OTHER SUBSIDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30D(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by Public Law 117-169, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Such term shall not include any person who has received a loan under section 136(d) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, a loan guarantee under section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 with respect to a project described in section 1703(b)(8) of such Act, or a grant under section 50143 of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14' for the taxable year in which the new clean vehicle is placed in service or any prior taxable year."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 791—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2022 AS "NATIONAL VOTING RIGHTS MONTH"

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. REED, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 791

Whereas voting is one of the single most important rights that can be exercised in a democracy;

Whereas, over the course of history, various voter suppression laws in the United States have hindered, and even prohibited, certain individuals and groups from exercising the right to vote;

Whereas, during the 19th and early 20th centuries, Native Americans and people who were born to United States citizens abroad, people who spoke a language other than English, and people who were formerly subjected to slavery were denied full citizenship and prevented from voting by English literacy tests;

Whereas, since the 1870s, minority groups such as Black Americans in the South have

suffered from the oppressive effects of Jim Crow laws that were designed to prevent political, economic, and social mobility;

Whereas Black Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and other underrepresented voters were subject to violence, poll taxes, literacy tests, all-White primaries, property ownership tests, and grandfather clauses that were designed to suppress the right of those individuals to vote;

Whereas 5,800,000 people in the United States are currently banned from voting because of a felony conviction, including 1 in 16 Black adults, due to the shameful entanglement of racial injustice in the criminal legal system and voting access in the United States;

Whereas members of the aforementioned groups and others are currently, in some cases, subject to intimidation, voter roll purges, and financial barriers that act effectively as modern-day poll taxes;

Whereas, in 1965, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) to protect the right of Black Americans and other traditionally disenfranchised groups to vote, among other reasons;

Whereas, in 2013, in the landmark case of *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), the Supreme Court of the United States invalidated section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, dismantling the preclearance formula provision in that Act that protected voters in States and localities that historically have suppressed the right of minorities to vote;

Whereas, since the invalidation of the preclearance formula provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, gerrymandered districts in many States have gone unchallenged and have become less likely to be invalidated by the courts;

Whereas these gerrymandered districts have been found to have discriminatory impacts on traditionally disenfranchised minorities through tactics that include "cracking", diluting the voting power of minorities across many districts, and "packing", concentrating minority voters' power in one district to reduce their voting power in other districts;

Whereas the courts have found the congressional and, in some cases, State legislative district maps, in Texas, North Carolina, Florida, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Wisconsin to be gerrymandered districts that were created to favor some groups over others;

Whereas these restrictive voting laws encompass cutbacks in early voting, voter roll purges, placement of faulty equipment in minority communities, requirement of photo identification, and the elimination of same-day registration;

Whereas these policies could outright disenfranchise or make voting much more difficult for more than 80,000,000 minority, elderly, poor, and disabled voters, among other groups;

Whereas, in 2016, discriminatory laws in North Carolina, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Texas were ruled to violate voters' rights and overturned by the courts;

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), calls on Congress to update the formula in the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (referred to in this preamble as "COVID-19") public health emergency has only exacerbated the state of elections and the difficulties voters face in obtaining access to the ballot;

Whereas a lack of fair and safe election policies threatens minority communities, which have been disproportionately impacted and disenfranchised due to the

COVID-19 pandemic, and their access to the ballot;

Whereas addressing the challenges of administering future elections requires increasing the accessibility of vote-by-mail and other limited-contact options to ensure the protection of voters' health and safety amid a global pandemic;

Whereas, as voting by mail becomes a safer and more accessible option for voters to exercise their constitutional right to vote during the unprecedented times caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the work of the United States Postal Service will be of paramount importance in successfully conducting elections;

Whereas Congress must work to combat any attempts to dismantle or underfund the United States Postal Service or obstruct the passage of the mail as blatant tactics of voter suppression and election interference;

Whereas following the 2020 elections there has been a relentless attack on the right to vote with more than 400 bills having been introduced to roll back the right to vote, including such bills being introduced in almost every State and at least 31 of such bills having been signed into law in 18 States;

Whereas there is much more work to be done to ensure all citizens of the United States have the right to vote through free, fair, and accessible elections, and Congress must exercise its Constitutional authority to protect the right to vote;

Whereas National Voter Registration Day is September 20; and

Whereas September 2022 would be an appropriate month to designate as "National Voting Rights Month" and to ensure that, through the registration of voters and awareness of elections, the democracy of the United States includes all citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2022 as "National Voting Rights Month";

(2) encourages all people in the United States to uphold the right of every citizen to exercise the sacred and fundamental right to vote;

(3) encourages Congress to pass—

(A) the For the People Act of 2021 (S. 2093 and H.R. 1 of the 117th Congress), to increase voters' access to the ballot, prohibit the use of deceptive practices to intimidate voters, end gerrymandering, create automatic voter registration, limit the power of restrictive voter identification laws, make critical investments in election infrastructure and technology, and address corruption in campaign finance and ethics;

(B) the Freedom to Vote Act (S. 2747 of the 117th Congress), to set basic national standards to make sure all people in the United States can cast their ballots in the way that works best for them, regardless of what ZIP code they live in, improve access to the ballot for people in the United States, advance commonsense election integrity reforms, and protect the democracy of the United States from relentless attacks;

(C) the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021 (H.R. 4 of the 117th Congress), to restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) that prohibit discriminatory voting practices, remove barriers to voting, and provide protections for minority voters in States with a history of voting discrimination;

(D) the Democracy Restoration Act of 2021 (S. 481 of the 117th Congress), to restore Federal voting rights to citizens after release from imprisonment, honoring the responsibilities of citizenship and civic engagement necessary for building healthy and safe communities, while welcoming the contributions

of people returning home after imprisonment; and

(E) other voting rights legislation that seeks to advance voting rights and protect elections in the United States;

(4) recommends that public schools and universities in the United States develop an academic curriculum that educates students about—

(A) the importance of voting, how to register to vote, where to vote, and the different forms of voting;

(B) the history of voter suppression in the United States before and after passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and

(C) current measures that have been taken to restrict the vote;

(5) encourages the United States Postal Service to issue a special Representative John R. Lewis stamp during the month of September—

(A) to honor the life and legacy of Representative John R. Lewis in supporting voting rights; and

(B) to remind people in the United States that ordinary citizens risked their lives, marched, and participated in the great democracy of the United States so that all citizens would have the fundamental right to vote; and

(6) invites Congress to allocate the requisite funds for public service announcements on television, radio, newspapers, magazines, social media, billboards, buses, and other forms of media—

(A) to remind people in the United States when elections are being held;

(B) to share important registration deadlines; and

(C) to urge people to get out and vote.

SENATE RESOLUTION 792—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF NOVEMBER 2022 AS "NATIONAL ALPHA-1 ANTITRYPSIN DEFICIENCY AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 792

Whereas an estimated 1 in every 2,500 individuals in the United States have the genetic disorder alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency (referred to in this preamble as "Alpha-1");

Whereas there are an estimated 19,000,000 carriers of Alpha-1 in the United States who may pass Alpha-1 on to their children;

Whereas Alpha-1 can lead to lung destruction and is often misdiagnosed as asthma or smoking-related chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD);

Whereas Alpha-1 symptoms relating to the lungs include—

- (1) shortness of breath;
- (2) wheezing;
- (3) chronic bronchitis;
- (4) recurring chest colds;
- (5) less exercise tolerance;
- (6) year-round allergies; and
- (7) bronchiectasis;

Whereas Alpha-1 occurs when there is a lack of a protein in the blood called alpha-1 antitrypsin, which is mainly produced by the liver;

Whereas Alpha-1 symptoms relating to the liver include—

- (1) unexplained liver disease or elevated liver enzymes;
- (2) eyes and skin turning yellow, known as jaundice;
- (3) swelling of the abdomen, known as ascites, or legs; and

(4) vomiting blood;

Whereas Alpha-1 is the most commonly known genetic risk factor for emphysema;

Whereas Alpha-1 can affect individuals at any age;

Whereas Alpha-1 cannot be diagnosed by symptoms or by a medical examination alone;

Whereas individuals who may have Alpha-1 must take a blood test to confirm a diagnosis;

Whereas early diagnosis and avoiding risk factors, such as smoking, can help prevent Alpha-1 from causing disease; and

Whereas November 2022 would be an appropriate month to designate as National Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency Awareness Month to—

(1) raise awareness about Alpha-1; and

(2) encourage more individuals to get tested for Alpha-1 if they present symptoms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the designation of November 2022 as "National Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency Awareness Month".

SENATE RESOLUTION 793—COMMENDING TALL SHIPS AMERICA FOR ADVANCING CHARACTER-BUILDING EXPERIENCES AT SEA AND REPRESENTING THE TALL SHIPS AND SAIL TRAINING COMMUNITY OF THE UNITED STATES IN NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL FORUMS

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Whereas the American Sail Training Association (doing business as Tall Ships America), located in Rhode Island, is an educational non-profit corporation whose declared mission is "to encourage character-building through sail training, promote sail training to the North American public, and support education under sail";

Whereas, since its founding in 1973, Tall Ships America has promoted and supported character-building experiences aboard traditional sail training vessels and supported a fleet of more than 120 tall ships and sail training vessels, including barques, barquentines, brigs, brigantines, schooners, sloops, and full-rigged ships, which fly the flag of the United States and bring life-changing adventures to thousands of young trainees each year;

Whereas April 2023 marks the 50th anniversary of Tall Ships America, which—

(1) continues to ably represent the United States as a founding member of Sail Training International, the recognized international body for the promotion of sail training since the 1950s; and

(2) as a member of the International Council of Sail Training International, actively promotes international fellowship of the sea through governance and events;

Whereas Tall Ships America has established a program of scholarship and grant funding to support onboard experiences for young people and the professional training and development of sailing ship crew members;

Whereas Tall Ships America promotes safe and ethical practices and supports the business efficiency of its member vessels and programs;

Whereas Tall Ships America has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Maritime Administration in support of maritime workforce development;

Whereas Tall Ships America collaborates extensively with the Coast Guard with respect to—

- (1) the regulation of sail training vessels;
- (2) Marine Events of National Significance, including the Tall Ships Challenge series;
- (3) the premier sail training vessel of the United States, namely the square-rigged Coast Guard Cutter Barque *Eagle*; and
- (4) professional mariner training and development, including through participation in the Annual Conference on Sail Training and Tall Ships;

Whereas Tall Ships America has a long history of arranging and supporting tall ship races, rallies, and maritime festivals dating as far back as 1976;

Whereas, since 2001, Tall Ships America has organized 78 Tall Ships Challenge races and maritime festivals that have—

- (1) involved sail training ships, trainees, and crews from around the world on all the coasts of the United States;
- (2) advanced the mission of Tall Ships America;
- (3) helped sustain the economic vitality of member vessels of Tall Ships America; and
- (4) attracted more than 26,000,000 visitors and \$3,000,000,000 in economic impact to maritime communities; and

Whereas Tall Ships America has hosted the Annual Conference on Sail Training and Tall Ships for 49 years in cities throughout the United States and Canada, including the Safety Under Sail Forum and the Education Under Sail Forum, to enhance professionalism, historical skills of seamanship, impactful approaches for education at sea, best-practices of organizational collaboration, and cutting-edge non-profit and business practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) commends Tall Ships America for—
 - (A) advancing character-building experiences at sea and on inland waterways aboard traditional sail training vessels;
 - (B) acting as the national sail training association of the United States; and
 - (C) representing the tall ships and sail training community of the United States in national and international forums, including in Sail Training International;
- (2) commends Tall Ships America and its member vessels and programs for providing workforce training and development opportunities for the maritime industry in the finest traditions of the sea; and
- (3) encourages the people of the United States and the world to join in celebration of the first 50 years of the Adventure and Education Under Sail program of Tall Ships America, which provides character-building, educational, and work experiences for people of all nations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 794—PROCLAIMING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 26 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2022, TO BE “NATIONAL CLEAN ENERGY WEEK”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BURR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 794

Whereas, across the United States, clean and readily abundant forms of energy are

powering more homes and businesses than ever before;

Whereas clean energy generation is readily available from zero- and low-emissions sources;

Whereas the clean energy sector is a growing part of the economy and has been a key driver of economic growth in the United States in recent years;

Whereas technological innovation can further reduce costs, enhance reliability, and increase deployment of clean energy sources;

Whereas the “2022 U.S. Energy and Employment Report” published by the Department of Energy found that, at the end of 2021, the energy and energy efficiency sectors in the United States employed approximately 7,800,000 individuals;

Whereas the scaling of affordable and exportable clean energy is essential to reducing global emissions;

Whereas clean energy jobs are inherently local, contribute to the growth of local economies, and cannot be outsourced due to the on-site nature of construction, installation, and maintenance; and

Whereas innovative clean energy solutions and clean energy jobs are part of the energy future of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) proclaims the week of September 26 through September 30, 2022, to be “National Clean Energy Week”;
- (2) encourages individuals and organizations across the United States to support commonsense solutions that address the economic, environmental, and energy needs of the United States in the 21st century;
- (3) encourages the Federal Government, States, municipalities, and individuals to invest in affordable, clean, and low-emitting energy technologies; and
- (4) recognizes the role of entrepreneurs and small businesses in ensuring the energy leadership of the United States in the global marketplace and supporting low-cost, clean, and reliable energy in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 795—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2022 AS “SCHOOL BUS SAFETY MONTH”

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 795

Whereas, in an average year, on every school day in the United States, approximately 506,520 public and private school buses carry more than 26,000,000 K–12 students to and from school;

Whereas school buses comprise the largest mass transportation fleet in the United States;

Whereas, in an average year, 48 percent of all K–12 students ride a school bus for each of the 180 school days in a year, and school bus operators drive school buses a total of nearly 4,400,000,000 miles;

Whereas the Child Safety Network (referred to in this preamble as the “CSN”), which is celebrating 33 years of public service in the United States, supports the CSN Safe Ride campaign, which is designed to provide the school bus industry with driver training, the latest technology, and free safety and security resources, including resources to help parents raise safer and healthier children;

Whereas the designation of School Bus Safety Month will allow broadcast and digital media and social networking industries to commit to disseminating public service announcements that are produced to—

(1) provide free resources designed to safeguard children;

(2) recognize school bus operators and professionals; and

(3) encourage the driving public to engage in safer driving behavior near school buses when students board and disembark from school buses;

Whereas key leaders who deserve recognition during School Bus Safety Month and beyond have—

- (1) provided security awareness training materials to more than 14,000 public and private schools;
- (2) trained more than 118,139 school bus operators; and
- (3) provided more than 166,798 counterterrorism guides to individuals who are key to providing both safety and security for children in the United States; and

Whereas School Bus Safety Month offers the Senate and the people of the United States an opportunity to recognize and thank the school bus operators and the professionals focused on school bus safety and security in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2022 as “School Bus Safety Month”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 796—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT “BOB” CHARLES KRUEGER

Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 796

Whereas Robert “Bob” Charles Krueger (referred to in this preamble as “Bob Krueger”) was born on September 19, 1935, to Arlon and Faye Krueger in New Braunfels, Texas;

Whereas Bob Krueger earned a bachelor’s degree from the Southern Methodist University, a master’s degree from Duke University, and a doctorate in philosophy in English literature from Oxford University;

Whereas Bob Krueger subsequently returned home to run the family business, the Comal Hosiery Mills;

Whereas Bob Krueger began his career in public service in 1975, representing the 21st Congressional District of Texas in the House of Representatives until 1979;

Whereas, in 1979, Bob Krueger was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to serve as Ambassador-at-Large and Coordinate for Mexican Affairs at the Department of State until 1981;

Whereas Bob Krueger was elected to statewide office in 1991 and served as Railroad Commissioner of Texas until 1993;

Whereas, in January 1993, Bob Krueger was appointed to the United States Senate, where he served until June 1993;

Whereas, from 1994 to 1995, former Senator Krueger served as Ambassador to Burundi;

Whereas, while serving as Ambassador to Burundi, Bob Krueger witnessed the human rights abuses that occurred during the civil war in Rwanda and advocated for those human rights to be upheld;

Whereas, from 1996 to 1999, Bob Krueger served as Ambassador to Botswana;

Whereas, in 2000, after years of distinguished public service, Bob Krueger returned to Oxford as a research fellow;

Whereas Bob Krueger also taught at Rice University, the University of Texas at Austin, Texas Tech University, and Texas State University;

Whereas Bob Krueger was a kind person who was generous with his time to his students, friends, and family; and

Whereas, on April 30, 2022, at the age of 86, Bob Krueger died, leaving behind—

- (1) his wife, Kathleen Tobin;
- (2) his children, Mariana, Sarah, and Christian; and
- (3) his grandson, Brooks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—
(1) the Senate—

(A) honors the life and legacy of the late Robert “Bob” Charles Krueger (referred to in this resolution as “Bob Krueger”) for his—

- (i) accomplishments as—
- (I) a patriot; and
- (II) an example for future generations of leaders; and

(ii) dedication to Texas as a Senator, a member of the House of Representatives, an Ambassador, and a public servant; and

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

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

(ii) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Bob Krueger; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of Bob Krueger.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5571. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5572. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5573. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5574. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5575. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5576. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5577. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5578. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R.

7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5579. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5580. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5581. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KING, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5582. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5583. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5584. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5585. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5586. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5587. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5588. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5589. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5590. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5591. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5592. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5593. Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5594. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5595. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5596. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5597. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5598. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5599. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5600. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5601. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5602. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5603. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5604. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5605. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5571. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WITH PERSONS THAT HAVE BUSINESS OPERATIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION OR THE RUSSIAN ENERGY SECTOR.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract for the procurement of goods or services with any person that has business operations with—

(1) an authority of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) a fossil fuel company that operates in the Russian Federation, except if the fossil fuel company transports oil or gas—

(A) through the Russian Federation for sale outside of the Russian Federation; and

(B) that was extracted from a country other than the Russian Federation with respect to the energy sector of which the President has not imposed sanctions as of the date on which the contract is awarded.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE, DISASTER RELIEF, AND NATIONAL SECURITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under subsection (a) does not apply to a contract that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State jointly determine—

(i) is necessary for purposes of providing humanitarian assistance to the people of the Russian Federation;

(ii) is necessary for purposes of providing disaster relief and other urgent life-saving measures; or

(iii) is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

(B) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of any contract entered into on the basis of an exception under subparagraph (A).

(2) OFFICE OF FOREIGN ASSETS CONTROL LICENSES.—The prohibition under subsection (a) does not apply to a person that has a valid license to operate in the Russian Federation issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury or is otherwise authorized to operate notwithstanding the imposition of sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

(3) AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC MISSION IN RUSSIA.—The prohibition under subsection (a) does not apply to contracts related to the operation and maintenance of the consular offices and diplomatic posts of the United States Government in the Russian Federation.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any contract entered into on or after such date.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification in writing that contains a de-

termination of the President that the Russian Federation—

(1) has reached an agreement relating to the withdrawal of Russian forces from Ukraine and cessation of military hostilities in Ukraine that is accepted by the free and independent government of Ukraine;

(2) poses no immediate military threat of aggression to any member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(3) recognizes the right of the people of Ukraine to independently and freely choose their own government.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—The term “agency or instrumentality of the Government of the Russian Federation” means an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state as defined in section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code, with each reference in such section to “a foreign state” deemed to be a reference to “the Russian Federation”.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives.

(3) BUSINESS OPERATIONS.—The term “business operations” means the act of engaging in commerce in any form, including acquiring, developing, maintaining, owning, selling, possessing, leasing, or operating equipment, facilities, personnel, products, services, personal property, real property, or any other apparatus of business or commerce.

(4) FOSSIL FUEL COMPANY.—The term “fossil fuel company” means a person that—

(A) carries out oil, gas, or coal exploration, development, or production activities;

(B) processes or refines oil, gas, or coal; or

(C) transports, or constructs facilities for the transportation of, oil, gas, or coal.

(5) GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—The term “Government of the Russian Federation” includes the government of any political subdivision of the Russian Federation and any agency or instrumentality of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(6) PERSON.—The term “person” means—

(A) a natural person, corporation, company, business association, partnership, society, trust, or any other nongovernmental entity, organization, or group;

(B) a governmental entity or instrumentality of a government, including a multilateral development institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(3) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(3))); and

(C) a successor, subunit, parent entity, or subsidiary of, or an entity under common ownership or control with, an entity described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

SA 5572. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. EXTENSION OF CUSTOMS WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) TARIFF ACT OF 1930.—Section 401(j) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1401(j)) is amended—

(1) by striking “means, in the case” and inserting the following: “means—

“(1) in the case”;

(2) by striking “of the coast of the United States” and inserting “from the baselines of the United States (determined in accordance with international law)”;

(3) by striking “and, in the case” and inserting the following: “; and

“(2) in the case”;

(4) by striking “the waters within four leagues of the coast of the United States.” and inserting the following: “the waters within—

“(A) the territorial sea of the United States, to the limits permitted by international law in accordance with Presidential Proclamation 5928 of December 27, 1988; and

“(B) the contiguous zone of the United States, to the limits permitted by international law in accordance with Presidential Proclamation 7219 of September 2, 1999.”.

(b) ANTI-SMUGGLING ACT.—Section 401(c) of the Anti-Smuggling Act (19 U.S.C. 1709(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “means, in the case” and inserting the following: “means—

“(1) in the case”;

(2) by striking “of the coast of the United States” and inserting “from the baselines of the United States (determined in accordance with international law)”;

(3) by striking “and, in the case” and inserting the following: “; and

“(2) in the case”;

(4) by striking “the waters within four leagues of the coast of the United States.” and inserting the following: “the waters within—

“(A) the territorial sea of the United States, to the limits permitted by international law in accordance with Presidential Proclamation 5928 of December 27, 1988; and

“(B) the contiguous zone of the United States, to the limits permitted by international law in accordance with Presidential Proclamation 7219 of September 2, 1999.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 5573. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON AFGHANISTAN.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a joint select committee of Congress to be known as the “Joint Select Committee on Afghanistan” (in this section referred to as the “Joint Committee”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Joint Committee shall be composed of 12 members appointed pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) APPOINTMENT.—Members of the Joint Committee shall be appointed as follows:

(A) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(B) The minority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(C) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(D) The minority leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(3) CO-CHAIRS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Two of the appointed members of the Joint Committee shall serve as co-chairs. The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate shall jointly appoint one co-chair, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the Senate shall jointly appoint the second co-chair. The co-chairs shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) STAFF DIRECTOR.—The co-chairs, acting jointly, shall hire the staff director of the Joint Committee.

(4) DATE.—Members of the Joint Committee shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Joint Committee. Any vacancy in the Joint Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled not later than 14 calendar days after the date on which the vacancy occurs, in the same manner as the original designation was made. If a member of the Joint Committee ceases to be a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be, the member is no longer a member of the Joint Committee and a vacancy shall exist.

(C) INVESTIGATION AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee shall conduct an investigation and submit to Congress a report on the United States 2021 withdrawal from Afghanistan.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A summary of any intelligence reports that indicated an imminent threat at the Hamid Karzai International Airport preceding the deadly attack on August 26, 2021, and the risks to United States and allied country civilians as well as Afghan partners for various United States withdrawal scenarios.

(B) A summary of any intelligence reports that indicated that withdrawing military personnel and closing United States military installations in Afghanistan before evacuating civilians would negatively affect the evacuation of United States citizens, green card holders, and Afghan partners and thus put them at risk.

(C) A full review of planning by the National Security Council, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense for a noncombatant evacuation from Afghanistan, including details of all scenarios used by the Department of State or the Department of Defense to plan and prepare for noncombatant evacuation operations.

(D) An analysis of the relationship between the retrograde and noncombatant evacuation operation plans and operations.

(E) A description of any actions that were taken by the United States Government to protect the safety of United States forces and neutralize threats in any withdrawal scenarios.

(F) A full review of all withdrawal scenarios compiled by the intelligence community and the Department of Defense with timelines for the decisions taken, including all advice provided by military leaders to President Joseph R. Biden and his national security team beginning in January 2021.

(G) An analysis of why the withdrawal timeline expedited from the September 11, 2021, date set by President Biden earlier this year.

(H) An analysis of United States and allied intelligence shared with the Taliban.

(I) An analysis of any actions taken by the United States Government to proactively prepare for a successful withdrawal.

(J) A summary of intelligence that informed statements and assurances made to the American people that the Taliban would not take over Afghanistan with the speed that it did in August 2021.

(K) A full and unredacted transcript of the phone call between President Joe Biden and President Ashraf Ghani of Afghanistan on July 23, 2021.

(L) A summary of any documents, reports, or intelligence that indicates whether any members of the intelligence community, the United States Armed Forces, or NATO partners supporting the mission warned that the Taliban would swiftly reclaim Afghanistan.

(M) A description of the extent to which any members of the intelligence community, the United States Armed Forces, or NATO partners supporting the mission advised steps to be taken by the White House that were ultimately rejected.

(N) An assessment of the decision not to order a noncombatant evacuation operation until August 14, 2021.

(O) An assessment of whose advice the President heeded in maintaining the timeline and the status of forces on the ground before Thursday, August 12, 2021.

(P) A description of the initial views and advice of the United States Armed Forces and the intelligence community given to the National Security Council and the White House before the decisions were taken regarding closure of United States military installations, withdrawal of United States assets, and withdrawal of United States military personnel.

(Q) An assessment of United States assets, as well as any assets left behind by allies, that could now be used by the Taliban, ISIS-K, and other terrorist organizations operating within the region.

(R) An assessment of United States assets slated to be delivered to Afghanistan, if any, the delivery of which was paused because of the President's decision to withdraw, and the status of and plans for those assets now.

(S) An assessment of vetting procedures for Afghan civilians to be evacuated with a timeline for the decision making and ultimate decisions taken to ensure that no terrorist suspects, persons with ties to terrorists, or dangerous individuals would be admitted into third countries or the United States.

(T) An assessment of the discussions between the United States Government and allies supporting our efforts in Afghanistan and a timeline for decision making regarding the withdrawal of United States forces, including discussion and decisions about how to work together to repatriate all foreign nationals desiring to return to their home countries.

(U) A review of the policy decisions with timeline regarding all Afghan nationals and other refugees evacuated from Afghanistan by the United States Government and brought to third countries and the United States, including a report on what role the United States Armed Forces performed in vetting each individual and what coordina-

tion the Departments of State and Defense engaged in to safeguard members of the Armed Forces from infectious diseases and terrorist threats.

(3) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(d) MEETINGS.—

(1) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Joint Committee have been appointed, the Joint Committee shall hold its first meeting.

(2) FREQUENCY.—The Joint Committee shall meet at the call of the co-chairs.

(3) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Joint Committee shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(4) VOTING.—No proxy voting shall be allowed on behalf of the members of the Joint Committee.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To enable the Joint Committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties, there are authorized to be disbursed by the Senate the actual and necessary expenses of the Joint Committee approved by the co-chairs, subject to the rules and regulations of the Senate.

(2) EXPENSES.—In carrying out its functions, the Joint Committee is authorized to incur expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as the Joint Economic Committee is authorized by section 11 of Public Law 79-304 (15 U.S.C. 1024 (d)).

(3) HEARINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Joint Committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, require attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Joint Committee considers advisable.

(B) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRS.—

(i) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The co-chairs of the Joint Committee shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted, not less than 7 days in advance of such hearing, unless the co-chairs determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(ii) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the Joint Committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 2 calendar days before the appearance of the witness, unless the requirement is waived by the co-chairs, following their determination that there is good cause for failure to comply with such requirement.

(4) COOPERATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon written request of the co-chairs, a Federal agency shall provide technical assistance to the Joint Committee in order for the Joint Committee to carry out its duties.

(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the heads of the elements of the intelligence community, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the National Security Council shall expeditiously respond to requests for information related to compiling the report under subsection (c).

(f) STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The co-chairs of the Joint Committee may jointly appoint and fix the compensation of staff as they deem necessary, within the guidelines for employees of the Senate and following all applicable rules and employment requirements of the Senate.

(2) ETHICAL STANDARDS.—Members on the Joint Committee who serve in the House of

Representatives shall be governed by the ethics rules and requirements of the House. Members of the Senate who serve on the Joint Committee and staff of the Joint Committee shall comply with the ethics rules of the Senate.

(g) **TERMINATION.**—The Joint Committee shall terminate on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) **FUNDING.**—Funding for the Joint Committee shall be derived in equal portions from—

(1) the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriations account “Miscellaneous Items”, subject to the rules and regulations of the Senate.

SA 5574. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

Subtitle F—American Security Drone Act of 2022

SEC. 881. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “American Security Drone Act of 2022”.

SEC. 882. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COVERED FOREIGN ENTITY.**—The term “covered foreign entity” means an entity included on a list developed and maintained by the Federal Acquisition Security Council. This list will include entities in the following categories:

(A) An entity included on the Consolidated Screening List.

(B) Any entity that is subject to extrajudicial direction from a foreign government, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(C) Any entity the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Attorney General, Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense, determines poses a national security risk.

(D) Any entity domiciled in the People’s Republic of China or subject to influence or control by the Government of the People’s Republic of China or the Communist Party of the People’s Republic of China, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(E) Any subsidiary or affiliate of an entity described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(2) **COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.**—The term “covered unmanned aircraft system” has the meaning given the term “unmanned aircraft system” in section 44801 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 883. PROHIBITION ON PROCUREMENT OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided under subsections (b) through (f), the head of an executive agency may not procure any covered unmanned aircraft system that is manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity, which includes associated elements (consisting of communication links and the components that control the unmanned aircraft) that enable the operator to operate the air-

craft in the National Airspace System. The Federal Acquisition Security Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation, shall develop and update a list of associated elements.

(b) **EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General are exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement—

(1) is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of unmanned aircraft system or counter-unmanned aircraft system technology;

(2) is for the sole purposes of conducting counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities, protective missions, or Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations;

(3) is an unmanned aircraft system that, as procured or as modified after procurement but before operational use, can no longer transfer to, or download data from, a covered foreign entity and otherwise poses no national security cybersecurity risks as determined by the exempting official; and

(4) is required in the national interest of the United States.

(c) **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement is for research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis purposes carried out by the Department.

(d) **NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD EXEMPTION.**—The National Transportation Safety Board, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement is necessary for the sole purpose of conducting safety investigations.

(e) **NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION EXEMPTION.**—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement is necessary for the purpose of meeting NOAA’s science or management objectives.

(f) **WAIVER.**—The head of an executive agency may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis—

(1) with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the Federal Acquisition Security Council; and

(2) upon notification to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Reform in the House of Representatives; and

(C) other appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction.

SEC. 884. PROHIBITION ON OPERATION OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, no Federal department or agency may operate a covered unmanned aircraft system manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity.

(2) **APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTED SERVICES.**—The prohibition under paragraph (1) applies to any covered unmanned aircraft systems that are being used by any executive agency through the method of contracting for the services of covered unmanned aircraft systems.

(b) **EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and

the Attorney General are exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation—

(1) is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of an unmanned aircraft system or counter-unmanned aircraft system technology;

(2) is for the sole purposes of conducting counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities, protective missions, or Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations;

(3) is an unmanned aircraft system that, as procured or as modified after procurement but before operational use, can no longer transfer to, or download data from, a covered foreign entity and otherwise poses no national security cybersecurity risks as determined by the exempting official; and

(4) is required in the national interest of the United States.

(c) **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement is for research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis purposes carried out by the Department.

(d) **NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD EXEMPTION.**—The National Transportation Safety Board, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement is necessary for the sole purpose of conducting safety investigations.

(e) **NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION EXEMPTION.**—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement is necessary for the purpose of meeting NOAA’s science or management objectives.

(f) **WAIVER.**—The head of an executive agency may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis—

(1) with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the Federal Acquisition Security Council; and

(2) upon notification to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Reform in the House of Representatives; and

(C) other appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction.

(g) **REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General shall prescribe regulations or guidance to implement this section.

SEC. 885. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PURCHASES AND OPERATION OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), no Federal funds awarded through a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, or otherwise made available may be used—

(1) to purchase a covered unmanned aircraft system that is manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity; or

(2) in connection with the operation of such a drone or unmanned aircraft system.

(b) **EXEMPTION.**—A Federal department or agency is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if—

(1) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement was awarded prior to the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) the operation or purchase is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of an unmanned aircraft system or counter-unmanned aircraft system technology;

(3) the operation or purchase is for the sole purposes of conducting counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities, protective missions, or Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations;

(4) is an unmanned aircraft system that, as purchased or as modified after purchase but before operational use, can no longer transfer to, or download data from, a covered foreign entity and otherwise poses no national security cybersecurity risks as determined by the exempting official; and

(5) is required in the national interest of the United States.

(c) **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is for research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis purposes carried out by the Department deemed to support the safe, secure, or efficient operation of the National Airspace System or maintenance of public safety.

(d) **NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION EXEMPTION.**—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is necessary for the purpose of meeting NOAA's science or management objectives.

(e) **WAIVER.**—The head of an executive agency may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis—

(1) with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the Federal Acquisition Security Council; and

(2) upon notification to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Reform in the House of Representatives; and

(C) other appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction.

(f) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall prescribe regulations or guidance, as necessary, to implement the requirements of this section pertaining to Federal contracts.

SEC. 886. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GOVERNMENT-ISSUED PURCHASE CARDS TO PURCHASE COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

Effective immediately, Government-issued Purchase Cards may not be used to procure any covered unmanned aircraft system from a covered foreign entity.

SEC. 887. MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING INVENTORIES OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All executive agencies must account for existing inventories of covered unmanned aircraft systems manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity in their personal property accounting systems, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, regardless of the original procurement cost, or the purpose of procurement due to the special monitoring and accounting measures necessary to track the items' capabilities.

(b) **CLASSIFIED TRACKING.**—Due to the sensitive nature of missions and operations conducted by the United States Government, inventory data related to covered unmanned aircraft systems manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity may be tracked at a classified level.

(c) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, and Department of Transportation may exclude from the full inventory process, covered unmanned aircraft systems that are deemed expendable due to mission risk such as recovery issues or that are one-time-use covered unmanned aircraft due to requirements and low cost.

SEC. 888. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.

Not later than 275 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the amount of commercial off-the-shelf drones and covered unmanned aircraft systems procured by Federal departments and agencies from covered foreign entities.

SEC. 889. GOVERNMENT-WIDE POLICY FOR PROCUREMENT OF UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security, Department of Transportation, the Department of Justice, and other Departments as determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall establish a government-wide policy for the procurement of an unmanned aircraft system—

(1) for non-Department of Defense and non-intelligence community operations; and

(2) through grants and cooperative agreements entered into with non-Federal entities.

(b) **INFORMATION SECURITY.**—The policy developed under subsection (a) shall include the following specifications, which to the extent practicable, shall be based on industry standards and technical guidance from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, to address the risks associated with processing, storing, and transmitting Federal information in an unmanned aircraft system:

(1) Protections to ensure controlled access to an unmanned aircraft system.

(2) Protecting software, firmware, and hardware by ensuring changes to an unmanned aircraft system are properly managed, including by ensuring an unmanned aircraft system can be updated using a secure, controlled, and configurable mechanism.

(3) Cryptographically securing sensitive collected, stored, and transmitted data, including proper handling of privacy data and other controlled unclassified information.

(4) Appropriate safeguards necessary to protect sensitive information, including during and after use of an unmanned aircraft system.

(5) Appropriate data security to ensure that data is not transmitted to or stored in non-approved locations.

(6) The ability to opt out of the uploading, downloading, or transmitting of data that is not required by law or regulation and an ability to choose with whom and where information is shared when it is required.

(c) **REQUIREMENT.**—The policy developed under subsection (a) shall reflect an appropriate risk-based approach to information security related to use of an unmanned aircraft system.

(d) **REVISION OF ACQUISITION REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date

on which the policy required under subsection (a) is issued—

(1) the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation, as necessary, to implement the policy; and

(2) any Federal department or agency or other Federal entity not subject to, or not subject solely to, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall revise applicable policy, guidance, or regulations, as necessary, to implement the policy.

(e) **EXEMPTION.**—In developing the policy required under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) incorporate policies to implement the exemptions contained in this subtitle; and

(2) incorporate an exemption to the policy in the case of a head of the procuring department or agency determining, in writing, that no product that complies with the information security requirements described in subsection (b) is capable of fulfilling mission critical performance requirements, and such determination—

(A) may not be delegated below the level of the Deputy Secretary, or Administrator, of the procuring department or agency;

(B) shall specify—

(i) the quantity of end items to which the waiver applies and the procurement value of those items; and

(ii) the time period over which the waiver applies, which shall not exceed three years;

(C) shall be reported to the Office of Management and Budget following issuance of such a determination; and

(D) not later than 30 days after the date on which the determination is made, shall be provided to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 890. STATE, LOCAL, TERRITORIAL, AND TRIBAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AND EMERGENCY SERVICE EXEMPTION.

(a) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subtitle shall prevent a State, local, territorial, or Tribal law enforcement or emergency service agency from procuring or operating a covered unmanned aircraft system purchased with non-Federal dollars.

(b) **CONTINUITY OF ARRANGEMENTS.**—The Federal Government may continue entering into contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements or other Federal funding instruments with State, local, territorial, or Tribal law enforcement or emergency service agencies under which a covered unmanned aircraft system will be purchased or operated if the agency has received approval or waiver to purchase or operate a covered unmanned aircraft system pursuant to section 885.

SEC. 891. STUDY.

(a) **STUDY ON THE SUPPLY CHAIN FOR UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the supply chain for covered unmanned aircraft systems, including a discussion of current and projected future demand for covered unmanned aircraft systems.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the current and future global and domestic market for covered unmanned aircraft systems that are not widely commercially available except from a covered foreign entity.

(B) A description of the sustainability, availability, cost, and quality of secure sources of covered unmanned aircraft systems domestically and from sources in allied and partner countries.

(C) The plan of the Secretary of Defense to address any gaps or deficiencies identified in subparagraph (B), including through the use of funds available under the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.) and partnerships with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other interested persons.

(D) Such other information as the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment determines to be appropriate.

(3) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section the term “appropriate congressional committees” means:

(A) The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 892. SUNSET.

Sections 883, 884, and 885 shall cease to have effect on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 5575. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . ANNUITY SUPPLEMENT.

Section 8421a(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “as an air traffic” and inserting the following: “as an—

“(1) air traffic”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) air traffic controller pursuant to a contract made with the Secretary of Transportation under section 47124 of title 49.”.

SA 5576. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. PROCESS FOR EXCLUSIONS FROM DUTIES UNDER SECTION 301 OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974.

Section 305 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2415) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **PROCESS OF ISSUING EXCLUSIONS FROM DUTIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Trade Representative shall establish and maintain a process for—

“(A) issuing exclusions from duties imposed under section 301 for articles subject to such duties; and

“(B) renewing such exclusions in a timely manner.

“(2) **PRODUCT-WIDE APPLICATION.**—An exclusion issued or renewed under paragraph (1) with respect to an article shall apply without regard to the importer of the article.”.

SA 5577. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 575. BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENT SCHOOLS.

(a) **BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each covered local educational agency and each Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, shall have in effect policies and procedures that—

(1) require that a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee of the agency or school, respectively, that includes—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (34 U.S.C. 20921);

(2) prohibit the employment of a school employee as a school employee at the agency or school, respectively, if such employee—

(A) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under paragraph (1);

(B) makes a false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(i) murder;

(ii) child abuse or neglect;

(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

(iv) spousal abuse;

(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

(vi) kidnapping;

(vii) arson; or

(viii) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed on or after the date that is 5 years before the date of such employee’s criminal background check under paragraph (1); or

(D) has been convicted of any other crime that is a violent or sexual crime against a minor;

(3) require that each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be peri-

odically repeated or updated in accordance with policies established by the covered local educational agency or the Department of Defense (in the case of a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code);

(4) upon request, provide each school employee who has had a criminal background check under paragraph (1) with a copy of the results of the criminal background check;

(5) provide for a timely process, by which a school employee of the school or agency may appeal, but which does not permit the employee to be employed as a school employee during such appeal, the results of a criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) which prohibit the employee from being employed as a school employee under paragraph (2) to—

(A) challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information produced by such criminal background check; and

(B) establish or reestablish eligibility to be hired or reinstated as a school employee by demonstrating that the information is materially inaccurate or incomplete, and has been corrected; and

(6) allow the covered local educational agency or school, as the case may be, to share the results of a school employee’s criminal background check recently conducted under paragraph (1) with another local educational agency that is considering such school employee for employment as a school employee.

(b) **FEEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—The Attorney General, attorney general of a State, or other State law enforcement official may charge reasonable fees for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1), but such fees shall not exceed the actual costs for the processing and administration of the criminal background check.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The term “covered local educational agency” means a local educational agency that receives funds under subsection (b) or (d) of section 7003, or section 7007, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703, 7707).

(2) **SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.**—The term “school employee” means—

(A) a person who—

(i) is an employee of, or is seeking employment with—

(I) a covered local educational agency; or

(II) a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, such elementary and secondary school; and

(ii) as a result of such employment, has (or will have) a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students; or

(B)(i) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services to a covered local educational agency or a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code; and

(ii) such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students.

SA 5578. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and

intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TREATMENT OF EXEMPTIONS UNDER FARA.

(a) **LIMITATION ON EXEMPTIONS.**—Section 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 613), is amended, in the matter preceding subsection (a), by inserting “, except that the exemptions under subsections (d)(1) and (h) shall not apply to any agent of a foreign principal that is listed as a foreign adversary (as defined in section 8(c) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1607(c))) in accordance with that Act” before the colon.

(b) **NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM MODIFICATION.**—Section 8(a) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1607(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **INFORMATION ON FOREIGN ADVERSARIES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the Secretary of Commerce shall periodically submit to the Attorney General a list of, and any relevant information relating to, each foreign adversary identified for purposes of the program established under paragraph (1).”

SA 5579. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PURCHASE OF RETIRED HANDGUNS BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) the term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given that term in section 115(c)(1) of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the term “handgun” has the meaning given that term in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code; and

(3) the term “retired handgun” means any handgun that has been declared surplus by the applicable agency.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—A Federal law enforcement officer may purchase a retired handgun from the Federal agency that issued the handgun to such officer.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—A Federal law enforcement officer may purchase a retired handgun under subsection (b) if—

(1) the purchase is made during the 6-month period beginning on the date the handgun was so retired; and

(2) the officer is not prohibited from possessing or receiving the handgun under the laws of the United States or the laws of the State, territory, or possession of the United States in which the officer resides.

(d) **COST.**—A handgun purchased under this section shall be sold at the fair market value for such handgun taking into account the age and condition of the handgun.

(e) **POLICY GUIDANCE.**—The Administrator of General Services shall develop policies to facilitate the sale and disposition of eligible handguns under this section consistent with section 922 of title 18, United States Code.

SA 5580. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 357. USE OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR REMOVAL OF MUNITIONS AND EXPLOSIVES OF CONCERN IN GUAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may use amounts available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance to remove munitions and explosives of concern from military installations in Guam.

(b) **MONITORING OF REMOVAL.**—The Secretary shall monitor and assess the removal by the Department of munitions and explosives of concern from military installations in Guam and shall constantly update processes for such removal to mitigate any issues relating to such removal.

(c) **REPORT ON AMOUNTS NECESSARY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report indicating the amounts necessary to conduct removal of munitions and explosives of concern from military installations in Guam.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **MUNITIONS AND EXPLOSIVES OF CONCERN.**—The term “munitions and explosives of concern” has the meaning given that term in section 179.3 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulations.

SA 5581. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KING, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe mili-

tary personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 829. EMERGENCY ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.
Section 3204 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) the head of the agency—

“(A) determines that the use of procedures other than competitive procedures is necessary to—

“(i) replenish United States stockpiles with like defense articles when those stockpiles are diminished as a result of the United States providing defense articles in response to an armed attack, by a foreign adversary of the United States (as that term is defined in section 8(c) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1607(c))) against—

“(I) a United States ally (as that term is defined in section 201(d) of the Act of December 2, 1942, entitled, ‘To provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes’ (56 Stat. 1028, chapter 668; 42 U.S.C. 1711(d))); or

“(II) a United States partner; or

“(ii) to contract for the movement or delivery of defense articles transferred to such ally or partner through the President’s draw-down authorities in connection with such response;

provided that the United States is not a party to the hostilities; and

“(B) submits to the congressional defense committees written notification of the use of such procedures within one week after such use.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “and (7)” and inserting “(7), and (8)”.

SA 5582. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 916. CLARIFICATION OF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FORCE MODERNIZATION EFFORTS OF THE ARMY.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan that comprehensively defines the roles and responsibilities of officials and organizations of the Army with respect to the force modernization efforts of the Army.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify the official within the Army who shall have primary responsibility for the force modernization efforts of the Army, and

specify the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of that official;

(2) clearly define the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of the Army Futures Command and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology with respect to such efforts;

(3) clarify the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of officials and organizations of the Army with respect to acquisition in support of such efforts; and

(4) include such other information as the Secretary of the Army determines appropriate.

(c) **ROLE OF ARMY FUTURES COMMAND.**—In the event the Secretary of the Army does not submit the plan required under subsection (a) by the expiration of the 180-day period specified in such subsection, then beginning at the expiration of such period—

(1) the Commanding General of the Army Futures Command shall have the roles, responsibilities, and authorities assigned to the Commanding General pursuant to Army Directive 2020-15 (“Achieving Persistent Modernization”) as in effect on November 16, 2020; and

(2) any provision of Army Directive 2022-07 (“Army Modernization Roles and Responsibilities”), or any successor directive, that modifies or contravenes a provision of the directive specified in paragraph (1) shall have no force or effect.

SA 5583. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. PROTECTING AMERICA FROM NARCOTICS AND ILLICIT CHEMICALS.

(a) **SHORT TITLES.**—This section may be cited as the “Protecting America from Narcotics and Illicit Chemicals Act of 2022” or the “PANIC Act of 2022”.

(b) **MODIFIED DEFINITION OF MAJOR ILLICIT DRUG PRODUCING COUNTRY.**—Section 481(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by adding “or” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: “(E) that is a significant direct source of covered synthetic drugs, psychotropic drugs, or other controlled substances, including precursor chemicals, when those precursor chemicals are used in the production of such drugs and substances, significantly affecting the United States;”;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) the term ‘covered synthetic drug’ means—

“(A) a synthetic controlled substance (as defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6))), including fentanyl or a fentanyl analogue; or

“(B) a new psychoactive substance.”.

SA 5584. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1239. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE SALE, SUPPLY, OR TRANSFER OF GOLD TO OR FROM RUSSIA.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically as necessary thereafter, the President—

(1) shall submit to Congress a report identifying foreign persons that knowingly participated in a significant transaction—

(A) for the sale, supply, or transfer (including transportation) of gold, directly or indirectly, to or from the Russian Federation or the Government of the Russian Federation, including from reserves of the Central Bank of the Russian Federation held outside the Russian Federation; or

(B) that otherwise involved gold in which the Government of the Russian Federation had any interest; and

(2) shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b)(1) with respect to each such person; and

(3) may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b)(2) with respect to any such person that is an alien.

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required by subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) may be—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) may be subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) **IMMEDIATE EFFECT.**—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect pursuant to section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)); and

(II) cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien’s possession.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.**—

(1) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sec-

tions 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this section or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this section shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) **NATIONAL INTEREST WAIVER.**—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States; and

(2) submits to Congress a notification of the waiver and the reasons for the waiver.

(e) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the requirement to impose sanctions under this section, and any sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to Congress that—

(i) the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased its destabilizing activities with respect to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine; and

(ii) such termination in the national interests of the United States.

(2) **TRANSITION RULES.**—

(A) **CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES.**—Any authorities exercised before the termination date under paragraph (1) to impose sanctions with respect to a foreign person under this section may continue to be exercised on and after that date if the President determines that the continuation of those authorities is in the national interests of the United States.

(B) **APPLICATION TO ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS.**—The termination date under paragraph (1) shall not apply to any investigation of a civil or criminal violation of this section or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this section, or the imposition of a civil or criminal penalty for such a violation, if—

(i) the violation occurred before the termination date; or

(ii) the person involved in the violation continues to be subject to sanctions pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(f) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(1) **EXCEPTIONS FOR AUTHORIZED INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—This section shall not apply with respect to activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence or law enforcement activities of the United States.

(2) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.**—Sanctions under subsection (b)(2) may not apply with respect to the admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with the obligations of the United States under the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other international obligations.

(3) **HUMANITARIAN EXEMPTION.**—The President shall not impose sanctions under this

section with respect to any person for conducting or facilitating a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices or for the provision of humanitarian assistance.

(4) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The requirement or authority to impose sanctions under this section shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The terms “admission”, “admitted”, “alien”, and “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) The term “foreign person” means an individual or entity that is not a United States person.

