



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 2021

No. 123

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, July 16, 2021, at 9 a.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 2021

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, the fountain of wisdom, teach us this day that You continue to work for the good of those who love You.

Lord, strengthen the hearts of our lawmakers against temptations and make them more than conquerors in Your love. May they faithfully perform whatever You command, thankfully enduring whatever burdens You have chosen for them to bear.

Lord, guard their desires so that they will not deviate from the right path. Empower them with Your mighty arms to do Your will on Earth, even as it is done in heaven.

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, July 14, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUJÁN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jocelyn Sam-

uels, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2026. (Reappointment)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BUDGET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, well, late last night, after a very, very, just amazing meeting—several-hour meeting—of the Budget Committee, where people spoke their minds and we came together, last night, the Senate Democratic majority on the Budget Committee reached a landmark agreement on a \$3.5 trillion budget resolution, which will pave the way for historic legislation later this year called the American Jobs and Families Plan.

Very simply, this budget resolution will allow us to pass the most significant legislation to expand support and help American families since the New Deal—since the New Deal. This is a generational and transformational change to help American families, who need the help in this rapidly changing world.

Every major program that President Biden has asked for is funded in a robust way. The President will be attending the Democratic caucus lunch later today to talk about not only agreement but the next steps along the way. When you consider the American Jobs and Families Plan, in conjunction with the bipartisan infrastructure bill, which is close to \$600 billion, you get \$4.1 trillion, which is very, very close to the total amount that President Biden has asked Congress to invest.

● This “buller” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4871

Both traditional infrastructure, like roads and bridges, and social infrastructure—we mean by that things that help people and families directly, such as healthcare, family leave, and education—will receive the kind of support that the American people so need and are asking for. We are very proud of this plan.

Now, we know, the road ahead is going to be long. There are bumps along the way. This is only the first step in a long road we will have to travel and must travel, but we are going to get this done because we so fervently believe that we must make average American lives a whole lot better.

We want middle-class people to be able to stay in the middle class and breathe easier in the middle class. We want poor people to be able to climb that ladder to get to the middle class. And nothing, nothing that has been put on the floor of this Senate will do that better than this bill. Nothing that has been put on the floor of the Senate for the last several decades will do that the way this bill will. It is transformational. And, frankly, it is exciting.

The eventual legislation we are talking about is best understood in three buckets: jobs, families, climate. Instead of giving a giant tax break to large corporations and the wealthy, as our Republican colleagues did when they were in the majority, we are going to strengthen the backbone of the middle class by making critical investments in infrastructure, creating thousands upon thousands upon thousands of good-paying jobs in the process with apprenticeships and training so that people who never had opportunities to have these jobs can get them and then lead good lives for decades later.

The resolution will make sure that there are no tax increases for families under \$400,000 and no tax increases for small businesses. This is about rebuilding the middle class and creating jobs. And we will change our tax policy far different than what our Republican friends did. The very wealthy, the people at the top who escaped paying all or a lot of taxes—no, no, no—they are going to pay their fair share for the first time in a long time, so different than what our Republican colleagues did. Their bill gave the top 1 percent a huge percentage, some estimated as high as 83 percent of the breaks. We are going to give it to the middle class, to the working people.

For American families, we will introduce paid family leave, as well as one important addition to President Biden's proposal, which is a robust expansion of Medicare to cover dental, vision, and hearing. This is something that Chairman SANDERS, Budget Chairman SANDERS, has championed and alerted not just this Chamber but the Nation to its need. We are going to get it done.

And on climate, we must act on climate. We have seen what is going on

just in the last month. We are going to invest in green infrastructure—strong, bold, green infrastructure; electric vehicles; clean and renewable power; resilient projects, housing, and more that will not only help our country adapt to a changing climate but slow climate change itself.

On top of President Biden's plans, Democrats will add other policies to significantly deal with climate, such as reducing methane emissions, one of the most potent and deadly of the greenhouse gases.

So jobs, families, climate, these are the three buckets that Democrats will be working on.

Again, let me repeat. There is a long road ahead of us. But the fact that we were able to come together last night with the diverse views on the Budget Committee was a strong shot out of the gate.

Now, I am sure my friends on the other side of the aisle are going to pan this and say one thing or another. We can predict they will label anything where we reach out to help American families. They don't want to do that. They just want to help those wealthy people. They don't want their taxes to rise. They don't want the government to help the people, so they are going to criticize it and use their usual name-calling. That is what they have been doing for years, no matter what legislation there is. I am quite sure they will raise phony concerns about the debt and deficit.

Hello, my colleagues, you raised the deficit by \$2 trillion so you can give tax cuts; namely, to wealthy people and big corporations. And now you are going to claim, when we want to help middle-class families, poor families, that there is a deficit? Give us and give the American people a break. It is hypocrisy.

The American people won't buy their criticisms. Creating jobs; providing family leave; making education, housing, and healthcare more affordable; fighting climate change, no one seriously believes that these policies are the policies on the road to what they might call socialism. These are what American people want. Paid family leave, helping people go to college, come on, that is part of our democratic tradition where we build ladders up. And I mean small "d," American tradition, where we build ladders up to help people climb up and live a good life.

So the goals we must pursue are goals to build back our middle class, secure our middle class, help more people get to the middle class, to bolster our economy, to lay the foundation for another century of American prosperity, just as Franklin Roosevelt did close to 100 years ago. And that is exactly what the Democratic majority is going to do.

MARIJUANA

Mr. President, now on another subject, later today, on marijuana, I will join my colleagues Senators Booker and Wyden to release draft legislation

to reform the Federal marijuana laws, principally to end the prohibition on marijuana at the Federal level for the first time in several generations.

Over the past decades, Americans' attitudes toward marijuana have undergone a dramatic transformation. Listen to this: Nearly 70 percent of Americans support legalizing adult use of marijuana—70. Eighteen States, plus DC, have passed laws on adult use of marijuana. Thirty-seven States and DC have legalized marijuana for medical use.

The States are supposed to be our laboratory for democracy, and by all accounts, these experiments have been a success. The doom-and-gloom predictions of the naysayers—oh, crime will go way up, drug use will go all the way up—have never, never materialized. I note that a State like South Dakota had it on its ballot in the last election. In that conservative State, the majority people voted in the same direction that we are talking about here.

For decades, for decades, young men and young women, disproportionately young Black and Hispanic men and women have been arrested and jailed for even carrying a small amount of marijuana in their pocket, a charge that often came with exorbitant penalties and a serious criminal record because of the overcriminalization of marijuana, and it followed them for the remainder of their lives. It makes no sense, and it is time for change.

Now is the time for Congress to engage in this debate, update our Federal laws to not only reflect popular wisdom but science. Marijuana, amazingly in this 21st century, is still treated by Federal law with the same hostility as heroin, despite it being far, far less dangerous.

So I greatly look forward to releasing this draft legislation with my colleagues Senators Wyden and Booker today. We will speak about how our bill will address the issues relating to updating our Federal marijuana laws, not just ending the Federal prohibition, but how it will ensure restorative justice, protect public health, and implement responsible taxes and regulations.