(3) The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(4) The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States;

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity; or

(C) any person in the United States.

SA 5585. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1239. UNITED STATES EFFORTS WITH RESPECT TO WAR CRIMES AND OTHER ATROCITIES COMMITTED DURING RUSSIAN INVASION OF UKRAINE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in its premeditated, unprovoked, unjustified, and unlawful full-scale invasion of Ukraine that commenced on February 24, 2022, the military of the Government of the Russian Federation under the direction of President Vladimir Putin has committed war crimes that include—

(A) the deliberate targeting of civilians and injuring or killing of noncombatants;

(B) the deliberate targeting and attacking of hospitals, schools, and other non-military buildings dedicated to religion, art, science, or charitable purposes, such as the bombing of a theater in Mariupol that served as a shelter for noncombatants and had the word “children” written clearly in the Russian language outside;

(C) the indiscriminate bombardment of undefended dwellings and buildings;

(D) the wanton destruction of property not justified by military necessity;

(E) unlawful civilian deportations;

(F) the taking of hostages; and

(G) rape, or sexual assault or abuse;

(2) the use of chemical weapons by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine would constitute a war crime, and engaging in any military preparations to use chemical weapons or to develop, produce, stockpile, or retain chemical weapons is prohibited by the Chemical Weapons Convention, to which the Russian Federation is a signatory;

(3) Vladimir Putin has a long record of committing acts of aggression, systematic abuses of human rights, and acts that constitute war crimes or other atrocities both at home and abroad, and the brutality and scale of these actions, including in the Russian Federation republic of Chechnya, Georgia, Syria, and Ukraine, demonstrate the extent to which his regime is willing to flout international norms and values in the pursuit of its objectives;

(4) Vladimir Putin has previously sanctioned the use of chemical weapons at home and abroad, including in the poisonings of Russian spy turned double agent Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia and leading Russian opposition figure Aleksey Navalny, and aided and abetted the use of chemical weapons by President Bashar al-Assad in Syria; and

(5) in 2014, the Government of the Russian Federation initiated its unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine which resulted in its illegal occupation of Crimea, the unrecognized declaration of independence by the so-called “Donetsk People’s Republic” and “Luhansk People’s Republic” by Russia-backed proxies, and numerous human rights violations and deaths of civilians in Ukraine.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to collect, analyze, and preserve evidence and information related to war crimes and other atrocities committed during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine that began on February 24, 2022, for use in appropriate domestic, foreign, and international courts and tribunals prosecuting those responsible for such crimes;

(2) to help deter the commission of war crimes and other atrocities in Ukraine by publicizing to the maximum possible extent, including among Russian and other foreign military commanders and troops in Ukraine, efforts to identify and prosecute those responsible for the commission of war crimes during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine that began on February 24, 2022; and

(3) to continue efforts to identify, deter, and pursue accountability for war crimes and other atrocities committed around the world and by other perpetrators, and to leverage international cooperation and best practices in this regard with respect to the current situation in Ukraine.

(c) REPORT ON UNITED STATES EFFORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and consistent with the protection of intelligence sources and methods, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report, which may include a classified annex, describing in detail the following:

(1) United States Government efforts to collect, analyze, and preserve evidence and information related to war crimes and other atrocities committed during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine since February 24, 2022, including a description of—

(A) the respective roles of various agencies, departments, and offices, and the inter-

agency mechanism established for the coordination of such efforts;

(B) the types of information and evidence that are being collected, analyzed, and preserved to help identify those responsible for the commission of war crimes or other atrocities during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022; and

(C) steps taken to coordinate with, and support the work of, allies, partners, international institutions and organizations, and nongovernmental organizations in such efforts.

(2) Media, public diplomacy, and information operations to make Russian military commanders, troops, political leaders, and the Russian people aware of efforts to identify and prosecute those responsible for the commission of war crimes or other atrocities during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022, and of the types of acts that may be prosecutable.

(3) The process for a domestic, foreign, or international court or tribunal to request and obtain from the United States Government information related to war crimes or other atrocities committed during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) ATROCITIES.—The term “atrocities” has the meaning given that term in section 6(2) of the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-441; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

(3) WAR CRIME.—The term “war crime” has the meaning given that term in section 2441(c) of title 18, United States Code.

SA 5586. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1239. STRATEGY TO COUNTER RUSSIAN ENERGY INFLUENCE GLOBALLY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall submit to Congress a report evaluating how Federal laws and authorities available as of the date of the enactment of this Act can be used to counter Russian energy influence globally.

(b) STRATEGY.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include a strategy to reduce or replace the Russian Federation’s supply of energy products in global markets, including a plan for cooperation and coordination with United States allies and partners to counter Russian energy influence.

SA 5587. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. STUDY OF THE PROGRAMS, ACQUISITIONS, AND BUDGET OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into an arrangement with a federally funded research and development center under which the center will—

(1) conduct a study of the programs, acquisitions, and budget of the Department of Defense; and

(2) make recommendations with respect to how the Department can ensure that program development cycles and acquisition of new technologies within the Department can best keep pace with the increasing rate at which technologies acquired for programs of the Department become outdated or are replaced by new technologies.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study required by subsection (a).

SA 5588. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 601, strike lines 6 and 7 and insert the following:

striking “fiscal year 2022” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2023 through 2030”.

SA 5589. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. EXCLUSION OF IMPOSITION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT QUOTAS FROM PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITIES UNDER INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT.

Section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c)(1) The authority granted to the President by this section does not include the authority to impose duties or tariff-rate quotas or (subject to paragraph (2)) other quotas on articles entering the United States.

“(2) The limitation under paragraph (1) does not prohibit the President from excluding all articles, or all of a certain type of article, imported from a country from entering the United States.”.

SA 5590. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ANTI-PERSONNEL LANDMINE REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (g), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2023 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the purpose of implementing the activities described in subsection (b) until the date on which the Secretary of Defense provides to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives—

(1) the certification described in subsection (c);

(2) the report on the results of the assessment under subsection (d); and

(3) the report under subsection (e).

(b) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The activities described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Development, production, or acquisition of anti-personnel landmines.

(2) Employment of anti-personnel landmines by the United States Armed Forces.

(3) Export or transfer of anti-personnel landmines to allied or partner countries or other third parties.

(4) Assistance, encouragement, or inducement of allied and partner country military activities related to anti-personnel landmines, including acquisition, deployment, or employment of anti-personnel landmines.

(5) Destruction, or redeployment for purposes of destruction, of anti-personnel landmines.

(6) Removal of anti-personnel landmines from existing in-theater munitions warstocks or afloat pre-positioned warstocks.

(c) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—The certification described in this subsection is a certification by the Secretary that implementation of the changes to the United States Anti-Personnel Landmine Policy announced on June 21, 2022, would not inhibit United States or allied or partner country capabili-

ties to delay, degrade, and deny armed seizure of allied or partner country territory, in particular the seizure of North Atlantic Treaty Organization territory by the Russian Federation and the seizure of Taiwan by the People’s Republic of China.

(d) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall direct a federally funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the role of anti-personnel landmines, on their own or in combination with other types of mines, such as anti-tank mines, to delay, degrade, and deny armed territorial seizure, in particular the seizure of North Atlantic Treaty Organization territory by the Russian Federation and the seizure of Taiwan by the People’s Republic of China.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) The role anti-personnel landmines may be able to play in supporting efforts by the United States Armed Forces and the military forces of allied and partner countries in delaying, degrading, or denying aggression by the Russian Federation or the People’s Republic of China, including by—

(i) impeding enemy mobility;

(ii) forcing enemy movement in directions that permit friendly forces to more effectively engage and destroy enemy forces;

(iii) alerting defenders to enemy approach or infiltration and delaying or preventing dismounted infantry or insurgent attacks;

(iv) protecting anti-tank mines from enemy tampering or rapid breaching;

(v) providing rear-area protection for operational bases and combat support and logistics units; and

(vi) providing protection for smaller, lighter forces during the early stages of forced entry operations.

(B) The ability of weapons other than anti-personnel landmines to achieve similar operational effects as anti-personnel landmines in support of United States and allied and partner country force requirements at similar or reduced costs relative to anti-personnel and anti-tank landmines.

(C) The costs associated with the changes to the United States Anti-Personnel Landmine Policy announced on June 21, 2022, relative to maintaining the Department of Defense Anti-Personnel Landmine Policy issued on January 31, 2020.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the findings of the assessment required by paragraph (1).

(B) FORM.—The report required by this paragraph shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report detailing the process by which the comprehensive policy review described in the changes to the United States Anti-Personnel Landmine Policy announced on June 21, 2022, was conducted, including—

(A) the findings of such comprehensive policy review;

(B) a description of the analytical process and research methodology used for such comprehensive policy review; and

(C) a description of the role of, and the comments and perspectives provided by, the Secretary, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, the Commander of the United States

European Command, the Commander of the United States Indo-Pacific Command, the Commander of the United States Central Command, the Commander of the United States Africa Command, and the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command during such comprehensive policy review.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(f) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2023 for the Department of Defense by this Act, \$300,000 shall be made available to carry out the reports under subsections (d)(3) and (e).

(g) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to the deactivation, dismantlement, or retiring of anti-personnel landmine ordnance and components for the express purpose of safety and sustainment.

SA 5591. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2825. BRIEFING ON FUNDING NEEDED TO ENSURE QUALITY HOUSING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMY.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a briefing on the amount of additional military construction funding needed by the Department of the Army to ensure quality housing for members of the Army.

SA 5592. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1254. ASYMMETRIC DEFENSE CAPABILITIES OF TAIWAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense has warned that the Government of the People's Republic of China may conclude that it can successfully invade and seize control of Taiwan in the latter half of the 2020s.

(2) In October 2021, the Minister of National Defense of Taiwan, Chiu Kuo-cheng, echoed these warnings when he stated that the People's Republic of China—

(A) “is capable now” of invading Taiwan; and

(B) will have “lowered the costs and losses” associated with invading Taiwan “to a minimum” after 2025.

(3) If the People's Republic of China were to invade and seize control of Taiwan, it would deal a severe blow to United States interests by—

(A) destroying one of the world's leading democracies;

(B) casting doubt on the ability and resolve of the United States to uphold its security commitments;

(C) incentivizing other countries in the Indo-Pacific region to bandwagon with the People's Republic of China; and

(D) facilitating the formation of a regional order dominated by the People's Republic of China in which the Government of the People's Republic of China may—

(i) regulate or otherwise limit the ability of individuals in the United States to trade in the Indo-Pacific region, which would have dire effects on the livelihoods and freedoms of such individuals; and

(ii) use the Indo-Pacific region as a secure base from which to project military power into other regions, including the Western Hemisphere.

(4) Taiwan's proximity to the People's Republic of China, coupled with investments by the People's Republic of China in capabilities designed to delay intervention by the United States Armed Forces in support of Taiwan, means that Taiwan may be forced to delay, degrade, and deny an invasion by the People's Republic of China with limited support from the United States Armed Forces for the initial days, weeks, or months of such an invasion.

(5) If Taiwan is unable to delay, degrade, and deny an invasion by the People's Republic of China with limited support from the United States Armed Forces, especially in the initial period of war, then the People's Republic of China may conclude that it is, or may actually be, capable of—

(A) invading and seizing control of Taiwan before the United States or any other partner country of Taiwan is able to respond effectively, thereby achieving a fait accompli; and

(B) potentially rendering any attempt by the United States or any other partner country of Taiwan to reverse territorial gains by the People's Republic of China prohibitively difficult, costly, or both.

(6) To defend itself effectively, especially in the initial period of war, it is imperative that Taiwan accelerate deployment of cost-effective and resilient asymmetric defense capabilities, including mobile coastal and air defenses, naval mines, missile boats, man-portable anti-armor weapons, civil defense forces, and their enablers.

(7) The deployment of such asymmetric defense capabilities by Taiwan would not only improve the ability of Taiwan to defend itself, but also reduce operational risk to members of the United States Armed Forces under a Taiwan contingency.

(8) The President of Taiwan, Tsai Ing-Wen, has—

(A) vowed to bolster the national defense of Taiwan and demonstrate Taiwan's determination to defend itself so as to ensure that Taiwan will not be forced to take the path that the People's Republic of China has laid out for Taiwan; and

(B) advocated the deployment of asymmetric defense capabilities.

(9) The Government of Taiwan has begun taking steps to improve Taiwan's defenses, including by increasing Taiwan's defense budget and through Taiwan's new proposed special defense budget, but far more is needed, and quickly, to ensure that Taiwan is able to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the threat of an invasion of Taiwan by the People's Republic of China is increasing rapidly and expected to reach especially dangerous levels by the latter half of the 2020s;

(2) the United States has a strong interest in preventing the People's Republic of China from invading and seizing control of Taiwan, especially by ensuring that Taiwan is able to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability;

(3) the United States should establish a security assistance initiative so as to accelerate, to the greatest extent possible, Taiwan's deployment of cost-effective and resilient asymmetric defense capabilities;

(4) the United States should provide such assistance on the condition that Taiwan—

(A) matches investments by the United States in its asymmetric defense capabilities;

(B) increases its defense spending to a level commensurate with the threat it faces;

(C) prioritizes acquiring cost-effective and resilient asymmetric defense capabilities as rapidly as possible, including from foreign suppliers, if necessary; and

(D) demonstrates progress on defense reforms required to maximize the effectiveness of its asymmetric defenses, with special regard to Taiwan's reserve forces; and

(5) in the course of executing such a security assistance initiative, the United States should—

(A) seek to co-produce or co-develop cost-effective and resilient asymmetric defense capabilities with suppliers in Taiwan, including by providing incentives to that effect, so long as those suppliers can produce such capabilities at a reasonable cost, in the quantities required, as rapidly, and to the same quality and technical standards as suppliers in the United States or other countries; and

(B) encourage other countries, particularly United States allies and partners, to sell, lease, or otherwise provide appropriate asymmetric defense capabilities to Taiwan so as to facilitate Taiwan's rapid deployment of the asymmetric defense capabilities required to deter or, if necessary, defeat an invasion by the People's Republic of China.

(c) TAIWAN SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an initiative, to be known as the “Taiwan Security Assistance Initiative” (referred to in this subsection as the “Initiative”), to accelerate Taiwan's deployment of asymmetric defense capabilities required to deter or, if necessary, defeat an invasion by the People's Republic of China.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000,000 for the Department of Defense for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to provide assistance to the Government of Taiwan under this subsection.

(3) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall use the funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) to provide assistance to the Government of Taiwan for the purpose described in paragraph (4).

(4) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Initiative is to provide assistance, including equipment, training, and other support, to the Government of Taiwan so as to accelerate Taiwan's deployment of asymmetric defense capabilities required to achieve, with limited support from the United States Armed Forces for the initial days, weeks, or months after the initiation of an invasion by the People's Republic of China of Taiwan, the following objectives:

(A) To delay, degrade, and deny attempts by People's Liberation Army forces to enter

or transit the Taiwan Strait and adjoining seas.

(B) To delay, degrade, and deny attempts by People's Liberation Army forces to secure a lodgment on Taiwan and expand or otherwise use that lodgment to seize control of a population center or other key territory in Taiwan.

(C) To prevent the People's Republic of China from decapitating, seizing control of, or otherwise neutralizing or rendering ineffective the Government of Taiwan.

(5) **ASYMMETRIC DEFENSE CAPABILITIES.**—In this section, the term "asymmetric defense capabilities" includes, in such quantities as the Secretary of Defense determines to be necessary to achieve the purpose specified in paragraph (4), the following:

(A) Mobile, ground-based coastal defense cruise missiles and launchers.

(B) Mobile, ground-based short-range and medium-range air defense systems.

(C) Smart, self-propelled naval mines and coastal minelaying platforms.

(D) Missile boats and fast-attack craft equipped with anti-ship and anti-landing craft missiles.

(E) Unmanned aerial and other mobile, resilient surveillance systems to support coastal and air defense operations.

(F) Equipment to support target location, tracking, identification, and targeting, especially at the local level, in communications degraded or denied environments.

(G) Man-portable anti-armor weapons, mortars, and small arms for ground combat operations.

(H) Equipment and technical assistance for the purpose of developing civil defense forces, composed of civilian volunteers and militia.

(I) Training and equipment, including appropriate war reserves, required for Taiwan forces to independently maintain, sustain, and employ capabilities described in subparagraphs (A) through (H).

(J) Concept development for coastal defense, air defense, decentralized command and control, civil defense, logistics, planning, and other critical military functions, with an emphasis on operations in a communications degraded or denied environment.

(K) Any other capability the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for the purpose described in paragraph (4).

(6) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—

(A) **PLAN.**—Not later than December 1, 2022, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a plan for using funds authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (2) for the purpose specified in paragraph (4).

(B) **INITIAL CERTIFICATION.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (2) for fiscal year 2023 may not be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies that the Government of Taiwan has committed—

(i) to spending an equivalent amount on asymmetric defense capabilities in fiscal year 2023;

(ii) to spending not less than three percent of Taiwan's national gross domestic product on defense on an annual basis by the end of fiscal year 2027, including expenditures under the normal defense budget and any supplemental or special defense budgets of Taiwan;

(iii) to acquiring asymmetric defense capabilities as rapidly as possible, including from suppliers in the United States or other countries, if the Secretary of Defense determines that such suppliers will be able to provide such capabilities at a reasonable cost, in sufficient quantities, of sufficient quality and

technical standards, and more rapidly than suppliers in Taiwan; and

(iv) to undertaking the defense reforms required to maximize the effectiveness of an asymmetric defense against an invasion by the People's Republic of China, including by improving organization, mobilization, and training of the reserve forces and other military personnel of Taiwan.

(C) **SUBSEQUENT CERTIFICATIONS.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (2) for each of fiscal years 2024, 2025, 2026, and 2027 may not be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies that the Government of Taiwan has committed—

(i) to spending an equivalent amount on asymmetric defense capabilities in the applicable fiscal year and upheld its commitment to spend an equivalent amount as the United States in the preceding fiscal year on asymmetric defense capabilities to be deployed by Taiwan;

(ii) to spending not less than three percent of Taiwan's national gross domestic product on defense on an annual basis by the end of fiscal year 2027, including expenditures under the normal defense budget and any supplemental or special defense budgets of Taiwan, and demonstrated progress toward that spending target in the preceding fiscal year;

(iii) to acquiring asymmetric defense capabilities as rapidly as possible, including from suppliers in the United States or other countries, if the Secretary of Defense determines that such suppliers will be able to provide such capabilities at reasonable cost, in sufficient quantities, of sufficient quality and technical standards, and more rapidly than suppliers in Taiwan, and upheld its commitment to acquire asymmetric defense capabilities as rapidly as possible in the preceding fiscal year; and

(iv) to undertaking the defense reforms required to maximize the effectiveness of an asymmetric defense against an invasion by the People's Republic of China, including by improving the organization, mobilization, and training of the reserve forces and other military personnel of Taiwan, and demonstrated progress on such reforms in the preceding fiscal year.

(D) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after making a certification under subparagraph (B) or (C), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice and explanation of such certification.

(E) **REMAINING FUNDS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), amounts appropriated for a fiscal year pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under paragraph (2) that are not obligated and expended during that fiscal year shall be added to the amount that may be used for the Initiative in the subsequent fiscal year.

(ii) **RESCISSION.**—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriation under paragraph (2) that remain unobligated by the end of fiscal year 2027 shall be rescinded and deposited into the general fund of the Treasury.

(7) **DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES FROM UNITED STATES INVENTORY AND OTHER SOURCES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to assistance provided pursuant to paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may make available to the Government of Taiwan, in such quantities as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for the purpose described in paragraph (4), the following:

(i) Weapons and other defense articles from the United States inventory and other sources.

(ii) Excess defense articles from the United States inventory.

(iii) Defense services.

(B) **REPLACEMENT.**—Amounts for the replacement of any item provided to the Government of Taiwan under subparagraph (A)(i) may be made available from the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (2).

(8) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Assistance may not be provided under this subsection after September 30, 2027.

(d) **LIMITATION ON CONVENTIONAL ARMS SALES.**—

(1) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) historically, the Government of Taiwan has prioritized the acquisition of conventional weapons that would be of limited utility in deterring or defeating an invasion by the People's Republic of China at the expense of the timely acquisition of cost-effective and resilient asymmetric defense capabilities;

(B) the United States Government has often shared responsibility for the misguided prioritization of defense acquisitions described in subparagraph (A) by approving sales of conventional weapons to Taiwan, despite knowledge that such sales would do little to enhance, and may even undermine, the ability of Taiwan to deter or defeat an invasion by the People's Republic of China;

(C) the misguided prioritization of defense acquisitions described in subparagraph (A) has not only undermined the ability of Taiwan to deter or defeat an invasion by the People's Republic of China, but has also placed at greater risk of death or injury members of the United States Armed Forces who may come under attack or be asked to come to the aid of Taiwan to repel such an invasion; and

(D) any future sales, leases, or other provision of conventional weaponry to Taiwan by the United States should be conditioned on meaningful progress by the Government of Taiwan on the acquisition of appropriate asymmetric defense capabilities.

(2) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—For each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027, the United States Government shall not sell, lease, or otherwise provide military capabilities to Taiwan other than asymmetric defense capabilities described in paragraph (5) of subsection (c) until the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary of Defense has submitted a notification under paragraph (6)(D) of that subsection for the fiscal year in which the Government of Taiwan has requested the sale, lease, or other provision of military capabilities other than such asymmetric defense capabilities; or

(B) the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that the sale, lease, or other provision to Taiwan of military capabilities other than such asymmetric defense capabilities—

(i) is necessary to enhance the ability of Taiwan to deter or, if necessary, defeat an invasion by the People's Republic of China; or

(ii) will not slow, delay, limit, or otherwise detract from or undermine the ability of Taiwan to deploy such asymmetric defense capabilities.

(e) **DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 5593. Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DIGITAL TRADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Over half of the world's population, totaling more than 5,000,000,000 people, use the internet.

(2) The digital economy encompasses the economic and social activity from billions of online connections among people, businesses, devices, and data as a result of the internet, mobile technology, and the internet of things.

(3) The Bureau of Economic Analysis found that the digital economy contributed nearly 10.2 percent of United States gross domestic product and supported 7,800,000 United States jobs in 2020.

(4) The technology-commerce ecosystem added 1,400,000 jobs between 2017 and 2021, and served as the main job-creating sector in 40 States.

(5) United States jobs supported by the digital economy have sustained annual wage growth at a rate of 5.9 percent since 2010, as compared to a 4.2 percent for all jobs.

(6) In 2020, United States exports of digital services surpassed \$520,000,000,000, accounting for more than half of all United States services exports and generating a digital services trade surplus for the United States of \$214,000,000,000.

(7) Digital trade bolsters the digital economy by enabling the sale of goods on the internet and the supply of online services across borders and depends on the free flow of data across borders to promote commerce, manufacturing, and innovation.

(8) Digital trade has become increasingly vital to United States workers and businesses of all sizes, including the countless small and medium-sized enterprises that use digital technology, data flows, and e-commerce to export goods and services across the world.

(9) Digital trade has advanced entrepreneurship opportunities for women, people of color, and individuals from otherwise underrepresented backgrounds and enabled the formation of innovative start-ups.

(10) International supply chains are becoming increasingly digitized and data driven and businesses in a variety of industries, such as construction, healthcare, transportation, and aerospace, invested heavily in digital supply chain technologies in 2020.

(11) United States Trade Representative Katherine Tai said, “[T]here is no bright line separating digital trade from the digital economy—or the ‘traditional’ economy for that matter. Nearly every aspect of our economy has been digitized to some degree.”

(12) Industries outside of the technology sector, such as manufacturing and agriculture, are integrating digital technology into their businesses in order to increase efficiency, improve safety, reach new customers, and remain globally competitive.

(13) The increasing reliance on digital technologies has modernized legacy processes, accelerated workflows, increased access to information and services, and strengthened security in a variety of industries, leading to better health, environmental, and safety outcomes.

(14) The COVID-19 pandemic has led to increased uptake and reliance on digital technologies, data flows, and e-commerce.

(15) 90 percent of adults in the United States say that the internet has been essential or important for them personally during the COVID-19 pandemic.

(16) United States families, workers, and business owners have seen how vital access to the internet has been to daily life, as work, education, medicine, and communication with family and friends have shifted increasingly online.

(17) Many individuals and families, especially in rural and Tribal communities, struggle to participate in the digital economy because of a lack of access to a reliable and affordable internet connection.

(18) New developments in technology must be deployed with consideration to the unique access challenges of rural, urban underserved, and vulnerable communities.

(19) Digital trade has the power to help level the playing field and uplift those in traditionally unrepresented or underrepresented communities.

(20) Countries have negotiated international rules governing digital trade in various bilateral and plurilateral agreements, but those rules remain fragmented, and no multilateral agreement on digital trade exists within the World Trade Organization.

(21) The United States, through free trade agreements or other digital agreements, has been a leader in developing a set of rules and standards on digital governance and e-commerce that has helped allies and partners of the United States unlock the full economic and social potential of digital trade.

(22) Congress recognizes the need for agreements on digital trade, as indicated by its support for a robust digital trade chapter in the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

(23) Other countries are operating under their own digital rules, some of which are contrary to democratic values shared by the United States and many allies and partners of the United States.

(24) Those countries are attempting to advance their own digital rules on a global scale.

(25) Examples of the plethora of nontariff barriers to digital trade that have emerged around the globe include—

(A) overly restrictive data localization requirements and limitations on cross border data flows that do not achieve legitimate public policy objectives;

(B) intellectual property rights infringement;

(C) policies that make market access contingent on forced technology transfers or voluntary transfers subject to coercive terms;

(D) web filtering;

(E) economic espionage;

(F) cybercrime exposure; and

(G) government-directed theft of trade secrets.

(26) Certain countries are pursuing or have implemented digital policies that unfairly discriminate against innovative United States technology companies and United States workers that create and deliver digital products and services.

(27) The Government of the People's Republic of China is currently advancing a model for digital governance and the digital economy domestically and abroad through its Digital Silk Road Initiative that permits

ensorship, surveillance, human and worker rights abuses, forced technology transfers, and data flow restrictions at the expense of human and worker rights, privacy, the free flow of data, and an open internet.

(28) The 2020 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices of the Department of State highlighted significant human rights issues committed by the People's Republic of China in the digital realm, including “arbitrary interference with privacy; pervasive and intrusive technical surveillance and monitoring; serious restrictions on free expression, the press, and the internet, including physical attacks on and criminal prosecution of journalists, lawyers, writers, bloggers, dissidents, petitioners, and others as well as their family members, and censorship and site blocking”.

(29) The United States discourages digital authoritarianism, including practices that undermine human and worker rights and result in other social and economic coercion.

(30) Allies and trading partners of the United States in the Indo-Pacific region have urged the United States to deepen economic engagement in the region by negotiating rules on digital trade and technology standards.

(31) The digital economy has provided new opportunities for economic development, entrepreneurship, and growth in developing countries around the world.

(32) Negotiating strong digital trade principles and commitments with allies and partners across the globe enables the United States to unite like-minded economies around common standards and ensure that principles of democracy, rule of law, freedom of speech, human and worker rights, privacy, and a free and open internet are at the very core of digital governance.

(33) United States leadership and substantive engagement is necessary to ensure that global digital rules reflect United States values so that workers are treated fairly, small businesses can compete and win in the global economy, and consumers are guaranteed the right to privacy and security.

(34) The United States supports rules that reduce digital trade barriers, promote free expression and the free flow of information, enhance privacy protections, protect sensitive information, defend human and worker rights, prohibit forced technology transfer, and promote digitally enabled commerce.

(35) The United States supports efforts to cooperate with allies and trading partners to mitigate the risks of cyberattacks, address potentially illegal or deceptive business activities online, promote financial inclusion and digital workforce skills, and develop rules to govern the use of artificial intelligence and other emerging and future technologies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should negotiate strong, inclusive, forward-looking, and enforceable rules on digital trade and the digital economy with like-minded countries as part of a broader trade and economic strategy to address digital barriers and ensure that the United States values of democracy, rule of law, freedom of speech, human and worker rights, privacy, and a free and open internet are at the very core of the digital world and advanced technology;

(2) in conducting such negotiations, the United States must—

(A) pursue digital trade rules that—

(i) serve the best interests of workers, consumers, and small and medium-sized enterprises;

(ii) empower United States workers;

(iii) fuel wage growth; and

(iv) lead to materially positive economic outcomes for all people in the United States;

(B) ensure that any future agreement prevents the adoption of non-democratic, coercive, or overly restrictive policies that would be obstacles to a free and open internet and harm the ability of the e-commerce marketplace to continue to grow and thrive;

(C) coordinate sufficient trade-related assistance to ensure that developing countries can improve their capacity and benefit from increased digital trade; and

(D) consult closely with all relevant stakeholders, including workers, consumers, small and medium-sized enterprises, civil society groups, and human rights advocates; and

(3) with respect to any negotiations for an agreement facilitating digital trade, the United States Trade Representative and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies must—

(A) consult closely and on a timely basis with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives about the substance of those negotiations and the requisite legal authority to bind the United States to any such agreement;

(B) keep both committees fully apprised of those negotiations; and

(C) provide to those committees, including staff with appropriate security clearances, adequate access to the text of the negotiating proposal of the United States before presenting the proposal in the negotiations.

SA 5594. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 575. PILOT PROGRAM ON GRIEF COMPANIONS FOLLOWING CASUALTY NOTIFICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Commencing not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall carry out a pilot program on providing training to, validating, and deploying grief companions to facilitate bereavement care provided by the Department of Defense following casualty notifications with respect to members of the Armed Forces.

(b) DURATION.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall carry out the pilot program required under subsection (a) for a period of not less than one year.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness \$250,000 to carry out the pilot program required under subsection (a).

SA 5595. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel

strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF TIKTOK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered application” means the social networking service TikTok or any successor application or service developed or provided by ByteDance Limited or an entity owned by ByteDance Limited;

(2) the term “executive agency” has the meaning given that term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code; and

(3) the term “information technology” has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

(b) PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF TIKTOK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense, and consistent with the information security requirements under subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall develop standards and guidelines for executive agencies requiring the removal of any covered application from information technology.

(2) NATIONAL SECURITY AND RESEARCH EXCEPTIONS.—The standards and guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) exceptions for law enforcement activities, national security interests and activities, and security researchers; and

(B) for any authorized use of a covered application under an exception, requirements for agencies to develop and document risk mitigation actions for such use.

SA 5596. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1254. STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION LICENSE EXCEPTION FOR TAIWAN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States has a strong interest, in accordance with its obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), in ensuring that Taiwan has all resources necessary to defend itself, especially by asymmetric ways and means, against military action by the People’s Republic of China;

(2) the threat of military action by the People’s Republic of China against Taiwan is growing more rapidly than many anticipated, with the current and former commanders of the United States Indo-Pacific Command testifying that the Government of the People’s Republic of China may view the local military balance over Taiwan as favorable to an invasion well before 2035 and potentially as soon as 2027;

(3) it is imperative that the United States provide Taiwan with defensive resources

with urgency, not only so that Taiwan can better defend itself against military action by the People’s Republic of China, but also to reduce the operational risk to the United States Armed Forces, if the President commits such forces to Taiwan’s defense following the initiation of hostilities by the Government of the People’s Republic of China;

(4) the inclusion of Taiwan in Country Group A:5 under Supplement No. 1 to part 740 of the Export Administration Regulations would address the need described in paragraph (3) by allowing Taiwan to acquire critical asymmetric defensive capabilities on an expedited basis, including undersea sensors, naval mines, man-portable air defense systems, and unmanned aerial vehicles, pursuant to the strategic trade authorization license exception under section 740.20 of the Export Administration Regulations; and

(5) Taiwan has been designated a major non-NATO ally under section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321k).

(b) STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION LICENSE EXCEPTION FOR TAIWAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall revise part 740 of the Export Administration Regulations to remove Taiwan from Country Group A:6 and add it to Country Group A:5.

(c) DEFINITION OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS.—In this section, the term “Export Administration Regulations” has the meaning given that term in section 1742 of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4801).

SA 5597. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1254. ESTABLISHMENT OF PRECLEARANCE FACILITIES IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Taiwan Preclearance Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection Preclearance stations U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and specialists at foreign airports to inspect travelers prior to boarding United States-bound flight.

(2) More than 600 U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and specialists are stationed in Aruba, The Bahamas, Bermuda, Canada, Ireland, and The United Arab Emirates.

(3) A Preclearance program at Taiwan’s Taoyuan International Airport (TPE) would signal Taiwan’s importance to the United States and compliance with international aviation rules.

(4) In 2012, the United States announced Taiwan’s designation for participation in the Visa Waiver Program, which allows for Taiwanese passport holders to enter and remain in the United States for up to 90 days obtaining a United States visa.

(5) In 2017, Taiwan became the third location in East Asia and the 12th nation worldwide to be eligible for the Global Entry program, which allows for expedited immigration and customs clearance and pre-approval.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Taiwan is a steadfast partner of the United States in the common pursuit of a free and open Indo-Pacific region; and

(2) the United States should prioritize the establishment of Preclearance facilities and other security programs with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region, including Taiwan.

(d) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(5) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) describes the plan for the establishment of a Preclearance facility in Taiwan or in other countries in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) analyzes the feasibility and advisability for the establishment of a Preclearance facility in Taiwan;

(3) assesses the impacts that Preclearance operations in Taiwan will have on—

(A) trade between the United States and Taiwan, including the impact on established supply chains;

(B) the tourism industry in the United States, including the potential impact on revenue and tourist-related commerce;

(C) United States and foreign passengers traveling to the United States for business-related activities;

(D) cost savings and potential market access by expanding operations into the Indo-Pacific region;

(E) opportunities for government-to-government collaboration available in Taiwan after Preclearance operations are established; and

(F) U.S. Customs and Border Patrol international and domestic port of entry staffing; and

(4) includes country-specific information on the anticipated homeland security benefits and the security vulnerabilities associated with conducting Preclearance operations in Taiwan.

SA 5598. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Prevention of Conflicts of Interest Among Consulting Firms

SECTION 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Time to Choose Act of 2022”.

SEC. 1282. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense and other agencies in the United States Government

regularly award contracts to firms such as Deloitte, McKinsey & Company, and others who are simultaneously providing consulting services to the Government of the People’s Republic of China and proxies or affiliates thereof.

(2) The provision of such consulting services by firms like Deloitte, McKinsey & Company, and others to entities in the People’s Republic of China directly supports efforts by that nation’s government to generate economic and military power that it can then use to undermine the economic and national security of the American people, including through economic coercion and by threatening or using military force against us.

(3) It is a conflict of interest for firms like Deloitte, McKinsey & Company, and others to simultaneously aid in the efforts of the Government of the People’s Republic of China to undermine the economic and national security of the United States while they are simultaneously contracting with the Department of Defense and other United States Government agencies responsible for defending the United States from foreign threats, above all from China.

(4) Firms like Deloitte, McKinsey & Company, and others should no longer be allowed to engage in such a conflict of interest and should instead be required to choose between aiding the efforts of the Government of the People’s Republic of China to harm the United States or helping the United States Government to defend its citizens against such foreign coercion.

SEC. 1283. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL CONTRACTING WITH ENTITIES THAT ARE SIMULTANEOUSLY AIDING IN THE EFFORTS OF THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO HARM THE UNITED STATES.

In order to end conflict of interests in Federal contracting among consulting firms that simultaneously contract with the United States Government and covered foreign entities, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation—

(1) to require any entity that provides the services described in the North American Industry Classification System’s Industry Group code 5416, prior to entering into a Federal contract, to certify that neither it nor any of its subsidiaries or affiliates hold a contract with one or more covered foreign entities; and

(2) to prohibit Federal contracts from being awarded to an entity that provides the services described under the North American Industry Classification System’s Industry Group code 5416 if the entity or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates are determined, based on the self-certification required under paragraph (1) or other information, to be a contractor of, or otherwise providing services to, a covered foreign entity.

SEC. 1284. PENALTIES FOR FALSE INFORMATION ON CONTRACTING WITH THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) TERMINATION, SUSPENSION, AND DEBARMENT.—If the head of an executive agency determines that a consulting firm described in section 1283 has knowingly submitted a false certification or information on or after the date on which the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council amends the Federal Acquisition Regulation pursuant to such section, the head of the executive agency shall terminate the contract with the consulting firm and consider suspending or debarring the firm from eligibility for future Federal contracts in accordance with subpart 9.4 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(b) FALSE CLAIMS ACT.—A consulting firm described in section 1283 that, for the purposes of the False Claims Act, intentionally

hides or misrepresents one or more contracts with covered foreign entities shall be subject to the penalties and corrective actions described in the False Claims Act, including liability for three times the amount of damages which the United States Government sustains, including funds or other resources expended on or in support of the solicitation, selection, and performance of such contracts.

SEC. 1285. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term “covered foreign entity” means—

(A) a person, business trust, business association, company, institution, government agency, university, partnership, limited liability company, corporation, or any other individual or organization that can legally enter into contracts, own properties, or pay taxes on behalf of, the Government of the People’s Republic of China;

(B) the Chinese Communist Party;

(C) the People’s Republic of China’s United Front;

(D) an entity owned or controlled by, or that performs activities on behalf of, a person or entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C); and

(E) an individual that is a member of the board of directors, an executive officer, or a senior official of an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D).

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

(3) FALSE CLAIMS ACT.—The term “False Claims Act” means sections 3729 through 3733 of title 31, United States Code

(4) NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM’S INDUSTRY GROUP CODE 5416.—The term “North American Industry Classification System’s Industry Group code 5416” refers to the North American Industry Classification System category that covers Management, Scientific, and Technical Consulting Services as Industry Group code 5416, including industry codes 54151, 541611, 541612, 541613, 541614, 541618, 54162, 541620, 54169, 541690.

SA 5599. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1077. SLAVE-FREE BUSINESS CERTIFICATION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Slave-Free Business Certification Act of 2022”.

(b) REQUIRED REPORTING ON USE OF FORCED LABOR FROM COVERED BUSINESS ENTITIES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) COVERED BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term “covered business entity” means any issuer, as that term is defined in section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)), that—

(i) has annual, worldwide gross receipts that exceed \$500,000,000; and

(ii) is involved in the mining, production, or manufacture of goods for sale.

(B) FORCED LABOR.—The term “forced labor” means any labor practice or human

trafficking activity in violation of national and international standards, including—

(i) International Labor Organization Convention No. 182;

(ii) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.); and

(iii) any act that would violate the criminal provisions related to slavery and human trafficking under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, if the act had been committed within the jurisdiction of the United States.

(C) GROSS RECEIPTS.—The term “gross receipts” has the meaning given to the term in section 993(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(D) ON-SITE SERVICE.—The term “on-site service” means any service work provided on the site of a covered business entity, including food service work and catering services.

(E) ON-SITE SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term “on-site service provider” means any entity that provides workers who perform, collectively, a total of not less than 30 hours per week of on-site services for a covered business entity.

(F) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Labor.

(G) SUPPLY CHAIN.—The term “supply chain” means the end-to-end process for producing and transporting goods beginning at the point of origin through a point of distribution to the destination, inclusive of suppliers, manufacturers, and vendors.

(2) AUDIT AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, each covered business entity shall—

(i) conduct an audit of its supply chain, pursuant to the requirements of subsection (c), to investigate the presence or use of forced labor by the covered business entity or its suppliers, including by direct suppliers, secondary suppliers, and on-site service providers of the covered business entity;

(ii) submit a report to the Secretary containing the information described in subparagraph (B) on the results of such audit and efforts of the covered business entity to eradicate forced labor from the supply chain and on-site services of the covered business entity; and

(iii)(I) publish the report described in clause (ii) on the public website of the covered business entity, and provide a conspicuous and easily understood link on the homepage of the website that leads to the report; or

(II) in the case of a covered business entity that does not have a public website, provide the report in written form to any consumer of the covered business entity not later than 30 days after the consumer submits a request for the report.

(B) REQUIRED REPORT CONTENTS.—Each report required under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall contain, at a minimum—

(i) a disclosure of the covered business entity’s policies to prevent the use of forced labor by the covered business entity, its direct suppliers, and its on-site service providers;

(ii) a disclosure of what policies or procedures, if any, the covered business entity uses—

(I) for the verification of product supply chains and on-site service provider practices to evaluate and address risks of forced labor and whether the verification was conducted by a third party;

(II) to require direct suppliers and on-site service providers to provide written certification that materials incorporated into the product supplied or on-site services, respectively, comply with the laws regarding forced labor of each country in which the

supplier or on-site service provider is engaged in business;

(III) to maintain internal accountability standards and procedures for employees or contractors of the covered business entity failing to meet requirements regarding forced labor; and

(IV) to provide training on recognizing and preventing forced labor, particularly with respect to mitigating risks within the supply chains of products and on-site services of the covered business entity, to employees, including management personnel, of the covered business entity who have direct responsibility for supply chain management or on-site services;

(iii) a description of the findings of each audit required under subparagraph (A)(i), including the details of any instances of found or suspected forced labor; and

(iv) a written certification, signed by the chief executive officer of the covered business entity, that—

(I) the covered business entity has complied with the requirements of this section and exercised due diligence in order to eradicate forced labor from the supply chain and on-site services of the covered business entity;

(II) to the best of the chief executive officer’s knowledge, the covered business entity has found no instances of the use of forced labor by the covered business entity or has disclosed every known instance of the use of forced labor; and

(III) the chief executive officer and any other officers submitting the report or certification understand that section 1001 of title 18, United States Code (popularly known as the “False Statements Act”), applies to the information contained in the report submitted to the Secretary.

(3) REPORT OF VIOLATIONS TO CONGRESS.—Each year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit a report to Congress regarding the covered business entities that—

(A) have failed to conduct audits required under this section for the preceding year or have been adjudicated in violation of any other provision of this section; or

(B) have been found to have used forced labor, including the use of forced labor in their supply chain or by their on-site service providers.

(c) AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each audit conducted under subsection (b)(2)(A)(i) shall meet the following requirements:

(A) WORKER INTERVIEWS.—The auditor shall—

(i) select a cross-section of workers to interview that represents the full diversity of the workplace, and includes, if applicable, men and women, migrant workers and local workers, workers on different shifts, workers performing different tasks, and members of various production teams;

(ii) if individuals under the age of 18 are employed at the facility of the direct supplier or on-site service provider, interview a representative group using age-sensitive interview techniques;

(iii) conduct interviews—

(I) off-site of the facility and during non-work hours for the worker;

(II) individually or in groups (except for purposes of clause (ii)); and

(III) using methods of communication that limit, to the greatest practicable extent, any reliance on devices or services provided to the worker by the covered business entity, supplier, or on-site service provider;

(iv) use audit tools to ensure that each worker is asked a comprehensive set of questions;

(v) collect from interviewed workers copies of the workers’ pay stubs, in order to com-

pare the pay stubs with payment records provided by the direct supplier;

(vi) ensure that all worker responses are confidential and are never shared with management; and

(vii) interview a representative of the labor organization or other worker representative organization that represents workers at the facility or, if no such organization is present, attempt to interview a representative from a local worker advocacy group.

(B) MANAGEMENT INTERVIEWS.—The auditor shall—

(i) interview a cross-section of the management of the supplier, including human resources personnel, production supervisors, and others; and

(ii) use audit tools to ensure that managers are asked a comprehensive set of questions.

(C) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—The auditor shall—

(i) conduct a thorough review of information regarding the supplier or on-site service provider to provide tangible proof of compliance and to corroborate or find discrepancies in the information gathered through the worker and management interviews; and

(ii) review, at a minimum, the following information related to the supplier or on-site service provider:

(I) Age verification procedures and documents.

(II) A master list of juvenile workers or information related to juvenile workers.

(III) Selection and recruitment procedures.

(IV) Contracts with labor brokers, if any.

(V) Worker contracts and employment agreements.

(VI) Introduction program materials.

(VII) Personnel files.

(VIII) Employee communication and training plans, including certifications provided to workers including skills training, worker preparedness, government certification programs, and systems or policy orientations.

(IX) Collective bargaining agreements, including collective bargaining representative certification, descriptions of the role of the labor organization, and minutes of the labor organization’s meetings.

(X) Contracts with any security agency, and descriptions of the scope of responsibilities of the security agency.

(XI) Payroll and time records.

(XII) Production capacity reports.

(XIII) Written human resources policies and procedures.

(XIV) Occupational health and safety plans and records including legal permits, maintenance and monitoring records, injury and accident reports, investigation procedures, chemical inventories, personal protective equipment inventories, training certificates, and evacuation plans.

(XV) Disciplinary notices.

(XVI) Grievance reports.

(XVII) Performance evaluations.

(XVIII) Promotion or merit increase records.

(XIX) Dismissal and suspension records of workers.

(XX) Records of employees who have resigned.

(XXI) Worker pay stubs.

(D) CLOSING MEETING WITH MANAGEMENT.—The auditor shall hold a closing meeting with the management of the covered business entity to—

(i) report violations and nonconformities found in the facility; and

(ii) determine the steps forward to address and remediate any problems.

(E) REPORT PREPARATION.—The auditor shall prepare a full report of the audit, which shall include—

(i) a disclosure of the direct supplier’s or on-site service provider’s—

(I) documented processes and procedures that relate to eradicating forced labor; and

(II) documented risk assessment and prioritization policies as such policies relate to eradicating forced labor;

(i) a description of the worker interviews, manager interviews, and documentation review required under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C);

(iii) a description of all violations or suspected violations by the direct supplier or on-site service provider of any forced labor laws of the United States or, if applicable, the laws of another country as described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii)(II); and

(iv) for each violation described in clause (iii), a description of any corrective and protective actions recommended for the direct supplier consisting of, at a minimum—

(I) the issues relating to the violation and any root causes of the violation;

(II) the implementation of a solution; and

(III) a method to check the effectiveness of the solution.

(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO AUDITS.—

(A) NO RETALIATION FOR AUDIT COOPERATION.—A covered business entity or supplier, including a direct supplier, secondary supplier, or on-site service provider, shall not retaliate against any worker for participating in interviews under subsection (c)(1)(A) or providing information necessary for the audit requirements under subsection (c)(1)(C)(i) to the auditor.

(B) CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—Each covered business entity shall include, in any contract with a direct supplier or on-site service provider, a requirement that—

(i) the supplier or provider shall not retaliate against any worker for participating in an audit relating to forced labor; and

(ii) worker participation in an audit shall be protected through the same grievance mechanisms available to the worker available for any other type of workplace grievance.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) CIVIL DAMAGES.—The Secretary may assess civil damages in an amount of not more than \$100,000,000 if, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary determines that a covered business entity has violated any requirement of subsection (b)(2).

(2) PUNITIVE DAMAGES.—In addition to damages under paragraph (1), the Secretary may assess punitive damages in an amount of not more than \$500,000,000 against an entity that is a covered business entity or supplier, including a direct supplier, secondary supplier, or on-site service provider, if, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary determines the entity—

(A) willfully violated any requirement of subsection (b)(2); or

(B) willfully violated subsection (c)(2)(A).

(3) DECLARATIVE OR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The Secretary may request the Attorney General institute a civil action for relief, including a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or any other appropriate order, in the district court of the United States for any district in which the covered business entity conducts business, whenever the Secretary believes that a violation of subsection (b)(2) constitutes a hazard to workers.

(e) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate rules to carry out this section.

SA 5600. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R.

7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle H—Afghanistan Vetting and Accountability Act of 2022

SEC. 1081. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Afghanistan Vetting and Accountability Act of 2022”.

SEC. 1082. VERIFICATION AND VETTING REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO INDIVIDUALS EVACUATED FROM AFGHANISTAN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL MEANS-TESTED PUBLIC BENEFIT.—The term “Federal means-tested public benefit” means a Federal means-tested public benefit within the meaning of section 403 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613).

(2) INDIVIDUAL EVACUATED FROM AFGHANISTAN.—The term “individual evacuated from Afghanistan”—

(A) means any individual, other than a United States citizen or a member of the United States Armed Forces, conveyed out of Afghanistan into the United States in coordination with the Government of the United States during the period beginning on January 20, 2021, and ending on January 20, 2022; and

(B) includes each individual, other than a United States citizen or a member of the United States Armed Forces, evacuated from Afghanistan as part of Operation Allies Welcome.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—The term “unemployment compensation” has the meaning given the term in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) VERIFICATION AND VETTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall verify the personal and biometric information and conduct in-person vetting of each individual evacuated from Afghanistan.

(2) VETTING DATABASE.—The Secretary shall develop and maintain a database that contains, for each individual evacuated from Afghanistan, the following:

(A) Personal information, including name and date of birth.

(B) Biometric information.

(C) Any criminal record since the date on which the individual entered the United States.

(D) Any application for, or receipt of, unemployment compensation or a Federal means-tested public benefit.

(E) The vetting status of the individual, including whether the individual has undergone in-person vetting.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than quarterly until the date on which the Secretary submits the certification under subsection (d), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report detailing the compliance of the Secretary with subsection (b).

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of all individuals evacuated from Afghanistan.

(B) With respect to each such individual—

(i) vetting status, including whether the individual has undergone in-person vetting;

(ii) an assessment as to whether the individual has received unemployment compensation or a Federal means-tested benefit;

(iii) a description of any arrest or criminal record for conduct that occurred in Afghanistan, if available; and

(iv) a description of any arrest or criminal record for conduct that occurred in the United States.

(C) The estimated number of days remaining until the Secretary completes the verification and vetting of each individual evacuated from Afghanistan as required by subsection (b)(1).

(d) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary completes the verification and vetting required by subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a certification that such verification and vetting has been completed.

(e) GAO AUDITS AND REPORTS.—

(1) AUDITS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit and investigation with respect to the compliance of the Secretary with this subtitle—

(A) not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary makes the certification under subsection (d).

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of each audit and investigation required by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the audit and investigation.

(f) RESTRICTION ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—An individual evacuated from Afghanistan who has not provided personal information and biometric information to the Secretary, and undergone in-person vetting, shall not be eligible to receive unemployment compensation or any Federal means-tested public benefit.

SEC. 1083. DECLASSIFICATION OF INFORMATION RELATED TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM AFGHANISTAN.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall—

(1) declassify all intelligence products related to the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, including as relate to—

(A) anticipated timelines for a Taliban takeover of Afghanistan, especially as the Taliban seized control of additional districts and provinces, often without fighting, in early to mid 2021;

(B) the ability of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces to prevent a Taliban takeover of Afghanistan after the withdrawal of American forces and associated combat, logistical, and other support;

(C) the willingness of then-President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan Ashraf Ghani and other Afghan political leaders to remain in Afghanistan as the military situation deteriorated, including any plans such leaders may have made to escape Afghanistan as the Taliban advanced;

(D) threats to United States forces, diplomats, or citizens in Kabul or other parts of Afghanistan over the course of the withdrawal, including the noncombatant evacuation operation in August 2021;

(E) any other intelligence that may have informed decisions by the United States Government regarding the timeline for the withdrawal of its forces, moving of its embassy in Kabul, initiation of a noncombatant evacuation operation, force requirements for a noncombatant evacuation operation, or other related matters; and

(F) any dissenting views shared in writing or other formats, including verbally, by

United States military commanders, diplomats, or other government officials regarding the topics described in subparagraphs (A) through (E); and

(2) submit to Congress an unclassified report that contains—

(A) all the information described under paragraph (1); and

(B) only such redactions as the Director determines necessary to protect sources and methods.

SA 5601. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 925. ESTABLISHMENT OF SPACE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a Space National Guard that is part of the organized militia of the several States and Territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia—

(A) in which the Space Force operates; and

(B) active and inactive.

(2) RESERVE COMPONENT.—There is established a Space National Guard of the United States that is the reserve component of the United States Space Force all of whose members are members of the Space National Guard.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Space National Guard shall be composed of the Space National Guard forces of the several States and Territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia—

(1) in which the Space Force operates; and

(2) active and inactive.

(c) NO EFFECT ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed to authorize or require the relocation of any facility, infrastructure, or military installation of the Space National Guard or Air National Guard.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF SPACE NATIONAL GUARD.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Except as specifically provided by this section, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall implement this section, and the amendments made by this section, not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually for the five subsequent years, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of the Space Force, and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall jointly provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the status of the implementation of the Space National Guard pursuant to this section and the amendments made by this section.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required by subparagraph (A) shall address—

(i) the current missions, operations and activities, personnel requirements and status,

and budget and funding requirements and status of the Space National Guard; and

(ii) such other matters with respect to the implementation and operation of the Space National Guard as the Secretary and the Chiefs jointly determine appropriate to keep Congress fully and currently informed on the status of the implementation of the Space National Guard.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—

(A) TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 101(c)—

(I) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(II) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraphs:

“(6) The term ‘Space National Guard’ means that part of the organized militia of the several States and territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, active and inactive, that—

“(A) is a space force;

“(B) is trained, and has its officers appointed under the sixteenth clause of section 8, article I of the Constitution;

“(C) is organized, armed, and equipped wholly or partly at Federal expense; and

“(D) is federally recognized.

“(7) The term ‘Space National Guard of the United States’ means the reserve component of the Space Force all of whose members are members of the Space National Guard.”; and

(ii) in section 10101—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “the following” before the colon; and

(II) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) The Space National Guard of the United States.”.

(B) TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 101 of title 32, United States Code is amended—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (19) as paragraphs (10) through (21), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraphs:

“(8) The term ‘Space National Guard’ means that part of the organized militia of the several States and territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, in which the Space Force operates, active and inactive, that—

“(A) is a space force;

“(B) is trained, and has its officers appointed under the sixteenth clause of section 8, article I of the Constitution;

“(C) is organized, armed, and equipped wholly or partly at Federal expense; and

“(D) is federally recognized.

“(9) The term ‘Space National Guard of the United States’ means the reserve component of the Space Force all of whose members are members of the Space National Guard.”.

(2) RESERVE COMPONENTS.—Chapter 1003 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by adding at the end the following new sections:

“§ 10115. Space National Guard of the United States: composition

“The Space National Guard of the United States is the reserve component of the Space Force that consists of—

“(1) federally recognized units and organizations of the Space National Guard; and

“(2) members of the Space National Guard who are also Reserves of the Space Force.

“§ 10116. Space National Guard: when a component of the Space Force

“The Space National Guard while in the service of the United States is a component of the Space Force.

“§ 10117. Space National Guard of the United States: status when not in Federal service

“When not on active duty, members of the Space National Guard of the United States shall be administered, armed, equipped, and trained in their status as members of the Space National Guard.”; and

(B) in the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter, by adding at the end the following new items:

“10115. Space National Guard of the United States: composition.

“10116. Space National Guard: when a component of the Space Force.

“10117. Space National Guard of the United States: status when not in Federal service.”.

SA 5602. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XXVII, add the following:

SEC. 2703. AUTHORIZATION TO FUND CERTAIN DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL ACTIVITIES THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT.

Section 2906(c)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) To carry out the demolition or removal of any building or structure under the control of the Secretary of the Navy that is not designated as historic under a Federal, State, or local law and is located on a military installation closed or realigned under a base closure law (as such term is defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code) at which the sampling or remediation of radiologically contaminated materials has been the subject of substantiated allegations of fraud, without regard to—

“(i) whether the building or structure is radiologically impacted; or

“(ii) whether such demolition or removal is carried out, as part of a response action or otherwise, under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program specified in subparagraph (A) or CERCLA (as such term is defined in section 2700 of title 10, United States Code).”.

SA 5603. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. DEFINITION OF LAND USE REVENUE UNDER WEST LOS ANGELES LEASING ACT OF 2016.

Section 2(d)(2) of the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-226) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) any funds received as compensation for an easement described in subsection (e); and”.

SA 5604. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. AIR FORCE ASSESSMENT OF COMBAT-TO-DWELL POLICY AND HEALTH WITHIN THE REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT COMMUNITY.

(a) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall conduct an assessment of—

(1) the combat-to-dwell policy of the Air Force; and

(2) health and wellness within the remotely piloted aircraft community.

(b) **BRIEFING AND REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Air Force shall—

(1) brief the Committees on the Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status of the assessment required by subsection (a) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) submit to those committees a report on the assessment at a time agreed to at the time of the briefing.

(c) **ELEMENTS OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (b)(2) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the extent to which data is being collected on the current status and strategy of achieving combat-to-dwell policy for the remotely piloted aircraft community, including with respect to the following:

(A) The retention rate of pilots of remotely piloted aircraft.

(B) The retention rate of sensor operators for remotely piloted aircraft.

(C) Instructor staffing levels at the remotely piloted aircraft formal training unit.

(2) An assessment of the progress on the metric (or set of metrics) that allows the Air Force to track changes in the number of pilots and sensor operators of remotely piloted aircraft from its combined accession and retention efforts over a projected timeline of implementing the combat-to-dwell policy by 2024.

(3) A description of how the Air Force is addressing the health and wellness of the remotely piloted aircraft community after the closure of the Culture and Process Improvement Program, including with respect to the following:

(A) Work shifts and hours.

(B) Back, eyes, and other physical issues.

(C) Mental health issues.

SA 5605. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN BUREAU OF RECLAMATION DAMS AND DIKES.

Section 4309 of the America’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (43 U.S.C. 377b note; Public Law 115-270) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “DAMS AND” before “DIKES”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “effective beginning on the date of enactment of this section, the Federal share of the operations and maintenance costs of a dike described in subsection (b)” and inserting “the Federal share of the dam safety modifications costs of a dike described in subsection (c)”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(4) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) **GATE REPAIRS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), effective during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal share of the costs to repair or replace a gate and any ancillary gate components of a dam described in subsection (c) shall be 100 percent.”; and

(5) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “DAMS AND” before “DIKES”;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “A dike referred to in subsection (a) is a” and inserting “A dam or dike referred to in subsections (a) and (b) is a dam or”;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “December 31, 1945” and inserting “December 31, 1948”.

SA 5606. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 521.

SA 5607. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. ADVANCE CONSULTATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS AND MONTHLY REPORTS TO CONGRESS REGARDING THE RESETTLEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, AND RELOCATION OF ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 3 business days before any resettlement, transportation, or relocation of non-detained aliens in the United States that is directed, administered, or funded by the Federal Government, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in the case of minors) or the Secretary of Homeland Security (in the case of adults), as appropriate, shall consult with the governors and municipal chief executives of the directly affected States and local jurisdictions regarding the proposed resettlement, transportation, or relocation.

(b) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and monthly thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with other appropriate Federal officials, shall—

(1) submit a State-specific report regarding the resettlement, transportation, or relocation of non-detained aliens in the United States during the preceding month that was directed, administered, or funded by the Federal Government or that involved aliens subject to the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s Alternatives to Detention program that contains the information described in subsection (c) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(E) the governor of each affected State; and

(2) make the report described in paragraph (1) available on a publicly accessible website.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—Each report under subsection (b) shall contain, with respect to each State—

(1) the number of aliens resettled, transported, or relocated during the previous month and the current calendar year, disaggregated by—

(A) the numbers of single adults, members of family units, and minors;

(B) age;

(C) sex; and

(D) country of origin;

(2) the methods used to determine the ages of such aliens;

(3) the methods used to verify the familial status of such aliens;

(4) the types of settings in which such aliens are being resettled, transported, or relocated, which may be aggregated by the general type of setting;

(5) a summary of the educational or occupational resources or assistance provided to such aliens;

(6) whether such aliens are granted permits to work and how any such aliens without a work permit will financially support themselves;

(7) the amounts and types of Federal resources spent on alien resettlement, transportation, or relocation; and

(8) whether the aliens are being resettled, transported, or relocated on a temporary or permanent basis, disaggregated by—

(A) the numbers of single adults, members of family units, and minors;

- (B) age;
- (C) sex; and
- (D) country of origin.

SA 5608. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1226. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIONS RELATING TO SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before taking any action described in paragraph (2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes the proposed action and the reasons for that action.

(2) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An action described in this paragraph is—

(i) an action to terminate the application of any sanctions described in subparagraph (B);

(ii) with respect to sanctions described in subparagraph (B) imposed by the President with respect to a person, an action to waive the application of those sanctions with respect to that person; or

(iii) a licensing action that significantly alters United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subparagraph are sanctions with respect to Iran provided for under—

(i) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(ii) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(iii) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(iv) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.);

(v) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.);

(vi) the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); or

(vii) any other statute or Executive order that requires or authorizes the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF ACTION.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) shall include a description of whether the action—

(A) is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran; or

(B) is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(4) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran shall include a description of—

(i) the significant alteration to United States foreign policy with respect to Iran;

(ii) the anticipated effect of the action on the national security interests of the United States; and

(iii) the policy objectives for which the sanctions affected by the action were initially imposed.

(B) REQUESTS FROM BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEES.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives may request the submission to the Committee of the matter described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(5) CONFIDENTIALITY OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Proprietary information that can be associated with a particular person with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) may be included in a report submitted under paragraph (1) only if the appropriate congressional committees and leadership provide assurances of confidentiality, unless that person otherwise consents in writing to such disclosure.

(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (2)(A)(iii) shall not be construed to require the submission of a report under paragraph (1) with respect to the routine issuance of a license that does not significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report; and

(B) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a)(1) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under paragraph (1) of a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not take that action unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that action is enacted in accordance with subsection (c).

(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action for a period of 12 calendar days after

the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), and the President vetoes the joint resolution, the President may not take that action for a period of 10 calendar days after the date of the President's veto.

(6) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) is enacted in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of approval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(i) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution approving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to Iran.”; and

(ii) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress approves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 1226(a)(1) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 on _____, relating to _____,” with the first blank space

being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(B) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of disapproval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(i) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to Iran.”; and

(ii) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 1226(a)(1) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 on _____, relating to _____,” with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days

after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

(i) referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs if the joint resolution relates to a report under subsection (a)(3)(A) that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran; and

(ii) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations if the joint resolution relates to a report under subsection (a)(3)(B) that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(5) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) TREATMENT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION IN HOUSE.—In the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply to a joint resolution of approval or a joint resolution of disapproval received from the Senate (unless the House has already passed a joint resolution relating to the same proposed action):

(i) The joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committees.

(ii) If a committee to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 2 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(iii) Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall

be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(iv) The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(B) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

(i) RECEIPT BEFORE PASSAGE.—If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

(I) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

(II) With respect to that joint resolution—

(aa) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

(bb) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

(ii) RECEIPT AFTER PASSAGE.—If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

(iii) NO COMPANION MEASURE.—If a joint resolution of approval or a joint resolution of disapproval is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

(C) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

(6) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

SA 5609. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. OFFICE OF GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES AND THE WOMEN'S GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROSPERITY INITIATIVE.

Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 138. OFFICE OF GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES AND THE WOMEN'S GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROSPERITY INITIATIVE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall establish, in the Office of the Secretary of State, the Office of Global Women's Issues (referred to in this section as the ‘Office’).

“(b) PURPOSE; DUTIES.—

“(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Office is to advance equal opportunity for women and the status of women and girls in United States foreign policy.

“(2) DUTIES.—In carrying out the purpose described in paragraph (1), the Office—

“(A)(i) shall advise the Secretary of State and provide input on all activities, policies, programs, and funding relating to equal opportunity for women and the advancement of women and girls internationally to all bureaus and offices of the Department of State; and

“(ii) may, as appropriate, provide to the international programs of other Federal agencies input on all activities, policies, programs, and funding relating to equal opportunity for women and the advancement of women and girls internationally;

“(B)(i) shall work to ensure that efforts to advance equal opportunity for women and men and women's and girls' empowerment are fully integrated into the programs, structures, processes, and capacities of all bureaus and offices of the Department of State; and

“(ii) may, as appropriate, work to ensure that efforts to advance equal opportunity for women and men and women's and girls' empowerment are fully integrated into the international programs of other Federal agencies;

“(C) shall implement the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative, in accordance with subsection (c); and

“(D) may not engage in any activities not described in subparagraphs (A) through (C).

“(c) WOMEN'S GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROSPERITY INITIATIVE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State shall establish the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Initiative’) to carry out the activities described in paragraphs (2) through (4).

“(2) WOMEN PROSPERING IN THE WORKFORCE.—The Initiative shall advance women in the workforce by improving their access to quality vocational education and skills training, which will enable them to secure jobs in their local economies.

“(3) WOMEN SUCCEEDING AS ENTREPRENEURS.—The Initiative shall promote

women's entrepreneurship and increasing access to capital, financial services, markets, technical assistance, and mentorship.

“(4) **WOMEN ENABLED IN THE ECONOMY.**—The Initiative shall identify and reduce the binding constraints in economic and property laws and practices that prevent women's full and free participation in the global economy and promote foundational legal reforms, including—

“(A) ensuring that women can fully participate in the workforce and engage in economic activities by—

“(i) ending impunity for violence against women;

“(ii) ensuring that women have the authority to sign legal documents, such as contracts and court documents; and

“(iii) addressing unequal access to courts and administrative bodies for women, whether officially or through lack of proper enforcement;

“(B) ensuring women's equal access to credit and capital to start and grow their businesses, savings, and investments, including prohibiting discrimination in access to credit on the basis of sex or marital status;

“(C) lifting restrictions on women's right to own, manage, and make decisions relating to the use of property, including repealing limitations on inheritance and ensuring the ability to transfer, purchase, or lease such property;

“(D) addressing constraints on women's freedom of movement, including sex-based restrictions on obtaining passports and identification documents; and

“(E) promoting the free and equal participation of women in the economy with regard to working hours, occupations, and occupational tasks.

“(d) **SUPERVISION.**—The Office shall be headed by an Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues and the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative (referred to in this section as the ‘Ambassador’), who shall—

“(1) be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate;

“(2) report directly to the Secretary; and

“(3) have the rank and status of Ambassador-at-Large.

“(e) **COORDINATION.**—United States Government efforts to advance women's economic empowerment globally shall be closely aligned and coordinated with the Initiative.

“(f) **ABORTION NEUTRALITY.**—

“(1) **PROHIBITIONS.**—The Office, the Initiative, and the Ambassador may not—

“(A) lobby other countries, including through multilateral mechanisms and foreign nongovernmental organizations—

“(i) to change domestic laws or policies with respect to abortion; or

“(ii) to include abortion as a programmatic requirement of any foreign activities; or

“(B) provide Federal funding appropriated for foreign assistance to pay for or to promote abortion.

“(2) **LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.**—Amounts appropriated for the Office or the Initiative may not be used—

“(A) to lobby other countries, including through multilateral mechanisms and foreign nongovernmental organizations—

“(i) to change domestic laws or policies with respect to abortion; or

“(ii) to include abortion as a programmatic requirement of any foreign activities; or

“(B) to provide Federal foreign assistance funding to pay for or to promote abortion.

“(3) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent—

“(A) the funding of activities for the purpose of treating injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions; or

“(B) agencies or officers of the United States from engaging in activities in opposition to policies of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

“(g) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall—

“(1) submit a written report to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that describes the implementation of this section, including—

“(A) measures taken to ensure compliance with subsection (f); and

“(B) with respect to funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (h)—

“(i) amounts awarded to prime recipients and subrecipients since the end of the previous reporting period; and

“(ii) descriptions of each program for which such funds are used; and

“(2) make such report publicly available.

“(h) **FUNDING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be reserved to carry out this section, from funds made available for development assistance programs of the United States Agency for International Development, \$200,000,000, for each of the fiscal years 2023 through 2027, which shall be—

“(A) deposited into the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Fund (W-GDP);

“(B) administered by the United States Agency for International Development;

“(C) expended solely for the purpose, duties, and activities set forth in subsections (b) and (c); and

“(D) expended, to the greatest extent practicable, in support of removing legal barriers to women's economic freedom in accordance with the findings of the W-GDP Women's Economic Freedom Index report published by the Council of Economic Advisers in February 2020.

“(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), amounts reserved under paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2024, or for any later fiscal year, may not be obligated or expended unless the most recent report submitted pursuant to subsection (g)(1) includes the information required under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (g)(1).

“(3) **OVERSIGHT.**—The expenditure of amounts reserved under paragraph (1) shall be jointly overseen by—

“(A) the United States Agency for International Development;

“(B) the Ambassador; and

“(C) the Initiative.”

SA 5610. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 1531. REPORT ON INCREASING TRAINING CAPACITY FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION CIVIL SUPPORT TEAMS.

Not later than December 31, 2023, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the

Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report—

(1) assessing the feasibility of increasing training capacity for weapons of mass destruction civil support teams, including through—

(A) the establishment of new facilities and programs to provide such training; and

(B) the augmentation of existing facilities and programs to provide such training;

(2) estimating the costs associated with increasing training capacity as described in paragraph (1); and

(3) identifying facilities and programs that could be established or augmented as described in paragraph (1).

SA 5611. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. REPORT ON IMPACT OF GLOBAL CRITICAL MINERAL AND METAL RESERVES ON UNITED STATES MILITARY EQUIPMENT SUPPLY CHAINS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to Congress a report on the impact of global critical mineral and metal reserves on United States military equipment supply chains.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the efforts of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation to acquire global reserves of critical minerals and metals, including reserves of lithium, tungsten, tantalum, cobalt, and molybdenum;

(2) a description of the efforts of the Department of Defense to procure critical minerals and metals; and

(3) a description of planned investments by the Department to ensure the resiliency and security of United States military supply chains requiring critical minerals and metals.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form and include a classified annex.

SA 5612. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____ . DISCLOSE GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) INFORMATION CONTENT PROVIDER; INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—The terms “information content provider” and “interactive computer service” have the meanings given the terms in section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230).

(2) LEGITIMATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSE.—The term “legitimate law enforcement purpose” means for the purpose of investigating a criminal offense by a law enforcement agency that is within the lawful authority of that agency.

(3) NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSE.—The term “national security purpose” means a purpose that relates to—

- (A) intelligence activities;
- (B) cryptologic activities related to national security;
- (C) command and control of military forces;
- (D) equipment that is an integral part of a weapon or weapons system; or
- (E) the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions.

(b) DISCLOSURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any officer or employee in the executive or legislative branch shall disclose and, in the case of a written communication, make available for public inspection, on a public website in accordance with paragraph (4), any communication by that officer or employee with a provider or operator of an interactive computer service regarding action or potential action by the provider or operator to restrict access to or the availability of, bar or limit access to, or decrease the dissemination or visibility to users of, material posted by another information content provider, whether the action is or would be carried out manually or through use of an algorithm or other automated or semi-automated process.

(2) TIMING.—The disclosure required under paragraph (1) shall be made not later than 7 days after the date on which the communication is made.

(3) LEGITIMATE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any communication for a legitimate law enforcement purpose or national security purpose shall be disclosed and, in the case of a written communication, made available for inspection, to each House of Congress.

(B) TIMING.—The disclosure required under subparagraph (A) shall be made not later than 60 days after the date on which the communication is made.

(C) RECEIPT.—Upon receipt, each House shall provide copies to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate regarding the subject matter to which the communication pertains. Such information shall be deemed the property of such committee and may not be disclosed except—

- (i) in accordance with the rules of the committee;
- (ii) in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and
- (iii) as permitted by law.

(4) WEBSITE.—

(A) LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives shall designate a single location on an internet website where the disclosures and communications of employees and officers in the legislative branch shall be published in accordance with paragraph (1).

(B) EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall designate a single location on an internet website where the disclosures and communications of employees and officers in the ex-

ecutive branch shall be published in accordance with paragraph (1).

(5) NOTICE.—The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall take reasonable steps to ensure that each officer and employee of the legislative branch and executive branch, as applicable, are informed of the duties imposed by this section.

(6) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—Any person who is a former officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States (including any independent agency) or any person who is a former officer or employee of the legislative branch or a former Member of Congress, who personally and substantially participated in any communication under paragraph (1) while serving as an officer, employee, or Member of Congress, shall not, within 2 years after any such communication under paragraph (1) or 1 year after termination of his or her service as an officer, employee, or Member of Congress, whichever is later, knowingly make, with the intent to influence, any communication to or appearance before any officer or employee of any department, agency, court, or court-martial of the United States, on behalf of any person with which the former officer or employee personally and substantially participated in such communication under paragraph (1).

(7) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (6) shall be punished as provided in section 216 of title 18, United States Code.

SA 5613. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 357. BRIEFING ON DEPOT MAINTENANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Readiness shall brief the congressional defense committees on the source of repair decision-making process of the Department of Defense for depots.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required under subsection (a) shall include—

- (1) information on how costs and risks to readiness of the Armed Forces are being addressed in the process described in subsection (a);
- (2) a timeline for decision making under such process; and
- (3) an assessment of the objective balance of workload between the public and private sectors under such process.

SA 5614. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel

strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 357. REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN ACCESS TO CERTAIN CATEGORY 3 SUBTERRANEAN TRAINING FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Department of Defense maintains access to a covered category 3 subterranean training facility on a continuing basis.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE.—The Secretary may enter into a short-term lease with a provider of a covered category 3 subterranean training facility for purposes of compliance with subsection (a).

(c) COVERED CATEGORY 3 SUBTERRANEAN TRAINING FACILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered category 3 subterranean training facility” means a category 3 subterranean training facility that is—

- (1) operational as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and
- (2) determined by the Secretary to be safe for use as of such date.

SA 5615. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. LUJAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY ON NATIONAL LABORATORY CONSORTIUM FOR CYBER RESILIENCE.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense, conduct a study to analyze the feasibility of authorizing a consortia within the National Laboratory system to address information technology and operational technology cybersecurity vulnerabilities in critical infrastructure (as defined in section 1016(e) of the Critical Infrastructures Protection Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

- (1) An analysis of any additional authorities needed to establish a research and development program to leverage the expertise at the Department of Energy National Laboratories to accelerate development and delivery of advanced tools and techniques to defend critical infrastructure against cyber intrusions and enable resilient operations during a cyber attack.
- (2) Evaluation of potential pilot programs in research, innovation transfer, academic partnerships, and industry partnerships for critical infrastructure protection research.
- (3) Identification of and assessment of near-term actions, and cost estimates, necessary for the proposed consortia to be established and effective at a broad scale expeditiously.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the appropriate committees of

Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) Committee on Armed Services, the Committee Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SA 5616. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 144. PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF T-1A AIRCRAFT IN THE TRAINING AIRCRAFT INVENTORY.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for the Air Force for fiscal year 2023 may be used to reduce the number of T-1A aircraft in the training aircraft inventory of the Air Force.

SA 5617. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 517. DIVESTITURE OF TACTICAL CONTROL PARTY.

No divestiture of any Tactical Control Party specialist force structure from the Air National Guard may occur until the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, provides a report to the congressional defense committees describing—

(1) the capability gaps caused by divestiture of Tactical Control Party force structure from the Air National Guard and its impact on the Department of Defense to execute the National Defense Strategy; and

(2) the impacts of such divestiture to the operational capabilities of the Army National Guard.

SA 5618. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE)

and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ENTITIES WHO MAINTAIN CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION DOMICILED IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 201 may be obligated or expended to provide to an entity that maintains a contract between the entity and an entity identified on the list established under subsection (b)(2).

(b) LIST.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, identify each entity that is an institution of higher education domiciled in the People's Republic of China that provides support to the People's Liberation Army, including involvement in the implementation of the military-civil fusion strategy of China and participation in the defense industrial base of China.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT AND SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of each entity identified pursuant to paragraph (1).

(3) ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Director, make additions or deletions to the most recent list established under paragraph (2) on an ongoing basis based on the latest information available to the Secretary.

(4) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 5619. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. REPORT ON PHARMACEUTICALS IMPORTED FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that sets forth a list of—

(1) each finished pharmaceutical product that is imported into the United States from the People's Republic of China in a quantity that exceeds 20 percent of the quantity of the product available for use in the United States; and

(2) each active pharmaceutical ingredient that is imported into the United States from the People's Republic of China in a quantity that exceeds 20 percent of the quantity of the ingredient available for use in the United States.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

SA 5620. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION E—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Department of State Authorization Act of 2022”.

SEC. 5002. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(3) DEPARTMENT.—Unless otherwise specified, the term “Department” means the Department of State.

(4) SECRETARY.—Unless otherwise specified, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of State.

(5) USAID.—The term “USAID” means the United States Agency for International Development.

TITLE LI—ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 5101. MODERNIZING THE BUREAU OF ARMS CONTROL, VERIFICATION, AND COMPLIANCE AND THE BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND NONPROLIFERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary should take steps to address staffing shortfalls in the chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons issue areas in the Bureau of Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance and in the Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation;

(2) maintaining a fully staffed and resourced Bureau of Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance and Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation is necessary to effectively confront the threat of increased global proliferation; and

(3) the Bureau of Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance and the Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation should increase efforts and dedicate resources to combat the dangers posed by the People's Republic of China's conventional and nuclear build-up, the Russian Federation's tactical nuclear weapons and new types of nuclear weapons, bioweapons proliferation, dual use of life sciences research, and chemical weapons.

SEC. 5102. NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS FOR UNITED STATES NATIONALS UNLAWFULLY OR WRONGFULLY DETAINED ABROAD.

Section 302 of the Robert Levinson Hostage Recovery and Hostage-Taking Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 1741) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “, as expeditiously as possible,” after “review”; and
(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) REFERRALS TO SPECIAL ENVOY; NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon a determination by the Secretary of State, based on the totality of the circumstances, that there is credible information that the detention of a United States national abroad is unlawful or wrongful, and regardless of whether the detention is by a foreign government or a nongovernmental actor, the Secretary shall—

“(A) expeditiously transfer responsibility for such case from the Bureau of Consular Affairs of the Department of State to the Special Envoy for Hostage Affairs; and

“(B) not later than 14 days after such determination, notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of such determination and provide such committees with a summary of the facts that led to such determination.

“(2) FORM.—The notification described in paragraph (1)(B) may be classified, if necessary.”

SEC. 5103. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATOR.

Section 303 of the Robert Levinson Hostage Recovery and Hostage-Taking Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 1741a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FAMILY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATOR.—There shall be, in the Office of the Special Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs, a Family Engagement Coordinator, who shall ensure—

“(1) for a United States national unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, that—

“(A) any interaction by executive branch officials with any family member of such United States national occurs in a coordinated fashion;

“(B) such family member receives consistent and accurate information from the United States Government; and

“(C) appropriate coordination with the Family Engagement Coordinator described in section 304(c)(2); and

“(2) for a United States national held hostage abroad, that any engagement with a family member is coordinated with, consistent with, and not duplicative of the efforts of the Family Engagement Coordinator described in section 304(c)(2).”

SEC. 5104. REWARDS FOR JUSTICE.

Section 36(b) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “or (10);” and inserting “(10), or (14);”;

(2) in paragraph (12), by striking “or” at the end;

(3) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) the prevention, frustration, or resolution of the hostage taking of a United States

person, the identification, location, arrest, or conviction of a person responsible for the hostage taking of a United States person, or the location of a United States person who has been taken hostage, in any country.”

SEC. 5105. ENSURING GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF PASSPORT AGENCIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Department initiatives to expand passport services and accessibility, including through online modernization projects, should include the construction of new physical passport agencies.

(b) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of the geographic diversity and accessibility of existing passport agencies to identify—

(1) the geographic areas in the United States that are farther than 6 hours' driving distance from the nearest passport agency;

(2) the per capita demand for passport services in the areas described in paragraph (1); and

(3) a plan to ensure that in-person services at physical passport agencies are accessible to all eligible Americans, including Americans living in large population centers, in rural areas, and in States with a high per capita demand for passport services.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary shall consider the metrics identified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) when determining locations for the establishment of new physical passport agencies.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that contains the findings of the review conducted pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 5106. CULTURAL ANTIQUITIES TASK FORCE.

The Secretary is authorized to use up to \$1,000,000 for grants to carry out the activities of the Cultural Antiquities Task Force.

SEC. 5107. BRIEFING ON “CHINA HOUSE”.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the organizational structure, personnel, resources, and mission of the Department of State's “China House” team.

SEC. 5108. OFFICE OF SANCTIONS COORDINATION.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended, in paragraph (4)(B) of subsection (1), as redesignated by section 5502(a)(2) of this Act, by striking “the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this subsection” and inserting “December 31, 2024”.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Office of Sanctions Coordination shall brief the appropriate congressional committees with respect to the steps the Office has taken to coordinate its activities with the Office of Foreign Assets Control and humanitarian aid programs, in an effort to help ensure appropriate flows of humanitarian assistance and goods to countries subject to United States sanctions.

TITLE LII—PERSONNEL ISSUES

SEC. 5201. DEPARTMENT OF STATE PAID STUDENT INTERNSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish the Department of State Student Internship Program (referred to in this section as the “Program”) to offer internship opportunities at the Department to eligible stu-

dents to raise awareness of the essential role of diplomacy in the conduct of United States foreign policy and the realization of United States foreign policy objectives.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An applicant is eligible to participate in the Program if the applicant—

(1) is enrolled at least half-time at—

(A) an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a))); or

(B) an institution of higher education based outside the United States, as determined by the Secretary of State; and

(2) is eligible to receive and hold an appropriate security clearance.

(c) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall establish selection criteria for students to be admitted into the Program that includes a demonstrated interest in a career in foreign affairs.

(d) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall—

(1) widely advertise the Program, including—

(A) on the internet;

(B) through the Department's Diplomats in Residence program; and

(C) through other outreach and recruiting initiatives targeting undergraduate and graduate students; and

(2) conduct targeted outreach to encourage participation in the Program from—

(A) individuals belonging to an underrepresented group; and

(B) students enrolled at minority-serving institutions (which shall include any institution listed in section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a)).

(e) COMPENSATION.—

(1) HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—

(A) ABROAD.—The Secretary shall provide housing assistance to any student participating in the Program whose permanent address is within the United States if the location of the internship in which such student is participating is outside of the United States.

(B) DOMESTIC.—The Secretary may provide housing assistance to a student participating in the Program whose permanent address is within the United States if the location of the internship in which such student is participating is more than 50 miles away from such student's permanent address.

(2) TRAVEL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide a student participating in the Program whose permanent address is within the United States with financial assistance that is sufficient to cover the travel costs of a single round trip by air, train, bus, or other appropriate transportation between the student's permanent address and the location of the internship in which such student is participating if such location is—

(A) more than 50 miles from the student's permanent address; or

(B) outside of the United States.

(f) WORKING WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall structure internships to ensure that such internships satisfy criteria for academic credit at the institutions of higher education in which participants in such internships are enrolled.

(g) TRANSITION PERIOD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), beginning not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) the Secretary shall convert unpaid internship programs of the Department, including the Foreign Service Internship Program, to internship programs that offer compensation; and

(B) upon selection as a candidate for entry into an internship program of the Department, a participant in such internship program may refuse compensation, including if

doing so allows such participant to receive college or university curricular credit.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The transition required under paragraph (1) shall not apply to unpaid internship programs of the Department that are part of the Virtual Student Federal Service internship program.

(3) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may waive the requirement under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to a particular unpaid internship program if the Secretary, not later than 30 days after making a determination that the conversion of such internship program to a compensated internship program would not be consistent with effective management goals, submits a report explaining such determination to—

(i) the appropriate congressional committees;

(ii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(iii) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(B) REPORT.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) describe the reasons why converting an unpaid internship program of the Department to an internship program that offers compensation would not be consistent with effective management goals; and

(ii) (I) provide justification for maintaining such unpaid status indefinitely; or

(II) identify any additional authorities or resources that would be necessary to convert such unpaid internship program to offer compensation in the future.

(h) REPORTS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the committees referred to in subsection (g)(3)(A) that includes—

(1) data, to the extent the collection of such information is permissible by law, regarding the number of students who applied to the Program, were offered a position, and participated, respectively, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, institution of higher education, home State, State where each student graduated from high school, and disability status;

(2) data regarding the number of security clearance investigations initiated for the students described in paragraph (1), including the timeline for such investigations, whether such investigations were completed, and when an interim security clearance was granted;

(3) information on Program expenditures; and

(4) information regarding the Department's compliance with subsection (g).

(i) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section may be construed to compel any student who is a participant in an internship program of the Department to participate in the collection of the data or divulge any personal information. Such students shall be informed that their participation in the data collection under this section is voluntary.

(2) PRIVACY PROTECTION.—Any data collected under this section shall be subject to the relevant privacy protection statutes and regulations applicable to Federal employees.

(j) SPECIAL HIRING AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, with respect to the number of interns to be hired each year, may—

(1) select, appoint, and employ individuals for up to 1 year through compensated internships in the excepted service; and

(2) remove any compensated intern employed pursuant to paragraph (1) without regard to the provisions of law governing ap-

pointments in the competitive excepted service.

(k) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Internships offered and compensated by the Department under this section shall be funded solely by available amounts appropriated under the heading "Diplomatic Programs".

SEC. 5202. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PREVENTION OF, AND THE RESPONSE TO, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND RELATED RETALIATION.

(a) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies that provide personnel to serve in overseas posts under Chief of Mission authority, should develop interagency policies regarding harassment, discrimination, sexual assault, and related retaliation, including policies for—

(1) addressing, reporting, and providing transitioning support;

(2) advocacy, service referrals, and travel accommodations; and

(3) disciplining anyone who violates Department policies regarding harassment, discrimination, sexual assault, or related retaliation occurring between covered individuals and noncovered individuals.

(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—

(1) SEPARATION FOR CAUSE.—Section 610(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010(a)(1)), is amended—

(A) by striking "decide to"; and

(B) by inserting "upon receiving notification from the Bureau of Diplomatic Security that such member has engaged in criminal misconduct, such as murder, rape, or other sexual assault" before the period at the end.

(2) UPDATE TO MANUAL.—The Director of Global Talent shall—

(A) update the "Grounds for Disciplinary Action" and "List of Disciplinary Offenses and Penalties" sections of the Foreign Affairs Manual to reflect the amendments made under paragraph (1); and

(B) communicate such updates to Department staff through publication in Department Notices.

(c) SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE VICTIM ADVOCATES.—

(1) PLACEMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Diplomatic Security Service's Victims' Resource Advocacy Program—

(A) is appropriately staffed by advocates who are physically present at—

(i) the headquarters of the Department; and

(ii) major domestic and international facilities and embassies, as determined by the Secretary;

(B) considers the logistics that are necessary to allow for the expedient travel of victims from Department facilities that do not have advocates; and

(C) uses funds available to the Department to provide emergency food, shelter, clothing, and transportation for victims involved in matters being investigated by the Diplomatic Security Service.

SEC. 5203. INCREASING THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT AUTHORIZED FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

Section 504(e)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1979 (22 U.S.C. 2656d(e)(3)) is amended by striking "\$500,000" and inserting "\$2,000,000".

SEC. 5204. ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL TO ADDRESS BACKLOGS IN HIRING AND INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall seek to increase the number of personnel within the Bureau of Global Talent Management and the Office of Civil Rights to address backlogs in hiring and investigations into complaints conducted by the Office of Civil Rights.

(b) EMPLOYMENT TARGETS.—The Secretary shall seek to employ—

(1) not fewer than 15 additional personnel in the Bureau of Global Talent Management and the Office of Civil Rights (compared to the number of personnel so employed as of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act) by the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment; and

(2) not fewer than 15 additional personnel in such Bureau and Office (compared to the number of personnel so employed as of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act) by the date that is 1 year after such date of enactment.

SEC. 5205. COMMISSION ON REFORM AND MODERNIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Commission on Reform and Modernization of the Department of State Act".

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—There is established, in the legislative branch, the Commission on Reform and Modernization of the Department of State (referred to in this section as the "Commission").

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Commission are—

(1) to examine the changing nature of diplomacy in the 21st century and the ways in which the Department and its personnel can modernize to advance the interests of the United States; and

(2) to offer recommendations to the President and Congress related to—

(A) the organizational structure of the Department, including a review of the jurisdictional responsibilities of all of the Department's regional bureaus (the Bureau of African Affairs, the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, and the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs);

(B) personnel-related matters, including recruitment, promotion, training, and retention of the Department's workforce in order to retain the best and brightest personnel and foster effective diplomacy worldwide, including measures to strengthen diversity and inclusion to ensure that the Department's workforce represents all of America;

(C) the Department of State's infrastructure (both domestic and overseas), including infrastructure relating to information technology, transportation, and security;

(D) the link among diplomacy and defense, intelligence, development, commercial, health, law enforcement, and other core United States interests;

(E) core legislation that authorizes United States diplomacy, including the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-465);

(F) related regulations, rules, and processes that define United States diplomatic efforts, including the Foreign Affairs Manual;

(G) Chief of Mission authority at United States diplomatic missions overseas, including authority over employees of other Federal departments and agencies; and

(H) treaties that impact United States overseas presence.

(d) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 8 members, of whom—

(A) 1 member shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, who shall serve as co-chair of the Commission;

(B) 1 member shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, who shall serve as co-chair of the Commission;

(C) 1 member shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(D) 1 member shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(E) 1 member shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(F) 1 member shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(G) 1 member shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and

(H) 1 member shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS; MEETINGS.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the Commission should be prominent United States citizens, with national recognition and significant depth of experience in international relations and with the Department.

(B) POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 members of the Commission may be from the same political party.

(C) MEETINGS.—

(i) INITIAL MEETING.—The Commission shall hold the first meeting and begin operations as soon as practicable.

(ii) FREQUENCY.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the co-chairs.

(iii) QUORUM.—Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting business, except that 2 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for purposes of receiving testimony.

(D) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the powers of the Commission, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall act by resolution agreed to by a majority of the members of the Commission voting and present.

(2) PANELS.—The Commission may establish panels composed of less than the full membership of the Commission for purposes of carrying out the duties of the Commission under this section. The actions of any such panel shall be subject to the review and control of the Commission. Any findings and determinations made by such a panel may not be considered the findings and determinations of the Commission unless such findings and determinations are approved by the Commission.

(3) DELEGATION.—Any member, agent, or staff of the Commission may, if authorized by the co-chairs of the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take pursuant to this section.

(f) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or any panel or member of the Commission, as delegated by the co-chairs, may, for the purpose of carrying out this section—

(A) hold such hearings and meetings, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member considers necessary;

(B) require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member considers necessary; and

(C) subject to applicable privacy laws and relevant regulations, secure directly from any Federal department or agency information and data necessary to enable it to carry out its mission, which shall be provided by the head or acting representative of the department or agency not later than 30 days after the Commission provides a written request for such information and data.

(2) CONTRACTS.—The Commission, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, may enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this section.

(3) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this section.

(B) FURNISHING INFORMATION.—Each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, to the extent authorized by law, shall furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by a co-chair, the chair of any panel created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(C) HANDLING.—Information may only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive orders.

(4) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary shall provide to the Commission, on a nonreimbursable basis, such administrative services, funds, staff, facilities, and other support services as are necessary for the performance of the Commission's duties under this section.

(B) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Other Federal departments and agencies may provide the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support as such departments and agencies consider advisable and as may be authorized by law.

(C) COOPERATION.—The Commission shall receive the full and timely cooperation of any official, department, or agency of the Federal Government whose assistance is necessary, as jointly determined by the co-chairs of the Commission, for the fulfillment of the duties of the Commission, including the provision of full and current briefings and analyses.

(5) ASSISTANCE FROM INDEPENDENT ORGANIZATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to inform its work, the Commission should review reports that were written during the 15-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act by independent organizations and outside experts relating to reform and modernization of the Department.

(B) AVOIDING DUPLICATION.—In analyzing the reports referred to in subparagraph (A), the Commission should pay particular attention to any specific reform proposals that have been recommended by 2 or more of such reports.

(6) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(7) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(8) CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATION.—Not less frequently than quarterly, the Commission shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees about the work of the Commission.

(g) STAFF AND COMPENSATION.—

(1) STAFF.—

(A) COMPENSATION.—The co-chairs of the Commission, in accordance with rules established by the Commission, shall appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties, without regard to the provisions of title

5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the equivalent of that payable to a person occupying a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(B) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—A Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(C) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The co-chairs of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals that do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

(2) COMMISSION MEMBERS.—

(A) COMPENSATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each member of the Commission may be compensated at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission under this section.

(ii) WAIVER OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Subsections (a) through (d) of section 824 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4064) are waived for an annuitant on a temporary basis so as to be compensated for work performed as part of the Commission.

(3) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service for the Commission, members and staff of the Commission, and any Federal Government employees detailed to the Commission, shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.—The appropriate Federal agencies or departments shall cooperate with the Commission in expeditiously providing to Commission members and staff appropriate security clearances to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements, except that no person shall be provided access to classified information under this section without the appropriate security clearances.

(h) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a final report to the President and to Congress that—

(A) examines all substantive aspects of Department personnel, management, and operations; and

(B) contains such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include findings, conclusions, and recommendations related to—

(A) the organizational structure of the Department, including recommendations on whether any of the jurisdictional responsibilities among the bureaus referred to in subsection (c)(2)(A) should be adjusted, with particular focus on the opportunities and costs of adjusting jurisdictional responsibility between the Bureau of Near Eastern

Affairs to the Bureau of African Affairs, the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, the Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, and any other bureaus as may be necessary to advance United States efforts to strengthen its diplomatic engagement in the Indo-Pacific region;

(B) personnel-related matters, including recruitment, promotion, training, and retention of the Department's workforce in order to retain the best and brightest personnel and foster effective diplomacy worldwide, including measures to strengthen diversity and inclusion to ensure that the Department's workforce represents all of America;

(C) the Department of State's infrastructure (both domestic and overseas), including infrastructure relating to information technology, transportation, and security;

(D) the link between diplomacy and defense, intelligence, development, commercial, health, law enforcement, and other core United States interests;

(E) core legislation that authorizes United States diplomacy;

(F) related regulations, rules, and processes that define United States diplomatic efforts, including the Foreign Affairs Manual;

(G) treaties that impact United States overseas presence;

(H) the authority of Chiefs of Mission at United States diplomatic missions overseas, including the degree of authority that Chiefs of Mission exercise in reality over Department employees and other Federal employees at overseas posts;

(I) any other areas that the Commission considers necessary for a complete appraisal of United States diplomacy and Department management and operations; and

(J) the amount of time, manpower, and financial resources that would be necessary to implement the recommendations specified under this paragraph.

(3) DEPARTMENT RESPONSE.—The Secretary shall have the right to review and respond to all Commission recommendations—

(A) before the Commission submits its report to the President and to Congress; and

(B) not later than 90 days after receiving such recommendations from the Commission.

(i) TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities under this section, shall terminate on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the final report is submitted pursuant to subsection (h).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.—The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in paragraph (1) for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its reports and disseminating the report.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to carry out this section \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available to the Commission pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available until the date on which the Commission is terminated pursuant to subsection (i)(1).

(k) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

(1) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(2) FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.—The provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Freedom of Information Act") shall not apply to the activities, records, and proceedings of the Commission.

SEC. 5206. FOREIGN AFFAIRS TRAINING.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department is a crucial national security agency, whose employees, both Foreign Service and Civil Service, require the best possible training and professional development at every stage of their careers to prepare them to promote and defend United States national interests and the health and safety of United States citizens abroad;

(2) the Department faces increasingly complex and rapidly evolving challenges, many of which are science- and technology-driven, and which demand continual, high-quality training and professional development of its personnel;

(3) the new and evolving challenges of national security in the 21st century necessitate the expansion of standardized training and professional development opportunities linked to equitable, accountable, and transparent promotion and leadership practices for Department and other national security agency personnel; and

(4) consistent with gift acceptance authority of the Department and other applicable laws in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department and the Foreign Service Institute may accept funds and other resources from foundations, not-for-profit corporations, and other appropriate sources to help the Department and the Institute enhance the quantity and quality of training and professional development offerings, especially in the introduction of new, innovative, and pilot model courses.

(b) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIZATION.—In order to provide the Civil Service of the Department and the Foreign Service with the level of professional development and training needed to effectively advance United States interests across the world, the Secretary shall—

(1) increase relevant offerings provided by the Department—

(A) of interactive virtual instruction to make training and professional development more accessible and useful to personnel deployed throughout the world; or

(B) at partner organizations, including universities, industry entities, and nongovernmental organizations, throughout the United States to provide useful outside perspectives to Department personnel by providing such personnel—

(i) a more comprehensive outlook on different sectors of United States society; and

(ii) practical experience dealing with commercial corporations, universities, labor unions, and other institutions critical to United States diplomatic success;

(2) offer courses using computer-based or computer-assisted simulations, allowing civilian officers to lead decision making in a crisis environment, and encourage officers of the Department, and reciprocally, officers of other Federal departments to participate in similar exercises held by the Department or other government organizations and the private sector;

(3) increase the duration and expand the focus of certain training and professional development courses, including by extending—

(A) the A-100 entry-level course to as long as 12 weeks, which better matches the length of entry-level training and professional de-

velopment provided to the officers in other national security departments and agencies; and

(B) the Chief of Mission course to as long as 6 weeks for first time Chiefs of Mission and creating comparable courses for new Assistant Secretaries and Deputy Assistant Secretaries to more accurately reflect the significant responsibilities accompanying such roles; and

(4) ensure that Foreign Service officers who are assigned to a country experiencing significant population displacement due to the impacts of climatic and non-climatic shocks and stresses, including rising sea levels and lack of access to affordable and reliable energy and electricity, receive specific instruction on United States policy with respect to resiliency and adaptation to such climatic and non-climatic shocks and stresses.