NOMINATION OF MYRNA PEREZ

Mr. President, on a final matter, Myrna Perez. In a moment, I am excited to head over to the Judiciary Committee to introduce an outstanding nominee for one of the most important courts in the country, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York. And the person I will introduce is Myrna Perez, one of the foremost election lawyers in the country.

The daughter of Mexican immigrants, Myrna graduated from Yale, Harvard, and Columbia Law School before joining the Brennan Center for Justice as a voting rights and election litigator. The Federal bench has long been occupied by former prosecutors and corporate lawyers. It is about time that civil rights attorneys, Federal defenders, and voting rights experts, like

Myrna Perez, one of the foremost voting experts in the country, join the ranks.

Especially now, when our democracy is in peril in many ways, it is crucial we elevate someone like Ms. Perez to the bench, someone we can trust to faithfully and equally apply the law of our great democracy.

I was proud to recommend her to President Biden, and I look forward to formally introducing her to the committee today. When I met her, as I did to interview candidates, she knocked my socks off with her brilliance, her persistence, and her strong and wonderful personality.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

VOTING LAWS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, at any particular moment, with total certainty, Washington Democrats know one of two things to be true, either American democracy is so well-functioning, so sacrosanct that nobody can possibly question or badmouth it; or democracy is in total crisis, hanging on by a thread, and only a massive, sweeping partisan overhaul by Democrats can save it.

Now, it can be hard to guess which of those opposite stories Democrats will be shouting on any given day. The narrative flip-flops at a dizzying pace.

After 2016, when voters picked Republicans, Secretary Clinton and a whole cast of senior Democrats called the new President illegitimate. Two-thirds of all Democrats said Russia had probably or definitely hacked into our voting systems and actually changed the tallies, a baseless conspiracy theory, a big lie.

Four years later, they kept insisting that democracy was broken and Democrats had to overhaul it. H.R. 1 was written and introduced on that pretense.

As recently as last summer, when the 2020 election was looking close, Democrats and cable news spent multiple weeks in literal hysterics over what they said was a massive secret election conspiracy revolving around the Postal Service—another big lie.

It was one frantic meltdown after another, constant, silly claims that our democracy would die. But last November, their story turned on a dime because Democrats got election results they liked a lot better.

Now, suddenly, our elections were no longer in crisis. Now American democracy was finely tuned, fully legitimate, and beyond reproach. For about 11 weeks, from President Biden's election through his inauguration, Democrats and their immediate friends briefly stopped being our democracy's biggest doubters and became its No. 1 fans. But now, as Democrats look ahead to the first midterm that is almost always challenging for the sitting President's party, the silly hysterics have been switched right back on.

This spring, the State of Georgia passed a mainstream election law that expanded early voting and made drop boxes permanent for the first time. The left responded with a total meltdown. Regulations that left Georgia with more flexible early voting and more flexible absentee voting than many blue States, including New York, were, insanely, called "Jim Crow 2.0." What nonsense.

Georgia Democrats scared huge corporations into promoting a moral panic that was completely and totally false. It was a shameless effort to manufacture an air of crisis to help Democrats ram their election takeover bills through the Congress, but it didn't work. The Senate rejected all the bad ideas in S. 1, so the made-up outrage had to be cranked up even higher—even higher.

So this week, State legislators from Texas decided to grab some beer, hop on a private plane, and flee the State in what they are pretending is some great moral crusade. In reality, they have just come here to Washington to snap selfies, bask in the limelight, and beg Senate Democrats to take over Texas elections.

Once again, this outrage is completely phony. The Texas Legislature was going to consider bills that would expand the minimum hours of early voting, make even more counties provide 12-hour days of early voting, and make it even easier for voters to fix mistakes on mail-in ballots so their votes would actually count. These bills would apply voter ID to mail-in ballots through a simple process that doesn't even require a driver's license number. They would clean up voter rolls to remove voters who have died or moved away.

This is not controversial stuff; it is common sense. More than 80 percent of Texans support voter ID. But Democrats have pulled out the same Chicken Little playbook that failed in Georgia, the same big lies.

Yesterday, the President of the United States delivered a speech that was set in an alternate universe. He called these mainstream State laws, these modest integrity measures that are wildly popular with Americans—now, listen to this—"the most significant test of our democracy since the Civil War." Really? This is our new President, who promised to lower the temperature, bring America back together, and rebuild a civil society where we can dialogue as fellow citizens? That is the person who is now yelling that mainstream State laws are more dangerous than two world wars, more dangerous than poll tests and Bull Connor and actual Jim Crow segregation and somehow analogous to the Civil War? That is what the President of the United States said yesterday? What utter nonsense. It would be laugh-out-loud funny if it wasn't so completely and totally irresponsible.

Here are the great sins of the Texas proposals. Here is what is apparently

so outrageous: They want to wind down a few emergency COVID voting procedures, including drive-through voting and polling places that are open all night long. I am serious. That is what this is all about, that they want to wind down two COVID voting procedures: drive-through voting and polling places that are open 24/7.

Because of the pandemic, for the first time ever, some places in Texas experimented with these brandnew, unusual measures, but now winding them down is somehow an assault on democracy? Really? If Texas is not interested in permanently letting people vote from their car windows or at 3 in the morning, then President Biden says that "they want to make it so hard and inconvenient they hope people don't vote at all," simply because you can't vote all night? Really? These brandnew exceptions for a 100-year pandemic are supposed to now be sacred pillars of our system. Things that we did last year to deal with a 100-year pandemic—to get rid of any of that is a threat to our system?

Voter ID protections are supported by majorities of White Americans, Black Americans, and Hispanic Americans, but President Biden calls these things "a 21st-century Jim Crow assault"—one big lie after another. These people think that if they just keep repeating the same melodramatic clichés, they will finally get to pull off the power grab.

These false comparisons are an insult to the actual hurdles that Americans have overcome over the years together. We have won two world wars, faced down the Soviets, unwound brutal segregation, defeated actual Jim Crow laws, and endured the 9/11 attacks, but now the sky is falling? The sky is falling because of these mainstream laws that people actually support? Because Texans want to allow 16-hour days of voting but just not in the dead of night?

Do they know that nobody outside of liberal Twitter and cable television is buying an ounce of what they are selling? The big lies, the fake outrage failed in Georgia. The big lies and fake outrage failed here in the Senate, and they will fail in Texas.

The big lies and fake outrage are totally failing to persuade the American people. Americans want to make it easy to vote but hard to cheat. Americans know that having widespread and accessible voting, along with voter ID, isn't an attack on democracy; it is the definition of democracy.

So, look, I understand the Democrats may be growing nervous about the 2022 elections. I can see why. Liberal policies are overspending, overborrowing, and hurting our economy. They are destabilizing the Middle East, weakening our southern border, and increasing violent crime across our country. But the solution is not to keep lying to the American people about the health of our democracy. The answer is not this desperate craving for an unprecedented

partisan takeover so Washington Democrats can appoint themselves the board of elections for every county and State.

The longer these fake hysterics keep up, the more Americans will keep wondering just why Democrats are this desperate—this desperate to seize control over election laws and why Democrats are this panicked by the prospect of voter integrity measures that are simple, that are fair, and that are popular with the American people.