(d) FELLOWSHIPS.—The Director General of the Foreign Service shall—

(1) expand and establish new fellowship programs for Foreign Service and Civil Service officers that include short- and long-term opportunities at organizations, including—

(A) think tanks and nongovernmental organizations;

(B) the Department of Defense, the elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)), and other relevant Federal agencies;

(C) industry entities, especially such entities related to technology, global operations, finance, and other fields directly relevant to international affairs; and

(D) schools of international relations and other relevant programs at universities throughout the United States; and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit a report to Congress that describes how the Department could expand the Pearson Fellows Program for Foreign Service Officers and the Brookings Fellow Program for Civil Servants to provide fellows in such programs with the opportunity to undertake a follow-on assignment within the Department in an office in which fellows will gain practical knowledge of the people and processes of Congress, including offices other than the Legislative Affairs Bureau, including—

(A) an assessment of the current state of congressional fellowships, including the demand for fellowships and the value the fellowships provide to both the career of the officer and to the Department; and

(B) an assessment of the options for making congressional fellowships for both the Foreign and Civil Services more career-enhancing.

(e) BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall establish a Board of Visitors of the Foreign Service Institute (referred to in this subsection as the "Board").

(2) DUTIES.—The Board shall provide the Secretary with independent advice and recommendations regarding organizational management, strategic planning, resource management, curriculum development, and other matters of interest to the Foreign Service Institute, including regular observations about how well the Department is integrating training and professional development into the work of the Bureau for Global Talent Management.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be—

(i) nonpartisan; and

(ii) composed of 12 members, of whom—

(I) 2 members shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(II) 2 members shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(III) 2 members shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(IV) 2 members shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(V) 4 members shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(B) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Members of the Board shall be appointed from among individuals who—

(i) are not officers or employees of the Federal Government; and

(ii) are eminent authorities in the fields of diplomacy, national security, management, leadership, economics, trade, technology, or advanced international relations education.

(C) **OUTSIDE EXPERTISE.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not fewer than 6 members of the Board shall have a minimum of 10 years of relevant expertise outside the field of diplomacy.

(ii) **PRIOR SENIOR SERVICE AT THE DEPARTMENT.**—Not more than 6 members of the Board may be persons who previously served in the Senior Foreign Service or the Senior Executive Service at the Department.

(4) **TERMS.**—Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, except that of the members first appointed—

(A) 4 members shall be appointed for a term of 3 years;

(B) 4 members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

(C) 4 members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year.

(5) **REAPPOINTMENT; REPLACEMENT.**—A member of the Board may be reappointed or replaced at the discretion of the official who made the original appointment.

(6) **CHAIRPERSON; CO-CHAIRPERSON.**—

(A) **APPROVAL.**—The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Board shall be approved by the Secretary of State based upon a recommendation from the members of the Board.

(B) **SERVICE.**—The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall serve at the discretion of the Secretary.

(7) **MEETINGS.**—The Board shall meet—

(A) at the call of the Director of the Foreign Service Institute and the Chairperson; and

(B) not fewer than 2 times per year.

(8) **COMPENSATION.**—Each member of the Board shall serve without compensation, except that a member of the Board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service for the Board. Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary may accept the voluntary and uncompensated service of members of the Board.

(9) **APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Board established under this subsection.

(f) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVOST OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Foreign Service Institute the position of Provost.

(2) **APPOINTMENT; REPORTING.**—The Provost shall—

(A) be appointed by the Secretary; and

(B) report to the Director of the Foreign Service Institute.

(3) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—The Provost shall be—

(A) an eminent authority in the field of diplomacy, national security, education, management, leadership, economics, history, trade, adult education, or technology; and

(B) a person with significant experience outside the Department, whether in other national security agencies or in the private sector, and preferably in positions of authority in educational institutions or the field of professional development and mid-career training with oversight for the evaluation of academic programs.

(4) **DUTIES.**—The Provost shall—

(A) oversee, review, evaluate, and coordinate the academic curriculum for all courses taught and administered by the Foreign Service Institute;

(B) coordinate the development of an evaluation system to ascertain how well participants in Foreign Service Institute courses have absorbed and utilized the information, ideas, and skills imparted by each such course, such that performance assessments can be included in the personnel records maintained by the Bureau of Global Talent Management and utilized in Foreign Service Selection Boards, which may include—

(i) the implementation of a letter or numerical grading system; and

(ii) assessments done after the course has concluded; and

(C) report not less frequently than quarterly to the Board of Visitors regarding the development of curriculum and the performance of Foreign Service officers.

(5) **TERM.**—The Provost shall serve for a term of not fewer than 5 years and may be reappointed for 1 additional 5-year term.

(6) **COMPENSATION.**—The Provost shall receive a salary commensurate with the rank and experience of a member of the Senior Foreign Service or the Senior Executive Service, as determined by the Secretary.

(g) **OTHER AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.**—

(1) **OTHER AGENCIES.**—National security agencies other than the Department should be afforded the ability to increase the enrollment of their personnel in courses at the Foreign Service Institute and other training and professional development facilities of the Department to promote a whole-of-government approach to mitigating national security challenges.

(2) **CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that describes—

(A) the training and professional development opportunities at the Foreign Service Institute and other Department facilities available to congressional staff;

(B) the budget impacts of offering such opportunities to congressional staff; and

(C) potential course offerings.

(h) **STRATEGY FOR ADAPTING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR MODERN DIPLOMATIC NEEDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a strategy for adapting and evolving training requirements to better meet the Department's current and future needs for 21st century diplomacy.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(A) Integrating training requirements into the Department's promotion policies, including establishing educational and professional development standards for training and attainment to be used as a part of tenure and promotion guidelines.

(B) Addressing multiple existing and emerging national security challenges, including—

(i) democratic backsliding and authoritarianism;

(ii) countering, and assisting United States allies to address, state-sponsored disinformation, including through the Global Engagement Center;

(iii) cyber threats;

(iv) the aggression and malign influence of Russia, Cuba, Iran, North Korea, the Maduro Regime, and the Chinese Communist Party's multi-faceted and comprehensive challenge to the rules-based order;

(v) the implications of climate change for United States diplomacy; and

(vi) nuclear threats.

(C) An examination of the likely advantages and disadvantages of establishing residential training for the A-100 orientation course administered by the Foreign Service Institute and evaluating the feasibility of residential training for other long-term training opportunities.

(D) An examination of the likely advantages and disadvantages of establishing a press freedom curriculum for the National Foreign Affairs Training Center that enables Foreign Service officers to better understand issues of press freedom and the tools that are available to help protect journalists and promote freedom of the press norms, which may include—

(i) the historic and current issues facing press freedom, including countries of specific concern;

(ii) the Department's role in promoting press freedom as an American value, a human rights issue, and a national security imperative;

(iii) ways to incorporate press freedom promotion into other aspects of diplomacy; and

(iv) existing tools to assist journalists in distress and methods for engaging foreign governments and institutions on behalf of individuals engaged in journalistic activity who are at risk of harm.

(E) The expansion of external courses offered by the Foreign Service Institute at academic institutions or professional associations on specific topics, including in-person and virtual courses on monitoring and evaluation, audience analysis, and the use of emerging technologies in diplomacy.

(3) **UTILIZATION OF EXISTING RESOURCES.**—In examining the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a residential training program pursuant to paragraph (2)(C), the Secretary shall—

(A) collaborate with other national security departments and agencies that employ residential training for their orientation courses; and

(B) consider using the Department's Foreign Affairs Security Training Center in Blackstone, Virginia.

(i) **REPORT AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that includes—

(A) a strategy for broadening and deepening professional development and training at the Department, including assessing current and future needs for 21st century diplomacy;

(B) the process used and resources needed to implement the strategy referred to in subparagraph (A) throughout the Department; and

(C) the results and impact of the strategy on the workforce of the Department, particularly the relationship between professional development and training and promotions

for Department personnel, and the measurement and evaluation methods used to evaluate such results.

(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required under paragraph (1), and annually thereafter for 2 years, the Secretary shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the information required to be included in the report.

(j) FOREIGN LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized to establish and implement an incentive program, with a similar structure as the Foreign Language Proficiency Bonus offered by the Department of Defense, to encourage members of the Foreign Service who possess language proficiency in any of the languages that qualify for additional incentive pay, as determined by the Secretary, to maintain critical foreign language skills.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that includes a detailed plan for implementing the program authorized under paragraph (1), including anticipated resource requirements to carry out such program.

(k) DEPARTMENT OF STATE WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that informed, data-driven, and long-term workforce management, including with respect to the Foreign Service, the Civil Service, locally employed staff, and contractors, is needed to align diplomatic priorities with the appropriate personnel and resources.

(2) ANNUAL WORKFORCE REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to understand the Department's long-term trends with respect to its workforce, the Secretary, in consultation with relevant bureaus and offices, including the Bureau of Global Talent Management and the Center for Analytics, shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that details the Department's workforce, disaggregated by Foreign Service, Civil Service, locally employed staff, and contractors, including, with respect to the reporting period—

(i) the number of personnel who were hired;

(ii) the number of personnel whose employment or contract was terminated or who voluntarily left the Department;

(iii) the number of personnel who were promoted, including the grade to which they were promoted;

(iv) the demographic breakdown of personnel; and

(v) the distribution of the Department's workforce based on domestic and overseas assignments, including a breakdown of the number of personnel in geographic and functional bureaus, and the number of personnel in overseas missions by region.

(B) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit the report described in subparagraph (A) for each of the fiscal years 2016 through 2022.

(C) RECURRING REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2023, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary shall submit the report described in subparagraph (A) for the most recently concluded fiscal year.

(D) USE OF REPORT DATA.—The data in each of the reports required under this paragraph shall be used by Congress, in coordination with the Secretary, to inform recommendations on the appropriate size and composition of the Department.

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF FILLING THE POSITION OF UNDERSECRETARY FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AF-

FAIRS.—It is the sense of Congress that since a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs is detrimental to the national security interests of the United States, the President should expeditiously nominate a qualified individual to such position whenever such vacancy occurs to ensure that the bureaus reporting to such position are able to fulfill their mission of—

(1) expanding and strengthening relationships between the people of the United States and citizens of other countries; and

(2) engaging, informing, and understanding the perspectives of foreign audiences.

(m) REPORT ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that includes—

(1) an evaluation of the May 2019 merger of the Bureau of Public Affairs and the Bureau of International Information Programs into the Bureau of Global Public Affairs with respect to—

(A) the efficacy of the current configuration of the bureaus reporting to the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs in achieving the mission of the Department;

(B) the metrics before and after such merger, including personnel data, disaggregated by position and location, content production, opinion polling, program evaluations, and media appearances;

(C) the results of a survey of public diplomacy practitioners to determine their opinion of the efficacy of such merger and any adjustments that still need to be made;

(D) a plan for evaluating and monitoring, not less frequently than once every 2 years, the programs, activities, messaging, professional development efforts, and structure of the Bureau of Global Public Affairs, and submitting a summary of each such evaluation to the appropriate committees of Congress; and

(2) a review of recent outside recommendations for modernizing diplomacy at the Department with respect to public diplomacy efforts, including—

(A) efforts in each of the bureaus reporting to the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs to address issues of diversity and inclusion in their work, structure, data collection, programming, and personnel, including any collaboration with the Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion;

(B) proposals to collaborate with think tanks and academic institutions working on public diplomacy issues to implement recent outside recommendations; and

(C) additional authorizations and appropriations necessary to implement such recommendations.

SEC. 5207. SECURITY CLEARANCE APPROVAL PROCESS.

(a) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees for streamlining the security clearance approval process within the Bureau of Diplomatic Security so that the security clearance approval process for Civil Service and Foreign Service applicants is completed within 6 months, on average, and within 1 year, in the vast majority of cases.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the recommendations are submitted pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) describes the status of the efforts of the Department to streamline the security clearance approval process; and

(2) identifies any remaining obstacles preventing security clearances from being com-

pleted within the time frames set forth in subsection (a), including lack of cooperation or other actions by other Federal departments and agencies.

SEC. 5208. ADDENDUM FOR STUDY ON FOREIGN SERVICE ALLOWANCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an addendum to the report required under section 5302 of the Department of State Authorization Act of 2021 (division E of Public Law 117–81), which shall be entitled the “Report on Bidding for Domestic and Overseas Posts and Filling Unfilled Positions”. The addendum shall be prepared using input from the same federally funded research and development center that prepared the analysis conducted for the purposes of such report.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The addendum required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the total number of domestic and overseas positions open during the most recent summer bidding cycle;

(2) the total number of bids each position received;

(3) the number of unfilled positions at the conclusion of the most recent summer bidding cycle, disaggregated by bureau; and

(4) detailed recommendations and a timeline for—

(A) increasing the number of qualified bidders for underbid positions; and

(B) minimizing the number of unfilled positions at the end of the bidding season.

SEC. 5209. CURTAILMENTS, REMOVALS FROM POST, AND WAIVERS OF PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.

(a) CURTAILMENTS REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding curtailments of Department personnel from overseas posts.

(2) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report required under paragraph (1)—

(A) relevant information about any post that, during the 6-month period preceding the report—

(i) had more than 5 curtailments; or

(ii) had curtailments representing more than 5 percent of Department personnel at such post; and

(B) for each post referred to in subparagraph (A), the number of curtailments, disaggregated by month of occurrence.

(b) REMOVAL OF DIPLOMATS.—Not later than 5 days after the date on which any United States personnel under Chief of Mission authority is declared persona non grata by a host government, the Secretary shall—

(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such declaration; and

(2) include with such notification—

(A) the official reason for such declaration (if provided by the host government);

(B) the date of the declaration; and

(C) whether the Department responded by declaring a host government's diplomat in the United States persona non grata.

(c) WAIVER OF PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Not later than 15 days after any waiver of privileges and immunities pursuant to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961, that is applicable to an entire diplomatic post or to the majority of United States personnel under Chief of Mission authority, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver and the reason for such waiver.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5210. REPORT ON WORLDWIDE AVAILABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the feasibility of requiring that each member of the Foreign Service, at the time of entry into the Foreign Service and thereafter, be worldwide available, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the feasibility of a worldwide availability requirement for all members of the Foreign Service;

(2) considerations if such a requirement were to be implemented, including the potential effect on recruitment and retention; and

(3) recommendations for exclusions and limitations, including exemptions for medical reasons, disability, and other circumstances.

SEC. 5211. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall strongly encourage that Foreign Service officers seeking entry into the Senior Foreign Service participate in professional development described in subsection (c).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit recommendations on requiring that Foreign Service officers complete professional development described in subsection (c) to be eligible for entry into the Senior Foreign Service.

(c) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DESCRIBED.—Professional development described in this subsection is not less than 6 months of training or experience outside of the Department, including time spent—

(1) as a detailee to another government agency, including Congress or a State, Tribal, or local government;

(2) in Department-sponsored and -funded university training that results in an advanced degree, excluding time spent at a university that is fully funded or operated by the Federal Government.

(d) PROMOTION PRECEPTS.—The Secretary shall instruct promotion boards to consider positively long-term training and out-of-agency detail assignments.

SEC. 5212. MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENTS AT DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR POSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall annually conduct, at each diplomatic and consular post, a voluntary survey, which shall be offered to all staff assigned to that post who are citizens of the United States (excluding the Chief of Mission) to assess the management and leadership of that post by the Chief of Mission, the Deputy Chief of Mission, and the Charge d'Affaires.

(b) ANONYMITY.—All responses to the survey shall be—

(1) fully anonymized; and

(2) made available to the Director General of the Foreign Service.

(c) SURVEY.—The survey shall seek to assess—

(1) the general morale at post;

(2) the presence of any hostile work environment;

(3) the presence of any harassment, discrimination, retaliation, or other mistreatment; and

(4) effective leadership and collegial work environment.

(d) DIRECTOR GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS.—Upon compilation and review of the surveys, the Director General of the Foreign Service shall issue recommendations to posts, as appropriate, based on the findings of the surveys.

(e) REFERRAL.—If the surveys reveal any action that is grounds for referral to the Inspector General of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, the Director General of the Foreign Service may refer the matter to the Inspector General of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, who shall, as the Inspector General considers appropriate, conduct an inspection of the post in accordance with section 209(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(b)).

(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Director General of the Foreign Service shall submit an annual report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) any trends or summaries from the surveys;

(2) the posts where corrective action was recommended or taken in response to any issues identified by the surveys; and

(3) the number of referrals to the Inspector General of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, as applicable.

(g) INITIAL BASIS.—The Secretary shall carry out the surveys required under this section on an initial basis for 5 years.

SEC. 5213. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF PROMOTION POLICIES.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a comprehensive review of the policies, personnel, organization, and processes related to promotions within the Department, including—

(1) a review of—

(A) the selection and oversight of Foreign Service promotion panels; and

(B) the use of quantitative data and metrics in such panels;

(2) an assessment of the promotion practices of the Department, including how promotion processes are communicated to the workforce and appeals processes; and

(3) recommendations for improving promotion panels and promotion practices.

SEC. 5214. THIRD PARTY VERIFICATION OF PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION (PCS) ORDERS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a mechanism for third parties to verify the employment of, and the validity of permanent change of station (PCS) orders received by, members of the Foreign Service, in a manner that protects the safety, security, and privacy of sensitive employee information.

SEC. 5215. POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS ON SENATE-CONFIRMED OFFICIALS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the executive branch have recognized the importance of preventing and mitigating the potential for conflicts of interest following government service, including with respect to senior United States officials working on behalf of foreign governments; and

(2) Congress and the executive branch should jointly evaluate the status and scope of post-employment restrictions.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) EXTENDED POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS FOR CERTAIN SENATE-CONFIRMED OFFICIALS.—

“(1) SECRETARY OF STATE AND DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE.—With respect to a person serving as the Secretary of State or Deputy Secretary of State, the restrictions described in section 207(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a foreign governmental entity be-

fore an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States at any time after the termination of that person's service as Secretary or Deputy Secretary.

“(2) UNDER SECRETARIES, ASSISTANT SECRETARIES, AND AMBASSADORS.—With respect to a person serving as an Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, or Ambassador at the Department of State or the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, the restrictions described in section 207(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a foreign governmental entity before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States for 3 years after the termination of that person's service in a position described in this paragraph, or the duration of the term or terms of the President who appointed that person to their position, whichever is longer.

“(3) ENHANCED RESTRICTIONS FOR POST-EMPLOYMENT WORK ON BEHALF OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES OF CONCERN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to all former officials listed in this subsection, the restrictions described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a country of concern described in subparagraph (B) before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States at any time after the termination of that person's service in a position described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(B) COUNTRIES SPECIFIED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘country of concern’ means—

“(i) the People's Republic of China;

“(ii) the Russian Federation;

“(iii) the Islamic Republic of Iran;

“(iv) the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

“(v) the Republic of Cuba; and

“(vi) the Syrian Arab Republic.

“(4) PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIONS.—Any violations of the restrictions in paragraphs (1) or (2) shall be subject to the penalties and injunctions provided for under section 216 of title 18, United States Code.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) FOREIGN GOVERNMENT ENTITY.—The term ‘foreign governmental entity’ includes—

“(i) any person employed by—

“(I) any department, agency, or other entity of a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level;

“(II) any governing party or coalition of a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level; or

“(III) any entity majority-owned or majority-controlled by a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level; and

“(ii) in the case of a country described in paragraph (3)(B), any company, economic project, cultural organization, exchange program, or nongovernmental organization that is more than 33 percent owned or controlled by the government of such country.

“(B) REPRESENTATION.—The term ‘representation’ does not include representation by an attorney, who is duly licensed and authorized to provide legal advice in a United States jurisdiction, of a person or entity in a legal capacity or for the purposes of rendering legal advice.

“(6) NOTICE OF RESTRICTIONS.—Any person subject to the restrictions of this subsection shall be provided notice of these restrictions by the Department of State upon appointment by the President, and subsequently upon termination of service with the Department of State.

“(7) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The restrictions under this subsection shall apply only to persons who are appointed by the President to the positions referenced in this subsection on

or after 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Department of State Authorization Act of 2022.

“(8) SUNSET.—The enhanced restrictions under paragraph (3) shall expire on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.”.

SEC. 5216. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITIES REGARDING SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN MONTHLY WORKERS' COMPENSATION PAYMENTS AND OTHER PAYMENTS.

Section 901 of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) EXPANSION OF AUTHORITIES.—The head of any Federal agency may exercise the authorities of this section, including to designate an incident, whether the incident occurred in the United States or abroad, for purposes of subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) of subsection (e)(4) when the incident affects United States Government employees of the agency or their dependents who are not under the security responsibility of the Secretary of State as set forth in section 103 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4802) or when operational control of overseas security responsibility for such employees or dependents has been delegated to the head of the agency.”.

TITLE LIII—EMBASSY SECURITY AND CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 5301. AMENDMENTS TO SECURE EMBASSY CONSTRUCTION AND COUNTERTERRORISM ACT OF 1999.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 2022”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (title VI of division A of appendix G of Public Law 106-113) was a necessary response to bombings on August 7, 1998, at the United States embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, that were destroyed by simultaneously exploding bombs. The resulting explosions killed 220 persons and injured more than 4,000 others. Twelve Americans and 40 Kenyan and Tanzanian employees of the United States Foreign Service were killed in the attacks.

(2) Those bombings, followed by the expeditionary diplomatic efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, demonstrated the need to prioritize the security of United States posts and personnel abroad above other considerations.

(3) Between 1999 and 2022, the risk calculus of the Department impacted the ability of United States diplomats around the world to advance the interests of the United States through access to local populations, leaders, and places.

(4) America’s competitors and adversaries do not have the same restrictions that United States diplomats have, especially in critically important medium-threat and high-threat posts.

(5) The Department’s 2021 Overseas Security Panel report states that—

(A) the requirement for setback and collocation of diplomatic posts under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 606(a) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865(a)) has led to skyrocketing costs of new embassies and consulates; and

(B) the locations of such posts have become less desirable, creating an extremely suboptimal nexus that further hinders United States diplomats who are willing to accept more risk in order to advance United States interests.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the setback and collocation requirements referred to in subsection (b)(5)(A), even with available waivers, no longer provide the security such requirements used to provide because of advancement in technologies, such as remote controlled drones, that can evade walls and other such static barriers;

(2) the Department should focus on creating performance security standards that—

(A) attempt to keep the setback requirements of diplomatic posts as limited as possible; and

(B) provide diplomats access to local populations as much as possible, while still providing a necessary level of security;

(3) collocation of diplomatic facilities is often not feasible or advisable, particularly for public diplomacy spaces whose mission is to reach and be accessible to wide sectors of the public, including in countries with repressive governments, since such spaces are required to permit the foreign public to enter and exit the space easily and openly;

(4) the Bureau of Diplomatic Security should—

(A) fully utilize the waiver process provided under paragraphs (2)(B) and (3)(B) of section 606(a) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865(a)); and

(B) appropriately exercise such waiver process as a tool to right-size the appropriate security footing at each diplomatic post rather than only approving waivers in extreme circumstances;

(5) the return of great power competition requires—

(A) United States diplomats to do all they can to outperform our adversaries; and

(B) the Department to better optimize use of taxpayer funding to advance United States national interests; and

(6) this section will better enable United States diplomats to compete in the 21st century, while saving United States taxpayers millions in reduced property and maintenance costs at embassies and consulates abroad.

(d) DEFINITION OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITY.—Section 603 of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (title VI of division A of appendix G of Public Law 106-113) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 603. UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITY DEFINED.

“In this title, the terms ‘United States diplomatic facility’ and ‘diplomatic facility’ mean any chancery, consulate, or other office that—

“(1) is considered by the Secretary of State to be diplomatic or consular premises, consistent with the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961, and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and was notified to the host government as such; or

“(2) is otherwise subject to a publicly available bilateral agreement with the host government (contained in the records of the United States Department of State) that recognizes the official status of the United States Government personnel present at the facility.”.

(e) GUIDANCE AND REQUIREMENTS FOR DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES.—

(1) GUIDANCE FOR CLOSURE OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FACILITIES.—Section 5606(a) of the Public Diplomacy Modernization Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-81; 22 U.S.C. 1475g note) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to preserve public diplomacy facilities that are accessible to the publics of foreign countries, not later

than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 2022, the Secretary of State shall adopt guidelines to collect and utilize information from each diplomatic post at which the construction of a new embassy compound or new consulate compound could result in the closure or co-location of an American Space that is owned and operated by the United States Government, generally known as an American Center, or any other public diplomacy facility under the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865 et seq.).”.

(2) SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES.—Section 606(a) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “the threat” and inserting “a range of threats, including that”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “in a location that has certain minimum ratings under the Security Environment Threat List as determined by the Secretary in his or her discretion” after “abroad”; and

(II) by inserting “, personnel of the Peace Corps, and personnel of any other type or category of facility that the Secretary may identify” after “military commander”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Secretary of State may waive subparagraph (A) if the Secretary, in consultation with, as appropriate, the head of each agency employing personnel that would not be located at the site, if applicable, determines that it is in the national interest of the United States after taking account of any considerations the Secretary in his or her discretion considers relevant, which may include security conditions.”; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “(ii) CHANCERY OR CONSULATE BUILDING.—” and all that follows through “15 days prior” and inserting the following:

“(ii) CHANCERY OR CONSULATE BUILDING.—Prior”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) REQUIREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each newly acquired United States diplomatic facility in a location that has certain minimum ratings under the Security Environment Threat List as determined by the Secretary of State in his or her discretion shall—

“(I) be constructed or modified to meet the measured building blast performance standard applicable to a diplomatic facility sited not less than 100 feet from the perimeter of the property on which the facility is situated; or

“(II) fulfill the criteria described in clause (ii).

“(ii) ALTERNATIVE ENGINEERING EQUIVALENCY STANDARD REQUIREMENT.—Each facility referred to in clause (i) may, instead of meeting the requirement under such clause, fulfill such other criteria as the Secretary is authorized to employ to achieve an engineering standard of security and degree of protection that is equivalent to the numerical perimeter distance setback described in such clause seeks to achieve.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by striking “security considerations permit and”; and

(bb) by inserting “after taking account of any considerations the Secretary in his or her discretion considers relevant, which may

include security conditions” after “national interest of the United States”;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “(ii) CHANCERY OR CONSULATE BUILDING.—” and all that follows through “15 days prior” and inserting the following:

“(ii) CHANCERY OR CONSULATE BUILDING.—Prior”; and

(III) in clause (iii), by striking “an annual” and inserting “a quarterly”.

SEC. 5302. DIPLOMATIC SUPPORT AND SECURITY.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Diplomatic Support and Security Act of 2022”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A robust overseas diplomatic presence is part of an effective foreign policy, particularly in volatile environments where a flexible and timely diplomatic response can be decisive in preventing and addressing conflict.

(2) Diplomats routinely put themselves and their families at great personal risk to serve their country overseas where they face threats related to international terrorism, violent conflict, and public health.

(3) The Department has a remarkable record of protecting personnel while enabling an enormous amount of global diplomatic activity, often in insecure and remote places and facing a variety of evolving risks and threats. With support from Congress, the Department of State has revised policy, improved physical security through retrofitting and replacing old facilities, deployed additional security personnel and armored vehicles, and greatly enhanced training requirements and training facilities, including the new Foreign Affairs Security Training Center in Blackstone, Virginia.

(4) Diplomatic missions rely on robust staffing and ambitious external engagement to advance United States interests as diverse as competing with China’s malign influence around the world, fighting terrorism and transnational organized crime, preventing and addressing violent conflict and humanitarian disasters, promoting United States businesses and trade, protecting the rights of marginalized groups, addressing climate change, and preventing pandemic disease.

(5) Efforts to protect personnel overseas have often resulted in inhibiting diplomatic activity and limiting engagement between embassy personnel and local governments and populations.

(6) Given that Congress currently provides annual appropriations in excess of \$1,900,000,000 for embassy security, construction, and maintenance, the Department should be able to ensure a robust overseas presence without inhibiting the ability of diplomats to—

(A) meet outside United States secured facilities with foreign leaders to explain, defend, and advance United States priorities;

(B) understand and report on foreign political, social, and economic conditions through meeting and interacting with community officials outside of United States facilities;

(C) provide United States citizen services; and

(D) collaborate and, at times, compete with other diplomatic missions, particularly those, such as that of the People’s Republic of China, that do not have restrictions on meeting locations.

(7) Given these stakes, Congress has a responsibility to empower, support, and hold the Department accountable for implementing an aggressive strategy to ensure a robust overseas presence that mitigates potential risks and adequately considers the myriad direct and indirect consequences of a lack of diplomatic presence.

(c) **ENCOURAGING EXPEDITIONARY DIPLOMACY.**—

(1) **PURPOSE.**—Section 102(b) of the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4801(b)) is amended—

(A) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) to promote strengthened security measures, institutionalize a culture of learning, and, in the case of apparent gross negligence or breach of duty, recommend that the Secretary investigate accountability for United States Government personnel with security-related responsibilities;”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) to support a culture of risk management, instead of risk avoidance, that enables the Department of State to pursue its vital goals with full knowledge that it is neither desirable nor possible for the Department to avoid all risks;”.

(2) **BRIEFINGS ON EMBASSY SECURITY.**—Section 105(a)(1) of the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4804(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking “any plans to open or reopen a high risk, high threat post” and inserting “progress towards opening or reopening a high risk, high threat post, and the risk to national security of the continued closure or any suspension of operations and remaining barriers to doing so”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “the risk to United States national security of the post’s continued closure or suspension of operations,” after “national security of the United States.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “the type and level of security threats such post could encounter, and” before “security ‘tripwires’”.

(d) **SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 301 of the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4831) is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “**AC-COUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARDS**” and inserting “**SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEES**”;

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) **CONVENING THE SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEE.**—In any case of a serious security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at, or related to, a United States Government diplomatic mission abroad (referred to in this title as a ‘Serious Security Incident’), and in any case of a serious breach of security involving intelligence activities of a foreign government directed at a United States Government mission abroad, the Secretary of State shall convene a Security Review Committee, which shall issue a report providing a full account of what occurred, consistent with section 304.”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

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

“(2) **COMMITTEE COMPOSITION.**—The Secretary shall designate a Chairperson and may designate additional personnel of commensurate seniority to serve on the Security Review Committee, which shall include—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Management Strategy and Solutions;

“(B) the Assistant Secretary responsible for the region where the incident occurred;

“(C) the Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security;

“(D) the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research;

“(E) an Assistant Secretary-level representative from any involved United States Government department or agency; and

“(F) other personnel determined to be necessary or appropriate.”;

(i) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by clause (i)—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking “**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL**” and inserting “**EXCEPTIONS TO CONVENING A SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**”;

(II) by striking “The Secretary of State is not required to convene a Board in the case” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State is not required to convene a Security Review Committee—

“(i) if the Secretary determines that the incident involves only causes unrelated to security, such as when the security at issue is outside of the scope of the Secretary of State’s security responsibilities under section 103;

“(ii) if operational control of overseas security functions has been delegated to another agency in accordance with section 106;

“(iii) if the incident is a cybersecurity incident and is covered by other review mechanisms; or

“(iv) in the case”;

(III) by striking “In any such case” and inserting the following:

“(B) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INVESTIGATIONS.**—In the case of an incident described in subparagraph (A)(iv)”;

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **RULEMAKING.**—The Secretary of State shall promulgate regulations defining the membership and operating procedures for the Security Review Committee and provide such guidance to the Chair and ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “**BOARDS**” and inserting “**SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEES**”;

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

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall convene an SRC not later than 60 days after the occurrence of an incident described in subsection (a)(1), or 60 days after the Department first becomes aware of such an incident, whichever is earlier, except that the 60-day period for convening an SRC may be extended for one additional 60-day period if the Secretary determines that the additional period is necessary.”;

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Whenever the Secretary of State convenes a Security Review Committee, the Secretary shall promptly inform the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”.

(e) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 302 of the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4832) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**AC-COUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD**” and inserting “**SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**”;

(2) by striking “a Board” each place such term appears and inserting “a Security Review Committee”.

(f) **SERIOUS SECURITY INCIDENT INVESTIGATION PROCESS.**—Section 303 of the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4833) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 303. SERIOUS SECURITY INCIDENT INVESTIGATION PROCESS.

“(a) **INVESTIGATION PROCESS.**—

“(1) **INITIATION UPON REPORTED INCIDENT.**—A United States mission shall submit an initial report of a Serious Security Incident not later than 3 days after such incident occurs,

whenever feasible, at which time an investigation of the incident shall be initiated.

“(2) INVESTIGATION.—Not later than 10 days after the submission of a report pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall direct the Diplomatic Security Service to assemble an investigative team to investigate the incident and independently establish what occurred. Each investigation under this subsection shall cover—

“(A) an assessment of what occurred, who perpetrated or is suspected of having perpetrated the Serious Security Incident, and whether applicable security procedures were followed;

“(B) in the event the Serious Security Incident involved a United States diplomatic compound, motorcade, residence, or other facility, an assessment of whether adequate security countermeasures were in effect based on a known threat at the time of the incident;

“(C) if the incident involved an individual or group of officers, employees, or family members under Chief of Mission security responsibility conducting approved operations or movements outside the United States mission, an assessment of whether proper security briefings and procedures were in place and whether weighing of risk of the operation or movement took place; and

“(D) an assessment of whether the failure of any officials or employees to follow procedures or perform their duties contributed to the security incident.

“(3) INVESTIGATIVE TEAM.—The investigative team assembled pursuant to paragraph (2) shall consist of individuals from the Diplomatic Security Service who shall provide an independent examination of the facts surrounding the incident and what occurred. The Secretary, or the Secretary’s designee, shall review the makeup of the investigative team for a conflict, appearance of conflict, or lack of independence that could undermine the results of the investigation and may remove or replace any members of the team to avoid such an outcome.

“(b) REPORT OF INVESTIGATION.—Not later than 90 days after the occurrence of a Serious Security Incident, the investigative team investigating the incident shall prepare and submit a Report of Investigation to the Security Review Committee that includes—

“(1) a detailed description of the matters set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (a)(2), including all related findings;

“(2) a complete and accurate account of the casualties, injuries, and damage resulting from the incident; and

“(3) a review of security procedures and directives in place at the time of the incident.

“(c) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The investigative team investigating a Serious Security Incident shall adopt such procedures with respect to confidentiality as determined necessary, including procedures relating to the conduct of closed proceedings or the submission and use of evidence in camera, to ensure in particular the protection of classified information relating to national defense, foreign policy, or intelligence matters. The Director of National Intelligence shall establish the level of protection required for intelligence information and for information relating to intelligence personnel included in the report required under subsection (b). The Security Review Committee shall determine the level of classification of the final report prepared pursuant to section 304(b), and shall incorporate the same confidentiality measures in such report to the maximum extent practicable.”

(g) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEE.—Section 304 of

the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4834) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 304. SECURITY REVIEW COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND REPORT.

“(a) FINDINGS.—The Security Review Committee shall—

“(1) review the Report of Investigation prepared pursuant to section 303(b), and all other evidence, reporting, and relevant information relating to a Serious Security Incident at a United States mission abroad, including an examination of the facts and circumstances surrounding any serious injuries, loss of life, or significant destruction of property resulting from the incident; and

“(2) determine, in writing—

“(A) whether the incident was security related and constituted a Serious Security Incident;

“(B) if the incident involved a diplomatic compound, motorcade, residence, or other mission facility—

“(i) whether the security systems, security countermeasures, and security procedures operated as intended; and

“(ii) whether such systems worked to materially mitigate the attack or were found to be inadequate to mitigate the threat and attack;

“(C) if the incident involved an individual or group of officers conducting an approved operation outside the mission, whether a valid process was followed in evaluating the requested operation and weighing the risk of the operation, which determination shall not seek to assign accountability for the incident unless the Security Review Committee determines that an official breached his or her duty;

“(D) the impact of intelligence and information availability, and whether the mission was aware of the general operating threat environment or any more specific threat intelligence or information and took that into account in ongoing and specific operations; and

“(E) any other facts and circumstances that may be relevant to the appropriate security management of United States missions abroad.

“(b) REPORT.—

“(1) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY OF STATE.—Not later than 60 days after receiving the Report of Investigation prepared pursuant to section 303(b), the Security Review Committee shall submit a report to the Secretary of State that includes—

“(A) the findings described in subsection (a); and

“(B) any related recommendations.

“(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after receiving the report pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall submit a copy of the report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(c) PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS.—If in the course of conducting an investigation under section 303, the investigative team finds reasonable cause to believe any individual described in section 303(a)(2)(D) has breached the duty of that individual or finds lesser failures on the part of an individual in the performance of his or her duties related to the incident, it shall be reported to the SRC. If the SRC finds reasonable cause to support the determination, it shall be reported to the Secretary for appropriate action.”

(h) RELATION TO OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—Section 305 of the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4835) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) NO EFFECT ON EXISTING REMEDIES OR DEFENSES.—” before “Nothing in this title”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) FUTURE INQUIRIES.—Nothing in this title may be construed to preclude the Secretary of State from convening a follow-up public board of inquiry to investigate any security incident if the incident was of such magnitude or significance that an internal process is deemed insufficient to understand and investigate the incident. All materials gathered during the procedures provided under this title shall be provided to any related board of inquiry convened by the Secretary.”

SEC. 5303. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES EMBASSIES IN VANUATU, KIRIBATI, AND TONGA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Pacific Islands are vital to United States national security and national interests in the Indo-Pacific region and globally.

(2) The Pacific Islands region spans 15 percent of the world’s surface area and controls access to open waters in the Central Pacific, sea lanes to the Western Hemisphere, supply lines to United States forward-deployed forces in East Asia, and economically important fisheries.

(3) The Pacific Islands region is home to the State of Hawaii, 11 United States territories, United States Naval Base Guam, and United States Andersen Air Force Base.

(4) Pacific Island countries cooperate with the United States and United States partners on maritime security and efforts to stop illegal, unreported, and destructive fishing.

(5) The Pacific Islands are rich in biodiversity and are on the frontlines of environmental challenges and climate issues.

(6) The People’s Republic of China (PRC) seeks to increase its influence in the Pacific Islands region, including through infrastructure development under the PRC’s One Belt, One Road Initiative and its new security agreement with the Solomon Islands.

(7) The United States Embassy in Papua New Guinea manages the diplomatic affairs of the United States to the Republic of Vanuatu, and the United States Embassy in Fiji manages the diplomatic affairs of the United States to the Republic of Kiribati and the Kingdom of Tonga.

(8) The United States requires a physical diplomatic presence in the Republic of Vanuatu, the Republic of Kiribati, and the Kingdom of Tonga, to ensure the physical and operational security of our efforts in those countries to deepen relations, protect United States national security, and pursue United States national interests.

(9) Increasing the number of United States embassies dedicated solely to a Pacific Island country demonstrates the United States’ ongoing commitment to the region and to the Pacific Island countries.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF EMBASSIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as possible, and not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall establish physical United States embassies in the Republic of Kiribati and the Kingdom of Tonga, and a physical presence in the Republic of Vanuatu.

(2) OTHER STRATEGIES.—

(A) PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—In establishing embassies pursuant to paragraph (1) and creating the physical infrastructure to ensure the physical and operational safety of embassy personnel, the Secretary may pursue rent or purchase existing buildings or collocate personnel in embassies of like-minded partners, such as Australia and New Zealand.

(B) PERSONNEL.—In establishing a physical presence in the Republic of Vanuatu pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may assign 1 or more United States Government personnel to the Republic of Vanuatu as part of the United States mission in Papua New Guinea.

(3) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The President may waive the requirements under paragraph (1) for a period of one year if the President determines and reports to Congress in advance that such waiver is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance, \$40,200,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2023 for the establishment and maintenance of the three embassies pursuant to subsection (b), and \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2024 to maintain the embassies.

(d) **REPORT.**—

(1) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes—

(A) a description of the status of activities carried out to achieve the objectives described in this section;

(B) an estimate of when embassies and a physical presence will be fully established pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(C) an update on events in the Pacific Islands region relevant to the establishment of United States embassies, including activities by the People’s Republic of China.

(3) **REPORT ON FINAL DISPOSITION.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that—

(A) confirms the establishment of the 2 embassies and the physical presence required under subsection (b)(1); or

(B) if the embassies and physical presence required in subsection (b)(1) have not been established, a justification for such failure to comply with such requirement.

TITLE LIV—A DIVERSE WORKFORCE: RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION

SEC. 5401. REPORT ON BARRIERS TO APPLYING FOR EMPLOYMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) identifies any barriers for applicants applying for employment with the Department;

(2) provides demographic data of online applicants during the most recent 3 years disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, age, veteran status, disability, geographic region, and any other categories determined by the Secretary;

(3) assesses any barriers that exist for applying online for employment with the Department, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, age, veteran status, disability, geographic region, and any other categories determined by the Secretary; and

(4) includes recommendations for addressing any disparities identified in the online application process.

SEC. 5402. COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND DISSEMINATION OF WORKFORCE DATA.

(a) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes disaggregated demographic data and other information regarding the diversity of the workforce of the Department.

(b) **DATA.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, to the maximum extent that the collection and dissemination of such data can be done in a way that protects the confidentiality of individuals and is otherwise permissible by law—

(1) demographic data on each element of the workforce of the Department during the 5-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act, disaggregated by rank and grade or grade-equivalent, with respect to—

(A) individuals hired to join the workforce;

(B) individuals promoted, including promotions to and within the Senior Executive Service or the Senior Foreign Service;

(C) individuals serving as special assistants in any of the offices of the Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of State, the Counselor of the Department of State, the Secretary’s Policy Planning Staff, the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, the Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, the Under Secretary of State for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, the Under Secretary of State for Management, the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs;

(D) individuals serving in each bureau’s front office;

(E) individuals serving as detailees to the National Security Council;

(F) individuals serving on applicable selection boards;

(G) members of any external advisory committee or board who are subject to appointment by individuals at senior positions in the Department;

(H) individuals participating in professional development programs of the Department and the extent to which such participants have been placed into senior positions within the Department after such participation;

(I) individuals participating in mentorship or retention programs; and

(J) individuals who separated from the agency, including individuals in the Senior Executive Service or the Senior Foreign Service;

(2) an assessment of agency compliance with the essential elements identified in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Management Directive 715, effective October 1, 2003; and

(3) data on the overall number of individuals who are part of the workforce, the percentages of such workforce corresponding to each element specified in paragraph (1), and the percentages corresponding to each rank, grade, or grade equivalent.

(c) **EFFECTIVENESS OF DEPARTMENT EFFORTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall describe and assess the effectiveness of the efforts of the Department—

(1) to propagate fairness, impartiality, and inclusion in the work environment, both domestically and abroad;

(2) to enforce anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policies, both domestically and at posts overseas;

(3) to refrain from engaging in unlawful discrimination in any phase of the employment process, including recruitment, hiring, evaluation, assignments, promotion, retention, and training;

(4) to prevent retaliation against employees for participating in a protected equal em-

ployment opportunity activity or for reporting sexual harassment or sexual assault;

(5) to provide reasonable accommodation for qualified employees and applicants with disabilities; and

(6) to recruit a representative workforce by—

(A) recruiting women, persons with disabilities, and minorities;

(B) recruiting at women’s colleges, historically Black colleges and universities, minority-serving institutions, and other institutions serving a significant percentage of minority students;

(C) placing job advertisements in newspapers, magazines, and job sites oriented toward women and minorities;

(D) sponsoring and recruiting at job fairs in urban and rural communities and at land-grant colleges or universities;

(E) providing opportunities through the Foreign Service Internship Program under chapter 12 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4141 et seq.), and other hiring initiatives;

(F) recruiting mid-level and senior-level professionals through programs designed to increase representation in international affairs of people belonging to traditionally under-represented groups;

(G) offering the Foreign Service written and oral assessment examinations in several locations throughout the United States or via online platforms to reduce the burden of applicants having to travel at their own expense to take either or both such examinations;

(H) expanding the use of paid internships; and

(I) supporting recruiting and hiring opportunities through—

(i) the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Fellowship Program;

(ii) the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(iii) other initiatives, including agency-wide policy initiatives.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the publication of the report required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, and make such report available on the Department’s website, that includes, without compromising the confidentiality of individuals and to the extent otherwise consistent with law—

(A) disaggregated demographic data, to the maximum extent that collection of such data is permissible by law, relating to the workforce and information on the status of diversity and inclusion efforts of the Department;

(B) an analysis of applicant flow data, to the maximum extent that collection of such data is permissible by law; and

(C) disaggregated demographic data relating to participants in professional development programs of the Department and the rate of placement into senior positions for participants in such programs.

(2) **COMBINATION WITH OTHER ANNUAL REPORT.**—The report required under paragraph (1) may be combined with another annual report required by law, to the extent practicable.

SEC. 5403. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to advance the values and interests of the United States overseas through programs that foster innovation, competitiveness, and a diversity of backgrounds, views, and experience in the formulation and implementation of United States foreign policy and assistance; and

(2) to create opportunities for specialized research, education, training, professional

development, and leadership opportunities for individuals belonging to an underrepresented group within the Department and USAID.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator of USAID shall conduct a study on the feasibility of establishing Centers of Excellence in Foreign Affairs and Assistance (referred to in this section as the “Centers of Excellence”) within institutions that serve individuals belonging to an underrepresented group to focus on 1 or more of the areas described in paragraph (2).

(2) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Administrator, respectively, shall consider—

(A) opportunities to enter into public-private partnerships that will—

(i) increase diversity in foreign affairs and foreign assistance Federal careers;

(ii) prepare a diverse cadre of students (including nontraditional, mid-career, part-time, and heritage students) and nonprofit or business professionals with the skills and education needed to meaningfully contribute to the formulation and execution of United States foreign policy and assistance;

(iii) support the conduct of research, education, and extension programs that reflect diverse perspectives and a wide range of views of world regions and international affairs—

(I) to assist in the development of regional and functional foreign policy skills;

(II) to strengthen international development and humanitarian assistance programs; and

(III) to strengthen democratic institutions and processes in policymaking, including supporting public policies that engender equitable and inclusive societies and focus on challenges and inequalities in education, health, wealth, justice, and other sectors faced by diverse communities;

(iv) enable domestic and international educational, internship, fellowship, faculty exchange, training, employment or other innovative programs to acquire or strengthen knowledge of foreign languages, cultures, societies, and international skills and perspectives;

(v) support collaboration among institutions of higher education, including community colleges, nonprofit organizations, and corporations, to strengthen the engagement between experts and specialists in the foreign affairs and foreign assistance fields; and

(vi) leverage additional public-private partnerships with nonprofit organizations, foundations, corporations, institutions of higher education, and the Federal Government; and

(B) budget and staffing requirements, including appropriate sources of funding, for the establishment and conduct of operations of such Centers of Excellence.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains the findings of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 5404. INSTITUTE FOR TRANSATLANTIC ENGAGEMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to establish the Institute for Transatlantic Engagement (referred to in this section as the “Institute”).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Institute shall be to strengthen national security by highlighting, to a geographically diverse set of populations from the United States and member countries of the European Union, the importance of the transatlantic relation-

ship and the threats posed by adversarial countries, such as the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China, to democracy, free-market economic principles, and human rights, with the aim that lessons learned from the Institute will be shared across the United States and Europe.

(c) DIRECTOR.—The Institute shall be headed by a Director, who shall have expertise in transatlantic relations and diverse populations in the United States and Europe.

(d) SCOPE AND ACTIVITIES.—The Institute shall—

(1) strengthen knowledge of the formation and implementation of transatlantic policies critical to national security, including the threats posed by the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China;

(2) increase awareness of the roles of government and nongovernmental actors, such as multilateral organizations, businesses, civil society actors, academia, think tanks, and philanthropic institutions, in transatlantic policy development and execution;

(3) increase understanding of the manner in which diverse backgrounds and perspectives affect the development of transatlantic policies;

(4) enhance the skills, abilities, and effectiveness of government officials at national and international levels;

(5) increase awareness of the importance of, and interest in, international public service careers;

(6) annually invite not fewer than 30 individuals to participate in programs of the Institute;

(7) not less than 3 times annually, convene representatives of United States and European Union governments for a program offered by the Institute that is not less than 2 days in duration; and

(8) develop metrics to track the success and efficacy of the program.

(e) ELIGIBILITY TO PARTICIPATE.—Participants in the programs of the Institute shall include elected government officials—

(1) serving at national, regional, or local levels in the United States and member countries of the European Union; and

(2) who represent geographically diverse backgrounds or constituencies in the United States and Europe.

(f) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS.—

(1) UNITED STATES PARTICIPANTS.—Participants from the United States shall be appointed in an equally divided manner by the chairpersons and ranking members of the appropriate congressional committees.

(2) EUROPEAN UNION PARTICIPANTS.—Participants from European Union member countries shall be appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the chairpersons and ranking members of the appropriate congressional committees.

(g) RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) UNPAID PARTICIPATION.—Participants in the Institute may not be paid a salary for such participation.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Institute may pay or reimburse participants for reasonable travel, lodging, and food in connection with participation in the program.