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

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

TEXAS

MR. THUNE. Mr. President, the Republican leader was here a few moments ago discussing an issue which I think has gotten a lot of play here lately, and that is this attempt by Democrat members of the Texas Legislature to come to Washington, DC, to protest legislation that is being moved through the legislature in the State of Texas. In fact, this is the cover of one of yesterday's newspapers—or I should say today's newspapers.

It has a photo there of all the Democrat legislators from Texas meeting with the Democrat leadership here in the U.S. Senate. Allegedly, they are here, playing hooky from their jobs in Texas, having flown in, I am told, on private jets—so much for doing something about the climate—to protest the fact that in Texas their voices are not being heard and not being given input into the legislative process there.

I point that out simply because it is really incredibly ironic. I mean, it is rich with irony. Sometimes, around here, you just say you can't make this stuff up. They are here in Washington, DC, away from Texas, which is where their jobs are, to protest the fact that their views and voice are not being heard in Texas and that the majority in Texas is running roughshod over the minority and their rights.

The same Democrats, I would add, here in Washington, DC, are trying to get rid of the legislative filibuster in the U.S. Senate, the very mechanism that historically has protected the rights of the minority and given them a voice in the legislative process, the very thing that has been used historically in a way that ensures that the Senate has to come together behind big solutions, collaborate, find that common ground, find that compromise. The Democrats here in Washington and these Democrats from Texas are all in favor of getting rid of the legislative filibuster.

Think about that. It is really pretty remarkable that they would come up here to protest what is happening in

Texas at a time when they support getting rid of the very protections that give the minority here in the U.S. Senate a voice in that legislative process.

And the other really remarkable irony about this is the issue that they are here to speak in support of S. 1, the bill that would federalize, that would nationalize elections in this country and take power away from States when it comes to regulating and administering elections, a power that has been held by States going back to the Founders.

And so they came here basically to say you need to pass H.R. 1. Well, again, what is H.R. 1? H.R. 1 is this massive Federal takeover of elections in this country, and it is also the test case for why we have got to get rid of the legislative filibuster.

I would be willing to bet that the Democrat leader at some point in the next couple of weeks is going to call up S. 1 again. We voted on it once already, but he is going to call it up again because he thinks it is good politics, and, plus, he wants to pressure his Members to do away with the legislative filibuster in order to pass S. 1 with 51 votes.

So, again, the irony of all of this, honestly, is some stuff you just flat can't make up. But I would reiterate what I have said before about S. 1: It is a solution in search of a problem. We have States around this country who are, in some cases moving to put in place election integrity measures, measures that will ensure that every vote counts and that everybody has an opportunity to vote but that people don't have an opportunity to cheat.

That is all it is about. It is about election integrity. And most of the measures that are being adopted in States around this country are simply that—nothing more, nothing less—and, again, historically consistent with the way that our election process has been governed in this country, and that is to allow States to make those to do things in a decentralized way, to not consolidate power in Washington, DC, but rather to distribute that power and make it that much harder to hack into it.

I mean, you think about it, you have 50 election systems in this country. It was what the Founders intended. They wanted to distribute power. They wanted to have a decentralized system, not one that was driven and controlled by a bureaucracy here in Washington, DC. I think that is consistent with what the American people believe ought to happen and the cases it should be when it comes to elections in this country.

So it really is interesting to see these Democrat legislators from Texas coming to Washington, coming all the way up here—again, playing hooky from their jobs in Texas—to protest a piece of legislation that is being used by the Democrat leadership to try and get rid of the legislative filibuster, the very mechanism that protects the rights and the voice of the minority in the

U.S. Senate. It has, literally, since our country's founding.

AGRICULTURE

MR. PRESIDENT, last week, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced that, going forward, agriculture producers will be able to hay or graze cover crops on prevented plant acres at any time, without a reduction in their prevented planting payments.

This is good news for farmers around the country but particularly for farmers in more northern States like South Dakota, who were left at a significant disadvantage by the previous haying and grazing date. I have been working on this issue since 2019, when the effects of a tough winter, rainfall, and flooding kept many South Dakota farmers from their usual planting.

As a result, many farmers were looking to sow quick cover growing crops on the acres they were unable to plant with their usual crops. But they faced a problem. At the time, the Department of Agriculture would not allow farmers to harvest or graze these cover crops until November 1 each year. Farmers who hayed or grazed before this date faced a reduction in their prevented planting payments, which are crop insurance payments to help them cover their income loss when fields can't be planted due to flooding or other issues.

Now, November 1 was a generally pretty reasonable date for farmers in southern States. But in northern States, like South Dakota, November 1 was often too late for harvesting, thanks to the risk of snow and other late fall or early winter storms. It was also too late to maximize the use of cover crops for pasture, since the ground could freeze before cover crops were fully grazed.

So I and other Members of Congress successfully lobbied the Department of Agriculture to move up the hay and grazing date for 2019. But that was a short-term fix, I should say, for a frequent problem. So in March of 2020, I introduced, legislation, along with Senator STABENOW, to permanently remove the November 1 haying and grazing date. And I continued to lobby USDA on this issue.

I am very pleased that the Department of Agriculture has listened to farmers and the Members who represent them and permanently eliminated the November 1 date. Cover crops are a win-win situation for farmers and for the environment. They prevent soil erosion, which can pollute streams and rivers and worsen flooding. They improve soil health, which improves future crop yields and benefits the environment. And they reduce feed shortages for ag producers by providing another source of feed for their livestock.

Last week's decision by the Department of Agriculture will reduce a barrier to cover crop adaptation and ensure that farmers throughout the United States are able to reap the benefits of sowing these crops.

USDA's decision is a big victory—a big victory—for South Dakota farmers

and farmers in other northern States. But, unfortunately, it doesn't solve the challenges agriculture producers in my State are facing this summer. Right now, almost every acre of land in South Dakota is experiencing drought conditions. A huge portion of the State is facing a severe drought. And some areas of the State have been classified as being in extreme drought. And ag producers in other States are facing similar conditions.

Hay is in short supply. Without adequate forage, some cattle producers are being forced to cut down their herds, which is devastating for producers who have spent years building their herds. Emergency haying and grazing of Conservation Reserve Program acres can help alleviate forage shortages for livestock producers during drought years.

South Dakota has nearly 1.4 million acres enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program—at least at one time that was the number. It is not that high anymore. I am a longtime champion of this program, which supports both the production, agriculture, and hunting industries in South Dakota.

The Conservation Reserve Program provides critical habitat for pheasants and other wildlife, which contributes significantly to our State's economy. Haying and grazing CRP acres can also provide a lifeline for South Dakota ag producers during droughts like the one that our State is currently facing.

Last month, I sent a letter to USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack urging him to release additional Conservation Reserve Program acres to help South Dakota producers, many of whom are in desperate need. And while I am pleased USDA is currently allowing emergency grazing in many counties, emergency CRP haying is not allowed until after the primary nesting season ends on August 1, which is too late in a drought year.

Agriculture is a tough business, and our producers have had to endure a tremendous amount over the past few years from tough weather conditions, to the COVID pandemic. Cattle producers are also dealing with market volatility that has recently provided record-high profit margins for meatpackers, while producers struggle to stay in business.

I will continue pressing the administration and working with my colleagues to hold the big four meatpackers accountable to the producers and consumers who depend on them. The Department of Agriculture should do everything it can to help farmers and ranchers weather this drought. And I will keep doing everything I can to get relief to producers in my State and around the country.

I am grateful for the Department of Agriculture's decision on haying and grazing on prevented planting acres. And I will keep working to ensure that CRP and all USDA programs have the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of producers while also making sure we balance the wildlife and conservation needs of our State.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FENTANYL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the countdown is on. Today marks the beginning of 100 days until the critical and lifesaving authority placing fentanyl-related substances in schedule I expires. In 100 days that expires.

Congress has extended this authority multiple times, most recently in May. However, when choosing how long to extend this authority, Congress shortchanged itself by providing only 5 months to contemplate how to permanently control fentanyl analogs. I pushed for a longer extension, even spearheading bipartisan legislation that would have extended this authority into the next year, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle insisted that 5 months was sufficient to work with the administration to find a permanent solution scheduling fentanyl-related substances.

I had skepticism about this when the 5-month extension passed in May, and I have even more skepticism now. That is because we are only 100 days away from losing this essential authority and the administration still has not indicated how it intends to solve this problem. So Congress is operating in the dark.

The administration says that a legislative proposal will be sent to Congress as early as next month. But this proposal won't be a done deal once it arrives on Capitol Hill because, you know, Presidents propose, Congress disposes.

If it doesn't include measures to protect vulnerable communities, to prevent more drug overdose victims, and proactively deter and punish drug traffickers, then it won't be enough to solve the problems of a drug—fentanyl—killing several hundred thousand people.

I have been beating the drum on scheduling fentanyl analogs for a long period of time because it is a fight worth having. We simply can't afford to let these deadly substances go unscheduled.

What happens if we don't schedule fentanyl analogs in the next 100 days? Well, it is pretty obvious. Opioid-related deaths fueled by fentanyl analogs increased by 35 percent in my State of Iowa. What about the other 49 States? But 35 percent in Iowa last year. That happens to be in line with nationwide trends. So deaths will continue to rise if we don't buckle down and get onto this issue of scheduling fentanyl schedule I on a permanent basis.

Also, according to the Customs and Border Patrol, so far this year, enough

fentanyl and its analogs have been seized to kill the entire population of the United States not once, but 10 times over.

Some may view drug crimes as victimless. You need to tell that to the hundreds of thousands of families who have lost their brother, sister, parent, or child to fentanyl.

Tell that to Rob and Deb Courtney, the parents of Chad Courtney from North Liberty, IA. Chad died 5 years ago because of fentanyl. He used painkillers and then turned to abusing heroin. Rod and Deb tried to help their son through rehab and treatment. Then one day they received the call that they had been dreading. Their son died because a drug dealer laced heroin with a deadly fentanyl substance. Rod said that one of the last memories he has of his son was picking him up from treatment and Chad stating, "I just want to make a difference."

We owe it to Chad and the other 36,359 victims of fentanyl-related overdose deaths to make a difference now, and that means passing legislation that schedules fentanyl and its analogs permanently.

Congress can ensure that we put people over profits and communities over cartels by permanently scheduling fentanyl-related substances. I don't doubt that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle want to protect their constituents. Nobody wants more overdose deaths in their home States. So let's work together to put this issue to rest at last.

Starting today, the countdown is on. As I said in the beginning, 100 more days. I hope the administration and my Senate colleagues are ready to get to work on permanently scheduling fentanyl-related substances. I know that I am ready.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

NOMINATIONS OF TRACY STONE-MANNING AND DAVID CHIPMAN

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss two troubling nominations by President Biden for positions that have very real impacts on my State of Wyoming and the people who live there.

One of the simplest yet truest rules of governance is that personnel is policy. We have seen this rule play out over and over under President Biden.

During last year's election, the media created a narrative that a Biden Presidency would unite the country with bipartisanship. That has not happened. Many of the President's policies have been extreme appeals to the far left and decidedly hostile to our way of life in Wyoming and the West.

I believe much of this can be traced to the people with whom he has surrounded himself and to those he has appointed. That is why I am so concerned about two of the President's nominees that the Senate is considering.

First, there is Tracy Stone-Manning, President Biden's nominee to serve as

Director of the Bureau of Land Management. I am particularly interested in this nomination because the BLM manages about 18 million acres in Wyoming and huge tracts of land throughout the West. In fact, 90 percent of Federal and public land is west of the Mississippi.

We need a land manager who understands, respects, and implements multiple use of public lands with which Americans in the West are particularly accustomed.

The BLM has historically managed for multiple use, which is, in many cases, required by law. Under Ms. Stone-Manning, I am very concerned that multiple-use principles will change. The reason is quite simple. This nominee is a radical. She has been involved with ecoterrorists in the past, including a tree-spiking incident in Idaho.

Her extremist ties and past activism have even led a former Obama BLM Director to withdraw his support for her. Wyoming and other States in the West would be completely hamstrung if BLM land policy changed. Given Ms. Stone-Manning's militant history, I am not sure she would care.

Then there is David Chipman, President Biden's nominee to lead the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. One would be hard-pressed to identify a worse candidate for the job.

According to reports, Chipman may have lost his own gun while serving as an ATF agent. He also failed twice to define the term "assault weapon" during his confirmation hearing. This level of irresponsibility and lack of basic firearms knowledge is hardly an endorsement for someone tasked with overseeing gun use in the United States.

Chipman has also reportedly accused Black Americans who were successful on an ATF test of cheating because, in his opinion, too many were passing the test.

Let's be real. This kind of discrimination would tank a Republican candidate.

Mr. Chipman has also endorsed efforts to defund the police and has supported the science fiction-sounding notion of precrime arrests. His idea of effective law enforcement would be to arrest people before they commit crimes.

I came to Washington to solve real problems and get things done. I don't care if the solutions come from the right or the left. I am here to support good legislation and good policy. That is why I have backed President Biden's decision to bring our troops home from Afghanistan. That is why I have supported many of his nominees with whom I may disagree on some policy points, but they are nonetheless qualified for the roles—nominees including Janet Yellen, Pete Buttigieg, and Gary Gensler.

But based on their past experience and expressed behavior, Tracy Stone-Manning and David Chipman have dis-

qualified themselves and are direct contradictions to the bipartisanship and unity that President Biden called for and promised in his inaugural address.

If these extremist nominees are confirmed, they will direct their respective agencies toward ends that are actively and openly hostile to the Wyoming way of life that I am here in Washington to support and defend.

I call on President Biden to withdraw these names and, instead, send us nominees for these positions who better reflect the bipartisan reputation the President spent decades cultivating in this Senate. If the President does not withdraw these nominees, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote to reject them.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Arkansas.

HONORING OFFICER KEVIN DALE APPLE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, it is an honor to be with my friend and colleague Senator COTTON as we rise to honor Pea Ridge Police Officer Kevin Apple, who was killed in the line of duty on Saturday, June 26.

He made the ultimate sacrifice while attempting to apprehend two suspects who were fleeing from police. Although this was the last example of his selfless service and dedication to protecting his community, it was certainly not the only one.