(3) TRAVEL.—No funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (h) may be used for travel for Members of Congress to participate in Institute activities.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$750,000 for fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 5405. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this division may be construed as altering existing law regarding merit system principles.

TITLE LV—INFORMATION SECURITY AND CYBER DIPLOMACY

SEC. 5501. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, and secure internet governed by the multi-stakeholder model, which—

(A) promotes democracy, the rule of law, and human rights, including freedom of expression;

(B) supports the ability to innovate, communicate, and promote economic prosperity; and

(C) is designed to protect privacy and guard against deception, fraud, and theft;

(2) to encourage and aid United States allies and partners in improving their own technological capabilities and resiliency to pursue, defend, and protect shared interests and values, free from coercion and external pressure; and

(3) in furtherance of the efforts described in paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) to provide incentives to the private sector to accelerate the development of the technologies referred to in such paragraphs;

(B) to modernize and harmonize with allies and partners export controls and investment screening regimes and associated policies and regulations; and

(C) to enhance United States leadership in technical standards-setting bodies and avenues for developing norms regarding the use of digital tools.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing the policy described in subsection (a), the President, in consultation with outside actors, as appropriate, including private sector companies, nongovernmental organizations, security researchers, and other relevant stakeholders, in the conduct of bilateral and multilateral relations, shall strive—

(1) to clarify the applicability of international laws and norms to the use of information and communications technology (referred to in this subsection as “ICT”);

(2) to reduce and limit the risk of escalation and retaliation in cyberspace, damage to critical infrastructure, and other malicious cyber activity that impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure that provides services to the public;

(3) to cooperate with like-minded countries that share common values and cyberspace policies with the United States, including respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, to advance such values and policies internationally;

(4) to encourage the responsible development of new, innovative technologies and ICT products that strengthen a secure internet architecture that is accessible to all;

(5) to secure and implement commitments on responsible country behavior in cyberspace, including commitments by countries—

(A) to not conduct, or knowingly support, cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors;

(B) to take all appropriate and reasonable efforts to keep their territories clear of intentionally wrongful acts using ICT in violation of international commitments;

(C) not to conduct or knowingly support ICT activity that intentionally damages or otherwise impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure providing services to the public, in violation of international law;

(D) to take appropriate measures to protect the country’s critical infrastructure from ICT threats;

(E) not to conduct or knowingly support malicious international activity that harms the information systems of authorized emergency response teams (also known as “computer emergency response teams” or “cybersecurity incident response teams”) of another country or authorize emergency response teams to engage in malicious international activity, in violation of international law;

(F) to respond to appropriate requests for assistance to mitigate malicious ICT activity emanating from their territory and aimed at the critical infrastructure of another country;

(G) to not restrict cross-border data flows or require local storage or processing of data; and

(H) to protect the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms on the internet, while recognizing that the human rights that people have offline also need to be protected online; and

(6) to advance, encourage, and support the development and adoption of internationally recognized technical standards and best practices.

SEC. 5502. BUREAU OF CYBERSPACE AND DIGITAL POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsection (j) and (k), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) (as added by section 361(a)(1) of division FF of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260)) as subsection (l); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) BUREAU OF CYBERSPACE AND DIGITAL POLICY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established, within the Department of State, the Bureau of Cyberspace and Digital Policy (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Bureau’). The head of the Bureau shall have the rank and status of ambassador and shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(2) DUTIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Bureau shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, including implementing the policy described in section 5501(a) of the Department of State Authorization Act of 2022.

“(B) DUTIES DESCRIBED.—The principal duties and responsibilities of the head of the Bureau shall be—

“(i) to serve as the principal cyberspace policy official within the senior management of the Department of State and as the advisor to the Secretary of State for cyberspace and digital issues;

“(ii) to lead, coordinate, and execute, in coordination with other relevant bureaus and offices, the Department of State’s diplomatic cyberspace, cybersecurity (including efforts related to data privacy, data flows, internet governance, information and communications technology standards, and other issues that the Secretary has assigned to the Bureau);

“(iii) to advance United States national security and foreign policy interests in cyberspace and to coordinate cyberspace policy and other relevant functions with the Department of State and with other components of the Federal Government;

“(iv) to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, and secure information and communications technology infrastructure globally;

“(v) to represent the Secretary of State in interagency efforts to develop and advance Federal Government cyber priorities and activities, including efforts to develop credible national capabilities, strategies, and policies

to deter and counter cyber adversaries, and carry out the purposes of title V of the Department of State Authorization Act of 2022;

“(vi) to engage civil society, the private sector, academia, and other public and private entities on relevant international cyberspace and information and communications technology issues;

“(vii) to lead United States Government efforts to uphold and further develop global deterrence frameworks for malicious cyber activity;

“(viii) to advise the Secretary of State and coordinate with foreign governments regarding responses to national security-level cyber incidents, including coordination on diplomatic response efforts to support allies and partners threatened by malicious cyber activity, in conjunction with members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and like-minded countries;

“(ix) to promote the building of foreign capacity relating to cyberspace policy priorities;

“(x) to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, and secure information and communications technology infrastructure globally and an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable internet governed by the multi-stakeholder model;

“(xi) to promote an international regulatory environment for technology investments and the internet that benefits United States economic and national security interests;

“(xii) to promote cross-border flow of data and combat international initiatives seeking to impose unreasonable requirements on United States businesses;

“(xiii) to promote international policies to protect the integrity of United States and international telecommunications infrastructure from foreign-based threats, including cyber-enabled threats;

“(xiv) to lead engagement, in coordination with relevant executive branch agencies, with foreign governments on relevant international cyberspace, cybersecurity, cybercrime, and digital economy issues described in title V of the Department of State Authorization Act of 2022;

“(xv) to promote international policies to secure radio frequency spectrum for United States businesses and national security needs;

“(xvi) to promote and protect the exercise of human rights, including freedom of speech and religion, through the internet;

“(xvii) to build capacity of United States diplomatic officials to engage on cyberspace issues;

“(xviii) to encourage the development and adoption by foreign countries of internationally recognized standards, policies, and best practices;

“(xix) to support efforts by the Global Engagement Center to counter cyber-enabled information operations against the United States or its allies and partners; and

“(xx) to conduct such other matters as the Secretary of State may assign.

“(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The head of the Bureau should be an individual of demonstrated competency in the fields of—

“(A) cybersecurity and other relevant cyberspace and information and communications technology policy issues; and

“(B) international diplomacy.

“(4) ORGANIZATIONAL PLACEMENT.—

“(A) INITIAL PLACEMENT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the head of the Bureau shall report to the Deputy Secretary of State.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT PLACEMENT.—The head of the Bureau may report to an Under Secretary of State or to an official holding a higher position than Under Secretary if, not

later than 15 days before any change in such reporting structure, the Secretary of State—

“(i) consults with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) submits a report to such committees that—

“(I) indicates that the Secretary, with respect to the reporting structure of the Bureau, has consulted with and solicited feedback from—

“(aa) other relevant Federal entities with a role in international aspects of cyber policy; and

“(bb) the elements of the Department of State with responsibility for aspects of cyber policy, including the elements reporting to—

“(AA) the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs;

“(BB) the Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights;

“(CC) the Under Secretary of State for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment;

“(DD) the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs;

“(EE) the Under Secretary of State for Management; and

“(FF) the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs;

“(II) describes the new reporting structure for the head of the Bureau and the justification for such new structure; and

“(III) includes a plan describing how the new reporting structure will better enable the head of the Bureau to carry out the duties described in paragraph (2), including the security, economic, and human rights aspects of cyber diplomacy.

“(5) SPECIAL HIRING AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary of State may—

“(A) appoint employees without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, regarding appointments in the competitive service; and

“(B) fix the basic compensation of such employees without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title regarding classification and General Schedule pay rates.

“(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to preclude the head of the Bureau from being designated as an Assistant Secretary, if such an Assistant Secretary position does not increase the number of Assistant Secretary positions at the Department above the number authorized under subsection (c)(1).”

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Bureau established under section 1(i) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as added by subsection (a), should have a diverse workforce composed of qualified individuals, including individuals belonging to an underrepresented group.

(c) UNITED NATIONS.—The Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations should use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any measure that is inconsistent with the policy described in section 5501(a).

SEC. 5503. INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE AND DIGITAL POLICY STRATEGY.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, acting through the Secretary, and in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall develop an international cyberspace and digital policy strategy.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of actions and activities undertaken to support the policy described in section 5501(a);

(2) a plan of action to guide the diplomacy of the Department with regard to foreign countries, including—

(A) conducting bilateral and multilateral activities—

(i) to develop and support the implementation of norms of responsible country behavior in cyberspace consistent with the objectives specified in section 5501(b)(5);

(ii) to reduce the frequency and severity of cyberattacks on United States individuals, businesses, governmental agencies, and other organizations;

(iii) to reduce cybersecurity risks to United States and allied critical infrastructure;

(iv) to improve allies' and partners' collaboration with the United States on cybersecurity issues, including information sharing, regulatory coordination and improvement, and joint investigatory and law enforcement operations related to cybercrime; and

(v) to share best practices and advance proposals to strengthen civilian and private sector resiliency to threats and access to opportunities in cyberspace; and

(B) reviewing the status of existing efforts in relevant multilateral fora, as appropriate, to obtain commitments on international norms regarding cyberspace;

(3) a review of alternative concepts for international norms regarding cyberspace offered by foreign countries;

(4) a detailed description of new and evolving threats regarding cyberspace from foreign adversaries, state-sponsored actors, and non-state actors to—

(A) United States national security;

(B) the Federal and private sector cyberspace infrastructure of the United States;

(C) intellectual property in the United States; and

(D) the privacy and security of citizens of the United States;

(5) a review of the policy tools available to the President to deter and de-escalate tensions with foreign countries, state-sponsored actors, and private actors regarding—

(A) threats in cyberspace;

(B) the degree to which such tools have been used; and

(C) whether such tools have been effective deterrents;

(6) a review of resources required to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior;

(7) a review to determine whether the budgetary resources, technical expertise, legal authorities, and personnel available to the Department and other relevant Federal agencies are adequate to achieve the actions and activities undertaken to support the policy described in section 5501(a);

(8) a review to determine whether the Department is properly organized and coordinated with other Federal agencies to achieve the objectives described in section 5501(b); and

(9) a plan of action, developed in consultation with relevant Federal departments and agencies as the President may direct, to guide the diplomacy of the Department with respect to the inclusion of cyber issues in mutual defense agreements.

(c) FORM OF STRATEGY.—

(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be available to the public in unclassified form, including through publication in the Federal Register.

(2) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The strategy required under subsection (a) may include a classified annex.

(d) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the strategy required

under subsection (a), the Secretary shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the strategy, including any material contained in a classified annex.

(e) UPDATES.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be updated—

(1) not later than 90 days after any material change to United States policy described in such strategy; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the inauguration of each new President.

SEC. 5504. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT ON CYBER DIPLOMACY.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report and provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an assessment of the extent to which United States diplomatic processes and other efforts with foreign countries, including through multilateral fora, bilateral engagements, and negotiated cyberspace agreements, advance the full range of United States interests regarding cyberspace, including the policy described in section 5501(a);

(2) an assessment of the Department's organizational structure and approach to managing its diplomatic efforts to advance the full range of United States interests regarding cyberspace, including a review of—

(A) the establishment of a Bureau within the Department to lead the Department's international cyber mission;

(B) the current or proposed diplomatic mission, structure, staffing, funding, and activities of such Bureau;

(C) how the establishment of such Bureau has impacted or is likely to impact the structure and organization of the Department; and

(D) what challenges, if any, the Department has faced or will face in establishing such Bureau; and

(3) any other matters that the Comptroller General determines to be relevant.

SEC. 5505. REPORT ON DIPLOMATIC PROGRAMS TO DETECT AND RESPOND TO CYBER THREATS AGAINST ALLIES AND PARTNERS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that assesses the capabilities of the Department to provide civilian-led support for acute cyber incident response in ally and partner countries that includes—

(1) a description and assessment of the Department's coordination with cyber programs and operations of the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) recommendations on how to improve coordination and executive of Department involvement in programs or operations to support allies and partners in responding to acute cyber incidents; and

(3) the budgetary resources, technical expertise, legal authorities, and personnel needed for the Department to formulate and implement the programs described in this section.

SEC. 5506. CYBERSECURITY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that improving computer programming language proficiency will improve—

(1) the cybersecurity effectiveness of the Department; and

(2) the ability of foreign service officers to engage with foreign audiences on cybersecurity matters.

(b) TECHNOLOGY TALENT ACQUISITION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish positions within the Bureau of Global Talent Management that are solely dedicated to the recruitment and retention of Department personnel with backgrounds in cybersecurity, engineering, data science, application development, artificial intelligence, critical and emerging technology, and technology and digital policy.

(2) GOALS.—The goals of the positions described in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) to fulfill the critical need of the Department to recruit and retain employees for cybersecurity, digital, and technology positions;

(B) to actively recruit relevant candidates from academic institutions, the private sector, and related industries;

(C) to work with the Office of Personnel Management and the United States Digital Service to develop and implement best strategies for recruiting and retaining technology talent; and

(D) to inform and train supervisors at the Department on the use of the authorities listed in subsection (c)(1).

(3) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a plan to the appropriate congressional committees that describes how the objectives and goals set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) will be implemented.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$750,000 for each of the fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out this subsection.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT ON HIRING AUTHORITIES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) a list of the hiring authorities available to the Department to recruit and retain personnel with backgrounds in cybersecurity, engineering, data science, application development, artificial intelligence, critical and emerging technology, and technology and digital policy;

(2) a list of which hiring authorities described in paragraph (1) have been used during the previous 5 years;

(3) the number of employees in qualified positions hired, aggregated by position and grade level or pay band;

(4) the number of employees who have been placed in qualified positions, aggregated by bureau and offices within the Department;

(5) the rate of attrition of individuals who begin the hiring process and do not complete the process and a description of the reasons for such attrition;

(6) the number of individuals who are interviewed by subject matter experts and the number of individuals who are not interviewed by subject matter experts; and

(7) recommendations for—

(A) reducing the attrition rate referred to in paragraph (5) by 5 percent each year;

(B) additional hiring authorities needed to acquire needed technology talent;

(C) hiring personnel to hold public trust positions until such personnel can obtain the necessary security clearance; and

(D) informing and training supervisors within the Department on the use of the authorities listed in paragraph (1).

(d) INCENTIVE PAY FOR CYBERSECURITY PROFESSIONALS.—To increase the number of qualified candidates available to fulfill the cybersecurity needs of the Department, the Secretary shall—

(1) include computer programming languages within the Recruitment Language Program; and

(2) provide appropriate language incentive pay.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary shall provide a list to the appropriate congressional committees that identifies—

(1) the computer programming languages included within the Recruitment Language Program and the language incentive pay rate; and

(2) the number of individuals benefitting from the inclusion of such computer programming languages in the Recruitment Language Program and language incentive pay.

SEC. 5507. SHORT COURSE ON EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FOR SENIOR OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and begin providing, for senior officials of the Department, a course addressing how the most recent and relevant technologies affect the activities of the Department.

(b) THROUGHPUT OBJECTIVES.—The Secretary should ensure that—

(1) during the first year that the course developed pursuant to subsection (a) is offered, not fewer than 20 percent of senior officials are certified as having passed such course; and

(2) in each subsequent year, until the date on which 80 percent of senior officials are certified as having passed such course, an additional 10 percent of senior officials are certified as having passed such course.

SEC. 5508. ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPANSION OF REGIONAL TECHNOLOGY OFFICER PROGRAM.

(a) REGIONAL TECHNOLOGY OFFICER PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program, which shall be known as the “Regional Technology Officer Program” (referred to in this section as the “Program”).

(2) GOALS.—The goals of the Program shall include the following:

(A) Promoting United States leadership in technology abroad.

(B) Working with partners to increase the deployment of critical and emerging technology in support of democratic values.

(C) Shaping diplomatic agreements in regional and international fora with respect to critical and emerging technologies.

(D) Building diplomatic capacity for handling critical and emerging technology issues.

(E) Facilitating the role of critical and emerging technology in advancing the foreign policy objectives of the United States through engagement with research labs, incubators, and venture capitalists.

(F) Maintaining the advantages of the United States with respect to critical and emerging technologies.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an implementation plan to the appropriate congressional committees that outlines strategies for—

(1) advancing the goals described in subsection (a)(2);

(2) hiring Regional Technology Officers and increasing the competitiveness of the Program within the Foreign Service bidding process;

(3) expanding the Program to include a minimum of 15 Regional Technology Officers; and

(4) assigning not fewer than 2 Regional Technology Officers to posts within—

(A) each regional bureau of the Department; and

(B) the Bureau of International Organization Affairs.

(c) ANNUAL BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the status of the implementation plan required under subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out this section.

SEC. 5509. VULNERABILITY DISCLOSURE POLICY AND BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM REPORT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM.—The term “bug bounty program” means a program under which an approved individual, organization, or company is temporarily authorized to identify and report vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology of the Department in exchange for compensation.

(2) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term “information technology” has the meaning given such term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

(b) VULNERABILITY DISCLOSURE POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall design, establish, and make publicly known a Vulnerability Disclosure Policy (referred to in this section as the “VDP”) to improve Department cybersecurity by—

(A) creating Department policy and infrastructure to receive reports of and remediate discovered vulnerabilities in line with existing policies of the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Homeland Security Binding Operational Directive 20-01 or any subsequent directive; and

(B) providing a report on such policy and infrastructure to Congress.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the VDP pursuant to paragraph (1), and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary shall submit a report on the VDP to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that includes information relating to—

(A) the number and severity of all security vulnerabilities reported;

(B) the number of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities remediated as a result;

(C) the current number of outstanding previously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department of State remediation plans;

(D) the average time between the reporting of security vulnerabilities and remediation of such vulnerabilities;

(E) the resources, surge staffing, roles, and responsibilities within the Department used to implement the VDP and complete security vulnerability remediation;

(F) how the VDP identified vulnerabilities are incorporated into existing Department vulnerability prioritization and management processes;

(G) any challenges in implementing the VDP and plans for expansion or contraction in the scope of the VDP across Department information systems; and

(H) any other topic that the Secretary determines to be relevant.

(c) BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes any ongoing efforts by

the Department or a third-party vendor under contract with the Department to establish or carry out a bug bounty program that identifies security vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology of the Department.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which any bug bounty program is established, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives regarding such program, including information relating to—

(A) the number of approved individuals, organizations, or companies involved in such program, disaggregated by the number of approved individuals, organizations, or companies that—

(i) registered;

(ii) were approved;

(iii) submitted security vulnerabilities; and

(iv) received compensation;

(B) the number and severity of all security vulnerabilities reported as part of such program;

(C) the number of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities remediated as a result of such program;

(D) the current number of outstanding previously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department remediation plans for such outstanding vulnerabilities;

(E) the average length of time between the reporting of security vulnerabilities and remediation of such vulnerabilities;

(F) the types of compensation provided under such program;

(G) the lessons learned from such program;

(H) the public accessibility of contact information for the Department regarding the bug bounty program;

(I) the incorporation of bug bounty program identified vulnerabilities into existing Department vulnerability prioritization and management processes; and

(J) any challenges in implementing the bug bounty program and plans for expansion or contraction in the scope of the bug bounty program across Department information systems.

TITLE LVI—PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

SEC. 5601. UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL FAIRS AND EXPOSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 204 of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2452b), and subject to subsection (b), amounts available under title I of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2022 (division K of Public Law 117-103), or under prior such Acts, may be made available to pay for expenses related to United States participation in international fairs and expositions abroad, including for construction and operation of pavilions or other major exhibits.

(b) LIMITATION ON SOLICITATION OF FUNDS.—Senior employees of the Department, in their official capacity, may not solicit funds to pay expenses for a United States pavilion or other major exhibit at any international exposition or world’s fair registered by the Bureau of International Expositions.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 to the Department for United States participation in international fairs and expositions abroad, including for construction and operation of pavilions or other major exhibits.

SEC. 5602. PRESS FREEDOM CURRICULUM.

The Secretary shall ensure that there is a press freedom curriculum for the National Foreign Affairs Training Center that enables Foreign Service officers to better understand issues of press freedom and the tools that are available to help protect journalists and promote freedom of the press norms, which may include—

(1) the historic and current issues facing press freedom, including countries of specific concern;

(2) the Department's role in promoting press freedom as an American value, a human rights issue, and a national security imperative;

(3) ways to incorporate press freedom promotion into other aspects of diplomacy; and

(4) existing tools to assist journalists in distress and methods for engaging foreign governments and institutions on behalf of individuals engaged in journalistic activity who are at risk of harm.

SEC. 5603. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT CENTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1287(j) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by striking “the date that is 8 years after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “December 31, 2027”.

(b) **HIRING AUTHORITY FOR GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT CENTER.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and solely to carry out the functions of the Global Engagement Center described in section 1287(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2656 note), may—

(1) appoint employees without regard to appointment in the competitive service; and

(2) fix the basic compensation of such employees regarding classification and General Schedule pay rates.

SEC. 5604. UNDER SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

Section 1(b)(3) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) coordinate the allocation and management of the financial and human resources for public diplomacy, including for—

“(i) the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs;

“(ii) the Bureau of Global Public Affairs;

“(iii) the Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs;

“(iv) the Global Engagement Center; and

“(v) the public diplomacy functions within the regional and functional bureaus.”.

TITLE LVII—OTHER MATTERS**SEC. 5701. SUPPORTING THE EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department should continue to eliminate the unreasonable barriers United States nationals face to obtain employment in the United Nations Secretariat, funds, programs, and agencies; and

(2) the Department should bolster efforts to increase the number of qualified United States nationals who are candidates for leadership and oversight positions in the United Nations system, agencies, and commissions, and in other international organizations.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to promote the employment and advancement of United States citizens by international organizations and bodies, including by—

(1) providing stipends, consultation, and analytical services to support United States citizen applicants; and

(2) making grants for the purposes described in paragraph (1).

(c) **USING DIPLOMATIC PROGRAMS FUNDING TO PROMOTE THE EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—Amounts appropriated under the heading “DIPLOMATIC PROGRAMS” in any Act making appropriations for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs may be made available for grants, programs, and activities described in subsection (b).

(d) **STRATEGY TO ESTABLISH JUNIOR PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and other relevant cabinet members, shall publish a strategy for encouraging United States citizens to pursue careers with international organizations, particularly organizations that—

(A) set international scientific, technical, or commercial standards; or

(B) are involved in international finance and development.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and other relevant cabinet members, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that identifies—

(A) the number of United States citizens who are involved in relevant junior professional programs in an international organization;

(B) the distribution of individuals described in subparagraph (A) among various international organizations; and

(C) the types of predeployment training that are available to United States citizens through a junior professional program at an international organization.

SEC. 5702. INCREASING HOUSING AVAILABILITY FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED TO THE UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 9(2) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287e-1(2)), is amended by striking “30” and inserting “41”.

SEC. 5703. LIMITATION ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL.

The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**SEC. 12. LIMITATION ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL.**

“None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to pay assessed and other expenses of international peacekeeping activities under this Act may be made available for an international peacekeeping operation that has not been expressly authorized by the United Nations Security Council.”.

SEC. 5704. BOARDS OF RADIO FREE EUROPE/RADIO LIBERTY, RADIO FREE ASIA, THE MIDDLE EAST BROADCASTING NETWORKS, AND THE OPEN TECHNOLOGY FUND.

The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 306 (22 U.S.C. 6205) the following:

“**SEC. 307. GRANTEE CORPORATE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The corporate board of directors of each grantee under this title—

“(1) shall be bipartisan;

“(2) shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, have the sole responsibility to operate their respective grantees within the jurisdiction of their respective States of incorporation;

“(3) shall be composed of not fewer than 5 members, who shall be qualified individuals who are not employed in the public sector; and

“(4) shall appoint successors in the event of vacancies on their respective boards, in accordance with applicable bylaws.

“(b) **NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—No employee of any grantee under this title may be a Federal employee.”.

SEC. 5705. BROADCASTING ENTITIES NO LONGER REQUIRED TO CONSOLIDATE INTO A SINGLE PRIVATE, NONPROFIT CORPORATION.

Section 310 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6209) is repealed.

SEC. 5706. INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACTIVITIES.

Section 305(a) of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6204(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (20);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (21), (22), and (23) as paragraphs (20), (21), and (22), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (20), as redesignated, by striking “or between grantees.”.

SEC. 5707. GLOBAL INTERNET FREEDOM.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States to promote internet freedom through programs of the Department and USAID that preserve and expand the internet as an open, global space for freedom of expression and association, which shall be prioritized for countries—

(1) whose governments restrict freedom of expression on the internet; and

(2) that are important to the national interest of the United States.

(b) **PURPOSE AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.**—Global internet freedom programming under this section—

(1) shall be coordinated with other United States foreign assistance programs that promote democracy and support the efforts of civil society—

(A) to counter the development of repressive internet-related laws and regulations, including countering threats to internet freedom at international organizations;

(B) to combat violence against bloggers and other civil society activists who utilize the internet; and

(C) to enhance digital security training and capacity building for democracy activists;

(2) shall seek to assist efforts—

(A) to research key threats to internet freedom;

(B) to continue the development of technologies that provide or enhance access to the internet, including circumvention tools that bypass internet blocking, filtering, and other censorship techniques used by authoritarian governments; and

(C) to maintain the technological advantage of the Federal Government over the censorship techniques described in subparagraph (B); and

(3) shall be incorporated into country assistance and democracy promotion strategies, as appropriate.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2023—

(1) \$75,000,000 to the Department and USAID, which shall be used to continue efforts to promote internet freedom globally, and shall be matched, to the maximum extent practicable, by sources other than the

Federal Government, including the private sector; and

(2) \$49,000,000 to the United States Agency for Global Media (referred to in this section as the “USAGM”) and its grantees, which shall be used for internet freedom and circumvention technologies that are designed—

(A) for open-source tools and techniques to securely develop and distribute digital content produced by the USAGM and its grantees;

(B) to facilitate audience access to such digital content on websites that are censored;

(C) to coordinate the distribution of such digital content to targeted regional audiences; and

(D) to promote and distribute such tools and techniques, including digital security techniques.

(d) UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA ACTIVITIES.—

(1) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—For any new tools or techniques authorized under subsection (c)(2), the Chief Executive Officer of the USGAM, in consultation with the President of the Open Technology Fund (referred to in this subsection as the “OTF”) and relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall submit an annual certification to the appropriate congressional committees that verifies they—

(A) have evaluated the risks and benefits of such new tools or techniques; and

(B) have established safeguards to minimize the use of such new tools or techniques for illicit purposes.

(2) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary may not direct programs or policy of the USAGM or the OTF, but may share any research and development with relevant Federal departments and agencies for the exclusive purposes of—

(A) sharing information, technologies, and best practices; and

(B) assessing the effectiveness of such technologies.

(3) UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA.—The Chief Executive Officer of the USAGM, in consultation with the President of the OTF, shall—

(A) coordinate international broadcasting programs and incorporate such programs into country broadcasting strategies, as appropriate;

(B) solicit project proposals through an open, transparent, and competitive application process, including by seeking input from technical and subject matter experts; and

(C) support internet circumvention tools and techniques for audiences in countries that are strategic priorities for the OTF, in accordance with USAGM’s annual language service prioritization review.

(e) USAGM REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Executive Office of the USAGM shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes—

(1) as of the date of the report—

(A) the full scope of internet freedom programs within the USAGM, including—

(i) the efforts of the Office of Internet Freedom; and

(ii) the efforts of the Open Technology Fund;

(B) the capacity of internet censorship circumvention tools supported by the Office of Internet Freedom and grantees of the Open Technology Fund that are available for use by individuals in foreign countries seeking to counteract censors; and

(C) any barriers to the provision of the efforts described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A), including access to surge funding; and

(2) successful examples from the Office of Internet Freedom and Open Technology Fund involving—

(A) responding rapidly to internet shutdowns in closed societies; and

(B) ensuring uninterrupted circumvention services for USAGM entities to promote internet freedom within repressive regimes.

(f) JOINT REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator of USAID shall jointly submit a report, which may include a classified annex, to the appropriate congressional committees that describes—

(1) as of the date of the report—

(A) the full scope of internet freedom programs within the Department and USAID, including—

(i) Department circumvention efforts; and

(ii) USAID efforts to support internet infrastructure;

(B) the capacity of internet censorship circumvention tools supported by the Federal Government that are available for use by individuals in foreign countries seeking to counteract censors; and

(C) any barriers to provision of the efforts enumerated in clauses (i) and (ii) of subsection (e)(1)(A), including access to surge funding; and

(2) any new resources needed to provide the Federal Government with greater capacity to provide and boost internet access—

(A) to respond rapidly to internet shutdowns in closed societies; and

(B) to provide internet connectivity to foreign locations where the provision of additional internet access service would promote freedom from repressive regimes.

(g) SECURITY AUDITS.—Before providing any support for open source technologies under this section, such technologies must undergo comprehensive security audits to ensure that such technologies are secure and have not been compromised in a manner that is detrimental to the interest of the United States or to the interests of individuals and organizations benefitting from programs supported by such funding.

(h) SURGE.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subject to paragraph (2), there is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to amounts otherwise made available for such purposes, \$2,500,000 to support internet freedom programs in closed societies, including programs that—

(A) are carried out in crisis situations by vetted entities that are already engaged in internet freedom programs;

(B) involve circumvention tools; or

(C) increase the overseas bandwidth for companies that received Federal funding during the previous fiscal year.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) may not be expended until the Secretary has certified to the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that the use of such funds is in the national interest of the United States.

(i) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term “internet censorship circumvention tool” means a software application or other tool that an individual can use to evade foreign government restrictions on internet access.

SEC. 5708. ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT ALIGNMENT WITH THE EXPORT CONTROL REFORM ACT.

Section 38(e) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “subsections (c), (d), (e), and (g) of section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, and by subsections (a) and

(c) of section 12 of such Act” and inserting “subsections (c) and (d) of section 1760 of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4819), and by subsections (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(7), (c), and (h) of section 1761 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 4820)”;

(2) by striking “11(c)(2)(B) of such Act” and inserting “1760(c)(2) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 4819(c)(2))”;

(3) by striking “11(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979” and inserting “section 1760(c) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4819(c))”; and

(4) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “the greater of \$1,200,000 or the amount that is twice the value of the transaction that is the basis of the violation with respect to which the penalty is imposed.”.

SEC. 5709. INCREASING THE MAXIMUM ANNUAL LEASE PAYMENT AVAILABLE WITHOUT APPROVAL BY THE SECRETARY.

Section 10(a) of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 301(a)), is amended by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”.

SEC. 5710. REPORT ON UNITED STATES ACCESS TO CRITICAL MINERAL RESOURCES ABROAD.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that details, with regard to the Department—

(1) diplomatic efforts to ensure United States access to critical minerals acquired from outside of the United States that are used to manufacture clean energy technologies; and

(2) collaboration with other parts of the Federal Government to build a robust supply chain for critical minerals necessary to manufacture clean energy technologies.

SEC. 5711. OVERSEAS UNITED STATES STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the One Belt, One Road Initiative (referred to in this section as “OBOR”) exploits gaps in infrastructure in developing countries to advance the People’s Republic of China’s own foreign policy objectives;

(2) although OBOR may meet many countries’ short-term strategic infrastructure needs, OBOR—

(A) frequently places countries in debt to the PRC;

(B) contributes to widespread corruption;

(C) often fails to maintain the infrastructure that is built; and

(D) rarely takes into account human rights, labor standards, or the environment; and

(3) the need to challenge OBOR represents a major national security concern for the United States, as the PRC’s efforts to control markets and supply chains for strategic infrastructure projects, including critical and strategic minerals resource extraction, represent a grave national security threat.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) OBOR.—The term “OBOR” means the One Belt, One Road Initiative, a global infrastructure development strategy initiated by the Government of the People’s Republic of China in 2013.

(2) PRC.—The term “PRC” means the People’s Republic of China.

(c) ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT TO UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY OF PRC INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall enter into a contract with an independent research organization to prepare the report described in paragraph (2).

(2) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report described in this paragraph shall—

(A) describe the nature and cost of OBOR investments, operation, and construction of strategic infrastructure projects, including logistics, refining, and processing industries and resource facilities, and critical and strategic mineral resource extraction projects, including an assessment of—

(i) the strategic benefits of such investments that are derived by the PRC and the host nation; and

(ii) the negative impacts of such investments to the host nation and to United States interests;

(B) describe the nature and total funding of United States' strategic infrastructure investments and construction, such as projects financed through initiatives such as Prosper Africa and the Millennium Challenge Corporation;

(C) assess the national security threats posed by the foreign infrastructure investment gap between China and the United States, including strategic infrastructure, such as ports, market access to, and the security of, critical and strategic minerals, digital and telecommunications infrastructure, threats to the supply chains, and general favorability towards the PRC and the United States among the populations of host countries;

(D) assess the opportunities and challenges for companies based in the United States and companies based in United States partner and allied countries to invest in foreign strategic infrastructure projects in countries where the PRC has focused these types of investments;

(E) identify challenges and opportunities for the United States Government and United States partners and allies to more directly finance and otherwise support foreign strategic infrastructure projects, including an assessment of the authorities and capabilities of United States agencies, departments, public-private partnerships, and international or multilateral organizations to support such projects without undermining United States domestic industries, such as domestic mineral deposits;

(F) include a feasibility study and options for United States Government agencies to undertake or increase support for United States businesses to support foreign, large-scale, strategic infrastructure projects, such as roads, power grids, and ports; and

(G) identify at least 5 strategic infrastructure projects, with one each in the Western Hemisphere, Africa, and Asia, that are needed, but have not yet been initiated.

(3) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a copy of the report prepared pursuant to this subsection to the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 5712. ENSURING THE INTEGRITY OF COMMUNICATIONS COOPERATION.

(a) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(5) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(6) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(b) **DETERMINATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 15 days after any Chief of Mission determines that communications equipment provided by the United States Government to a foreign gov-

ernment has been used for a purpose other than the purpose for which the equipment was authorized, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) an unclassified notification that indicates that such an incident occurred and the country in which it occurred; and

(2) a classified notification that describes the incident concerned, including a description of—

(A) the Federal department or agency that provided the equipment;

(B) the foreign entity or individual that used the equipment for unlawful purposes; and

(C) how the equipment was used in an unlawful manner.

SEC. 5713. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, QUARTERLY REVIEW, AND AUTHORITY RELATING TO CONCURRENCE PROVIDED BY CHIEFS OF MISSION FOR THE PROVISION OF SUPPORT RELATING TO CERTAIN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS.

(a) **NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a Chief of Mission provides concurrence for the provision of United States Government support to entities or individuals engaged in facilitating or supporting United States Government military- or security-related operations within the area of responsibility of the Chief of Mission, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the provision of such concurrence.

(b) **SEMIANNUAL REVIEW, DETERMINATION, AND BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not less frequently than every 180 days, the Secretary, in order to ensure that the support described in subsection (a) continues to align with United States foreign policy objectives and the objectives of the Department, shall—

(1) conduct a review of any concurrence described in subsection (a) in effect as of the date of the review;

(2) based on the review, determine whether to revoke any such concurrence pending further study and review; and

(3) brief the appropriate congressional committees on the results of the review.

(c) **REVOCACTION OF CONCURRENCE.**—If the Secretary determines to revoke any concurrence described in subsection (a) pursuant to a review conducted under subsection (b), the Secretary may revoke such concurrence.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than January 31 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of any support described in subsection (a) that was provided with the concurrence of a Chief of Mission during the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the report is submitted.

(2) An analysis of the effects of the support described in paragraph (1) on diplomatic lines of effort, including with respect to—

(A) Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR) and associated Antiterrorism Assistance (ATA) programs;

(B) International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) programs; and

(C) Foreign Military Sales (FMS), Foreign Military Financing (FMF), and associated training programs.

SEC. 5714. PROVISION OF PARKING SERVICES AND RETENTION OF PARKING FEES.

The Secretary of State may—

(1) provide parking services, including electric vehicle charging and other parking services, in facilities operated by or for the Department; and

(2) charge fees for such services that may be deposited into the appropriate account of the Department, to remain available until expended for the purposes of such account.

SEC. 5715. DIPLOMATIC RECEPTION AREAS.

(a) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term “reception areas” has the meaning given such term in section 41(c) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2713(c)).

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may sell goods and services and use the proceeds of such sales for administration and related support of the reception areas consistent with section 41(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2713(a)).

(c) **AMOUNTS COLLECTED.**—Amounts collected pursuant to the authority provided under subsection (b) may be deposited into an account in the Treasury, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 5716. CONSULAR AND BORDER SECURITY PROGRAMS VISA SERVICES COST RECOVERY PROPOSAL.

Section 103 of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (8 U.S.C. 1713) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “or surcharge” after “machine-readable visa fee”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The amount of the machine-readable visa fee or surcharge under this subsection may also account for the cost of other consular services that are not otherwise subject to a fee or surcharge retained by the Department of State.”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting “or surcharges” after “amounts collected as fees”.

SEC. 5717. RETURN OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR PASSPORT APPLICATIONS THROUGH UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE CERTIFIED MAIL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a procedure that provides, to any individual applying for a new United States passport or to renew the United States passport of the individual by mail, the option to have supporting documents for the application returned to the individual by the United States Postal Service through certified mail.

(b) **COST.**—

(1) **RESPONSIBILITY.**—The cost of returning supporting documents to an individual as described in subsection (a) shall be the responsibility of the individual.

(2) **FEE.**—The fee charged to the individual by the Secretary for returning supporting documents as described in subsection (a) shall be the sum of—

(A) the retail price charged by the United States Postal Service for the service; and

(B) the estimated cost of processing the return of the supporting documents.

(3) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) details the costs included in the processing fee described in paragraph (2); and

(B) includes an estimate of the average cost per request.

SEC. 5718. REPORT ON DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES RELATED TO ORDERED DEPARTURES AND POST CLOSURES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes—

(1) how Department personnel and resources dedicated to Mission Afghanistan were reallocated following the closure of diplomatic posts in Afghanistan in August 2021; and

(2) the extent to which Department personnel and resources for Mission Iraq were reallocated following ordered departures for diplomatic posts in March 2020, and how such resources were reallocated.

SEC. 5719. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REPORTS.

(a) CERTIFICATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF THE AUSTRALIA GROUP.—Section 2(7) of Senate Resolution 75 (105th Congress) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(b) ACTIVITIES OF THE TALIBAN.—Section 7044(a)(4) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2021 (division K of Public Law 116-260) is amended by striking “the following purposes—” and all that follows through “(B)”.

(c) PLANS TO IMPLEMENT THE GANDHI-KING SCHOLARLY EXCHANGE INITIATIVE.—The Gandhi-King Scholarly Exchange Initiative Act (subtitle D of title III of division FF of Public Law 116-260) is amended by striking section 336.

(d) PROGRESS REPORT ON JERUSALEM EMBASSY.—The Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-45) is amended by striking section 6.

(e) BURMA’S TIMBER TRADE.—The Tom Lantos Block Burmese Jade (Junta’s Anti-Democratic Efforts) Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-286; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking section 12.

(f) MONITORING OF ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN.—Section 103 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7513) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(g) PRESIDENTIAL ANTI-PEDOPHILIA CERTIFICATION.—Section 102 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(h) MICROENTERPRISE FOR SELF-RELIANCE REPORT.—Title III of the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance and International Anti-Corruption Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-309; 22 U.S.C. 2462 note) is amended by striking section 304.

(i) PROMOTING THE RULE OF LAW IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO SUPPORT UNITED STATES TRADE AND INVESTMENT.—The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-208), is amended—

(1) in the table of contents, by amending the item relating to section 202 to read as follows:

“Sec. 202. Reporting bribery and corruption in the Russian Federation to support United States trade and investment.”.

(2) by amending section 202 to read as follows:

“SEC. 202. REPORTING BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO SUPPORT UNITED STATES TRADE AND INVESTMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall establish and maintain a dedicated phone hotline and secure website, accessible from within and outside the Russian Federation, for the purpose of allowing United States entities—

“(1) to report instances of bribery, attempted bribery, or other forms of corruption in the Russian Federation that impact or potentially impact their operations; and

“(2) to request the assistance of the United States with respect to issues relating to corruption in the Russian Federation.

“(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date under section 102(b) of the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of the Russian Federation, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives that includes—

“(A) the number of instances in which bribery, attempted bribery, or other forms of corruption have been reported using the hotline or website established pursuant to subsection (a);

“(B) a description of the regions in the Russian Federation in which such instances are alleged to have occurred;

“(C) a summary of actions taken by the United States to provide assistance to United States entities pursuant to subsection (a)(2); and

“(D) a description of the efforts taken by the Secretary of Commerce to inform United States entities conducting business in the Russian Federation, or considering conducting business in the Russian Federation, of the availability of assistance through the hotline and website established pursuant to subsection (a).

“(2) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Secretary of Commerce may not include, in the report required under paragraph (1), the identity of a United States entity that reports instances of bribery, attempted bribery, or other forms of corruption in the Russian Federation or requests assistance pursuant to subsection (a).”.

SEC. 5720. LOCALITY PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WORKING OVERSEAS UNDER DOMESTIC EMPLOYEE TELEWORKING OVERSEAS AGREEMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CIVIL SERVICE.—The term “civil service” has the meaning given the term in section 2101 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term “covered employee” means an employee who—

(A) occupies a position in the civil service; and

(B) is working overseas under a Domestic Employee Teleworking Overseas agreement.

(3) LOCALITY PAY.—The term “locality pay” means a locality-based comparability payment paid in accordance with subsection (b).

(4) NONFOREIGN AREA.—The term “nonforeign area” has the meaning given the term in section 591.205 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(5) OVERSEAS.—The term “overseas” means any geographic location that is not in—

(A) the continental United States; or

(B) a nonforeign area.

(b) PAYMENT OF LOCALITY PAY.—Each covered employee shall be paid locality pay in an amount that is equal to the lesser of—

(1) the amount of a locality-based comparability payment that the covered employee would have been paid under section 5304 or 5304a of title 5, United States Code, had the official duty station of the covered employee not been changed to reflect an overseas location under the applicable Domestic Employee Teleworking Overseas agreement; or

(2) the amount of a locality-based comparability payment that the covered employee would be paid under section 1113 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-32), as limited under section 5803(a)(4)(B) of this Act, if the covered employee were an eligible member of the Foreign Service (as defined in subsection (b) of such section 1113).

(c) APPLICATION.—Locality pay paid to a covered employee under this section—

(1) shall begin to be paid not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall be treated in the same manner, and subject to the same terms and conditions, as a locality-based comparability payment paid under section 5304 or 5304a of title 5, United States Code.

(d) ANNUITY COMPUTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of any annuity computation under chapter 83 or 84 of title 5, United States Code, the basic pay of a covered employee shall—

(1) be considered to be the rate of basic pay that would have been paid to the covered em-

ployee had the official duty station of the covered employee not been changed to reflect an overseas location under the applicable Domestic Employee Teleworking Overseas agreement; and

(2) include locality pay paid to the covered employee under this section.

SEC. 5721. DEPARTMENT OF STATE DIPLOMACY IN RESPONSE TO THE UNITED NATIONS INDEPENDENT INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON ISRAEL.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States for the Secretary to pursue, during the United Nations General Assembly and in all future participation in United Nations’ fora, with respect to the United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in Israel (referred to in this subsection as the “Commission”)—

(1) the establishment of criteria for the dissolution of the Commission, mirroring standard criteria established in other recent Commissions of Inquiry on Syria, Libya, South Sudan, and Venezuela;

(2) the dissolution of the Commission in the context of the United States’—

(A) participation in the United Nations General Assembly Third Committee; and

(B) engagement on the United Nations Human Rights Council;

(3) the determination of an expiration date for the Commission that is as soon as possible;

(4) continued advocacy in the United Nations General Assembly Fifth Committee to limit resources available to the Commission commensurate with other recent Commissions of Inquiry; and

(5) continued advocacy for membership in the United Nations Human Rights Council of countries that do not pursue antisemitic or anti-Israel agendas.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing the actions taken by the Department in pursuit of the goals set forth in subsection (a).

SEC. 5722. PROHIBITION ON ENTRY OF OFFICIALS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS INVOLVED IN SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION OR GROSS VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) INELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any official of a foreign government, and the immediate family members of such an official, about whom the Secretary has credible information has been involved, directly or indirectly, in significant corruption, including corruption related to the extraction of natural resources, or a gross violation of human rights shall be ineligible for entry into the United States.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall publicly or privately designate or identify each official of a foreign government, and the immediate family members of such official, about whom the Secretary has such credible information related to any act described in paragraph (1), without regard to whether the official has applied for a visa.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to an individual if the entry of the individual into the United States would further important United States law enforcement objectives or is necessary to permit the United States to fulfill its obligations under the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or any other applicable international obligations of the United States.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the application of subsection (a) if the Secretary

determines that such a waiver would serve a compelling national interest or that the circumstances that caused the individual concerned to be ineligible for entry or admission to the United States pursuant to subsection (a)(1) or to be designated pursuant to subsection (a)(2) have changed sufficiently.

(d) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report that, for the reporting period—

(A) includes the information related to corruption or violation of human rights concerning each individual found to be ineligible for entry into the United States under subsection (a)(1);

(B) identifies—

(i) each individual whom the Secretary designated or identified pursuant to subsection (a)(2); and

(ii) each individual who would have been so ineligible but for the application of subsection (b); and

(C) includes a list of waivers provided under subsection (c) and a justification for each waiver.

(2) **FORM.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make available to the public on a publicly accessible internet website of the Department of State the unclassified portion of each report required by paragraph (1).

(e) **REFERRAL FOR FINANCIAL SANCTIONS.**—Following the application of subsection (a), the Secretary should, as appropriate, refer to the Secretary of the Treasury, through the Office of Foreign Assets Control, a list of persons who have been designated pursuant to subsection (a)(2) and related supporting information for review for the imposition of sanctions, in accordance with United States law, to block the transfer of property and interests in property, and all financial transactions, in the United States involving any person described in subsection (a).

(f) **CLARIFICATION.**—For purposes of subsections (a) and (d), the records of the Department and of diplomatic and consular offices of the United States pertaining to the issuance or refusal of visas or permits to enter the United States shall not be considered confidential.

SEC. 5723. MODIFICATIONS TO SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1262 the following:

“SEC. 1262A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

“It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish and regularize information sharing and sanctions-related decision making with like-minded governments possessing human rights and anti-corruption sanctions programs similar in nature to those authorized under this subtitle.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 2(b) and in title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) are each amended by inserting after the items relating to section 1262 the following:

“Sec. 1262A. Sense of Congress.”

(b) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1263(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Account-

ability Act (22 U.S.C. 10102) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) through (4) and inserting the following:

“(2) is a current or former government official, or a person acting for or on behalf of such an official, who is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in—

“(A) corruption, including—

“(i) the misappropriation of state assets;

“(ii) the expropriation of private assets for personal gain;

“(iii) corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources; or

“(iv) bribery; or

“(B) the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption;

“(3) is or has been a leader or official of—

“(A) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, any of the activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) related to the tenure of the leader or official; or

“(B) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section as a result of activities related to the tenure of the leader or official;

“(4) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of—

“(A) an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) that is conducted by a foreign person;

“(B) a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

“(C) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) conducted by a foreign person; or

“(5) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or been purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section.”

(2) **CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by inserting “corruption and” after “monitor”.

(3) **REQUESTS BY CONGRESS.**—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A request under paragraph (1) with respect to whether a foreign person has engaged in an activity described in subsection (a) shall be submitted to the President in writing jointly by the chairperson and ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees.”

(c) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Section 1264(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10103(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) a description of additional steps taken by the President through diplomacy, international engagement, and assistance to foreign or security sectors to address persistent underlying causes of conduct giving rise to the imposition of sanctions under this section, as amended on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, in each country in which foreign persons with respect to which such sanctions have been imposed are located; and

“(8) a description of additional steps taken by the President to ensure the pursuit of judicial accountability in appropriate jurisdictions with respect to foreign persons subject to sanctions under this section.”

SEC. 5724. REPORT OF SHOOTING OF PALESTINIAN-AMERICAN JOURNALIST IN JENIN.

Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a complete copy, in classified or unclassified format, as appropriate, of the report overseen by the United States Security Coordinator for Israel and the Palestinian Authority regarding the circumstances surrounding the shooting of Shireen Abu Akleh in Jenin on May 11, 2022.

SEC. 5725. REPORT ON COUNTERING THE ACTIVITIES OF MALIGN ACTORS.

(a) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding United States diplomatic efforts in Africa in achieving United States policy goals and countering the activities of malign actors.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) case studies from Mali, Sudan, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and South Sudan, with the goal of assessing the effectiveness of diplomatic tools during the 5-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) an assessment of—

(i) the extent and effectiveness of certain diplomatic tools to advance United States priorities in the respective case study countries, including—

(I) in-country diplomatic presence;

(II) humanitarian and development assistance;

(III) support for increased 2-way trade and investment;

(IV) United States security assistance;

(V) public diplomacy; and

(VI) accountability measures, including sanctions;

(ii) whether the use of the diplomatic tools described in clause (i) achieved the diplomatic ends for which they were intended; and

(iii) the means by which the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China exploited any openings for diplomatic engagement in the case study countries.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (b) shall be submitted in classified form.

(c) **CLASSIFIED BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly brief Congress regarding the report required under subsection (b).

SEC. 5726. LIMITATION ON WITHDRAWAL FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.

(a) **OPPOSITION OF CONGRESS TO SUSPENSION, TERMINATION, DENUNCIATION, OR WITHDRAWAL FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.**—The President shall not suspend, terminate, denounce, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington, DC, April 4, 1949, except by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided that two-thirds of the Senators present concur, or pursuant to an Act of Congress.

(b) **LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.**—No funds authorized or appropriated by any Act may be used to support, directly or indirectly, any efforts on the part of any United States Government official to take steps to suspend, terminate, denounce, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington, DC, April 4, 1949, until such time as both the Senate and the House of Representatives pass, by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of Members, a

joint resolution approving the withdrawal of the United States from the treaty or pursuant to an Act of Congress.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF TREATY ACTION.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Prior to the notification described in paragraph (2), the President shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees in relation to any effort to suspend, terminate, denounce, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing of any effort to suspend, terminate, denounce, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, as soon as possible, but in no event later than 180 days before taking such action.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT CONGRESS.—Both the Senate Legal Counsel and the General Counsel to the House of Representatives are authorized to independently or collectively represent Congress in initiating or intervening in any judicial proceedings in any Federal court of competent jurisdiction on behalf of Congress in order to oppose any effort to suspend, terminate, denounce, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty in a manner inconsistent with this section.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Any legal counsel operating pursuant to subsection (d) shall report as soon as practicable to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to any judicial proceedings which the Senate Legal Counsel or the General Counsel to the House of Representatives, as the case may be, initiates or in which it intervenes pursuant to subsection (d).

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, imply, or otherwise indicate that the President may suspend, terminate, denounce, or withdraw from any treaty to which the Senate has provided its advice and consent without the advice and consent of the Senate to such act or pursuant to an Act of Congress.

(g) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section or the application of such provision is held by a Federal court to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this section and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “withdrawal”, “denunciation”, “suspension”, and “termination” have the meaning given such terms in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, concluded at Vienna May 23, 1969.

SEC. 5727. ENHANCING TRANSPARENCY ON INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS AND NON-BINDING INSTRUMENTS.

(a) SECTION 112B OF TITLE 1, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112b of title 1, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 112b. United States international agreements and non-binding instruments; transparency provisions

“(a)(1) Not less frequently than once each month, the Secretary shall provide in writing to the appropriate congressional committees the following:

“(A)(i) A list of all international agreements approved for negotiation by the Secretary or another Department of State officer at the Assistant Secretary level or higher and a list of all qualifying non-binding instruments described in subsection (1)(6)(A)(ii)(I) approved for negotiation by the appropriate department or agency during the prior month, or, in the event an international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument is not included in the lists required by this clause, a certification cor-

responding to the international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument as authorized under paragraph (5)(A).

“(ii) A description of the intended subject matter and parties to or participants for each international agreement and qualifying non-binding instrument listed pursuant to clause (i).

“(B)(i) A list of all international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments signed, concluded, or otherwise finalized during the prior month.

“(ii) The text of all international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments described in clause (i).

“(iii) A detailed description of the legal authority that, in the view of the Secretary, provides authorization for each international agreement and that, in the view of the appropriate department or agency, provides authorization for each qualifying non-binding instrument provided under clause (ii) to become operative. If multiple authorities are relied upon in relation to an international agreement, the Secretary shall cite all such authorities, and if multiple authorities are relied upon in relation to a qualifying non-binding instrument, the appropriate department or agency shall cite all such authorities. All citations to the Constitution of the United States, a treaty, or a statute shall include the specific article or section and subsection reference whenever available and, if not available, shall be as specific as possible. If the authority relied upon is or includes article II of the Constitution of the United States, the Secretary or appropriate department or agency shall explain the basis for that reliance.

“(C)(i) A list of all international agreements that entered into force and qualifying non-binding instruments that became operative for the United States or an agency of the United States during the prior month.

“(ii) The text of all international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments described in clause (i) if such text differs from the text of the agreement or instrument previously provided pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii).

“(iii) A statement describing any new or amended statutory or regulatory authority anticipated to be required to fully implement each proposed international agreement and qualifying non-binding instrument included in the list described in clause (i).

“(2) Not less frequently than once every three months, the Secretary shall provide in writing to the appropriate congressional committees the following:

“(A) A list of all qualifying non-binding instruments described in subsection (1)(6)(A)(ii)(I) approved for negotiation by the appropriate department or agency during the prior three months, or, in the event a qualifying non-binding instrument is not included in the list required by this subparagraph, a certification corresponding to the qualifying non-binding instrument as authorized under paragraph (5)(A).

“(B) A description of the intended subject matter and participants for each qualifying non-binding instrument listed pursuant to subparagraph (A).

“(3) The information and text required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(4) In the case of a general authorization issued for the negotiation or conclusion of a series of international agreements of the same general type, the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) may be satisfied by the provision in writing of—

“(A) a single notification containing all the information required by paragraph (1)(A); and

“(B) a list, to the extent described in such general authorization, of the countries or entities with which such agreements are contemplated.

“(5)(A) The Secretary may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A) with respect to a specific international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument, as applicable, for renewable periods of up to 180 days if the Secretary certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

“(i) exercising the waiver authority is vital to the negotiation of a particular international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument; and

“(ii) the international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument would significantly and materially advance the foreign policy or national security interests of the United States.

“(B) The Secretary shall brief the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and the Chairs and Ranking Members of the appropriate congressional committees on the scope and status of the negotiation that is the subject of the waiver under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary exercises the waiver; and

“(ii) once every 180 days during the period in which a renewed waiver is in effect.

“(C) The certification required by subparagraph (A) may be provided in classified form.

“(D) The Secretary shall not delegate the waiver authority or certification requirements under subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall not delegate the briefing requirements under subparagraph (B) to any person other than the Deputy Secretary.

“(b)(1) Not later than 120 days after the date on which an international agreement enters into force, the Secretary shall make the text of the agreement, and the information described in subparagraphs (B)(iii) and (C)(iii) of subsection (a)(1) relating to the agreement, available to the public on the website of the Department of State.

“(2) Not less frequently than once every 120 days, the Secretary shall make the text of each qualifying non-binding instrument that became operative during the preceding 120 days, and the information described in subparagraphs (B)(iii) and (C)(iii) of subsection (a)(1) relating to each such instrument, available to the public on the website of the Department of State.

“(3) The requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to the following categories of international agreements or qualifying non-binding instruments, or to information described in subparagraphs (B)(iii) and (C)(iii) of subsection (a)(1) relating to such agreements or qualifying non-binding instruments:

“(A) International agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments that contain information that has been given a national security classification pursuant to Executive Order 13526 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note; relating to classified national security information) or any predecessor or successor order, or that contain any information that is otherwise exempt from public disclosure pursuant to United States law.

“(B) International agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments that address specified military operations, military exercises, acquisition and cross servicing, logistics support, military personnel exchange or education programs, or the provision of health care to military personnel on a reciprocal basis.

“(C) International agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments that establish the terms of grant or other similar assistance, including in-kind assistance, financed

with foreign assistance funds pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) or the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.).

“(D) International agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments, such as project annexes and other similar instruments, for which the principal function is to establish technical details for the implementation of a specific project undertaken pursuant to another agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument that has been published in accordance with paragraph (1) or (2).

“(E) International agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments that have been separately published by a depository or other similar administrative body, except that the Secretary shall make the information described in subparagraphs (B)(iii) and (C)(iii) of subsection (a)(1), relating to such agreements or qualifying non-binding instruments, available to the public on the website of the Department of State within the timeframes required by paragraph (1) or (2).

“(c) For any international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument for which an implementing agreement or arrangement, or any document of similar purpose or function to the aforementioned regardless of the title of the document, is not otherwise required to be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees under subparagraphs (B)(ii) or (C)(ii) of subsection (a)(1), not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a written communication from the Chair or Ranking Member of either of the appropriate congressional committees requesting the text of any such implementing agreements or arrangements, whether binding or non-binding, the Secretary shall submit such implementing agreements or arrangements to the appropriate congressional committees.

“(d) Any department or agency of the United States Government that enters into any international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument on behalf of itself or the United States shall—

“(1) notify the Secretary of the approval for negotiation of a qualifying non-binding instrument within 15 days of such approval;

“(2) provide to the Secretary the text of each international agreement not later than 15 days after the date on which such agreement is signed or otherwise concluded;

“(3) provide to the Secretary the text of each qualifying non-binding instrument not later than 15 days after the date on which such instrument is concluded or otherwise becomes finalized;

“(4) provide to the Secretary a detailed description of the legal authority that provides authorization for each qualifying non-binding instrument to become operative not later than 15 days after such instrument is signed or otherwise becomes finalized; and

“(5) on an ongoing basis, provide any implementing material to the Secretary for transmittal to the appropriate congressional committees as needed to satisfy the requirements described in subsection (c).

“(e)(1) Each department or agency of the United States Government that enters into any international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument on behalf of itself or the United States shall designate a Chief International Agreements Officer, who shall—

“(A) be selected from among employees of such department or agency;

“(B) serve concurrently as the Chief International Agreements Officer; and

“(C) subject to the authority of the head of such department or agency, have department- or agency-wide responsibility for efficient and appropriate compliance with this section.

“(2) There shall be a Chief International Agreements Officer who serves at the Department of State with the title of International Agreements Compliance Officer.

“(f) The substance of oral international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments shall be reduced to writing for the purpose of meeting the requirements of subsections (a) and (b).

“(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an international agreement may not be signed or otherwise concluded on behalf of the United States without prior consultation with the Secretary. Such consultation may encompass a class of agreements rather than a particular agreement.

“(h)(1) If the Secretary is aware or has reason to believe that the requirements of subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), (b), or (c) have not been fulfilled with respect to an international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument, the Secretary shall—

“(A) immediately bring the matter to the attention of the office or agency responsible for the agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument; and

“(B) request the office or agency to provide within 7 days the information necessary to fulfill the requirements of the relevant subsection.

“(2) Upon receiving the information requested pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) fulfill the requirements of subsection (a), (b), or (c), as the case may be, with respect to the agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument concerned—

“(i) by including such information in the next submission required by subsection (a)(1);

“(ii) by providing such information in writing to the appropriate congressional committees before provision of the submission described in clause (i); or

“(iii) in relation to subsection (b), by making the text of the agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument and the information described in subparagraphs (B)(iii) and (C)(ii) of subsection (a)(1) relating to the agreement or instrument available to the public on the website of the Department of State within 15 days; and

“(B) provide to the appropriate congressional committees, either in the next submission required by subsection (a)(1) or before such submission, a written statement explaining the reason for the delay in fulfilling the requirements of subsection (a), (b), or (c), as the case may be.

“(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the requirements of subsection (a) have not been fulfilled with respect to an international agreement within 45 days of the date on which the Secretary made a request to an office or agency as described in paragraph (1)(B), no amounts appropriated to the Department of State under any law shall be available for obligation or expenditure to implement or to support the implementation of (including through the use of personnel or resources subject to the authority of a chief of mission) that particular international agreement, other than to facilitate compliance with this section, until the Secretary satisfies the substantive requirements in subsection (a) with respect to that particular international agreement.

“(i)(1) Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this section, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter during the 9-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the compliance of the Secretary with the requirements of this section.

“(2) In any instance in which a failure by the Secretary to comply with such require-

ments is determined by the Comptroller General to have been due to the failure or refusal of another agency to provide information or material to the Department of State, or the failure to do so in a timely manner, the Comptroller General shall engage such other agency to determine—

“(A) the cause and scope of such failure or refusal;

“(B) the specific office or offices responsible for such failure or refusal; and

“(C) recommendations for measures to ensure compliance with statutory requirements.

“(3) The Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees in writing the results of each audit required by paragraph (1).

“(4) The Comptroller General and the Secretary shall make the results of each audit required by paragraph (1) publicly available on the websites of the Government Accountability Office and the Department of State, respectively.

“(j) The President shall, through the Secretary, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

“(k) It is the sense of Congress that the executive branch should not prescribe or otherwise commit to or include specific legislative text in a treaty, executive agreement, or non-binding instrument unless Congress has authorized such action.

“(l) In this section:

“(1) The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(2) The term ‘appropriate department or agency’ means the department or agency of the United States Government that negotiates and enters into a qualifying non-binding instrument on behalf of itself or the United States.

“(3) The term ‘Deputy Secretary’ means the Deputy Secretary of State.

“(4) The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

“(5) The term ‘international agreement’ includes—

“(A) any treaty that requires the advice and consent of the Senate, pursuant to article II of the Constitution of the United States; and

“(B) any other international agreement to which the United States is a party and that is not subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(6) The term ‘qualifying non-binding instrument’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means a non-binding instrument that—

“(i) is or will be under negotiation, is signed or otherwise becomes operative, or is implemented with one or more foreign governments, international organizations, or foreign entities, including non-state actors; and

“(ii)(I) could reasonably be expected to have a significant impact on the foreign policy of the United States; or

“(II) is the subject of a written communication from the Chair or Ranking Member of either of the appropriate congressional committees to the Secretary; and

“(B) does not include any non-binding instrument that is signed or otherwise becomes operative or is implemented pursuant to the authorities relied upon by the Department of Defense, the Armed Forces of the United States, or any element of the intelligence community.

“(7) The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of State.

“(8)(A) The term ‘text’ with respect to an international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument includes—

“(i) any annex, appendix, codicil, side agreement, side letter, or any document of similar purpose or function to the aforementioned, regardless of the title of the document, that is entered into contemporaneously and in conjunction with the international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument; and

“(ii) any implementing agreement or arrangement, or any document of similar purpose or function to the aforementioned regardless of the title of the document, that is entered into contemporaneously and in conjunction with the international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument.

“(B) As used in subparagraph (A), the term ‘contemporaneously and in conjunction with’—

“(i) shall be construed liberally; and

“(ii) may not be interpreted to require any action to have occurred simultaneously or on the same day.

“(m) Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the withholding from disclosure to the public of any record if such disclosure is required by law.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 112b and inserting the following:

“112b. United States international agreements and non-binding instruments; transparency provisions.”.

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—Section 317(h)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 195c(h)(2)) is amended by striking “Section 112b(c)” and inserting “Section 112b(g)”.

(4) MECHANISM FOR REPORTING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a mechanism for personnel of the Department who become aware or who have reason to believe that the requirements under section 112b of title 1, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1), have not been fulfilled with respect to an international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument (as such terms are defined in such section) to report such instances to the Secretary.

(5) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, through the Secretary, shall promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out section 112b of title 1, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1).

(6) CONSULTATION AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees on matters related to the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section before and after the effective date described in subsection (c).

(B) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and once every 90 days thereafter for 1 year, the Secretary shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the status of efforts to implement this section and the amendments made by this section.

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2023 through 2027 for purposes of implementing the requirements of section 112b of title 1, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1).

(b) SECTION 112A OF TITLE 1, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 112a of title 1, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) Copies of international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments in the possession of the Department of State, but not published, other than the agreements described in section 112b(b)(3)(A), shall be made available by the Department of State upon request.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE LVIII—EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES

SEC. 5801. CONSULTING SERVICES.

Any consulting services through procurement contracts shall be limited to contracts in which such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive orders issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 5802. DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES.

For the purposes of calculating the costs of providing new United States diplomatic facilities in any fiscal year, in accordance with section 604(e) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865 note), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall determine the annual program level and agency shares for such fiscal year in a manner that is proportional to the contribution of the Department of State for this purpose.

SEC. 5803. EXTENSION OF EXISTING AUTHORITIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.—

(1) PASSPORT FEES.—Section 1(b)(2) of the Passport Act of June 4, 1920 (22 U.S.C. 214(b)(2)) shall be applied by striking “September 30, 2010” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

(2) INCENTIVES FOR CRITICAL POSTS.—The authority contained in section 1115(d) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32) shall remain in effect through “September 30, 2024”.

(3) USAID CIVIL SERVICE ANNUITANT WAIVER.—Section 625(j)(1)(B) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2385(j)(1)(B)) shall be applied by striking “October 1, 2010” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

(4) OVERSEAS PAY COMPARABILITY AND LIMITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The authority provided by section 1113 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32) shall remain in effect through September 30, 2024.

(B) LIMITATION.—The authority described in subparagraph (A) may not be used to pay an eligible member of the Foreign Service (as defined in section 1113(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32)) a locality-based comparability payment (stated as a percentage) that exceeds two-thirds of the amount of the locality-based comparability payment (stated as a percentage) that would be payable to such member under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, if such member’s official duty station were in the District of Columbia.

(5) INSPECTOR GENERAL ANNUITANT WAIVER.—The authorities provided in section 1015(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–212)—

(A) shall remain in effect through September 30, 2024; and

(B) may be used to facilitate the assignment of persons for oversight of programs in Somalia, South Sudan, Syria, Venezuela, and Yemen.

(6) ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARDS.—The authority provided under section 301(a)(3) of

the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4831(a)(3)) shall remain in effect for facilities in Afghanistan and shall apply to facilities in Ukraine through September 30, 2024, except that the notification and reporting requirements contained in such section shall include the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(7) DEPARTMENT OF STATE INSPECTOR GENERAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Inspector General of the Department may waive the provisions of subsections (a) through (d) of section 824 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4064), on a case-by-case basis, for an annuitant reemployed by the Inspector General on a temporary basis, subject to the same constraints and in the same manner by which the Secretary of State may exercise such waiver authority pursuant to subsection (g) of such section.

(b) EXTENSION OF PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 7077 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112–74) shall continue in effect until September 30, 2024.

SEC. 5804. WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AND MILITARY TRAINING REPORT.

(a) EXTENSION OF WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AUTHORITY.—Section 12001(d) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287; 118 Stat. 1011) is amended by striking “of this section” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “of this section after September 30, 2024”.

(b) ANNUAL FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING REPORT.—For the purposes of implementing section 656 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the term “military training provided to foreign military personnel by the Department of Defense and the Department of State” shall be deemed to include all military training provided by foreign governments with funds appropriated to the Department of Defense or the Department of State, except for training provided by the government of a country designated under section 517(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2321k(b)) as a major non-North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally. Such third-country training shall be clearly identified in the report submitted pursuant to such section 656.

TITLE LIX—GLOBAL CORRUPTION AND RESPECT

SEC. 5901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Combating Global Corruption Act of 2022”.

SEC. 5902. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CORRUPT ACTOR.—The term “corrupt actor” means—

(A) any foreign person or entity that is a government official or government entity responsible for, or complicit in, an act of corruption; and

(B) any company, in which a person or entity described in subparagraph (A) has a significant stake, which is responsible for, or complicit in, an act of corruption.

(2) CORRUPTION.—The term “corruption” means the unlawful exercise of entrusted public power for private gain, including by bribery, nepotism, fraud, or embezzlement.

(3) SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION.—The term “significant corruption” means corruption committed at a high level of government that has some or all of the following characteristics:

(A) Illegitimately distorts major decision-making, such as policy or resource determinations, or other fundamental functions of governance.

(B) Involves economically or socially large-scale government activities.

SEC. 5903. PUBLICATION OF TIERED RANKING LIST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall annually publish, on a publicly accessible website, a tiered ranking of all foreign countries.

(b) **TIER 1 COUNTRIES.**—A country shall be ranked as a tier 1 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is complying with the minimum standards set forth in section 5904.

(c) **TIER 2 COUNTRIES.**—A country shall be ranked as a tier 2 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is making efforts to comply with the minimum standards set forth in section 5904, but is not achieving the requisite level of compliance to be ranked as a tier 1 country.

(d) **TIER 3 COUNTRIES.**—A country shall be ranked as a tier 3 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is making de minimis or no efforts to comply with the minimum standards set forth in section 5904.

SEC. 5904. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF CORRUPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The government of a country is complying with the minimum standards for the elimination of corruption if the government—

(1) has enacted and implemented laws and established government structures, policies, and practices that prohibit corruption, including significant corruption;

(2) enforces the laws described in paragraph (1) by punishing any person who is found, through a fair judicial process, to have violated such laws;

(3) prescribes punishment for significant corruption that is commensurate with the punishment prescribed for serious crimes; and

(4) is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, including through prevention.

(b) **FACTORS FOR ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION.**—In determining whether a government is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, the Secretary of State shall consider, to the extent relevant or appropriate, factors such as—

(1) whether the government of the country has criminalized corruption, investigates and prosecutes acts of corruption, and convicts and sentences persons responsible for such acts over which it has jurisdiction, including, as appropriate, incarcerating individuals convicted of such acts;

(2) whether the government of the country vigorously investigates, prosecutes, convicts, and sentences public officials who participate in or facilitate corruption, including nationals of the country who are deployed in foreign military assignments, trade delegations abroad, or other similar missions, who engage in or facilitate significant corruption;

(3) whether the government of the country has adopted measures to prevent corruption, such as measures to inform and educate the public, including potential victims, about the causes and consequences of corruption;

(4) what steps the government of the country has taken to prohibit government officials from participating in, facilitating, or condoning corruption, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of such officials;

(5) the extent to which the country provides access, or, as appropriate, makes adequate resources available, to civil society organizations and other institutions to combat corruption, including reporting, investigating, and monitoring;

(6) whether an independent judiciary or judicial body in the country is responsible for, and effectively capable of, deciding corruption cases impartially, on the basis of facts and in accordance with the law, without any improper restrictions, influences, inducements, pressures, threats, or interferences (direct or indirect);

(7) whether the government of the country is assisting in international investigations of transnational corruption networks and in other cooperative efforts to combat significant corruption, including, as appropriate, cooperating with the governments of other countries to extradite corrupt actors;

(8) whether the government of the country recognizes the rights of victims of corruption, ensures their access to justice, and takes steps to prevent victims from being further victimized or persecuted by corrupt actors, government officials, or others;

(9) whether the government of the country protects victims of corruption or whistleblowers from reprisal due to such persons having assisted in exposing corruption, and refrains from other discriminatory treatment of such persons;

(10) whether the government of the country is willing and able to recover and, as appropriate, return the proceeds of corruption;

(11) whether the government of the country is taking steps to implement financial transparency measures in line with the Financial Action Task Force recommendations, including due diligence and beneficial ownership transparency requirements;

(12) whether the government of the country is facilitating corruption in other countries in connection with state-directed investment, loans or grants for major infrastructure, or other initiatives; and

(13) such other information relating to corruption as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

(c) **ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION IN RELATION TO RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS.**—In determining whether a government is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, the Secretary shall consider the government of a country's compliance with the following, as relevant:

(1) The Inter-American Convention against Corruption of the Organization of American States, done at Caracas March 29, 1996.

(2) The Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, done at Paris December 21, 1997 (commonly referred to as the "Anti-Bribery Convention").

(3) The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, done at New York November 15, 2000.

(4) The United Nations Convention against Corruption, done at New York October 31, 2003.

(5) Such other treaties, agreements, and international standards as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

SEC. 5905. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS UNDER GLOBAL MAGNITSKY HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, should evaluate whether there are foreign persons engaged in significant corruption for the purposes of potential imposition of sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note)—

(1) in all countries identified as tier 3 countries under section 5903; or

(2) in relation to the planning or construction or any operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after publishing the list required under section 5903(a) and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the committees specified in subsection (f) a report that includes—

(1) a list of foreign persons with respect to which the President imposed sanctions pursuant to the evaluation under subsection (a);

(2) the dates on which such sanctions were imposed;

(3) the reasons for imposing such sanctions; and

(4) a list of all foreign persons found to have been engaged in significant corruption in relation to the planning, construction, or operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required under subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) **BRIEFING IN LIEU OF REPORT.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, may (except with respect to the list required under subsection (b)(4)) provide a briefing to the committees specified in subsection (f) instead of submitting a written report required under subsection (b), if doing so would better serve existing United States anti-corruption efforts or the national interests of the United States.

(e) **TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO NORD STREAM 2.**—The requirements under subsections (a)(2) and (b)(4) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) **COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.**—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(5) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(6) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(7) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(8) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5906. DESIGNATION OF EMBASSY ANTI-CORRUPTION POINTS OF CONTACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall annually designate an anti-corruption point of contact at the United States diplomatic post to each country identified as tier 2 or tier 3 under section 5903, or which the Secretary otherwise determines is in need of such a point of contact. The point of contact shall be the chief of mission or the chief of mission's designee.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Each anti-corruption point of contact designated under subsection (a) shall be responsible for enhancing coordination and promoting the implementation of a whole-of-government approach among the relevant Federal departments and agencies undertaking efforts to—

(1) promote good governance in foreign countries; and

(2) enhance the ability of such countries—

(A) to combat public corruption; and

(B) to develop and implement corruption risk assessment tools and mitigation strategies.

(c) **TRAINING.**—The Secretary shall implement appropriate training for anti-corruption points of contact designated under subsection (a).

SA 5621. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr.

REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 906. REPORT ON REASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES PREVIOUSLY ASSIGNED TO CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Deputy Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation plan for and progress made toward reassignment of the responsibilities previously assigned to the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense abolished by section 901 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283; 134 Stat. 3794).

SA 5622. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY ON RESEARCH PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the research programs of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The study required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Identification of all research programs of the Department.

(2) Identification of which programs identified under paragraph (1) are duplicates of each other and which programs are duplicates of programs of other Federal agencies.

(3) For each program of the Department identified under paragraph (2) that is a duplicate of another program of the Department but is carried out by a different military department or Defense Agency, identification of which military department or Defense Agency is the most appropriate entity to carry out the program.

SA 5623. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10 ____ . SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DEBT AS A THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) in September 2020, the total public debt outstanding of the United States was more than \$26,000,000,000,000, resulting in a total interest expense of more than \$371,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2020;

(2) in September 2019, the total public debt as a percentage of gross domestic product was about 100 percent;

(3) leaders of the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office have testified that—

(A) the growth of the public debt is unsustainable; and

(B) Congress must undertake extensive fiscal consolidation to combat that growth;

(4) the last Federal budget surplus occurred in 2001;

(5) in fiscal year 2020, Federal tax receipts totaled \$3,420,000,000,000, but Federal outlays totaled \$6,652,000,000,000, leaving the Federal Government with a 1-year deficit of \$3,132,000,000,000;

(6) since the last Federal budget surplus occurred in 2001, Congress—

(A) has failed to maintain a fiscally responsible budget; and

(B) has had to raise the debt ceiling repeatedly;

(7) the Medicare Board of Trustees projects that the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be depleted in 2026;

(8) the Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees project that the Disability Insurance and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Funds will be depleted in 2026 and 2031, respectively;

(9) heavy indebtedness increases the exposure of the Federal Government to interest rate risks;

(10) the credit rating of the United States was reduced by Standard and Poor's from AAA to AA+ on August 5, 2011, and has remained at that level ever since;

(11) without a targeted effort to balance the Federal budget, the credit rating of the United States will continue to fall;

(12) improvements in the business climate in populous countries, and aging populations around the world, will likely contribute to higher global interest rates;

(13) more than \$7,000,000,000,000 of Federal debt is owned by individuals not located in the United States, including more than \$1,000,000,000,000 of which is owned by individuals in China;

(14) China and the European Union are developing alternative payment systems to weaken the dominant position of the United States dollar as a reserve currency;

(15) rapidly increasing interest rates will squeeze all policy priorities of the United States, including defense policy and foreign policy priorities;

(16) the National Security Strategy of the United States, as of the date of enactment of this Act, highlights the need to reduce the national debt through fiscal responsibility;

(17) on April 12, 2018, former Secretary of Defense James Mattis warned that “any Nation that can't keep its fiscal house in order eventually cannot maintain its military power”;

(18) on March 6, 2018, former Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats warned: “Our continued plunge into debt is unsustainable and represents a dire future threat to our economy and to our national security”;

(19) on November 15, 2017, former Secretaries of Defense Leon Panetta, Ash Carter, and Chuck Hagel warned: “Increase in the debt will, in the absence of a comprehensive budget that addresses both entitlements and

revenues, force even deeper reductions in our national security capabilities”;

(20) on September 22, 2011, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Michael Mullen warned: “I believe the single, biggest threat to our national security is debt”.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the national debt is a threat to the national security of the United States;

(2) persistent, structural deficits are unsustainable, irresponsible, and dangerous; and

(3) the looming fiscal crisis faced by the United States must be addressed.

SA 5624. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SHARING OF INFORMATION REGARDING SAFETY INVESTIGATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(A) upon request of a member of Congress for information regarding a safety investigation conducted by the Department of Defense, not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the request, submit to the member of Congress the information requested; and

(B) not later than 30 days after the date of the completion of an investigation with respect to which the Secretary submitted information under subparagraph (A) to a member of Congress, submit to the member updated information with respect to the investigation.

(2) **REDACTION.**—The Secretary of Defense may not redact any information submitted under paragraph (1).

(3) **FORM.**—Information submitted under paragraph (1) may be submitted in classified form as the Secretary determines necessary to protect national security and the investigatory process.

(b) **SHARING OF INFORMATION AMONG MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.**—For each safety investigation conducted by the Department of Defense that involves equipment used by more than one military department, the Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 30 days after the date of the completion of the safety investigation, ensure that information regarding the investigation is transmitted to the Secretary of each military department that uses such equipment.

SA 5625. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 730. REQUIREMENTS OF CONTRACTOR UNDER PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that all pharmacies that were considered in-network under the pharmacy benefits program under section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, under the contract that immediately preceded the contract by the Secretary with Express Scripts under such program in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act are considered in-network pharmacies under such contract with Express Scripts on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PREVIOUS AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that, in carrying out their contract under the pharmacy benefits program under section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, Express Scripts honors all agreements made with pharmacies under the contract that immediately preceded the contract by the Secretary with Express Scripts under such program and the terms of any such agreement.

SA 5626. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 730. LIMITATION ON USE OF PHARMACIES UNDER PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that any entity with which the Secretary has entered into a contract to carry out the pharmacy benefits program under section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, does not exclusively use the private network of pharmacies of the entity, or pharmacies with which the entity is affiliated, as the base for the network of pharmacies used by the entity under such contract.

SA 5627. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FOR MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:
(A) Law enforcement and corrections officers routinely respond to emergencies in-

volving individuals suffering from a mental health crisis.

(B) Recent statistics have shown that as many as—

(i) 1 in every 10 calls for police response involve a person suffering from a mental illness;

(ii) 1 in every 4 people killed by police suffer from a mental health problem; and

(iii) 1 in 3 people transported to a hospital emergency room for psychiatric reasons are taken by the police.

(C) Law enforcement response calls to individuals suffering from substance use disorder have increased during the current opioid epidemic.

(D) There is a need to ensure that law enforcement officers have access to proper evidence-based training in responding to mental health crises.

(E) Proper training for response to individuals suffering from a mental health crisis can better protect the safety of the general public and law enforcement officers.

(F) Law enforcement and corrections officers in the United States can better serve their communities if the officers receive training to effectively and safely resolve the mental health crises.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide grants to State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies and corrections agencies to obtain behavioral health crisis response training for law enforcement officers and corrections officers to—

(A) better train law enforcement officers and corrections officers to resolve behavioral health crisis situations;

(B) reduce the number of law enforcement officers and corrections officers killed or injured while responding to a behavioral health crisis; and

(C) reduce the number of individuals killed or injured during a behavioral health crisis in which a law enforcement officer or corrections officer responds.

(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FOR MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Section 506 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10157) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Of the total amount made available to carry out this subpart for a fiscal year, the Attorney General may reserve not more than \$10,000,000 to carry out the program under section 509.”.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FOR MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS GRANT PROGRAM.—Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 509. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FOR MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Attorney General is authorized to award grants to applicants for—

“(1) law enforcement officers or corrections officers to receive training from a program; and

“(2) the cost of transportation and lodging associated with law enforcement officers or corrections officers attending such program.

“(b) PROGRAM STANDARDS.—The Attorney General shall establish and publish qualification standards for organizations that provide programs.

“(c) APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an applicant shall submit to the Attorney General an application that—

“(A) shall include—

“(i) a statement describing the program the law enforcement officers or corrections officers will complete;

“(ii) the total number of law enforcement officers or corrections officers in the agency;

“(iii) the number of law enforcement officers or corrections officers of the agency that have been killed, or seriously injured while responding to a behavioral health crisis during the 5-year-period preceding the date of the application; and

“(iv) whether the law enforcement officers or corrections officers employed by the agency receive any behavioral health crisis response training, including during basic officer training; and

“(B) in addition to the information required under subparagraph (A), may, at the option of the applicant, include information relating to—

“(i) recent incidents involving officers of the agency during which behavioral health crisis response training could have played a role in protecting the safety of—

“(I) the law enforcement officer or the public, including the persons or persons the law enforcement officers encountered; or

“(II) the corrections officer or inmates at the correctional facility; and

“(ii) estimated cost of attendance of a program per officer.

“(d) RESTRICTIONS.—

“(1) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS.—Grant funds shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, State, local, and Tribal funds made available to any applicant for any of the purposes described in subsection (a).

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 3 percent of any grant made under this section may be used for administrative costs.

“(e) REPORTS AND RECORDS.—

“(1) REPORTS.—For each year during which grant funds are used, the recipient shall submit to the Attorney General a report containing—

“(A) a summary of any activity carried out using grant funds;

“(B) the number of officers that received training using grant funds; and

“(C) any other information relevant to the purpose of this Act that the Attorney General may determine appropriate.

“(2) RECORDS.—For the purpose of an audit by the Attorney General of the receipt and use of grant funds, a recipient shall—

“(A) keep—

“(i) any record relating to the receipt and use of grant funds; and

“(ii) any other record as the Attorney General may require; and

“(B) make the records described in subparagraph (A) available to the Attorney General upon request by the Attorney General.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPLICANT.—The term ‘applicant’ means a law enforcement agency or corrections agency that applies for a grant under this section.

“(2) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The term ‘Attorney General’ means the Attorney General, acting through the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs.

“(3) GRANT FUNDS.—The term ‘grant funds’ means funds from a grant awarded under this section.

“(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ‘law enforcement agency’ means an agency of a State or unit of local government that is authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

“(5) PROGRAM.—The term ‘program’ means a program or class that—

“(A) provides instructional training to law enforcement officers or corrections officers for response to a behavioral health crisis, including response to people suspected to be under the influence of a drug or psychoactive substance, and response to circumstances in

which a person is suspected to be suicidal or suffering from a mental illness;

“(B) includes training on techniques and strategies designed to protect—

“(i) the health and safety of law enforcement officers and the public, including the person or persons a law enforcement officer encounters during a behavioral health crisis response; or

“(ii) the health and safety of corrections officers and inmates at the correctional facility, including the inmate a corrections officer encounters during a behavioral health crisis response, or in the normal course of business of interactions with the inmate; and

“(C) is developed in conjunction with healthcare professionals to provide crisis intervention training focused on understanding mental and behavioral health, developing empathy, navigating community resources, de-escalation skills, and practical application training for officers.

“(6) RECIPIENT.—The term ‘recipient’ means an applicant that receives a grant under this section.”.

SA 5628. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2868. CONSTRUCTION OF FIRE HOUSE AT WALTER REED NATIONAL MILITARY MEDICAL CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall construct a new fire house at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center as part of the Phase 5 Military Construction Program of the Department of Defense.

(b) COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall complete the construction required under subsection (a) not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 5629. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2868. MOVEMENT OR CONSOLIDATION OF JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER TO FORT MEADE, MARYLAND OR ANOTHER APPROPRIATE LOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2023, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate action to move, consolidate, or both, the offices of the Joint Spectrum Center of the Department of Defense to the headquarters building of the Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, Maryland, or another appropriate location chosen by the Secretary for national secu-

rity purposes to ensure the physical and cybersecurity protection of personnel and missions of the Department.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.—Any facility, road, or infrastructure constructed or altered on a military installation as a result of the requirement under subsection (a) is deemed to be authorized by law in accordance with section 2802(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(c) TERMINATION OF EXISTING LEASE.—Upon completion of the relocation of the Joint Spectrum Center pursuant to subsection (a), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the existing lease for the Joint Spectrum Center shall be terminated.

(d) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE AUTHORITY.—Section 2887 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 569) is repealed.

SA 5630. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 144. PROHIBITION RELATING TO FLYING MISSION OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD; USE OF FUNDS FOR RUNWAYS OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may not reduce below 200 the inventory of A-10 aircraft or the inventory of F-22 aircraft.

(2) EXPIRATION OF PROHIBITION.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) shall cease to have effect on the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to Congress a plan to maintain the flying mission of the Air National Guard.

(b) AIR NATIONAL GUARD RUNWAYS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall use amounts available to the Secretary for sustainment, restoration and modernization (SRM) to enhance and improve runways of the Air National Guard in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 5631. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1115. PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITIONS FOR NAVY LABORATORIES AND NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTERS.

The Secretary of the Navy may not reduce the number of Senior Executive Service positions (as defined in section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code) maintained as of the date of the enactment of this Act for any—

- (1) laboratory of the Navy; or
- (2) Naval Surface Warfare Center.

SA 5632. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 389. PROHIBITION ON ELIMINATION OF CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL INCIDENT RESPONSE FORCE OF MARINE CORPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may not eliminate the Chemical Biological Incident Response Force of the Marine Corps or the funding for such force.

(b) REPORT ON FUNDING AND MAINTENANCE OF PROGRAM.—Not later than April 25, 2023, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commandant of the Marine Corps, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on how the Department of Defense will fund and maintain the Chemical Biological Incident Response Force of the Marine Corps.

SA 5633. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . NATIONAL BIODEFENSE ANALYSIS AND COUNTERMEASURES CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 323. NATIONAL BIODEFENSE ANALYSIS AND COUNTERMEASURES CENTER.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall designate the laboratory described in subsection (b) as an additional laboratory pursuant to the authority under section 308(c)(2), which shall be the lead Federal facility dedicated to defending the United States against biological threats by—

“(1) understanding the risks posed by intentional, accidental, and natural biological events; and

“(2) providing the operational capabilities to support the investigation, prosecution, and prevention of biocrimes and bioterrorism.

“(b) LABORATORY DESCRIBED.—The laboratory described in this subsection may be a federally funded research and development center—

“(1) known, as of the date of enactment of this section, as the National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center;

“(2) that may include—

“(A) the National Bioforensic Analysis Center, which conducts technical analyses in support of Federal law enforcement investigations; and

“(B) the National Biological Threat Characterization Center, which conducts experiments and studies to better understand biological vulnerabilities and hazards; and

“(3) transferred to the Department pursuant to subparagraphs (A), (D), and (F) of section 303(1) and section 303(2).

“(C) LABORATORY ACTIVITIES.—The National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center shall—

“(1) conduct studies and experiments to better understand current and future biological threats and hazards and pandemics;

“(2) provide the scientific data required to assess vulnerabilities, conduct risk assessments, and determine potential impacts to guide the development of countermeasures;

“(3) conduct and facilitate the technical forensic analysis and interpretation of materials recovered following a biological attack, or in other law enforcement investigations requiring evaluation of biological materials, in support of the appropriate lead Federal agency;

“(4) coordinate with other national laboratories to enhance research capabilities, share lessons learned, and provide training more efficiently;

“(5) collaborate with the Homeland Security Enterprise, as defined in section 2211(h), to plan and conduct research to address gaps and needs in biodefense; and

“(6) carry out other such activities as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(d) WORK FOR OTHERS.—The National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center shall engage in a continuously operating Work for Others program to make the unique biocontainment and bioforensic capabilities of the National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center available to other Federal agencies.

“(e) FACILITY REPAIR AND ROUTINE EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT.—The National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center shall—

“(1) perform regularly scheduled and required maintenance of laboratory infrastructure; and

“(2) procure mission-critical equipment and capability upgrades.

“(f) FACILITY MISSION NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To address capacity concerns and accommodate future mission needs and advanced capabilities, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall conduct a mission needs assessment, to include scoping for potential future needs or expansion, of the National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center.

“(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall provide the assessment conducted under paragraph (1) to—

“(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Subcommittee on Homeland Security Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and the Subcommittee on Homeland Security Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to support the activities of the laboratory designated under this section.

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting in any manner the authorities or responsibilities

of the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office of the Department.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 322 the following:

“Sec. 323. National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center.”.

SA 5634. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CHEMICAL SECURITY ANALYSIS CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 323. CHEMICAL SECURITY ANALYSIS CENTER.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall designate the laboratory described in subsection (b) as an additional laboratory pursuant to the authority under section 308(c)(2), which shall be used to conduct studies, analyses, and research to assess and address the threat, hazards, and risks associated with an accidental or intentional chemical event or chemical terrorism event.

“(b) LABORATORY DESCRIBED.—The laboratory described in this subsection is the laboratory known, as of the date of enactment of this section, as the Chemical Security Analysis Center.

“(c) LABORATORY ACTIVITIES.—The Chemical Security Analysis Center shall—

“(1) identify and develop countermeasures and mitigation strategies to chemical threats, including the development of comprehensive, research-based definable goals for those countermeasures;

“(2) provide an enduring science-based chemical threat and hazard analysis capability;

“(3) provide expertise in risk and consequence modeling, chemical sensing and detection, analytical chemistry, chemical toxicology, synthetic chemistry and reaction characterization, and nontraditional chemical agents and emerging chemical threats;

“(4) staff and operate a technical assistance program that provides operational support and subject matter expertise, design and execute laboratory and field tests, and provide a comprehensive knowledge repository of chemical threat information that is continuously updated with data from scientific, intelligence, operational, and private sector sources;

“(5) consult, as appropriate, with the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office of the Department to mitigate, prepare, and respond to threats, hazards, and risks associated with an accidental or intentional chemical event or chemical terrorism event; and

“(6) carry out other such activities as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting in

any manner the authorities or responsibilities of the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office of the Department.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 322 the following:

“Sec. 323. Chemical Security Analysis Center.”.

SA 5635. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON OPERATION OR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN FOREIGN-MADE UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON AGENCY OPERATION OR PROCUREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and subsection (c)(3), the Secretary may not operate, provide financial assistance for, or enter into or renew a contract for the procurement of—

(1) an unmanned aircraft system that—

(A) is manufactured in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country;

(B) uses flight controllers, radios, data transmission devices, cameras, or gimbals manufactured in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country;

(C) uses a ground control system or operating software developed in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country; or

(D) uses network connectivity or data storage located in a covered foreign country or administered by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country;

(2) a software operating system associated with a UAS that uses network connectivity or data storage located in a covered foreign country or administered by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country; or

(3) a system for the detection or identification of a UAS, which system is manufactured in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country.

(b) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS referred to in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) that is the subject of such a waiver is required—

(A) in the national interest of the United States;

(B) for counter-UAS surrogate research, testing, development, evaluation, or training; or

(C) for intelligence, electronic warfare, or information warfare operations, testing, analysis, or training.

(2) NOTICE.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which a waiver is issued under

paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit the certification described in paragraph (1) to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) WAIVER PROCESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a process by which the head of an office or component of the Department may request a waiver under subsection (b).

(3) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the prohibition under subsection (a), the head of an office or component of the Department may continue to operate a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) that was in the inventory of the office or component on the day before the effective date of this Act until the later of—

(A) such time as the Secretary has—

(i) granted a waiver relating thereto under subsection (b); or

(ii) declined to grant such a waiver; or

(B) one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) DRONE ORIGIN SECURITY REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a terrorism threat assessment and report that contains information relating to the following:

(1) The extent to which the Department has previously analyzed the threat that a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS from a covered foreign country operating in the United States poses, and the results of such analysis.

(2) The number of UAS, software operating systems associated with a UAS, or systems for the detection or identification of a UAS from a covered foreign country in operation by the Department, including an identification of the component or office of the Department at issue, as of the date on which the report is submitted.

(3) The extent to which information gathered by such a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS from a covered foreign country could be employed to harm the national or economic security of the United States.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED FOREIGN COUNTRY.—The term “covered foreign country” means a country that—

(A) the intelligence community has identified as a foreign adversary in the most recent annual report on worldwide threats issued by the Director of National Intelligence pursuant to section 108B of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043b) (commonly known as the “Annual Threat Assessment”); or

(B) the Secretary, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, has identified as a foreign adversary that is not included in such Annual Threat Assessment.

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(5) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM; UAS.—The terms “unmanned aircraft system” and “UAS” have the meaning given the term “unmanned aircraft system” in section 331 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note).

SA 5636. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 389. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS FOR UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS RELATED TO REVITALIZATION AND RECAPITALIZATION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE FACILITIES.

Section 2208(u)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “specified in subsection (a)(2)” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “shall be \$11,000,000 instead of any dollar limitation specified in section 2805 of this title.”.

SA 5637. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 875. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF SEMICONDUCTOR CHIP SHORTAGE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the effects of the semiconductor chip shortage on the Department of Defense, including the effects of the shortage on—

(1) current defense acquisition programs; and

(2) the ability of current and future defense acquisition programs—

(A) to use state-of-the-art semiconductor capabilities; and

(B) to incorporate state-of-the-art artificial intelligence capabilities.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 5638. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, and Mr.

MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. STUDY AND REPORT ON BARRIERS TO HOME OWNERSHIP FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center or nonprofit entity to conduct a study on the barriers to home ownership for members of the Armed Forces. At the conclusion of such study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the following elements:

(1) Potential barriers to home ownership, including down payments, concerns about home maintenance, and challenges in selling a home.

(2) The percentage of members who use the basic allowance for housing under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, to pay for a mortgage, disaggregated by Armed Force, rank, and military housing area.

(3) Any identified differences in home ownership rates among members correlated with race or gender.

(4) What percentage of members own a home before they separate from the Armed Forces.

SA 5639. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. REPORT ON BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the basic allowance for housing for members of the uniformed services.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain the following elements:

(1) The evaluation of the Secretary—

(A) of the efficiency and accuracy of the current system used to calculate the basic allowance for housing for members of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code;

(B) of the appropriateness of using mean and median housing costs in such calculation;

(C) of existing military housing areas, in relation to choices in, and availability of, housing for members of the uniformed services; and

(D) of the suitability of the six standard housing profiles in relation to the average family sizes of members of the uniformed services, disaggregated by uniformed service, rank, and military housing area.

(2) The recommendation of the Secretary—

(A) regarding the feasibility of including information, furnished by Federal entities, regarding school districts, in calculating the basic allowance for housing;

(B) whether to calculate the basic allowance for housing more frequently, including in response to a sudden change in the housing market;

(C) whether to enter into an agreement with a commercial entity, to compile data and develop an algorithm, in order to calculate the basic allowance for housing; and

(D) whether to publish the methods used by the Secretary to calculate the basic allowance for housing on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Defense.

SA 5640. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2825. RESPONSES TO THE HOUSING SHORTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPORT ON HOUSING SHORTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the housing shortage for members of the Armed Forces.

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

(A) The determination of the Secretary regarding the feasibility of acquiring real property near military installations that face housing shortages to be used for the development of privatized housing.

(B) The determination of the Secretary regarding the need for an officer or civilian employee of the Department of Defense to serve, at each military installation, as a housing manager.

(b) GUIDANCE TO LANDLORDS OF PRIVATIZED HOUSING.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe guidance for eligible entities and landlords regarding acceptable housing standards for privatized housing.

(c) PILOT AND GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM ON USING RENTAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ASSURE TENANTS FOR DEVELOPERS OF PRIVATIZED HOUSING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to assess the feasibility of using the rental partnership programs of the Armed Forces to assure tenants for eligible entities to secure financing to construct privatized housing.

(B) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall operate the pilot program under subparagraph (A) in not more than 10 military housing areas that each have a rental vacancy rate of less than seven percent.

(C) TERM.—The pilot program under subparagraph (A) shall terminate on the date that is five years after the Secretary establishes the pilot program.

(D) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the termination of the pilot program under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program.

(2) JOINT PILOT PROGRAM ON FINANCIAL INCENTIVES FOR DEVELOPERS OF PRIVATIZED HOUSING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall develop a pilot program to provide financial incentives to eligible entities to build privatized housing or to purchase or lease existing facilities to house members of the Armed Forces and their dependents and to house low-income individuals and families, as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(B) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In order to be eligible for an incentive under the pilot program under subparagraph (A), proposed privatized housing shall ensure that a percentage of such housing is reserved for members of the Armed Forces and dependents of such members.