Officer Apple bravely devoted his life to law enforcement and the good that it can bring about. He worked tirelessly to uphold law and order over the course of 23 years, serving several northwest Arkansas communities, including Pea Ridge for the last 3 years. He was known to consistently support others. The compassion he exhibited in and out of uniform will be fondly remembered by those he helped.

"He gave me hope again," one citizen remarked of Officer Apple.

Another individual commented that, as a result of Officer Apple, he changed his life. Now, more than 20 years later, he maintains a deep appreciation of the support he received from Officer Apple.

He did much more than serve and protect. The Pea Ridge police chief said that Officer Apple put humanity in the job. For a police officer, there is no higher compliment than that.

He was also known as a prankster. He was usually upbeat and lifted the spirits of those around him with a smile that would light up a room.

Friends, neighbors, and colleagues describe him as someone who cared passionately about his role in supporting public safety and was more concerned about lending a helping hand rather than writing tickets. He was a loyal friend and leader who always put the needs of others above his own.

Officer Apple leaves a legacy of lasting impact on all of those whose lives he touched in his own unique way. Whether attending a child's birthday party or checking on an elderly citizen,

he went above and beyond the call of duty and constantly showed his dedication to the people he was sworn to protect.

My hope is the community's support will provide comfort to his family, his friends, and brothers and sisters in blue. We can be very proud of how northwest Arkansas has already bonded together to give back to the Pea Ridge Police Department and this fallen law enforcement officer's loved ones.

Officer Apple was the embodiment of what it means to wear a police badge and uniform. His exemplary service and dedication to serving his community are truly inspirational, and he leaves behind a worthy example for other officers to imitate.

We all mourn the loss of Officer Apple and are deeply saddened by this tragedy. I join with Arkansans in expressing our gratitude for his service and sacrifice. I am honored to recognize his life with Senator COTTON today and pray that his family and his colleagues and community members know that he will forever be remembered as a hero.

With that, I yield to Senator COTTON.

Mr. COTTON. I thank Senator Boozman.

Mr. President, Police Officer Kevin Dale Apple of the Pea Ridge Police Department protected the community he loved for 23 years, but Officer Apple's long and honorable career in law enforcement was cut tragically short just a couple of weeks ago.

It all began with a call to "be on the lookout" for a blue Jeep that was fleeing from police in Rogers. Officer Apple and a fellow officer spotted the vehicle at a convenience store, and they sprang into action, approaching the car to speak to its occupants. When they did, the driver of the Jeep rammed one of their police cars and then struck Officer Apple, dragging him to his death. He succumbed to his injuries at the age of 53.

Officer Apple's death is a tragedy and a crime, but it is also a reminder; it is a reminder of the grave danger that police officers face across the country every day when they put on the bullet-proof vest and leave home, not knowing whether they will go home that night to take it off. This year alone, in being barely halfway through the year, 162 law enforcement officers have died in the line of duty across our country.

Officer Apple's death is also a reminder that, every time an officer approaches a suspect, he or she may be exposed to hidden threats, which may be a concealed weapon or, in this case, a vehicle that has been transformed into an instrument of death. All of the comfortable critics of the police who love to second-guess their every move, while officers are under incredible stress and danger in the heat of the moment, can stand to learn that sobering fact.

Officer Apple's death is also a warning of the tragic consequences of ill-

conceived, soft-on-crime policies. The woman who killed Officer Apple, Shawna Cash, was known by police long before that fateful day. She was facing multiple counts of theft and other drug-related offenses, but she was reportedly released from jail due to the coronavirus.

When criminals get let out of jail and are put back on our streets, tragedy tends to follow. A brave officer would still be alive today if his killer had remained behind bars. The trade-off here should be obvious. This criminal, with a rap sheet longer than your arm, should have remained in jail, and Officer Apple should have gone home to his friends and his family. For every future Shawna Cash who gets let out of jail early because of the coronavirus or soft-on-crime policies or other foolish and naive reasons, just remember: There could be another Officer Apple or another murder victim or rape victim.

Like every victim of the terrible murder wave sweeping our Nation, Officer Apple's life mattered. He leaves behind loved ones like Dalene, his mother, and Kyle, his brother. He leaves behind fellow officers and comrades who remember his jokes and his goofy sense of humor. He leaves behind a legacy of 23 years of honorable, courageous service to his fellow Arkansans.

Officer Apple will not be forgotten, and we must never forget the lawmen who lay down their lives to keep the rest of us safe. We will respect Officer Apple's memory just as we respect every law enforcement officer who wears the badge with honor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote previously scheduled at 11:30 a.m. start now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 121, Jocelyn Samuels, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2026. (Reappointment)

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Baldwin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Amy Klobuchar, Bernard Sanders, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patrick J. Leahy, Cory A. Booker, Mark R. Warner, Jacky Rosen, Jeff Merkley, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sherrod Brown, Ben Ray Lujan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination

of Jocelyn Samuels, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2026 (Reappointment), 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.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 258 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Portman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 120, Seema Nanda, of Virginia, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, Mazie Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Jon Ossoff, Tim Kaine, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Patrick J. Leahy, Tammy Baldwin, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Seema Nanda, of Virginia, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 259 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Lummis	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Paul	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Seema Nanda, of Virginia, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:48 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. ROSEN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, like all of us, I just got back from spending some time at home. I got back from being there and making a difference. I think one of the important things of being outside of Washington is you get a chance to hear what people are really concerned about. We have all kinds of speeches given here every day of what Members of Congress are absolutely sure people are concerned about. I

think that topic becomes much more crystal clear when you get home. I know it is certainly much more crystal clear to me when I am home in Missouri.

Over the Fourth of July holiday, there were a number of visits all over the State—to Columbia, St. Louis, Montgomery City, Monroe City. There were lots of events everywhere in the State at which I talked about the importance of getting the vaccine and the progress we were making there, but the first thing that people wanted to talk to me about was inflation. People are already seeing that prices are well above the numbers that they believe they are seeing that the official numbers are confirming.

In May of this year, prices were 5 percent higher than they were in May a year ago. In June, they were 5.4 percent higher than they were a year ago, but people are seeing a lot of prices that are higher than that. The price of whole milk is up 7.5 percent from a year ago. The price of an airplane ticket has averaged up about 25 percent from a year ago. Used cars are more expensive than they were last June. In fact, they are 45 percent more expensive than they were a year ago in June.

There is an incredible increase in the cost of things that people not only want to buy but on those things that are more pressing: what people have to buy and need to buy.

A lot of people specifically talked to me about gas prices. I was on the road a lot, driving a lot while I was home, and I saw those prices for myself. The average cost of a gallon of regular gasoline nationwide is about \$3.15. That is 45 percent higher than in June of last year. That is a hidden tax that working people pay every day.

Whether it is a hidden tax on a glass of milk, a hidden tax on a tank of gas, or a hidden tax on other things that they like to do or have to do, it makes a real difference for the people who want to take a vacation or have to travel to work. In the part of Missouri that I live in, there are a lot of little towns that have manufacturing jobs. It is not unusual for somebody to drive 40 or 50 miles one way to get to that job, and if gasoline is 45 percent higher than it was a year ago, it makes a real difference. That is a real hidden tax, and it is usually a hidden tax on the people to whom the President rightly would not want to pass on tax increases.

I think the administration has to start taking into account the issues that are out there. Larry Summers and others from the Obama administration have warned of the great risk of inflation. When we talk about energy, for instance, I think we have to do that, clearly, in a way that, if we are making transitions to energy, we don't make those transitions in a way that needlessly have a negative impact on families and on opportunities.

In his first few days in office, President Biden rescinded the permit for the

Keystone XL Pipeline, and not too long after that, he blocked the new oil and gas leases in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. These were things that Congress had talked about for a long time and, in some cases, were things Congress had specifically decided were timely to do, but an Executive order from the President decided, no, we are going to head in a different direction.

That was just the beginning, really, of what my colleagues have seen in the discussion in Congress and what my Democratic colleagues in Congress have in mind. So, if you like paying higher prices for gasoline, you are going to love what happens to the restrictions that go into effect and drive prices of all energy even higher.

The other thing I talked to small business owners about and, frankly, to all business owners about was the trouble in finding enough workers. Republican Governors in 25 States have now determined that the larger unemployment benefit kept people from going back to work. People were choosing to stay on the sidelines rather than go to work. Frankly, if you looked at that \$618 weekly unemployment check that was the average in America in May, that unemployment check didn't have any childcare costs associated with it, and it didn't have any travel to work associated with it. You have to have a job that pays a lot to not consider, if I am continuing to get this check, why should I go back to work?

Missouri was one of the 25 States that decided that the extra bonus was not only bad for families in their not going back to work but that it was bad for our economy. So, as of June 12, the return to the important but much lower normal unemployment benefit happened in our State, and I think you can already see people making the decision that it is time to go back to work.

Surprisingly, even though we have created a lot of opportunities for people to stay home, the June economy created 850,000 new jobs, and we should all feel good about that, but if this is an economy that has created 850,000 new jobs, at some point, we have to stop pushing money into that economy that we don't have. There are, obviously, a lot of factors at play here, but the 850,000 people going back to work is an important and a significant thing.

Part of the explanation, obviously, is the rush by Republican Governors, principally, to eliminate that bonus, but part of it is just simply an economy that is already beginning to rebound—to rebound based on the current tax structure and rebound based on what governments already spend rather than this incredible rush to drive inflation even further.

The Congressional Budget Office put out a new report recently that read the Federal deficit for this fiscal year will be more than \$3 trillion. The problem is that nobody has any idea what \$3 trillion really is, and that probably includes most of us. If I said the deficit

was \$3 million or \$300,000, somehow divided up to every American family, we would immediately think: Oh, my goodness. We could never deal with that.

By the way, it was just announced that there is a budget agreement on top of that \$3 trillion deficit to spend another \$3.5 trillion.

It is time we started talking frankly about how much \$3 trillion really is. That \$3 trillion is something that somebody has to pay back sometime. All that borrowing and spending has been one of the big factors contributing to inflation. It doesn't even count the \$3.5 trillion, again, that had been added just overnight in that discussion.

Some people are beginning to call this Bidenomics. I think Congress has to take its share of responsibility here. The belief that we can spend without limit and that it won't cause any problems is outrageous. The idea that we can pay people not to work or pay them more than they would make if they did work is outrageous. All of these things lead to unintended consequences. There is a belief that high gas prices and inflation are just temporary and that people shouldn't be concerned about it. Well, people are concerned, and they should be concerned.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will spend some time listening to people, hearing their concerns. I hope they will reconsider their policies that are fueling inflation and holding back our economy.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use a prop during my remarks.

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

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, President Biden's economic policies are causing nationwide sticker shock.

The price of nearly everything is higher today than it has been since Biden was in the White House the first time. The cost of consumer goods has gone up every month since January, and the markup in prices over the past year is the biggest annual increase since 2008. The Democrats' response to these rising prices is to simply spend more, which is making the problem worse.

Paying people not to work is contributing to worker shortages. Not having enough workers is resulting in service and supply shortages. Combine these two factors with trillions of dollars of government spending, and it all adds up to higher prices on everything for everyone. It is a common story wherever I visit on my 99-county tour. Because of Washington's upside-down economic policies, small businesses are struggling to hire workers, and our families are paying much more for far less.

Put simply, under Bidenomics, the price is up. Everyday products, like

diapers and paper towels, are either increasing in cost or decreasing in size, which is the same result: more money out of our wallets. Whether you are eating in or you are dining out, the one thing you are guaranteed to find on every supermarket shelf and restaurant menu is higher prices.

A pound of sliced bacon has increased a whole dollar in just the past year, and the fast-food dollar menu is disappearing. We are paying more at the pump too. A year ago, a gallon of gas cost about \$2.18. Today, the price is just under \$3 in Iowa. Nationally, the cost has risen to about \$3.15 per gallon and is expected to keep going up throughout the summer. Meanwhile, rising shipping costs are lifting the prices of everything from coffee to furniture.

All in all, Bidenomics has resulted in the biggest surge in inflation in nearly 13 years. For Iowans who are living on a budget, these unpredictable price markups are making every purchase a real guessing game. They keep finding themselves asking if the price is right.

To demonstrate just how much costs are spinning out of control, I have brought the wheel of inflation with me here today. Each of the numbers on the wheel represents a price increase for a common household product. It will tell us exactly how much more Bidenomics is costing hard-working Americans.

So, folks, let's go ahead and give it a spin.

No. 8. In the past year, the price of bacon is up about 8 percent.

Give her a good spin.

OK. No. 5, and it is a black 5. In the past year, the price of clothes is up about 5 percent.

No. 11. In the past year, the price of auto insurance is up 11 percent; and if you go to the 17 there, you will find that hotel rates, the price has gone up 17 percent in the last year.

There are no winning numbers on this wheel. Again, every number represents the increase of a common good American consumers are dealing with. There are no winning numbers on this wheel. No matter how you spin it, we simply cannot afford any more Bidenomics. I think the American people will agree, all of these prices need to come on down. But instead of addressing inflation, Democrats are trying to outbid one another over a massive new government spending program they are calling human infrastructure.

Want to guess what the price tag being floated by the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee for this package might be? Three and a half trillion dollars—all capital letters, folks.

The endless giveaway of cash and prizes may make it appear like Democrats in Washington are running a game show, but we all know that this is not a game. With our national debt approaching \$30 trillion, the bills are eventually going to come due. And you know who will be stuck with the tab? Taxpayers.

What runaway inflation doesn't take from working Americans' paychecks, the IRS will take to pay for the Democrats' never-ending spending. We are all going to be paying back the trillions of dollars borrowed to pay for Bidenomics, both in higher taxes and in higher consumer costs, and that price—folks, it isn't right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, like my colleague from Iowa who has just spoken, I travel Iowa as well, and in holding my county meetings and visiting with employers and employees—not just these last 2 weeks that we have been in recess, but all year—I have been hearing all of what Senator ERNST has referred to, that people are afraid of inflation and a lot of people are old enough to remember the 12- to 15-percent inflation we had during the mid-1970s to the early 1980s. We don't want to repeat that.

Traveling Iowa, it is always refreshing to hear directly from my constituents because, as I often say, Washington is an island surrounded by reality. The Midwest seems to be the real America compared to what we know here in Washington, DC, where everything that dominates the economy is affected by government—and very Big Government.