(ii) PERCENTAGE.—The percentage under clause (i) shall vary proportionately to the value of the incentive provided under subparagraph (A).

(C) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall operate the pilot program under subparagraph (A) in areas that have the longest wait times for on-base housing.

(D) PRIORITY.—In selecting eligible entities under the pilot program under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority to entry-level housing and projects with greater density.

(E) TERM.—The pilot program under subparagraph (A) shall terminate on the date that is five years after the Secretary of Defense establishes the pilot program.

(F) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the termination of the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program.

(3) JOINT GRANT PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may jointly operate a grant program through the Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation of the Department of Defense to build housing for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents and for low-income individuals and families.

(B) TREATMENT OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME LIMITS.—Household income limits for entities eligible to receive a grant under subparagraph (A) shall not differ based on whether a household includes a member of the Armed Forces.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY; LANDLORD.—The terms “eligible entity” and “landlord” have the meanings given such terms in section 2871 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) PRIVATIZED HOUSING.—The term “privatized housing” means housing under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of such title.

SA 5641. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ADVANCED BATTLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Air Force should—

(1) continue development and fielding of the Advanced Battle Management System (ABMS) and ground moving target indication (GMTI) capability; and

(2) increase the ability of the Air Force to develop and sustain air battle managers capable of conducting remote battlefield command and control missions in support of the National Defense Strategy.

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall carry out research and development activities relating to Advanced Battle Management System to sustain and enhance ground moving target indication and air battle management capabilities.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Research and development activities carried out under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Identifying necessary associated aircraft, technological platforms, personnel, functions, and necessary associated units to enable remote command and control by air battle managers.

(B) Identifying regional ecosystems with advantageous supporting base structures and academic institutions that would complement a central location for developing and sustaining that air battle manager capability.

(C) Assessing the feasibility and advisability of establishing an air battle manager center of excellence to be the processing, exploitation, and dissemination hub of development for the Advanced Battle Management System and associated platforms, systems, aircraft, and functions.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Advanced Battle Management System.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A timeline defining the breadth of the Advanced Battle Management System program.

(B) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of establishing of an air battle manager center of excellence as described in subsection (b)(2)(C).

SA 5642. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R.

7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. REVIEW OF DISLOCATION AND RELOCATION ALLOWANCES.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report—

(1) reviewing the adequacy of the amounts of dislocation and relocation allowances paid under section 452 of title 37, United States Code, to members of the uniformed services in connection with changes in such members' temporary or permanent duty assignment locations, taking into consideration the rising costs of moving, challenges in the housing market, and other expenses incurred by such members;

(2) assessing the effects of delays in the issuance of orders relating to changes to temporary or permanent duty assignment locations on the timing of dislocation and relocation allowances paid to members of the uniformed services;

(3) assessing the feasibility and advisability of paying dislocation or relocation allowances to members of the uniformed services who are permanently assigned from one unit to another with no change of permanent duty station when the units are within the same metropolitan area; and

(4) making recommendations with respect to the matters described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

SA 5643. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2868. CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION WHEN MAKING BASING DECISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2883 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283; 10 U.S.C. 1781b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (j) as subsections (f) through (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(e) EDUCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With regard to a military housing area in which an installation subject to a basing decision covered by subsection (a) is or will be located, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall take into account the extent to which high-quality public education is available and accessible to dependents of members of the Armed Forces in the military housing area by comparing progress of students served by relevant local educational agencies

described in paragraph (4) under the state-wide accountability system described in section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311) as compared to the progress of all students in such State under such system.”

“(2) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall ensure transparency in the factors used to make basing decisions under this section, including, as appropriate, by coordinating with the relevant local educational agencies to ensure that data used in carrying out paragraph (1) is publicly available and accessible to impacted communities.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1) with respect to an installation subject to a basing decision covered by subsection (a), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall consult with and seek input from leadership and education liaisons for the installation and State, local, and Tribal education agencies.

“(4) RELEVANT LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—Relevant local educational agencies described in this paragraph include—

“(A) local educational agencies that serve dependents of members of the Armed Forces in the State in which the military housing area described in paragraph (1) is located; and

“(B) local educational agencies in such State that serve or would be likely to serve a significant number or percentage of dependents of members of the Armed Forces in the military housing area described in paragraph (1) as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned, in consultation with the education liaisons for the installation described in such paragraph.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking “subsection (e)” and inserting “subsection (f)”.

SA 5644. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. INCREASE IN BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING INSIDE THE UNITED STATES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

Paragraph (3) of section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(3) The monthly amount of the basic allowance for housing for an area of the United States for a member of a uniformed service shall be the amount of the monthly cost of adequate housing in that area, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as the member.”

SA 5645. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and

intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 389. AUTHORIZATION OF AMOUNTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO BE USED TO CONDUCT ANNUAL AND PERIODIC INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE TRAINING ALONG THE LAND AND WATER BORDERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) JOINT TASK FORCE NORTH.—The amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2023 for operation and maintenance for the Joint Task Force North is hereby increased by \$25,000,000.

(2) JOINT INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE SOUTH.—The amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2023 for operation and maintenance for the Joint Interagency Task Force South is hereby increased by \$25,000,000.

(b) USE OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts of the increases under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall be used by aviation units from the Army, Navy, and Air Force to conduct annual and periodic intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance training along the land and water borders of the United States.

(2) USE OF CAMERA FEEDS.—In conducting training under paragraph (1), aviation units described in such paragraph shall provide the live feed from any cameras or sensors used on the aircraft during the training to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

SA 5646. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 144. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN REDUCTIONS TO B-BOMBER AIRCRAFT SQUADRONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—During the covered period, the Secretary of the Air Force may not—

(1) modify the designed operational capability statement for any B-1 bomber aircraft squadron, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, in a manner that would reduce the capabilities of such a squadron below the levels specified in such statement as in effect on such date; or

(2) reduce, below the levels in effect on such date of enactment, the number of personnel assigned to units responsible for the operation and maintenance of B-1 aircraft if such reduction would affect the ability of such units to meet the capability described in paragraph (1).

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to a bomb wing for which the Secretary of the Air Force has commenced the process of replacing B-1 bomber aircraft with B-21 bomber aircraft.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “covered period” means the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2026.

(2) The term “designed operational capability statement” has the meaning given that term in Air Force Instruction 10-201.

(d) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117-81; 135 Stat. 1574) is repealed.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

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, September 22, 2022, at 9:30 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, September 22, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. First of all, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to con-

sider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar No. 1041 and 1150; 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 the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; and that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Robin Meredith Cohn Hutcheson, of Utah, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration; and Kevin G. Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Tennessee for the term of four years?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I will note that the two Senators from Minnesota are now controlling the Chamber.

But we have also, during our time in the Chamber alone, confirmed someone who used to live in our State, and she would be Robin Meredith Cohn Hutcheson, to be the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, in addition to the U.S. attorney for the State of Tennessee.

VETERANS’ COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2022

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7846, which was received from the House.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7846) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2022, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bill, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 7846) was passed.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mo-

tion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

KEVIN AND AVONTE’S LAW REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, the next matter before the Senate is a bill that Senator GRASSLEY and I have long led, the Kevin and Avonte’s Law reauthorization.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 4885 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4885) to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Americans Alert Program.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 4885) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 4885

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 “Kevin and Avonte’s Law Reauthorization Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE MISSING AMERICANS ALERT PROGRAM.

Section 240001(d) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12621(d)) is amended by striking “2018 through 2022” and inserting “2023 through 2027”.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, now resolutions en bloc.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, introduced earlier today: S. Res. 793, S. Res. 794, and S. Res. 795.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT
"BOB" CHARLES KRUEGER

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 796, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 796) honoring the life and legacy of the late Senator Robert "Bob" Charles Krueger.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 796) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER
23, 2022, TO TUESDAY, SEP-
TEMBER 27, 2022

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn under the provisions of S. Res. 796 until 11 a.m. on Friday, September 23, to convene for a pro forma session, with no business conducted; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Tuesday, September 27, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 389, H.R. 6833; further, that the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed at 5:30 p.m.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator SULLIVAN of Alaska.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

TYPHOON MERBOK

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to talk about one of the strongest

storms in many, many years to hit my State. It was called Typhoon Merbok, and it hit western Alaska late last week and into the weekend. It brought gale-force winds, massive flooding, and loss of power, water, and communications. It has wreaked havoc.

I have just a few photos here. You see a house literally floating away into the ocean; whole communities completely flooded; a giant wave system—again, communities completely flooded in western Alaska.

This is an area of our State dotted with dozens of small villages, nearly all of them, the majority, Alaska Native communities. Roughly about 21,000 people live in these communities in western Alaska with a coastline of roughly 1,300 miles. That is just one little, small part of my State, but that is just about as many miles of all the Florida coastline combined just here in western Alaska. They got hammered.

There are very, very few roads. Alaska has over 200 communities that are not connected by any roads at all, and so it presents many challenges in terms of relief. Unfortunately, the very small number of roads that we have, many were washed away in these communities. The storm knocked out lines of communication, prompted evacuations, and wrenched homes from their foundations, as I mentioned, floating in the water.

The preliminary assessment shows very significant damage to bridges, roads, water treatment plants, bulk fuel tanks, seawalls, breakwaters, airstrips—if you don't have a road, every one of these small communities has an airport, a tiny little airport—generators, powerplants. This was a devastating storm.

But I am proud to say my fellow Alaskans pulled together—the Native communities in particular, as they do so often—to make sure that all residents and particularly the most vulnerable, the elderly in particular, were out of harm's way when this storm came pounding ashore in western Alaska.

Our State and local government emergency management teams, the Alaska National Guard, the Coast Guard, and our first responders have also been working day and night to ensure that communities are safe and that utility services and major infrastructure are becoming operational as soon as possible, but it is still a real challenge.

I will say from the Federal Government's perspective, FEMA has done a good job thus far—a really good job. They immediately got teams on the ground and are working to evaluate the damage. The head of FEMA, whom I spoke to shortly after the storm hit, is on her way to Alaska. The Secretary of Homeland Security just called me today on their focus on this. The Region 10 FEMA Director—which covers Alaska—is also on the ground there.

Thankfully, thank God there have been no reports of death or serious injury, and it is in part because of the re-

silience of the people in Alaska and the preparation.

Further, donations of food, water, clothes, and other essentials from businesses and nonprofits and just generous individuals throughout Alaska have been pouring in to this community. We are so grateful for all the help that has come.

Even though most Americans are very unaware of this, this was a devastating storm.

Let me talk a little bit about some of these wonderful communities that were hit by the storm. All of these communities—I have spent a lot of time in western Alaska. They are amazing people with an incredible generosity of spirit and thriving Alaska Native cultures. But these are some of the poorest communities in America—the poorest communities in America. Like I said, almost none of them have roads. Several of them do not have any water or sewer—running water or flush toilets. American citizens.

You know, I get a little frustrated in this body whenever there is a lower 48 community that has a problem with drinking water—the latest in Jackson, MS, and Detroit, MI. There is all this money, and they say: Hey, let's fix that aging infrastructure. I get it. That is important. But what I always say is, why don't we fix communities like mine that have no infrastructure, no water and sewer, no flush toilets, no access to the internet, housing where multiple generations are often crammed together?

And here is the thing. These are some of the most amazing people on the planet, and as Americans, they are some of the most patriotic people in the whole country. I always like to brag about Alaska, where there are more veterans per capita than any State in the country. But the Alaska Native people serve at higher rates in the U.S. military than any other ethnic group in America. This is what I call special patriotism. When you go to these small communities, everyone there is a veteran. It really warms your heart as an American.

So we need to help these communities, and we are going to do that. The Senate is going to do that; the Federal Government is going to do that; and the State of Alaska is going to do that.

I do want to make one mention of one issue that is important to me. It is an issue just to fairness, and I am just putting down a marker to make sure we have fairness as it relates to my constituents in this very significant storm that we need help with.

The majority leader was here on the floor recently talking about the impact that Hurricane Fiona was having on Puerto Rico, and we are all thinking about Puerto Rico as well. We want to make sure they are all safe, and that is something we need to be focused on in the Federal Government, in the U.S. Senate.

Now, normally, the Federal Government pays for 75 percent of the costs of

emergency medical care, disaster response, food distribution when those requests are made.

Our Governor just recently declared a Federal disaster for this part of Alaska. The Alaska delegation sent a letter to the President urging him to immediately approve this Federal disaster declaration for Alaska. When this happens, as I mentioned, the Federal Government usually pays 75 percent; others are responsible back home for 25 percent. Sometimes it is even 90 percent and 10 percent.

As I mentioned, the majority leader recently requested, in a floor speech on the Senate floor—and I am fine with the speech—that the FEMA Federal Government pay 100 percent of the costs in Puerto Rico. OK. If FEMA wants to do that, if that is going to happen at the request of the majority leader, here is what else has to happen: Then FEMA must pay 100 percent of the costs in western Alaska, OK. That is a no-brainer. One hundred percent of the costs from FEMA in Puerto Rico, then the great people in western Alaska are going to get 100 percent of the costs paid for as well.

As a matter of fact, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I led with Senator MURKOWSKI and Congresswoman PELTOLA to Administrator Criswell, the Director of FEMA, just making note that, hey, if you are going to do 100 percent for Puerto Rico, you need to make sure you are doing 100 percent for western Alaska. I would like to submit that for the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2022.
Administrator DEANNE CRISWELL,
Federal Emergency Management Agency,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR CRISWELL: We write to urge your administrative approval of Governor Dunleavy's request to waive the State's cost share for federal individual and public assistance for recovery efforts in Western Alaska following the onslaught of Typhoon Merbok.

As your Region X team is aware, conditions prior to the storm in impacted rural communities were already difficult. Several Alaskan communities do not have running water or sewer systems. Where they do exist, it is common for sewer systems to be constructed above ground which further exposes flooded communities to the potential release of raw sewage. These communities are also experiencing high levels of unemployment and poverty, and it is likely that many

homes are not insured against the losses experienced. Additionally, the cost of providing immediate temporary housing will impede the finances available for housing construction.

Necessary cleanup efforts have begun, and Alaskan efforts and spirit in the face of trials is herculean as ever. However, this cost is too great to cover with currently available resources.

Preliminary assessments across more than a thousand miles of Western Alaska coastline include damage to bridges and roads, water treatment plants, homes, bulk fuel tanks, seawalls, breakwaters, berms, airstrips, generators, and power plants. On September 20, 2022, Governor Mike Dunleavy requested a federal disaster declaration. We sent a letter that same evening requesting the President expeditiously approve that request.

On September 19, 2022 Senator Schumer delivered a speech on the Senate floor in which he stated that he spoke with you and "urge[d] that [FEMA] be ready to approve a temporary 100% federal cost share for all emergency protective services that Puerto Rico conducts in the coming days." As you consider requests for storm recovery funding and cost shares across the nation, including for Puerto Rico in Region 2, we expect you to deliver an equitable decision for Alaska.

Sincerely,

LISA MURKOWSKI,
United States Senator.
DAN SULLIVAN,
United States Senator.
MARY SATTTLER PELTOLA,
*Representative for All
Alaska.*

Mr. SULLIVAN. So, Madam President, one of the things that I have always done in my job here in the U.S. Senate is, whenever there is a bill dealing with disaster relief, regardless of what part of the country it is, I always vote for it. The reason I do that is because I come from a State that has earthquakes, that has wildfires, that has typhoons, that has a lot of cold weather. We are tough in Alaska, but every now and then, we are going to need Federal help as well, and now is the time we do.

So we are all going to work together here in the Senate, whether it is Puerto Rico or Kentucky or western Alaska, where there have been a lot of recent natural disasters. We will work together.

I just want to make sure my constituents know: We got your back here in DC. We thank you for your resiliency, toughness, and everybody coming together. We will make sure that, whatever the results are in any of these other natural disasters, that Alaska is going to get the same result as well.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order and pursuant to S. Res. 796, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Friday, September 23, 2022, and does so as a further mark of respect to the late Robert "Bob" Charles Krueger, former Senator from Texas.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:30 p.m., adjourned until Friday, September 23, 2022, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

TRAVIS HILL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE JEREMIAH O'HEAR NORTON, TERM EXPIRED.

TRAVIS HILL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE VICE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, VICE THOMAS HOENIG.

JONATHAN MCKERNAN, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING MAY 31, 2024, VICE JELENA MCWILLIAMS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LYNNE M. TRACY, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ALVIN HOLSEY

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 22, 2022:

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

ROBIN MEREDITH COHN HUTCHESON, OF UTAH, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA

AMANDA BENNETT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ARATI PRABHAKAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KEVIN G. RITZ, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF TRUE LOVE
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. RASHIDA TLAI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Ms. TLAI. Madam Speaker, today I want to recognize the congregation at True Love Missionary Baptist Church, located in Detroit in Michigan's 13th District Strong, as they celebrate eighty years of faith, family, and service.

True Love as we know it today grew from humble beginnings. Founded in 1942 by eight worshippers united in their vision of faith and service, the church has moved its location in Detroit many times to accommodate its burgeoning flock and its many programs. True Love has remained at its current location on Tireman Street since 1967. Over the past eighty years, the congregation has witnessed upheaval, change, and progress, but has remained steadfast in their faith and commitment to providing services to its members and the surrounding community.

Whether it's providing youth programming, adult education, or support services to community elders, there is no doubt that True Love has made an indelible impact on the surrounding community. Due to its outstanding leadership and incredible devotion of its congregation, True Love Missionary Church has been blessed with a bright future.

Please join me in recognizing the congregation at True Love Missionary Baptist Church as they celebrate this milestone and many years to come.

ROBERT GIBNEY

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the Dorothy Volunteer Fire Company's presentation of 50-years of service plaques. At the event, a 50-years of service plaque was presented for Robert James Gibney. Bob was born in Philadelphia and moved to Dorothy, South Jersey as a young child. After graduating from Vineland High-School, he worked at Wheaton Plastics for 35 years until its closing. Additionally, at just 15 years old, Bob joined the Dorothy Volunteer Fire Company, where he accumulated 56 years of service. Throughout his years of service, he volunteered on the Dorothy Rescue Squad, Mays Landing Rescue Squad, and the New Jersey Forest Fire Service. Bob was eventually named Chief of the Dorothy Volunteer Fire Company and served in this role for many years. In his free time, he enjoyed spending time at the Winding River Campground or cooking for his friends and family. Unfortunately, Bob passed away on October 17,

2021. Bob's service to the South Jersey community will never be forgotten, and may he rest in peace.

HONORING MEALS ON WHEELS OF
THE SALINAS VALLEY

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the half-century of service Meals on Wheels of the Salinas Valley has provided to California's 20th congressional district. This organization has worked for the last 50 years to enhance the health and well-being and provide a sense of community for homebound seniors, disabled adults, and veterans in the Salinas Valley.

More than 10 million older Americans face hunger each year, and nearly 970,000 of those senior citizens reside in California, all of whom may be at a greater risk for developing a number of debilitating chronic health conditions if they experience persistent malnourishment and isolation.

Since its founding in 1972, Meals on Wheels of the Salinas Valley has provided healthy meals to over 16,000 seniors across our beautiful valley, providing an essential resource for the well-being of our community's most vulnerable members. To date, Meals on Wheels of the Salinas Valley has delivered over five million nutritious meals to households throughout the Salinas Valley and serves up to 180 clients weekly. Additionally, 114 pets have received AniMeals through Meals on Wheels' partnership with the SPCA of Monterey County.

Powered by the commitment and expertise of its staff members and the dedication and magnanimity of its approximately 97 active volunteers, Meals on Wheels of the Salinas Valley demonstrate its inestimable value for homebound seniors, disabled adults, and veterans during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Each volunteer is connected by their unwavering passion for supporting the independence and well-being of their community members. This past year, volunteers have driven 26,048 miles throughout the Salinas Valley, from Pajaro and Aromas in North Monterey County to San Ardo and Bradley in the South, and have donated 5,814 hours of their time.

Madam Speaker, I offer my sincere appreciation to the Meals on Wheels of the Salinas Valley for its 50 years of vital service to our community members in need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GLENN THOMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 446.

HONORING JORDAN MIX AS IOWAN
OF THE WEEK

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, as we begin celebrating Pride Month, I rise today to honor Jordan Mix as Iowan of the Week. Jordan Mix, an advocate for transgender and non-binary kids in Iowa, works with educators, families, businesses, and organizations to create LGBTQIA+ inclusive environments across the state. Jordan serves as the Director of Educational Programming at Iowa Safe Schools, where they work with educators to create inclusive curriculum and lead training sessions for community members to better support transgender and non-binary kids.

Jordan Mix was born in the Chicago area and now lives with their wife and cat in Des Moines. Growing up, Jordan's family was very supportive when they came out in 2010 as a member of the LGBTQIA+ community. This love and support was especially poignant to Jordan in the face of the enactment of anti-LGBTQ+ policies and has remained a very important part of their story. It's why Jordan enjoys working with families of LGBTQIA+ youth and empowering parents and families to support their children.

To pursue their passion for advocating for transgender and non binary young people, Jordan attended Drake University and graduated in 2016 with degrees in Law, Politics and Society; Sociology; and Women and Gender Studies. While at Drake, they were chosen to be the President of Rainbow Union, which is Drake's LGBTQ+ organization. In this role, they helped establish the first all-gender bathroom on campus. Additionally, Jordan collaborated in writing Drake's Transgender Inclusion Statement. To further their education, Jordan attended the University of North Carolina Charlotte and earned their graduate degree in Gender and Sexuality Studies.

One project that Jordan is especially proud of is called Breathe, Learn, Act. This project is the first virtual care package for families of transgender and non-binary kids. The purpose of the care package is to learn about gender, your child who has come out, talking with your family and friends, and how to be a supportive parent. The project is part of My Kid Is Gay, an organization that helps parents of LGBTQ+ kids.

● 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.

Jordan's favorite part of their job at Iowa Safe Schools is the kids. They enjoy helping empower youth to rise to the occasion and advocate for themselves. They also love teaching and helping and having conversations with people who want to be supportive, but just need extra time to process and learn. In taking the time to help Iowans learn about and support one another, Jordan is helping our families and communities grow stronger.

Besides being passionate about advocating for transgender and non-binary kids, Jordan loves spending time with their wife and cat, hiking, watching women's soccer, and practicing their professional barista skills.

Jordan Mix is a tremendous example of someone who goes above and beyond. They promote community and inclusion, empower parents and loved ones, create innovative ways to connect with others and to educate, and provide a safe space for those who need support. Jordan's work is crucial to Iowans and makes our communities a better place for everyone. I am so proud to honor Jordan Mix as Iowan of the Week.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
NORTH COUNTRY LEADER MAX
THWAITS III

HON. ELISE M. STEFANK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Ms. STEFANK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the incredible life of Max Thwaits III. Mr. Thwaits dedicated his entire life to serving his country and the Essex County community.

Mr. Thwaits graduated AuSable Valley Senior High School in 2001 and joined the United States Navy following the 9/11 attacks. For over four years, Mr. Thwaits served as a Damage Controlman in Norfolk, Virginia. After leaving the Navy, Thwaits turned his attention towards his community and dedicated his life to working for the Essex County Office of Emergency Services (OES).

In 2007, Thwaits joined the Essex County Emergency Services as a public safety dispatcher. He was subsequently promoted to assistant director and 911 coordinator in 2019. Last July, Thwaits was named OES Director in a promotion that was celebrated by first responders all over Essex County.

During all his years at OES, Thwaits simultaneously volunteered with fire and ambulance companies in AuSable Forks and Jay. He was assistant chief with the Jay Volunteer Fire Department and named their Firefighter of the Year in 2015. While president of the AuSable Forks Ambulance Service, Thwaits received the regional leadership award for Emergency Medical Services. In addition to his numerous community responsibilities, Thwaits also served as an Intelligence Liaison Officer for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Thwaits served as a mentor and leader to all those he worked with, and he will be dearly missed by his community. His life is a glowing example of everything that is good about selfless service in the North Country. His legacy will live on in the hearts of his partner, Lori Kilburn, his children, his parents, and everyone who had the pleasure of knowing him. On behalf of New York's 21st Congress-

sional District, it is my honor to remember and celebrate the life of Max Thwaits III.

INAUGURATION OF DR. ROBERT D.
KELLY AS THE UNIVERSITY OF
PORTLAND'S 21ST PRESIDENT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations to an exceptional educator and outstanding constituent, Dr. Robert D. Kelly as he celebrates inauguration as the University of Portland's 21st President, first Black president, and first lay president.

Dr. Robert Kelly has more than 25 years of experience working in higher education. A 1994 graduate of Loyola University, Dr. Kelly served on the University's Board of Trustees from 2003 to 2017 while serving in key leadership roles at institutions including Union College, Loyola University Chicago, and Seattle University. He has been a champion for students in various roles from athletics to ministry, community service to equity and inclusion. Dr. Kelly received his Ph.D. in Education Policy, Planning, and Administration from the University of Maryland and his master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration from the University of Vermont.

Dr. Kelly is assuming this leadership mantle at an instrumental time for the City of Portland, Multnomah County, and the State of Oregon. We are happy to have him and look forward to his leadership.

On behalf of Oregon's Third Congressional District: Welcome to Portland, Dr. Kelly. Go Pilots.

HOMETOWN HERO—CRYSTAL
SCANIO

HON. BETH VAN DUYN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Ms. VAN DUYN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize our Texas-24 Hometown Hero of the Week, Crystal Scanio, for her dedication to improving the lives of students and teachers in the Irving ISD school system.

Since 2012, Crystal has been an integral part of Irving Schools Foundation, a nonprofit that provides financial resources to maximize educational opportunities for teachers and students in Irving ISD by funding innovative programs, scholarships, and activities.

Her work on Irving Schools Foundation's "Food for Thought" program has helped provide 1,400 food bags to North Texas students facing food insecurity.

Crystal has also played an integral role in their "Spark Tank" program, a competitive grant program that awards funds for innovative classroom projects and learning experiences for students of all ages across Irving ISD. Since Crystal joined Irving Schools Foundation, she has helped fund 303 projects representing over \$1 million, impacting over 180,000 students, teachers, and staff.

Crystal has gone above and beyond to ensure the next generation of North Texans is

set up for success. On behalf of the entire community, I'd like to thank Crystal for her work and look forward to seeing the incredible impact she has made on Texas-24.

THOMAS BESSER

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, in July, I had the pleasure of attending Thomas Besser's Eagle Scout Court of Honor ceremony. Thomas is from Tabernacle, South Jersey and graduated from Seneca High School this year. He is currently a cadet at Norwich University, where he is on a four-year ROTC scholarship and studies Political Science. In addition to the ROTC program and his academics, Thomas is also on the University's football team. After graduation, he aspires to become an officer in the Army and then possibly run for public office one day. For his Eagle Scout project, Thomas built a large shelving unit for the Atco Christian Preschool, of which he is an alumnus. This shelving unit made the school's storage room more functional for the faculty and teachers. Thomas should be proud of his achievements, and I wish him the best of luck in all his future endeavors. God Bless Thomas, and God Bless our United States of America.

HONORING LOWELL SACHNOFF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Lowell Sachnoff, renowned fighter for justice, who will be receiving the 2022 Justice John Paul Stevens Award on September 29, 2022. The Stevens Award, presented by The Chicago Bar Association and Chicago Bar Foundation, is the highest and most prestigious award that is presented annually to lawyers and judges whose career best exemplifies the distinguished career of United States Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens.

Lowell Sachnoff was born on Maxwell Street in Chicago, the son of Ukrainian immigrants who fled Eastern Europe, settled in Chicago, and raised their family during the Great Depression. He was inspired to become a lawyer by his grandparents' stories about how terrible life was in a lawless society. Since graduating from Harvard Law School in 1957, Mr. Sachnoff has been on two parallel tracks: doing well and doing good.

He has had a long and successful legal career in Chicago. After a few years at Ross, McGowan, and O'Keefe, he was appointed General Counsel for the Illinois Department of Mental Health, where he overhauled the state mental health code to expand the rights of the mentally ill and worked with the medical community to bring treatment of the mentally ill into the 20th century.

In the early 1960s, Mr. Sachnoff established the law firm of Sachnoff & Weaver with a few friends. As he puts it, "We had a vision. We

wanted to do well, because we were young and had growing families, but we also wanted to do good. As the firm grew to 130 lawyers, we found that we could still do both; after our merger with Reed Smith, the firm encouraged us to stay on the same path."

On that path, Mr. Sachnoff was a successful securities and antitrust lawyer, winning groundbreaking price-fixing and takeover cases. But he also advocated for the wrongfully incarcerated, for women, minorities, the poor, and society's most vulnerable.

In 2006, Sachnoff & Weaver was one of the first firms to represent Guantanamo Bay detainees. Lowell and his colleagues helped successfully negotiate the release of three prisoners who had been held for many years without being charged with any crime. He also litigated women's rights issues, winning a jury verdict in the 1980s against the City of Chicago allowing police officers to routinely strip search women for minor traffic violations and represented a class of women's health clinics, obtaining a celebrated jury verdict and nationwide injunction in 1998 against forcible blockades of clinic entrances.

Now retired as a corporate litigator, Sachnoff continues to volunteer on public interest matters, most notably working with Senator DICK DURBIN and his staff toward closing the Guantanamo prison, thus removing a moral and legal stain on our country, and to release patients unlawfully held in state mental hospitals.

Lowell Sachnoff is a cherished friend, mentor, and advisor. He works alongside his wife, Fay Clayton, also an accomplished retired lawyer and women's rights advocate. My husband, Robert Creamer, and I have enjoyed the privilege of their friendship, wisdom, kindness, and insights. Congratulations to Lowell Sachnoff on this well-deserved recognition.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. STEVE
MURRAY

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my warmest congratulations to Dr. Steve Murray on receiving the "Lifetime Achievement" award from Albany Pro Musica. A devoted instrumentalist, vocalist, teacher, and composer, Dr. Murray's remarkable contributions to Albany Pro Musica, the choral arts, and western Massachusetts' performing arts community have earned him this well-deserved honor.

For more than twenty years, Dr. Murray has been involved with Albany Pro Musica, the northeast's preeminent choral ensemble. Originally joining the group as a singer in 2002, he has invigorated western Massachusetts with his talents, creating special compositions and arrangements for the group. He was the inaugural composer when their composer-in-residence program was first launched in 2015 and remains in that position today.

Dr. Murray's work with Albany Pro Musica has been transformative for both the organization and the audiences it serves. An accomplished composer, his works have been recognized at major national and international composition contests. As a long-time resident of

the Berkshires, he has brought his experience and knowledge back to his community, teaching music theory, song writing, and computer music notation at Berkshire Community College.

Madam Speaker, in light of Dr. Steve Murray's many achievements and remarkable contributions to the First District of Massachusetts, I wish to congratulate him once again on being presented the "Lifetime Achievement" award by Albany Pro Musica. Dr. Murray has devoted his life to the creation and performance of music and has undoubtedly played a pivotal role in shaping the performing arts culture throughout the Commonwealth. I am delighted to join with his family, friends, and the entire western Massachusetts community in thanking him for his many years of dedicated service.

CELEBRATING PACIFIC GROVE
MASON LODGE

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge as it celebrates 125 years of service to the people of the Central Coast. For over a century, the Lodge has fostered the belief that each person has a responsibility to help make the world a better place. Through personal development, philanthropy, and community service, the fraternity has upheld integral objectives of promoting ethics, personal growth, tolerance, education, diversity, philanthropy, family, and community.

Chartered by the Grand Lodge of California on February 12, 1897, Grand Master of the Masons in California William T. Lucas granted dispersions to the Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge on April 27, 1897. Becoming the 331st Masonic Lodge in California, the Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge supported local Freemasons' efforts to establish community advocacy and support. The founders of the Lodge were predominant leaders of Pacific Grove business community. Members have included past City Council members California state-elected dignitaries. Among these men were Mr. Russell Giles, the longest-tenured tax collector in the state's history, and Mr. Daniel Turrentine, a local antique dealer and World War II pilot, who served as Lodge Master.

In 1950, the Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge, after a period of meeting in the building that now houses the Pacific Grove Art Association, broke ground on the Masonic Temple of Pacific Grove. The construction used salvaged material from the recently decommissioned Pacific Grove Station of the Southern Pacific Railroad.

Over the last 125 years, the Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge has emphasized the importance of respecting others' opinions and striving to grow and develop as human beings. Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge has donated over \$60,000 to Pacific Grove High School, sponsored Little League teams, supported local organizations like First Friday Pacific Grove and the Heritage Society of Pacific Grove, and it is also home to the new Conservatory of Geometry and Music.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the history, dedication, and contributions

of the Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge to the Central Coast. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Pacific Grove Masonic Lodge for its invaluable place in Pacific Grove's history.

HONORING MR. LANDON VICTOR
BUTLER

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man whose philanthropy and dedication to the Washington, D.C. community is an admirable example of a life of service.

On October 3, 2022, Mr. Landon Victor Butler will be honored by the Shakespeare Theatre Company (STC) with the company's 2022 Sidney Harman Award for Philanthropy in the Arts, recognizing his exceptional support for the theater—and Washington, D.C. at large—over the past four decades. One of the nation's leading arts organizations, the Tony Award-winning Shakespeare Theatre Company is synonymous with dramatic excellence and devoted to making classical theater more accessible, both on a local and national level. Mr. Butler has played a dedicated and pivotal role in achieving their goals, as well as the goals of many other honorable efforts, by utilizing his many years of public service to collaborate with business, government, and arts organizations for the betterment of his city, his region, and his country.

Mr. Butler has served on STC's Board of Trustees since 1997, serving a decade as Chairman. During his tenure as Chair, Mr. Butler helped oversee the planning, construction, and opening of the theater's state-of-the-art Sidney Harman Hall in 2007. He also spearheaded the creation of District Shakespeare, an ambitious arts education program that invites every Washington, D.C. public high school student to experience at least one live classical theater performance before graduation.

A native of Memphis, TN and an Officer in the US Marine Corps who proudly served his country for three years during the Vietnam War, Mr. Butler started his career building affordable housing in the Atlanta area in the early 1970's. During this time, he became centrally involved in Governor Jimmy Carter's presidential campaign, and he has been an active part of the D.C. community since arriving here for the inauguration of President Carter in 1977. As President Carter's Deputy Chief of Staff, he facilitated communications across a broad array of Administration-wide task forces that were formed to support Carter-Mondale initiatives, playing lead roles in the Panama Canal Treaty and SALT II ratification efforts. In 1981, Mr. Butler co-founded the Multi-Employer Property Trust, one of the nation's largest commercial real estate commingled funds, serving U.S., Canadian and European pension plans. He was also a founder of the first private venture capital fund in eastern Europe following the collapse of the Soviet Union, and he served as President of the investor relations firm Landon Butler and Company until his retirement in 2010.

A proud graduate of Washington & Lee University and Harvard Business School, Mr. Butler has spent a lifetime in service to his community, admirably leveraging his strengths in business, government, and non-profit organizations to improve countless facets of life in the Washington, D.C. region and beyond. In addition to his tireless dedication to the Shakespeare Theatre Company and arts education, Mr. Butler has also devoted his time and attention to many other philanthropic efforts, most notably as a founder of Integrity Initiatives International (the leading advocate for the creation of an International Anti-Corruption Court) and as a director on the Board of the Piedmont Journalism Foundation (a Virginia non-profit organization, with the mission of providing nonpartisan in-depth news coverage of important local issues).

An avid western horseman with multiple Quarter Horse Competition ribbons and buckles to his name, Mr. Butler is also a faithful conservationist, with over 20 years commitment to protecting ranching lands and traditions in West Texas alone. In partnership with Texas' legendary horseman and rancher Mr. Buster Welch, Mr. Butler and two lifelong friends, Mr. Henry Turley and Mr. Meredith McCullar, worked together to protect 25,000 acres of prime West Texas cow country called the Double Mountain River Ranch, near Rotan, TX. Their shared love of land stewardship enabled Mr. Welch to further practice his celebrated reverence for and expertise in time-honored and proven ranching traditions. Mr. Welch, who is in the National Cutting Horse Association (NCHA) Riders Hall of Fame, NCHA Members Hall of Fame and American Quarter Horse Association (AQHA) Hall of Fame, and Texas Cowboy Hall of Fame, was a four-time NCHA World Champion and won the NCHA Futurity a record five times. In July of this year, Mr. Butler, Mr. Turley, and Mr. McCullar established the Texas Tech University "Buster and Sheila Welch Excellence in Conservation of Natural Resources Scholarship Endowment," in memory of the legendary Texas horseman and his wife.

Long before he discovered the beauty of Texas horse country, Mr. Butler was instrumental in protecting the treasured Cumberland Island, off the coast of Georgia, working with a team of dedicated preservationists to facilitate the creation of the Cumberland Island National Seashore in the early 1970s. This effort not only protected the island's pristine land and historic landmarks from encroaching development, but also created public access to its beauty. More recently, Mr. Butler has dedicated his energy to land conservation in Virginia horse country, working to celebrate and preserve the area's land, arts, and other traditions as a tireless leader in various community initiatives and organizations, including the National Sporting Library & Museum in Middleburg, VA.

At the gala honoring Mr. Butler's contribution to the Shakespeare Theatre Company and Philanthropy in the Arts, he will be joined by his proud family, including his wife of 32 years Carol, and his four children: Margaret (Marcy) Butler (husband Ryan Compton), Jamie Butler (wife Carolyn Kleiner Butler), Headley Butler (wife Noa Gimelli), and Sarah Stettinius (husband Ted Stettinius).

Madam Speaker, Mr. Butler has shown unwavering leadership throughout his life in dedication to his country and numerous philan-

thropic endeavors, and his service to his country is a testament to his character and generosity. Landon Butler's consistent and tireless commitment to his community and his values embodies the very spirit of service and today I ask that we celebrate this fine citizen of our country. I congratulate him on this well-deserved recognition and thank him for his contributions to the betterment of his fellow citizens.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT 11

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Colorado Springs School District 11's 150th Anniversary.

Colorado Springs School District 11 was established in 1872, when Mary "Queen" Palmer, the wife of General William Palmer, the founder of Colorado Springs, started a small school at the corner of Cascade and Bijou streets. District 11, the oldest school district in the Pikes Peak region, sits in the heart of downtown Colorado Springs.

In the beginning, District 11 averaged 21 square miles when it was established. Now, the ever-growing district spans roughly 73 square miles across Colorado Springs. District 11 encompasses 4.4 million square feet of facilities, all on 711 acres. The district's first graduating class in 1879 had five students. The graduating class in 2022 had 1,450 students.

Colorado Springs School District 11 is defined by its innovation, diversity, commitment to service, and passion for helping students grow and succeed. The district's alumni include entrepreneur and philanthropist Fannie Mae Duncan; Olympic Gold Medalists Henry Cejudo, Adam Goucher, and Haleigh Washington; NFL stars Terry Miller, Daryl Pollard, and Cullen Bryant; and Pro Baseball Hall of Famer Goose Gossage.

From the classrooms, to the school buses, the athletic fields, and playgrounds, District 11 has provided young minds with opportunities to learn, grow, succeed, and give back to their community. Its students thrive academically and consistently demonstrate leadership on the domestic and global stages.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in Congress join me in congratulating the past and present educators, administration, support staff, and board members of Colorado Springs School District 11.

Here is to 150 years of providing quality education to children in Colorado's 5th Congressional District.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LITTLE THEATRE OF WILKES-BARRE'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, today I honor the Little Theatre of Wilkes-Barre's

100th anniversary. The occasion will be celebrated on Friday, September 23, 2022 with a gala.

In keeping with the tradition of the 1920s and 1930s to have community "little theaters" for professional development and self-expression, the Drama League opened its doors in 1923. At the former Coughlin High School building in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, the curtain came up on a production of Rudyard Kipling's *The Elephant Child* directed by Mollie Weston Kent to kick off the Theatre's inaugural season. The League was renamed the Little Theatre of Wilkes-Barre in 1928 and was incorporated as a non-profit organization 501(c)3 by Judge Valentine the following year.

In 1956, Little Theatre of Wilkes-Barre purchased a playhouse located at 537 North Main Street in Wilkes-Barre and officially took residence in the space in 1957. The Pennsylvania Theater Association approved the building for production because of the impressive stage and equipment facilities in 1972. The Theatre's iconic features were generously donated and supported by many community members and founders. Dorothy Dickson Darte, one of the Theatre's founders, gifted the current lighting board built by Fuchs, a renowned stage lighting expert. Annette Evans gifted the stage curtains, and her love of the theatre has extended to her foundation providing grants for the Theatre for years after her death.

Since 1923, the Little Theatre has of Wilkes-Barre has reached more than two million people through hundreds of productions. The Theatre is still ranked among the top ten "little theater" groups and remains one of the longest continuously running community theatres in the country. As a charter member of the American National Theatre and Academy, the Theatre has been deeply committed to collaborating with other local theatrical groups and bringing high caliber performances to their stage. Despite changes to the entertainment landscape, the Little Theatre of Wilkes-Barre has remained dedicated to showcasing local talent in musicals, comedies, and dramas on its stage every season.

I am honored to join with the Little Theatre of Wilkes-Barre to celebrate its 100th anniversary. May it continue to inspire local actors and creatives to get involved in community theater, and may it welcome audiences for many years to come.

HONORING WILLIAM "BILL" HYSLOP

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor William "Bill" Hyslop, a champion for justice and a dedicated public servant to Washington State and the country.

Bill, a Washington State University alumnus, served as U.S. Attorney for Eastern Washington under President H.W. Bush and President Trump, the only person to hold this position for two separate terms.

His resume does not stop there—Bill served as President of the Washington State Bar Association and principal at Lukins & Annis, a Spokane-based law firm, and played a critical role in our work to address the missing and murdered indigenous women (MMIW) crisis.

In his most recent efforts as U.S. Attorney, he worked tirelessly to combat fentanyl trafficking and continued this effort as a founding member of the Spokane Alliance for Fentanyl Education until he passed away earlier this month.

Bill's commitment and passion for serving his community and country are inspiring. His death is truly a loss to Washington State, and we will miss him greatly.

ISABELLA GATTO

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, In July, I had the pleasure of attending Isabella Gatto's Eagle Scout Court of Honor ceremony. Throughout her scouting career, Isabella participated in the merit badge program, practiced leadership tactics, worked with other scouts on outdoor projects, and completed her Eagle Scout project. For her Eagle Scout project, she led a team to construct a GaGa ball pit. Isabella built this ball pit for the youth group at the Greentree Church in Egg Harbor Township, South Jersey. In addition to her Eagle Scout project, she also completed lifeguard certification training and the National Advanced Youth Leadership Experience, the highest level of leadership training available to the Scouts of America. Isabella should be proud of her scouting achievements, and it was a pleasure to attend her Eagle Scout ceremony. God Bless Isabella, and God Bless our America.

CELEBRATING THE GRAND OPENING OF THE ANGELO JOSEPH CAMARATO FOUNDATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Angelo Joseph Camarato Foundation on their grand opening. This new foundation, which bears the name of Sergeant Major Angelo Joseph Camarato, is dedicated to helping end food insecurity for veterans.

SGM Camarato was a first generation American, born in Herrin, Illinois on August 7, 1919. Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, SGM Camarato bravely answered the call to service, enlisting in the U.S. Army in 1942 and beginning a long and inspiring career of military service. During his 24 years in the military, which included campaigns in Salerno, France, Naples-Foggia, Rome-Arno, the Rhineland, and Central Europe in World War II, as well as the Korean and Vietnam wars, SGM Camarato earned three Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star. In addition, his battalion was the first to use self-propelled Howitzer.

After returning home from World War II, SGM Camarato married Mary Lou Pepper, and they raised their three children in Herrin. As a member of the American Legion, VFW, Eagles, and Knights of Columbus, he continued to serve his community long after he hung up his uniform. Today, the Angelo Joseph

Camarato Foundation continues his legacy by providing ready-to-eat meals for Southern Illinois veterans.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the grand opening of the Angelo Joseph Camarato Foundation as they proudly honor and continue the selfless service SGM Camarato exemplified throughout his life.

CELEBRATING DELGADO COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NEW ORLEANS REGION

HON. TROY A. CARTER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Delgado Community College as it celebrates 100 years of service to the New Orleans Region. The oldest and largest community college in Louisiana, Delgado offers students the most comprehensive array of education and training services available in the New Orleans region. Additionally, Delgado has articulation agreements with most of the state's four-year colleges and universities that allow students to transfer their Delgado credits to bachelor's degree programs. As well as offering degrees and transferable college credits, Delgado provides diplomas and certificates in many professional and technical areas. Workforce development is a priority at Delgado, hence the college's well-known motto: "Education that works!"

Delgado opened officially on September 13, 1921, as the Isaac Delgado Central Trades School, at 615 City Park Avenue in New Orleans. During its first century, the school evolved into Louisiana's first comprehensive community college and became one of the state's largest higher education institutions. The college has helped to educate generations while advancing the aviation, construction, culinary, health care, maritime, and other industries. Delgado serves a diverse population, providing career training, academic education, and programs to improve the lives of students and support the New Orleans region.

For 100 years, Delgado has remained true to its mission of providing post-secondary education that is relevant and positions graduates for rewarding careers in our region's key industries. Delgado communicates constantly with their business and industry partners to ensure that they provide relevant, world-class training.

Isaac Delgado's original gift of \$800,000 in 1921 to establish the Delgado Trades School has produced today's economic powerhouse for the region. Now, this investment in Delgado generates over \$10 in economic activity for every \$1 appropriated and has a total annual economic impact of \$588 million.

Students attend Delgado because they welcome them all and meet them where they are. The best and brightest come attend Delgado for college degrees that prepare them for careers or additional education at a four-year school. Those who need help to find their paths forward—including non-traditional students and those needing additional exposure to college fundamentals—find a nurturing environment at Delgado where they can thrive. Ev-

erything they do at Delgado is focused on the student—they help them succeed at whatever goals a student may have.

Delgado's reputation for educational excellence is growing both nationally and in Louisiana. Of the Top 50 community colleges in the nation, Intelligent.com ranks Delgado at No. 37. Given that there were 1,187 community colleges in the survey, that is quite an achievement. No other community college in Louisiana made the Top 50. The availability of these and other rankings online are helpful to those looking to Delgado to prepare for a career, additional study, and all of the other opportunities that a strong educational foundation opens up for Delgado students.

Delgado Community College is a Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Committee on Colleges (SACSCOC) accredited institution, affiliated with the Louisiana Community and Technical College System with 32,631 students enrolled; a faculty of nearly 900 full-time/part-time faculty members; more than 100 areas of study leading to degrees and certificates, located on seven campuses throughout the Greater New Orleans Region and online.

Earlier this year, Labor Secretary Marty Walsh visited New Orleans to participate in a roundtable discussion on investing in and improving conditions in the resilience worker and restoration economy at this campus. The strength of the American economy depends on the strength and resiliency of our workforce. We must ensure that as we grow our economy, we empower and invest in our workforce to include more diverse voices and welcome workers and businesses from all constituencies into critical, growing sectors. We were able to highlight a model example of increasing inclusion into the resilience economy Force's efforts to employ historically marginalized or underemployed communities with good-paying jobs. Delgado is a great example of this investment. I look forward to what they have in store as they begin their next 100 years.

CELEBRATING WATSONVILLE COMMUNITY BAND

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 75th Anniversary of the Watsonville Community Band and their mission to provide members the opportunity to play music, both for their enjoyment and education, and the entertainment of our community on the central coast of California.

On February 23, 1947, the then-called Watsonville Scouts Band held their first rehearsal at Watsonville High School. With just 15 members and their conductor, Ralph "Slip" Bohnett, the band performed for the first time at Watsonville's Independence Day Parade on July 4, 1947 and held their first concert at the Watsonville City Plaza on August 10, 1947.

Since its humble beginnings, over the past seven and a half decades, the Watsonville Community Band has given more than 1,500 public performances and amassed 325 First Place Awards out of the 337 times in parade competitions. The Band has appeared in almost every major parade on the West Coast and marched in over 500 parades.

The Watsonville Community Band has performed at fairs, parks, hospitals, festivals, and several televised concerts. It has served as representatives for the California-Nevada Lions Clubs at the International Convention of Lions Clubs in Chicago and performed at the Calgary Stampede Parade, a widely attended annual event in Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Notably, the Watsonville Community Band has performed for President Bill Clinton on three occasions: at California State University, Monterey Bay, at the National Oceans Conference in Monterey, and at the July 4th Concert at the White House in Washington, D.C.

Since their first rehearsal, the Watsonville Community Band has represented the vibrant spirit of the community of Watsonville by delivering enriching performances across the Central Coast and around the world.

Madam Speaker, I offer my utmost appreciation to all members of the Watsonville Community Band, both past and present, and their 75 years of service to the Central Coast.