There is no better example of this than how the Biden administration and Washington elites talk about inflation and rising prices. To them, inflation is transitory or the result of base effects, and those words “transitory” and “base effects” are used to justify this inflation. Really something not to worry about, I think, is the impression they want to leave us with.

To the Iowans I spoke with, inflation is real and persistent, as Senator ERNST has so colorfully shown. I heard concerns from my constituents about inflation wherever I went. And why? Because it is affecting people's lives right now.

I heard about how inflation was cutting into families' budgets, making it hard to make ends meet. I heard how prices in grocery staples, such as milk, meat, fruit, vegetables, are on the rise, along with all manner of household goods.

Yet the President and his top economic advisers say inflation is nothing to worry about, or as the President's Treasury Secretary put it, “I don't think there's going to be an inflationary problem. But if there is, the Fed will be counted on to address it.” They shouldn't be so nonchalant about it. As we know from the 1970s, once inflation takes off, getting it back under control can require very painful measures.

They should take the advice of former Clinton Treasury Secretary Summers. He recently stated, “The Fed has had almost no success gently bringing down inflation once an economy has started to overheat.”

Notice that word “gently” because everybody thinks this is going to just occur very easily, getting it under control, but we remember the results of the 1970s, early eighties. It took Paul Volcker to take a sledgehammer through the policies of the Federal Reserve to bring down interest rates.

And a lot of farmers in Iowa lost their farms when they were borrowing on that inflation, trusting the government that there was no problem, and then we have just farmers going out of business because Volcker used a sledgehammer, and he probably had to use it because there wasn't a gentle way of doing it. Unfortunately, instead of taking inflation seriously, the current administration appears intent on stoking its flames, pouring gasoline on the inflation fire.

In his budget, the President proposes government spending and debt at levels previously only seen temporarily during war or economic recession. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and economists surveyed by the Wall Street Journal both recently raised their inflation expectations. CBO raised its inflation projections because “output now exceeds its potential level sooner and by a larger amount than previously anticipated.”

Output exceeding its potential is economic speak for the economy is starting to overheat. Consumer price data released yesterday shows inflation heating up. In June, prices climbed 5.4 percent over the prior year compared to 5 percent in May. Moreover, core inflation, which omits volatile food and energy goods, rose at the highest rate in 29 years.

The trillions of dollars in new spending proposed by the President could set inflation ablaze. If that occurs, it is not going to be the wealthy and the Wall Street elites that pay the price. The average hard-working American living paycheck to paycheck, and particularly tough on the retiree on fixed incomes, those are the people that are going to pay more and get less for paying more. The President would be well served to listen more to everyday Americans about how rising prices are affecting their lives today.

President Biden might then realize pursuing another multitrillion-dollar spending spree isn't worth the risk. It could fan the flames of inflation and devastate the livelihoods of average Americans.

It is incumbent upon the President and the Congress to avert catastrophe by pursuing responsible fiscal policies. We can't just expect the Federal Reserve to clean up our mess if we act irresponsibly by spending another \$4 trillion. By that time, it could already be too late, waiting on the Fed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, what the senior Senator from Iowa just said is exactly right, and unfortunately, the Biden inflation tax increase is real, and it is already here.

We warned about it earlier this year when our friends on the Democratic side decided to spend almost \$2 trillion that was unnecessary, and here it is. Just the other day, consumer prices increased by 5.4 percent. This represents the largest year over year price surge since 2008. It is a tax increase on every American consumer.

And then today, even worse news, the producer price increased 7.3 percent. We are in an inflation problem. It is caused by this unnecessary spending spree that we have been on this year. We have known about it—now, we see the statistics—because we felt it at home.

And the senior Senator from Iowa mentioned what he was hearing during the break. Mississippians are paying more for a tank of gas, for a gallon of milk. They are paying more for a new home, for a used car. Used car prices have shot up by 10 percent since May and by 45 percent since June of last year—used cars, up by 45 percent. That is real inflation, and it affects real working Americans.

The hard reality is that our economy is now saturated with a tsunami of spending unleashed by the Democratic majority back in March, when party leaders abandoned what has been a balanced and bipartisan approach in the year 2020 to COVID relief. I would remind my colleagues that in February, the Congressional Budget Office had predicted our economy was already going to return to its prepandemic size by midyear without the spending of a new \$2 trillion.

As the senior Senator from Iowa mentioned, Larry Summers, a longtime Democratic adviser, an adviser to President Obama, warned that more stimulus could overheat the economy and cause inflation. And more spending came and the economy got overheated, and we are faced with real statistics about inflation that cannot be denied.

Our Democratic friends brushed off that warning and instead pumped trillions more of borrowed money into our economy. Our Nation's money supply has increased by an unheard of 31 percent since the pandemic. Now, some of it, we had to do in the year 2020, when the economy had fallen off a cliff, but we are halfway through 2021, the Fed is still printing cash, and the majority party in this body seems intent on spending trillions more.

As a result, inflation is now eating away at family earnings, at bank accounts, at 401(k) savings accounts, most of which are shrinking as a share of the economy. Loss of purchasing power is making it harder for Americans to buy a home, start a family, or send their children to college. All of this should serve as a caution to all of us, to our friends on the other side of the aisle. This week's Consumer Price Index and today's Producer Price Index information are an early alarm bell signaling that this Congress and the Biden administration are courting runaway inflation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, if I might, I ask unanimous consent that Senators MARSHALL, SCOTT of Florida, and MURRAY be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, this past week, we held 12 townhalls back home in my home State of Kansas. We heard from Kansans about a variety of issues, but thanks to this administration's economic policies, runaway inflation has replaced COVID at the top of the mountain of concerns for the people from my State.

Make no mistake about it—the inflation harming checking accounts of Kansans and all Americans rests squarely on the shoulders of the socialist economic policies coming out of the White House, otherwise known as Bidenomics.

As we all know, yesterday, the Department of Labor reported consumer prices climbed for the third straight month, jumping over 5 percent in June—the largest increase in 13 years. Gas prices are up, groceries are up, cars and truck prices are up, home prices are up, paper products are up, utilities are up, and I could go on and on.

Every day, we see the Bidenomics of inflation impacting hard-working Americans. In fact, inflation is a great social injustice. Inflation is really a regressive tax. It hurts everyone but none more than our seniors and young, hard-working families living paycheck to paycheck.

So what exactly is Bidenomics? Let's look at what they did to create this crisis. Stating the obvious, they are printing money, borrowing money we don't have, and implementing quantitative easing like there is no tomorrow, like there are no generations of America for our future.

Look no further than the cost of utilities. The administration has made it hard to use affordable, clean, traditional energy, and they leveled more and more regulations on the industry.

Manufactured products? Ditto. Bidenomics is paying people more to stay at home than go to work, creating labor shortages and government-created bottlenecks in manufacturing plants. And then, to top things off, we don't even have enough truckdrivers to transport goods to market.

As for gasoline, I bring your attention, which is up 31 percent since January, and according to AAA, it is expected to rise another 20 cents this summer.

Let's think about what all the administration has done. They shut down the Keystone XL. They stopped drilling on government lands and imposed harmful rules and regulations to slow down drilling and make it more expensive. We are now importing more oil from Russia than Alaska.