HONORING THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE GERALD R. FORD FEDERAL BUILDING AND COURTHOUSE

HON. PETER MEIJER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. MEIJER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the anniversary of Grand Rapids' own Gerald R. Ford Federal Building and United States Courthouse, which for 50 years has been emblematic to the people of West Michigan as a stronghold of service, integrity, and trust.

Originally opened to the public in September of 1972, the Grand Rapids Federal Building carried no name. At that time, the possibility of a federal building being named after our then-5th District Representative Ford crossed the minds of few, let alone the future 38th President of the United States. It wasn't until 1975, under H.R. 11897, that a bipartisan effort spearheaded by the 93rd Congress to rename the building after him was presented to President Ford himself.

Displaying the humility that his legacy reflects time and time again, especially today, President Ford vetoed H.R. 11897, citing that it would be "improper" to approve legislation that places his name on a federal building. "This," he argued, "is a precedent I do not wish to establish." President Ford continued in his memorandum that "office buildings which house the functions of Government should not be used as monuments to Federal officials, but rather as workshops for the people's business."

Not long after Ford's brief—but impactful—time in office came to a close, President Jimmy Carter signed into law Senate Resolution 385, which officially named the office and courthouse in honor of his predecessor. President Ford built a towering legacy of devoting his will to the people who offered him and his wife, Betty, their trust after a difficult period in our history where uncertainty and deception nearly redefined our national identity.

Over the past 50 years, the office has been home to many tenants belonging to all branches of government. I am proud to share

this space with my colleague in the U.S. Senate, Senator GARY PETERS, with distinguished jurists, and with the many honest and endearing employees who have devoted their careers to ensuring that the office can successfully serve as a welcoming place of leadership and order. I am grateful to the law enforcement officers who have sacrificed their time to protect the federal business which is necessary to the success of our community.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor not only to have been a tenant of the space, but to take this time to recognize the history and all-around good work of those who are instrumental in leading our Nation from the local level on up.

HONORING MICHAEL RAY

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael Ray. He has been honored with the 2022 Spirit of Discovery Award for his incredible gifts of time, diligence, and unwavering commitment to The Discovery Cube's purpose of being a place of purpose, and working to inspire, educate, and impact.

As an Orange County native who attended Occidental College as an undergraduate and earned his MBA from USC, Michael Ray has played an integral role in shaping Orange County's science, technology, education, and cultural landscape for over 25 years. He was instrumental in founding the Discovery Cube Orange County and the Orange County School of the Arts, two long-standing institutions he fought for and worked hard to secure critical funding and lines of credit to assist with their initial launches and then successfully thrive.

At the Discovery Cube Orange County, Michael has been involved with each major phase of the organization's development and growth, dating back to 1985, the beginning of the Cube. Back then, Michael was a part of the Art Spaces Irvine Board that hired legendary market consultant Buzz Price (who assisted with the initial creation of Disneyland) to determine if Orange County was a large enough market to create and support a science center. The result was positive, and the idea of the Discovery Science Center (now the Discovery Cube) was on its way. Along the journey, Michael met with various local elected officials, state legislators, and government officials to build public support for the project. Combined with the work of other early board members, the Science Center successfully opened its doors officially in Santa Ana in 1998. Michael has been a Cube Champion at each major campus expansion campaign and is still very active today as the Cube enters a new chapter of growth.

Michael was also the founding chairman of the Great Park Conservancy and, early on, was an advocate for bringing Discovery Cube's programming to the park. He also helped co-found the Sage Hill School in Newport Beach and, along with the late Richard O'Neil and David Stein, the Democratic Foundation of Orange County.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Michael Ray and all the work that he has done for everyone in the community.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF KEITH SWARTZENTRUBER

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate Keith Swartzentruber, the executive director of Snyder Village, who is retiring after 34 wonderful years of service across Central Illinois.

Keith Swartzentruber joined the staff as an administrator of Snyder Village when it opened its doors in 1988 and has held the position of executive director at Snyder Village for the last 17 years. Under his leadership, Snyder Village has grown from a modest organization offering a health center and six independent living cottages to the full-life plan community that it is today. Currently, over 400 residents call Snyder Village home, and roughly 240 staff members make up the Snyder Village team. Spanning over 48 acres, Snyder Village now encompasses a skilled nursing health center, assisted living, home care services, inpatient and outpatient therapy, and a retirement community with 40 apartments and 170 cottages.

As a true servant leader, Keith encourages and supports staff to embody the Snyder Village mission statement: to provide for the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of others in a loving, dignified, and Christian atmosphere. Keith exemplifies the high level of care and service which has made Snyder Village the remarkable place it is. He can often be found visiting with residents and staff members, ensuring they feel valued and cared for. His leadership and service have been recognized by his peers and the community through several awards, including the Life Services Network Leadership Recognition Award.

Our community has been fortunate to benefit from the service and leadership of Keith Swartzentruber. I extend my sincere congratulations to Keith on his 34 years of service at Snyder Village. I wish him much success as he continues to lead a life of service to the Metamora community and central Illinois.

ADDITIONAL NAMES FOR CONSIDERATION OF SANCTIONS IN THE CORRUPT ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I was pleased to have co-sponsored the CORRUPT Act, H.R. 6846 (Corruption, Overthrowing Rule of Law, and Ruining Ukraine: Putin's Trifecta Act) in the House and to see its passage on the floor this week. This Act requires the President to report to Congress, within 30 days of this bill's enactment, a determination as to whether specified Russian persons identified in the bill meet the criteria to be subject to sanctions under laws that authorize sanctions relating to corruption or human rights violations. This legislation identifies nearly 200 names for immediate review by the Administration and, in my belief, can play a very important role in stopping Putin's cronies from operating under the radar and from advancing the Kremlin's evil agenda.

While this bill represents a critically important step forward, there are additional Russian entities (and names representing the leadership ranks within those entities) that, while not included in this legislation, warrant close attention by the Administration as well. I believe a particular focus on the Russian financial sector is warranted, and that government agencies in the sector play an integral role in financing Russia's war in Ukraine.

One specific government agency worthy of sanctions is the Russian DIA, or the Russian Depository Insurance Agency, which I, along with Congressman JOHN CURTIS, brought to the Administration's attention earlier this year.

The DIA, established in 2004, is a Russian state-owned corporation, controlled by a board dominated by officials from the (now sanctioned) Central Bank of Russia. In its official capacity, the DIA operates the national deposit insurance system for Russian banks and acts as the sole authorized bankruptcy administrator of financial institutions deemed insolvent in Russia.

Hiding behind this innocuous role, however, the DIA leads Kremlin-directed efforts to nationalize the assets of Russian financial institutions, funneling the assets of privately owned businesses to now-sanctioned Russian state banks such as Sberbank, VTB and Gazprombank. I have been made aware that many of the businesses that the DIA targets on behalf of the Central Bank of Russia are owned by individuals who have been blacklisted as political targets of the Russian state and lack sufficient political protection from these kinds of schemes.

The CEO of the DIA, Andrey Melnikov, was sanctioned by the United States in 2017 for his role as Minister of Economic Development of the Russian-occupied territory of Crimea, following Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Mr. Melnikov was re-sanctioned by the Treasury Department just last week, for his role at the DIA, as well. Other members of the DIA's legal team (such as Andrey Pavlov) have been sanctioned under the Magnitsky Act for their key roles in attacking Russian opposition leader Alexei Navalny and his supporters in Russia and abroad, often using abusive lawsuits and court proceedings around the world to pressure them into abandoning their support for democratic change and rule-of-law in Russia.

By taking actions to target the DIA directly, the U.S. government can play a key role in cutting off Russia's long arm of oppression abroad and limit Putin's ability to fund his war chest. Sanctioning the DIA will not only hamper its ability to expropriate assets from privately held Russian financial businesses, but also help defend brave Russian dissidents and opponents of Putin abroad from predatory attacks by law firms in the employ of the DIA.

Individuals in leadership positions in the DIA, who I believe that, along with Director Melnikov, should be reviewed for the future imposition of sanctions include:

Filatova, Maria Vladislavovna, First Deputy General Director of the DIA

Dolgoleva, Olga Viktorovna, Deputy General Director of the DIA

Dolenko, Veronika Viktorovna, Acting Financial Director

Morozov, Oleg Borisovich, Deputy General Director of the DIA

Popelyukh, Alexander Anatolievich, Deputy General Director of the DIA

Savchenko, Sergey Mikhaylovich, Deputy General Director of the DIA

Fedorova, Natalia Vladimirovna, Deputy General Director of the DIA

I am hopeful that the Senate, in future action on companion legislation now pending in the body, can review these names with an eye toward adding them to the Senate bill. I also hope the Senate will consider adding the DIA itself to the pending legislation. Doing both can take direct aim at the ability of the DIA and its leadership to advance Putin's schemes, his war in Ukraine and his attacks on all those who dare stand up and oppose him.

HONORING COUNCILWOMAN
RYSHEEMA DIXON—FORMER WIL-
MINGTON CITY COUNCILWOMAN
AND ENTREPRENEUR

HON. LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor and commemorate the life of former Wilmington City Councilwoman Rysheema Dixon. We lost Councilwoman Dixon unexpectedly and far too soon on September 16, 2022. During her 35 years of life, she demonstrated exceptional leadership, entrepreneurship, and dedication to public service. The people of Delaware, myself included, will profoundly miss Councilwoman Dixon and her inimitable spirit.

Councilwoman Dixon was born in Philadelphia and moved to Wilmington, Delaware, at the age of 15. After graduating from the University of Delaware in 2009 with a bachelor's degree in Sociology, she began her career by serving two terms with Public Allies Delaware. Public Allies, an AmeriCorps program at the University of Delaware's Center for Community Research and Service, recruits and trains emerging leaders with a passion for social justice and impact. In 2013, Councilwoman Dixon furthered her education, earning her master's degree from the University of Delaware. She would later return to her alma mater as an educator, to share the knowledge she had gained with the next generation of students, serving as a professor of social entrepreneurship.

Councilwoman Dixon was a true public servant. As the first Black woman and youngest candidate to win an at-large Wilmington City Council seat, she was an exceptional and tireless advocate for her community. During her time in office, she established a legacy of inclusion, creative policymaking, and fearlessness. Notably, Councilwoman Dixon served as Chair of the Community Development & Urban Planning Committee, Chair of the Health, Aging, & Disabilities Committee, and Vice Chair of the Public Safety Committee. Among her significant legislative accomplishments was the launch of Wilmington's first disparity study which would help ensure Wilmington City government used its purchasing power fairly and equitably. She also sponsored legislation promoting sex education, consent, and reproductive health.

In addition to her years of direct public service, I must also mention Councilwoman Dixon's entrepreneurial prowess and talents in

business. In 2011, she founded RD Innovative Planning, now called RD Innovative Solutions. The organization aims to educate and support individuals advocating for more equitable access to affordable services and resources. With issues spanning from health care to nutrition, education, youth development, and beyond, RD Innovative Solutions offers support and advice. Councilwoman Dixon remained the Chief Executive Officer until her untimely passing.

Councilwoman Dixon also served as Executive Director of Delaware Pathways to Apprenticeship which helps individuals from low-income communities attain apprenticeships and sets them up for future success. The program serves particularly vulnerable groups including formerly incarcerated people, those on public assistance, and Delawareans living in public housing. This year, Councilwoman Dixon launched a Global Social Entrepreneurship program in Liberia to reach young people across the world.

I know I am in the company of so many Delawareans in my grief at Councilwoman Dixon's passing. She was a singular force in the First State and in our world, and we will never forget her kindness, tenacity, compassion, and service. I extend my deepest condolences to Councilwoman Dixon's parents and loved ones. Councilwoman Rysheema Dixon made a true difference in Delaware and beyond, and I am so grateful to have had the opportunity to know her. She will be missed and remembered forever.

MAYOR FANUCCI

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize the achievements of my friend, Mayor Anthony Fanucci. Mayor Fanucci is currently serving his second term as the mayor of the city of Vineland, South Jersey. Prior to becoming mayor, he served a single term as City Council President and was a two-term member on the Vineland Board of Education. Mayor Fanucci is also the owner of two successful businesses, A.R. Fanucci Insurance and A.R. Fanucci Real Estate. In addition, he serves on the New Jersey Conference of Mayors Board of Directors, as well as the Executive Board of the New Jersey League of Municipalities. Mayor Fanucci has left a very positive impact on South Jersey and has received several well-deserved awards for doing so. These awards include the Spirit of Achievement Award from the Italian Cultural Foundation of South Jersey, the Teach Anti-Bullying Community Award, the Greater Vineland NAACP Unit 2115 Community Award, and the Cultural Award from the St. Augustine Prep Hall of Fame. In his free time, Mayor Fanucci is a very active alumnus of St. Augustine Prep. He volunteers as a mentor and career counselor to local students, as well as aids student athletes by coaching sports teams and providing sponsorships. Mayor Fanucci has truly made such a positive impact on the South Jersey community, and I am so proud to call him a friend of mine. God Bless Mayor Fanucci and God Bless our United States of America.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANN
MCGUINNESS

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of an extraordinary woman's rights leader and advocate, Ann McGuinness, of Selkirk, New York. Ann passed away peacefully and surrounded by family on August 3, 2022, following an aggressive, and courageous battle with cancer. Ann's life and achievements will be celebrated and remembered on September 28, 2022, in Washington, DC, where she did so much work to advance privacy rights and delivery of women's health care based on science and medicine.

Born in 1957 and raised in Newington, Connecticut, to Edward and Catherine McGuinness, Ann's life was initiated and guided by her Connecticut origins. Her proud, Connecticut-Catholic upbringing—and with it an instilled affinity for social justice—was reinforced by her earning a political science degree from the College of St. Joseph in West Hartford, Connecticut. By that point, through her tenacious demeanor, she had already discovered what would ultimately grow into her life-long passion: advocating for women's reproductive rights.

Her tireless advocacy and passion can be observed in every step of her life's story—no matter what Ann was doing, she always tied it back to advancing equal rights for women. The earliest stage of her career prior to obtaining a master's in public administration from Columbia University, was with the National Women's Political Caucus. She continued her political advocacy by campaigning on Tim Wirth's campaign for Senate. Upon then Senator Wirth's successful electoral bid, Ann, equipped with her experience and passion, made a career transition to work for NARAL Pro-Choice in 1987, a mission which she remained dedicated to for 17 years. Madam Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing Ann personally, particularly in her earliest years of political activism. She was very bright, very principled and had a great sense of humor. Her husband and soul mate William "Chip" Reynolds was a perfect match and they supported each other's social activism as well as their commitment to growing and raising a beautiful family.

Having built up roughly two decades of experience and a network in reproductive rights advocacy, Ann transitioned her career again in 2006, this time lending her unmatched expertise to Planned Parenthood's fundraising arm. She approached her senior role at Planned Parenthood with the same sense of ferocity that she brought to every other project. What caused her to be most successful in her role, however, was her penchant for connecting with young people and her steadfast belief in affording reproductive rights for all that energized her to pour limitless energy into the mission. Relentless in her pursuits to ensure equal access to reproductive rights, Ann left Planned Parenthood in 2018, working to form the Contraceptive Access Initiative in 2020—an effort which was purposed towards ensuring contraceptives were available to women without barriers.

Madam Speaker, we have all come to know Ann McGuinness as a champion of community,

inspiring and convincing others to become philanthropists and donate hundreds of millions of dollars toward a cause fundamentally important to her and the lives of women across the country. We would be hard-pressed to find an example of someone more unwavering in their commitment to a cause. Of her critical work, nothing may have been more important to Ann than mentoring and recruiting youth on the issue of reproductive rights. For, over the decades, Ann McGuinness had not only solidified the legacy and strength of a post-Roe America, but has now undoubtedly inspired brigades of activists to carry the torch, as we collectively fight to not just regain, but expand even further women's reproductive rights. This legacy will hopefully provide solace for the loss her husband, Chip Reynolds, children Nora Reynolds and Nicholas Reynolds and siblings, Patrick McGuinness, Timothy McGuinness and Mary Kate Hallisey have and will endure. Those of us in public office can and should contribute to that effort to honor her memory. To that end, Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Ann McGuinness.

SUPPORTING H.R. 8542—MENTAL HEALTH JUSTICE ACT OF 2022; H.R. 6448—INVEST AND PROTECT ACT OF 2022; H.R. 4118—BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE ACT; AND H.R. 5768—VICTIM ACT OF 2022

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the four public safety bills that the House is considering today.

Crime, and in particular gun violence, continues to be a major problem affecting every community in our country. The annual cost of gun violence alone is more than \$280 billion.

This Congress has already taken the most significant action in 30 years with the enactment of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act to reduce gun violence.

Today, we take another step forward to strengthen public safety by passing four bills that will keep our communities safer.

Together the bills will save lives by increasing grants for police training and recruitment for small police departments which often lack the resources they need.

They will fund the deployment of mental health crisis response units and evidence-based community violence intervention programs—two strategies that have been used very successfully in my district.

And they will provide funding so local law enforcement can solve homicide and non-fatal shootings.

I would like to thank Representatives HORSFORD, DEMINGS, GOTTHEIMER, and PORTER for their leadership on these bills.

I urge my colleagues to put party over politics and vote YES on each of the public safety bills being considered today to reduce crime and save lives.

HOMETOWN HERO—LAWRENCE
THORNS

HON. BETH VAN DUYNE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 2022

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lawrence Thorns as our Texas-24 Hometown Hero of the week. Lawrence is a North Texan who has gone above and beyond to ensure the next generation of Texans are equipped with the necessary tools for greatness.

Lawrence is a hard worker in his community, especially with his local church—Forest Hill Church of Christ. His work in his church community has directly impacted the lives of North Texas students.

Since 2016, Lawrence has been supplying back to school supplies for local schools and shelters, ensuring the students have everything they need to pursue an education and achieve their dreams. This year alone, Lawrence supplied over 230 bags of school supplies to students.

On behalf of our entire community, I'd like to thank Lawrence for his selfless dedication to the next generation. I look forward to seeing the impact his work will have on our students.

HONORING STEPHANIE BAPTIST

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Stephanie Baptist, a district staff member of mine who runs and manages the Jacksonville office for the 18th District of Illinois.

Since coming to Congress, my office has prided itself on providing top-notch constituent services with four offices in our 19-county district. We all know this would not be possible without great staff in our districts, helping constituents with casework and being the front line of communication with our communities while we are here in Washington, D.C.

For the 18th District of Illinois, which includes many rural areas in central and west central Illinois, this is extremely important with long distances between towns and cities. In Stephanie's case, she manages our Jacksonville office by herself. Stephanie joined the office several years back, replacing Barb Baker, a longtime community advocate and a staff member who sadly passed away. To say Stephanie had big shoes to fill after Barb would be an understatement; however, she filled them incredibly well.

Stephanie served with professionalism and an unmatched dedication to the community, particularly during the extraordinary times that we have faced over the past two and a half years during the COVID-19 pandemic. Stephanie served as the point person for our office on IRS casework and SBA issues over the last several years, which was not easy given the challenges our communities faced. Throughout it all, Stephanie handled her work with grace, compassion, and resilience.

Sadly, because of our redistricting in Illinois, our Congressional District will no longer have Jacksonville and our office downtown.

While we could not be happier for Stephanie as she embarks on a new and exciting opportunity, she will be missed dearly by our office. I want to thank Stephanie for all the hard work on behalf of constituents in 18th Congressional District. It has been greatly appreciated. Stephanie will always be a part of Team LaHood, and most importantly, a friend.

TOYS FOR TOTS 75TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Toys for Tots program on their 75th Anniversary of bringing Christmas joy and a message of hope to America's disadvantaged children.

Established in 1947, the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves has protected the hopes, dreams, and positive future of our nation's most valuable resource—our children—with the Toys for Tots Program, an official mission of the Marine Corps Reserve.

Over the past 75 years the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Toys for Tots program has delivered the magic of Christmas to over 281 million less fortunate children and distributed over 627 million toys nationwide with the support of the U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Reserve and community coordinators who conduct toy collection campaigns.

In Missouri, the Toys for Tots program has 20 chapters. Two of those, reside in my district: Jefferson City, MO serves Cole, Maries, Miller and Morgan Counties and Troy, MO serves Lincoln County. These two chapters have done a tremendous job of bringing their volunteers together to bring the joy of Christmas and send a message of hope to central Missouri's less fortunate children.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the U.S. Marine Corps, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Toys for Tots program for their outstanding efforts on behalf of our needy children, both here in Missouri and across the Nation for the past 75 years.

HONORING SILVIA MARTINEZ DE
TAFOLLA

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today and honor Silvia Martinez de Tafolla, a constituent I am immensely proud of, and celebrating her 82nd birthday. Silvia was born to Jose Martinez Valades and Carment Martinez Solorzano in Irapuato Guanajuato, Mexico on May 4, 1940. She studied in Mexico for the occupation of Secretary.

At the age of 24 Silvia married a hard-working and responsible gentleman named Miguel Vargas Tafolla. Their union brought 2 wonderful children, Silvita and Miguel Angel who are her reason for living and source of unconditional support.

After 14 years of marriage, the family was separated 2 years, as Miguel immigrated to the United States, while the family stayed behind in Mexico. Silvia and her daughter then immigrated to the United States through a difficult and dangerous journey, leaving her youngest son behind in Mexico. All the family was final reunited in Anaheim, California. Silvia and her family have made Anaheim their home for the past 40 years. Silvia worked as a sales representative. After 55 years of marriage, Silvia's husband Miguel passed away, and with the love for her children she has been able to carry on.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Silvia Martinez de Tafolla, her ability to persevere to reach the American Dream and celebrate her 82nd birthday.

COMMEMORATING THE 250TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE SOUTH HAMP-
TON BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the South Hampton Baptist Church on its 250th Anniversary. This incredible milestone is a testament to the impact of the church on the town of South Hampton, and the vital role that faith plays in the community.

The town of South Hampton and the church have undergone tremendous change since 1772, but the values and faith of the towns' founders can still be seen in the community today. As one of the oldest churches in New Hampshire, South Hampton Baptist continues to involve itself in the town through volunteerism and community get-togethers to celebrate the history and legacy of this house of worship.

As Granite Staters come out of the pandemic looking for comfort, guidance, and how to best help their neighbors, the South Hampton Baptist Church remains an important resource and a partner for many families here on the Seacoast. The history and insights into early American life found in this church give congregants a glimpse into the past, while the volunteerism and public service they perform allows them to look toward the future of South Hampton.

I would like to thank Pastor Jeremy J. Pataro for his dedication to the town of South Hampton and congratulate him on maintaining 250 years of tradition. On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I congratulate the South Hampton Baptist Church for its outstanding contributions to the state and wish them another 250 years of success.

IN RECOGNITION OF NICK
WOOLDRIDGE

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my legislative staffer, Nick

Wooldridge, for his service to Kentucky's Second District.

Nick is a native of Kentucky's capital, Frankfort, which helped inspire his interest in politics. In high school, he served as a page in the Kentucky House of Representatives. Nick's interest in American politics continued through his years at Princeton University where he graduated with a degree in history. While in college, Nick interned for both U.S. Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO and U.S. Senate Republican Leader MITCH MCCONNELL.

In November 2021, Nick joined my congressional D.C. office as a staff assistant. Nick's initiative, strong work ethic, and extensive knowledge of Kentucky made him an excellent addition to my staff, and he quickly worked his way up in my office to a legislative correspondent. In this role, Nick does in-depth research on legislation, helps me effectively communicate complex legislative policy to constituents, and responds to constituent inquiries in a timely manner. On Nick's last week in my office, I want to thank him for his work serving Kentucky's Second District and wish him the best in the next chapter of his career.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTH-
DAY OF MOORESTOWN RELIEF
ENGINE COMPANY 312'S OLDEST
FIRE TRUCK, "BERTHA"

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. KIM of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th birthday of Moorestown Relief Engine Company 312's oldest fire truck, affectionately known by our district as "Bertha."

Since its acquisition by the Relief Engine Company in 1922, the predominantly Ahrens-Fox engine-powered fire truck has been an integral part of Moorestown's history and community safety. Throughout its nearly 50 years of active service to the Moorestown community, the volunteers of Relief Engine Company 312 counted on Bertha when responding to major fires, car accidents, and various incidents in between.

Its presence in the community cannot be understated either. The engine was so large that the floor of the company's building was found to be sagging from its weight. Today, while not in use, the fire truck is an attraction for visitors of Moorestown's Relief Engine Company, and it holds a place in our history.

Not only has the Bertha gained recognition by residents in the Moorestown area, but the truck has also been recognized throughout the region. In the 1980s, Bertha received three first place awards at a New York Fire Truck Muster.

Our volunteer firefighter corps are essential in maintaining our safe, secure, and connected community. Bertha remains a symbol of their rich history of dedication to us and our families, and it's my honor to represent them, this symbol of rich history, and this community.

CELEBRATING THE BIRTHDAY OF
PATTI KENNER

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the birthday of my dear friend Patti Askwith Kenner, who has dedicated her life to supporting women's civic participation, supporting the arts, and advancing Jewish causes.

Patti Kenner is a native New Yorker who was born in New York City and raised in Harrison, New York. She is a graduate of Carnegie Mellon University with a degree in French. She subsequently earned a master's degree in Early Childhood Education from the Columbia University Teachers College.

After 10 years as an educator, Ms. Kenner left teaching to join Campus Coach Lines, a charter bus company founded by her father in 1928. She continues to work at Campus Coach Lines to this day and currently serves as its President.

In a city full of larger-than-life personalities, Ms. Kenner is one New York's most iconic civic leaders. She has been a consummate advocate for women's participation in politics and civic engagement.

Ms. Kenner is also a devoted alumna of Carnegie Mellon and has given generously back to the school. She has served on the university's board of trustees for over 25 years and recently dedicated its Askwith Kenner Global Languages and Cultures Room. This amazing experiential space allows students to virtually travel the world and interact with people from different nations.

Ms. Kenner is also a major supporter of education in New York. In 2019 she created the Patti Kenner Fellowship in Arts Education at Guild Hall, where she is also a longtime trustee. This fellowship has substantially enhanced youth educational programming at Guild Hall.

Ms. Kenner has been dedicated to increasing awareness about the Holocaust and preserving its history. In 2011, Ms. Kenner produced a documentary about the renowned Jewish-American journalist Ruth Gruber, who documented life in Nazi Germany and was tasked by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to escort close to 1,000 refugees from Nazi-occupied Europe to the United States in 1944. She is currently working on another documentary focused on Swedish architect and humanitarian, Raoul Wallenberg, who saved tens of thousands of Jews in occupied Hungary at the end of World War II.

In addition to these many accomplishments, Ms. Kenner serves on the boards of Defiant Requiem Foundation, the Museum of Jewish Heritage, the University Musical Society at the University of Michigan, the Educational Alliance, along with numerous other organizations and institutions.

Madam Speaker, Ms. Kenner is a dear friend of mine who continues to inspire me with her tireless advocacy and activism. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the many contributions that Patti Kenner has made to New York City and wishing her every future success.

NANCY HUDANICH

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending Nancy Hudanich's retirement celebration. Nancy began her career in education as a math teacher. She taught in Cape May County for 16 years and at Middletown High School for 23 years, where she worked as both a teacher and as the assistant principal. In August of 2006, she became the assistant superintendent of Cape May County Technical Schools. Then, in July of 2012, Nancy took on the role of Superintendent of the Cape May County Special Services School District. In 2018, she went on to become the Superintendent of Cape May County Technical School District. In addition to her active involvement with educating the youth in South Jersey, Nancy also made a positive impact in the city of Avalon. She served as an elected councilwoman for Avalon for 32 years and served 5 terms as President of Avalon Borough Council. As a councilwoman, Nancy served on the Finance Committee, Technology Committee, and Insurance Committee. She also started Avalon's first Brownie Girl Scout Troop, as well as the Avalon Garden Club. Nancy should be proud of all her service to the South Jersey community, and it is truly my honor to have had the opportunity to attend her retirement celebration and recognize her many accomplishments. God Bless Nancy, and God Bless our United States of America.

REMEMBERING LIBERT BOZZELLI

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Libert Bozzelli, who passed away on August 25, 2022, at the age of 97.

A World War II Combat Veteran, he served his country with honor as a member of the Army-Air Corp Unit in the African campaign under General George S. Patton. Libert was honored in 2015 with a trip to Washington, D.C. with the Honor Flight Program. There he was selected for the highly distinguished honor to place a wreath on the tomb of the Unknown Soldier; an honor that would cause Libert to shed a tear every time he recounted the story.

Upon returning to America, Libert would attend a trade school, where he would train to become a sheet metal worker. He would work for Independence Sheet Metal Company for seven years until he was elected as a business agent for Sheet Metal Workers Local 70 (now known as The Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers' Local Union 33). There, he would fight for fair treatment and wages for his members. Well respected by his peers, Libert would be reelected to the position for 34 years, which was the longest anyone has held the position continuously in the nation. Libert also served on the Akron Labor Board, Akron Regional Development Board,

Summit County Construction Board and Appeals Review Board. His dedication would earn him the Peter Bommarito Community Award from Akron Labor.

Libert was a lifelong public servant and gave to his community relentlessly. He served 20 years on Cuyahoga Falls City Council and 4 years on Summit County Council. During that time, he implemented many important projects. He fought for his constituents and the people he represented always making sure their voice and their interests were heard. He was instrumental in establishing senior citizen housing in Cuyahoga Falls and throughout Summit County. This earned him the Akron Housing Urban Citizen award. Libert's true passion was fighting for the underdog. He was ahead of his time when it came to supporting mental health issues, the mentally challenged and handicapped youth and adults. He served on the boards of the Weaver School and Workshop, Tarry House for Mental Health and Housing, Fallsview Mental Health, served as President on Cuyahoga Falls Hospital, St. Thomas Mental Action Committee and ARC. He wanted all to have the opportunities, skills, and means to be a productive citizen and have a high quality of life.

Libert's voice was loudest when he was trying to get approval of the construction and funding for the Internal Brotherhood Home for Alcoholics. His words were heard as IBH is a success today. This earned him the Salvation Army Lifetime Humanitarian Achievement Award. In 1985, Kent State asked Libert to help them open The Kent State University Museum, an institution displaying important collections of fashion and decorative art. When they needed a leader to ensure their plans could be executed effectively and efficiently, Libert stepped up to become the first President of the fashion museum.

Italian heritage meant a lot to Libert. He was a member of the Italian Professional Business Men's Club, Kenmore Italian Club, Carvollese Men's Club, Italian Council and Sons of Italy where he played a role in leadership positions in each organization. He earned the Council of Italian American Society Service Award.

The latest in Libert's life of high achievement occurred this year. A week after his wife's passing, Libert would walk across the Blossom Music Center stage to receive his high school diploma 80 years later.

Libert gave his life to others, but his family was his priority. Sunday pasta dinners with his children, grandchildren, friends, and neighbors were a weekly occurrence. The family gathered again at his home for every holiday celebration.

Married to the love of his life for 75 years, on August 25 Libert died of a broken heart. He joins his wife Madeline who preceded him in May. Libert leaves his children, Dennis Bozzelli, Marlene and Eric Czetti, Kathleen and Bernie Hovey, Tom Bozzelli and Ken Pollard; 6 grandchildren, 15 great-grandchildren, and 6 great-great-grandchildren.

CELEBRATING BRUCE AND LINDA
TAYLOR

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Bruce and Linda

Taylor as the recipients of the Community Foundation for Monterey County's 2022 Distinguished Trustee Award. Bruce and Linda Taylor's philanthropy and leadership on the Central Coast is admirable and demonstrates an unwavering passion for the well-being of our local community.

As long-time residents of Salinas, Bruce and Linda are well-known for their generosity, both personally and through Taylor Fresh Foods, or Taylor Farms, and support of many non-profits that work to uplift our community. Bruce and Linda Taylor continue to support community development, including educational institutions like California State University, Monterey Bay, Hartnell College, Palma High School, Notre Dame High School, and Rancho Cielo. Additionally, the Taylors support the Boys and Girls Clubs of Monterey County, First Tee—Monterey County, Youth Orchestra Salinas, and Digital Nest. Because of their contributions, Monterey County youth have access to programs and facilities that play a vital role in their development.

Bruce and Linda Taylor, along with Taylor Farms, have impacted the lives of countless community members and their families. Through the Taylor Farms Scholarship Program, over 216 four-year scholarships—estimated at \$3.1 million—have been awarded to the children of Taylor Farms employees who plan to attend a four-year university. The Taylors' emphasis on supporting both their employees and their children is a testament to the generosity and compassion of Bruce and Linda Taylor and Taylor Farms. Efforts like these have made lasting contributions to Monterey County's social and economic climate. Additionally, since moving Taylor Farms' headquarters to Old Town Salinas, business activity in Old Town has increased, contributing to a thriving Salinas City Center.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Bruce and Linda Taylor as the recipients of the Community Foundation for Monterey County's 2022 Distinguished Trustee Award. I extend my sincere appreciation to Bruce and Linda Taylor for their philanthropy and for fostering a culture of innovation and compassion.

RECOGNIZING THE EBENEZER BAPTIST CHURCH ON CELEBRATING THEIR 100TH YEAR OF SERVING THE NEW ORLEANS COMMUNITY

HON. TROY A. CARTER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Ebenezer Baptist Church as they celebrate their 100th year of serving the New Orleans Community. On September 22, 1922, a meeting was called by Rev. Marshall Lewis, Sr. where the first officers were elected, prayer was offered, and the Church was organized. They began services in a rented space before shortly moving to its iconic and enduring home, 2415 South Clairborne Avenue.

Under Founder and 1st Pastor Reverend Marshall Lewis, Sr.'s leadership, the congregation grew, and the church thrived. They were incorporated in 1928, completely paid off by 1935, and Reverend Marshall Lewis, Sr.

successfully pastored this congregation from 1922 until his death in 1940. After his passing, and one year of mourning, the congregation chose his son Reverend Marshall Lewis, Jr. as the new pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church. Rev. Marshall Lewis, Jr. pastored the congregation until his untimely death in March of 1946. From April 1946 to January of 1947, Reverend Alexander BeBell served as the operating pastor; and from January 1947 to October 1947, he served as full Pastor.

On October 31, 1947, Reverend Lawrence E. Landrum, Jr. was elected the new Pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church, ushering in a new era, pioneering, and starting many traditions within the Church. Growing up in the church, Reverend Landrum, Jr. was strongly involved in the community and eventually became a popular musician, singer, and preacher in New Orleans. In 1948, Pastor Landrum led a renovation of their church sanctuary that was completed in 1950. By the next year, Pastor Landrum began a live radio broadcast, combining two of their service choirs to form one of the city's first Mass Choirs titled the "Radio Choir". In 1952, Pastor Landrum ordained the First Woman Preacher in the Baptist Church, Rev. Viola Allen Miller; and throughout his Ministry he ordained hundreds more. In 1958, Pastor Landrum began to expand the church's community outreach, demolishing the adjacent property to build an educational building. This was completed in 1960 and to this day, houses 6 classrooms, a kitchen, dining area, office, and restrooms. Over the years, Rev. Landrum continued to grow the congregation from 167 members when he first took over, reaching 1,700 members at their peak.

In the following years, Rev. Landrum's grandson, Minister Jermaine Landrum began working with and improving different ministries within the church, and by 1995, was appointed to Co-Pastor of the Church. Rev. Jermaine Landrum grew attendance and outreach ministries through both radio and television.

In 2005 Hurricane Katrina tested the very fiber of the church. Following this disaster, the church had to undergo many changes to continue its operations ultimately resulting in Rev. Lawrence Landrum deciding to retire after 59 years of dedicated pastoring.

In its modern era, Rev. Jermaine Landrum continue to strive for growth and rebuilding within this church community. This was accomplished through new forms of outreach, purchasing additional properties, a greater media presence, and many more opportunities. Ebenezer Baptist Church continues to weather through storms and pandemics, as their congregation survived all catastrophic events during 2020 through 2021. And now, the Church is still prospering, standing 100 years strong, and looking forward to better days ahead.

Their history shows adaptability and the higher level of determination required to weather through setbacks and storms. Through faith and dedication, remaining as a solid pillar to the New Orleans Community, we honor their resilience as they continue to stand strong and continue serving.

LAS VEGAS ACES WNBA CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

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

On September 18, 2022, the Las Vegas Aces defeated the Connecticut Sun, 78–71, in Game 4 of the WNBA Finals. The Aces won the championship three games to one and secured the first major professional sports championship in the history of the city of Las Vegas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Heading into the playoffs, the team was primed for success, having overcome so much adversity over the last few seasons.

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

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

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

So, in closing I want to again congratulate owner Mark Davis who, through continued investment and support, has put women's basketball on the map in Las Vegas; Coach

Becky Hammon; all the amazing players, directed by the fabulous A'ja Wilson; and the entire Las Vegas Aces organization led by its president, Nikki Fargas, and general manager, Natalie Williams. Congratulations on this tremendous achievement.

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

RELEASE OF AMERICAN ANDY
HUYNH

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, today I am proud to recognize and celebrate the free-

dom of Andy Tai Ngoc Huynh, who resides in Alabama's Fourth Congressional District, which I am honored to represent.

I was informed yesterday that Andy Huynh, along with Alex Drueke, another Alabamian who had gone missing, have been freed from their captivity in eastern Ukraine and are safe at the U.S. Embassy in the Saudi Arabian capital of Riyadh undergoing a medical evaluation.

In June, I was alerted that Andy and Alex—both former U.S. service members—had gone missing after volunteering to fight alongside the Ukrainian Army following the unprovoked Russian invasion.

Since hearing of Andy's disappearance, my office has worked to gather any information possible to share with Andy's loved ones and stayed in contact with the U.S. Department of State in the hopes of bringing Andy back home.

I know that Andy's fiancée, Joy Black, and soon to be mother-in-law, Darla Black, have been ever faithful in their prayers and efforts to seek Andy's release, never losing hope. Today their faith has been rewarded and Andy is safe. Furthermore, the same can be also said about Alex's family, as they have been ever diligent in working toward his release.

I thank all of my colleagues and fellow citizens for their prayers for Andy's safety. When Andy Huynh and Alex Drueke return to Alabama, I look forward to meeting them and their families in person. We are thankful to God for their safe release.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4941–S5033

Measures Introduced: Thirty-one bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4917–4947, S.J. Res. 63, and S. Res. 791–796.

Pages S4969–70

Measures Reported:

S. 4577, to improve plain writing and public experience, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 117–159)

Report to accompany S. 1127, to require the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to make certain operational models available to the public. (S. Rept. No. 117–160)

Pages S4966–67

Measures Passed:

Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act: Senate passed H.R. 7846, to increase, effective as of December 1, 2022, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans.

Page S5031

Kevin and Avonte's Law Reauthorization Act of 2022: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 4885, to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Americans Alert Program, and the bill was then passed.

Page S5031

Commending Tall Ships America: Senate agreed to S. Res. 793, commending Tall Ships America for advancing character-building experiences at sea and representing the tall ships and sail training community of the United States in national and international forums.

Page S5031

National Clean Energy Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 794, proclaiming the week of September 26 through September 30, 2022, to be "National Clean Energy Week".

Page S5031

School Bus Safety Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 795, designating September 2022 as "School Bus Safety Month".

Page S5031

Honoring the late Senator Robert "Bob" Charles Krueger: Senate agreed to S. Res. 796, honoring the

life and legacy of the late Senator Robert "Bob" Charles Krueger.

Page S5032

Measures Considered:

DISCLOSE Act: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4822, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities.

Pages S4941–50

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 49 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 346), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Pages S4949–50

Affordable Insulin Now Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of 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.

Page S4955

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, September 22, 2022, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 27, 2022.

Page S5032

Prior to the consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S4955

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 3 p.m., on Tuesday, September 27, 2022; and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Page S5032

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 60 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. EX. 347), Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media. **Page S4950**

By 56 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. EX. 348), Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy. **Pages S4950–55**

Robin Meredith Cohn Hutcherson, of Utah, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Kevin G. Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Tennessee for the term of four years. **Page S5033**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Travis Hill, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

Travis Hill, of Maryland, to be Vice Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Jonathan McKernan, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring May 31, 2024.

Lynne M. Tracy, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Page S5033

Messages from the House: **Page S4966**

Measures Referred: **Page S4966**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S4966**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S4967–69**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4970–71**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4971–75**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4965–66**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4975–S5031**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5031**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—348) **Pages S4950, S4954–55**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Robert “Bob” Charles Krueger, in accordance with S. Res. 796, at 4:30 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Friday, September 23, 2022. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S5033.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Jose Emilio Esteban, of California, to be Under Secretary for Food Safety, and Alexis Taylor, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs, both of the Department of Agriculture, and Vincent Garfield Logan, of New York, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Milancy Danielle Harris, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, and Brendan Owens, of Virginia, and Laura Taylor-Kale, of California, both to be an Assistant Secretary, all of the Department of Defense, and 3,571 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Space Force.

BANKS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the nation’s largest banks, including S. 4619, to provide that all persons shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations of financial institutions, after receiving testimony from Charles W. Scharf, Wells Fargo and Company, San Francisco, California; Brian Moynihan, Bank of America, and William H. Rogers Jr., Truist, both of Charlotte, North Carolina; Jamie Dimon, JPMorgan Chase and Co., Washington, D.C.; Jane Fraser, Citi, New York, New York; Andy Cecere, U.S. Bancorp, Minneapolis, Minnesota; and William S. Demchak, The PNC Financial Services Group, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

BATTERY STORAGE

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine opportunities and challenges in deploying innovative battery and non-battery technologies for energy storage, after receiving testimony from Timothy J. Hemstreet, PacifiCorp, Portland, Oregon; Spencer Nelson, ClearPath, Inc., Washington, D.C.; and Ted Wiley, Form Energy, Somerville, Massachusetts.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 673, to provide a temporary safe harbor for publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which content may be distributed, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Thomas E. Brown, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Georgia, and Kirk M. Taylor, to be United States

Marshal for the District of Colorado, both of the Department of Justice.

STOPPING SENIOR SCAMS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine stopping senior scams, focusing on empowering communities to fight fraud, after receiving testimony from Nancy Pham-Klingler, County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency, San Diego, California; Marti DeLiema, University of Minnesota School of Social Work, St. Paul; Aurelia Costigan, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Polly Fehler, Seneca, South Carolina.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 32 public bills, H.R. 8949–8981; and 13 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 108; and H. Res. 1383–1394, were introduced.

Pages H8111–13

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H8114–15

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 7780, to support the behavioral needs of students and youth, invest in the school-based behavioral health workforce, and ensure access to mental health and substance use disorder benefits, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–484);

H. Res. 1239, of inquiry directing the Attorney General to provide certain documents in his possession to the House of Representatives relating to the October 4, 2021 memorandum issued by the Attorney General entitled “Partnership Among Federal, State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Law Enforcement to Address Threats Against School Administrators, Board Members, Teachers, and Staff”, with amendments; adversely (H. Rept. 117–485);

H. Res. 1238, of inquiry requesting the President to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the October 4, 2021 memorandum issued by the Attorney General entitled “Partnership Among Federal, State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Law Enforcement to Address Threats Against School Administrators, Board Members, Teachers, and Staff”, with amendments; adversely (H. Rept. 117–486);

H. Res. 1241, of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide certain documents in his possession to the House of Representatives relating to immigration enforcement and border secu-

urity, with an amendment; adversely (H. Rept. 117–487);

H. Res. 1249, of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the impact of illegal immigration on federal or tribal lands, with an amendment; adversely (H. Rept. 117–488);

H. Res. 1250, of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the impact of illegal immigration on Federal or Tribal lands, with an amendment; adversely (H. Rept. 117–489);

H. Res. 1257, of inquiry directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide certain documents in the Secretary’s possession to the House of Representatives relating to the establishment of an Emergency Intake Site in Erie, Pennsylvania, at the Pennsylvania International Academy, to house the influx of unaccompanied migrant children, with an amendment; adversely (H. Rept. 117–490); and H. Res. 1325, of inquiry requesting the President and directing Attorney General Merrick B. Garland to transmit, respectively, a copy of the affidavit to the House of Representatives related to the raid on the former President, with amendments; adversely (H. Rept. 117–491).

Page H8111

Recess: The House recessed at 9:54 a.m. and reconvened at 12:29 p.m.

Page H8080

Invest to Protect Act of 2022: The House passed H.R. 6448, to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer

than 200 law enforcement officers, by a yea-and-nay vote of 360 yeas to 64 nays, Roll No. 451.

Pages H8085–90, H8100–01

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–65 shall be considered as adopted.

Pages H8085–90

H. Res. 1377, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4118), (H.R. 5768), (H.R. 6448), and (H.R. 8542) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 215 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 450, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Pages H8080–81

Mental Health Justice Act of 2022: The House passed H.R. 8542, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 206 nays, Roll No. 452.

Pages H8081–85, H8101–02

H. Res. 1377, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4118), (H.R. 5768), (H.R. 6448), and (H.R. 8542) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 215 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 450, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Pages H8080–81

Break the Cycle of Violence Act: The House passed H.R. 4118, to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 453.

Pages H8090–96, H8102–03

H. Res. 1377, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4118), (H.R. 5768), (H.R. 6448), and (H.R. 8542) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 215 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 450, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Pages H8080–81

Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act: The House passed H.R. 5768, to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program to establish, create, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, by a yea-and-nay vote of 250 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 454.

Pages H8096–H8100, H8103–04

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program to establish, implement, and administer the

violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, and for other purposes.” **Page H8103**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–62, modified by the amendment printed in H. Rept. 117–483, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill.

Pages H8096–H8100

H. Res. 1377, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4118), (H.R. 5768), (H.R. 6448), and (H.R. 8542) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 215 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 450, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Pages H8080–81

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H8085.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8080–81, H8100–01, H8101–02, H8102–03, and H8103–04.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

Committee Meetings

STATE OF EMERGENCY: EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF GROWING WILDFIRE RISK ON THE INSURANCE MARKET

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance held a hearing entitled “State of Emergency: Examining the Impact of Growing Wildfire Risk on the Insurance Market”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEDERAL BUILDING SECURITY: EXAMINING THE RISK ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability held a hearing entitled “Federal Building Security: Examining the Risk Assessment Process”. Testimony was heard from Richard Cline, Principal Deputy Director, Federal Protective Service, Department of Homeland Security; Scott Breor, Associate Director of Security Programs, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security; and Catina Latham, Director of the Physical Infrastructure Team (Acting), Government Accountability Office.

POWER AND PROFITEERING: HOW CERTAIN INDUSTRIES HIKE PRICES, FLEECE CONSUMERS, AND DROVE INFLATION

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy held a hearing entitled “Power and Profiteering: How Certain Industries Hiked Prices, Fleeced Consumers, and Drove Inflation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: On September 21, 2022, Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6273, the “VA Zero Suicide Demonstration Project Act of 2021”; H.R. 3793, the “Support Families of the Fallen Act”; H.R. 8888, the “Food Security for All Veterans Act”; H.R. 8852, the “End Veteran Hunger Act of 2022”; H.R. 8875, the “Expanding Home Loans for Guard and Reservists Act”; H.R. 2800, the “WINGMAN Act”; H.R. 8510, the “Strengthening Whistleblower Protections at the Department of Veterans Affairs Act”; H.R. 5918, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs repays members of the Armed Forces for certain contributions made by

such members of towards Post-9/11 Educational Assistance; H.R. 1957, the “Veterans Infertility Treatment Act of 2021”; H.R. 4601, the “Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act”; H.R. 3304, the “CARS for Vets Act”; H.R. 2521, the “DOULA for VA Act of 2021”; and H.R. 7589, the “REMOVE Copays Act”. H.R. 6273, H.R. 3793, H.R. 8888, H.R. 8852, H.R. 8875, and H.R. 2800 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 5918, H.R. 1957, H.R. 8510, H.R. 4601, H.R. 3304, H.R. 2521, and H.R. 7589 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
SEPTEMBER 23, 2022**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Friday, September 23

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Monday, September 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 10 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E976
 Axne, Cynthia, Iowa, E965
 Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E966
 Blunt Rochester, Lisa, Del., E971
 Bost, Mike, Ill., E969
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E967
 Carter, Troy A., La., E969, E975
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E968
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E970

Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E970, E973
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E972
 Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E973
 Kim, Andy, N.J., E973
 LaHood, Darin, Ill., E970, E972
 Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E968
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E973
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E974
 Meijer, Peter, Mich., E970
 Neal, Richard E., Mass., E967
 Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E968

Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E965, E967, E969, E974
 Pappas, Chris, N.H., E973
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E974
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E966
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E966
 Thompson, Glenn, Pa., E965
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E972
 Titus, Dina, Nev., E975
 Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E965
 Van Drew, Jefferson, N.J., E965, E966, E969, E971, E974
 Van Dwyne, Beth, Tex., E966, E972



Congressional Record

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.