As a physician in rural Kansas, I had the privilege of delivering a baby most

every day, and one thing I always noticed, when that price of gasoline got above \$3 a gallon, all of a sudden, those moms were missing their appointments. Today, we are at that number, and we are expecting it to go even higher, unfortunately. Kansans aren't the only ones feeling the squeeze at the pump.

Many popular items we all regularly purchase at the grocery store increased in recent months. The cost of a typical all-American Kansas breakfast—two eggs, bacon, hash browns, toast, and orange juice—is up almost 10 percent.

Pre-COVID, we had the greatest economy in my lifetime, and that came about because we lowered people's taxes, we lowered regulations, and we lowered energy prices. Now, out-of-control spending and socialist policies dictated by the White House are leading to rampant inflation that shows no signs of stopping.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, America is in a debt crisis because of reckless government spending. Now, thanks to the insane spending and failed policies of President Joe Biden and Democrats in Washington, we are seeing higher and higher inflation.

Under the Biden administration, inflation has grown every month. Just look at this week's CPI numbers. From June 2020 to June 2021, the Consumer Price Index rose 5.4 percent. Energy costs are up 24.5 percent, and gasoline prices are up 45 percent—nearly \$1 more from where they were last year. Inflation is at the highest rate since the great recession. This week's Producer Price Index data shows a 7.3-percent increase in June and a historic 22.6-percent jump in the prices of processed goods, the highest since 1975. For 6 straight months, we have seen the data clearly shows that spending beyond our means has consequences. Inflation is growing at the fastest rate since 1981.

These aren't just numbers or statistics; these increases represent a growing pressure on Florida families and businesses. Every time prices rise, life gets harder.

Last month, I met with business owners in Miami and heard firsthand how their businesses were struggling with the rising price of goods. Every time I am home in Florida, I hear from families who are noticing prices are up, gas prices are up, and food prices are up. Every price increase has a direct impact on a family's budget.

When inflation goes up, it hurts everyone, especially our poor families, those on fixed incomes, and small businesses. I saw how hard it was for my parents to make ends meet when inflation hit in the seventies. When food and gas prices went up, we had less food on the table.

I remember going to the grocery store, when my mom took in ironing to

raise money every day for groceries, and she said: You have to look at the price of things because they are constantly going up.

That is happening again in Joe Biden's America. Families in Florida and across our Nation are suffering because of the Democrats' reckless spending spree led by Joe Biden.

Just take a look around. Average prices of everything—everything is up. Let's say families are filling up their tank once a week. If you drive a car, that means Joe Biden raised your expenses \$600 a year. If you drive a truck, that means Joe Biden raised your expenses by more than \$1,000 a year. And let's remember, half of Americans make less than \$35,000 a year. Inflation is a new tax on our families.

Instead of addressing this crisis that has hurt Americans, Biden and the Democrats are living in an economic fantasyland where debt doesn't matter, spending has no consequences, and inflation is impossible. They are ignoring the fact that our Nation is barreling towards \$30 trillion in debt. That is \$233,000 in debt for every family in America.

Now Democrats in the Senate want to spend another \$4 trillion of your money on a so-called infrastructure plan that has little to do with infrastructure. They don't care if Americans get a return on their hard-earned tax dollars.

But the truth is, we can't keep spending like this. There will be a day of reckoning coming if we don't act to get our fiscal house in order. That is why I have introduced legislation, the Federal Debt Emergency Control Act, to take real steps to rein in Washington's out-of-control spending. That includes preventing Biden and the Democrats from mindlessly spending by requiring that two-thirds of the Senate vote to increase the debt before approving any bill with deficit spending.

It would terminate any unobligated funding from the American Rescue Plan and any previous stimulus bills, sending it back to the Treasury General Fund for deficit reduction.

Finally, it would ensure that any bill reducing the debt by at least 5 percent over 10 years is fast-tracked through the legislative process.

We are in a debt crisis. This isn't monopoly money; it is Americans' money, and we have to be responsible with it. It is time to end the madness, and it is time to stand up for low- and fixed-income families and for small businesses that bear the brunt of President Biden's inflation crisis. With the debt ceiling suspension expiring on July 31, we must tackle these issues head-on and chart a new and fiscally responsible path forward that protects families and our Nation's financial security.

I look forward to every fiscally responsible Republican and Democrat working with me to reject Biden's insane spending spree, quickly pass my bill, and protect the future of this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the Nanda nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Liang nomination at 5:30 today and the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the Liang and Remy nominations in the order listed; further, I ask that the cloture motion on the Cunningham nomination ripen upon disposition of the Remy nomination.

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

NOMINATION OF JOCELYN SAMUELS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I was proud to vote to confirm Jocelyn Samuels to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission last year when she was confirmed in a bipartisan vote, and I am proud to do so again.

The EEOC has a critical role to play in protecting workers' rights and addressing inequities in our economy which disproportionately disadvantage women, people of color, people with disabilities, and more. For example, it is responsible for enforcing discrimination and harassment laws and works to address the gender pay gap.

Workers need a champion in the EEOC fighting for them, and Ms. Samuels has proven over her nearly two decades of experience with the Federal Government and her recent service as a Commissioner of the EEOC that she is that champion.

From pushing to pass the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act as vice president of education and employment at the National Women's Law Center to leading civil rights efforts at the Department of Justice and Department of Health and Human Services, to working as a staffer on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and a senior attorney at the EEOC, she has spent her career working to address discrimination and ensure no one is treated unfairly because of their age, sex, including sexual orientation and gender identity, race, religion, or disability.

I was pleased to see her nomination advanced out of our HELP Committee with bipartisan support, and I hope to see similar bipartisan support for her final confirmation.

NOMINATION OF SEEMA NANDA

Madam President, I would also like to urge my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm Seema Nanda as Solicitor for the Department of Labor—another nominee who was advanced from the HELP Committee on a bipartisan vote.

Ms. Nanda has served in the Department of Labor previously as Deputy Chief of Staff, Deputy Solicitor of Labor, and Chief of Staff. She previously served as a career attorney in the Department of Justice, where she fought to defend immigrant workers from discrimination and held employers accountable for unfair hiring prac-

tices. She has proven herself to be an excellent choice for this important role.

We take some hard votes in this Chamber. These should not be among them. Workers are the backbone of our economy, and that means every one of us should be fighting for them and voting to confirm Commissioner Samuels and Ms. Nanda, who will fight for them as well.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON SAMUELS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Samuels nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hooven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NANDA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nanda nomination?

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Rounds
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Liang nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of J. Nellie Liang, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE BUILDING COLLAPSE IN SURFSIDE, FLORIDA, ON JUNE 24, 2021, AND THE BRAVERY AND SELFLESS SERVICE OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO RESPONDED TO THE BUILDING COLLAPSE

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague Senator RUBIO for joining me to honor the lives lost in the horrific tragedy on June 24, when the Champlain Towers South condo building in Surfside, FL, suddenly collapsed in the middle of the night, and honor the brave men and women that have risked their lives in search, rescue, and recovery efforts.

Senator RUBIO and I were on the ground in Surfside following the collapse, talking to families, first responders, and members of the community. The pain these families are experiencing is unimaginable. Those unexpectedly lost in this horrific tragedy were mothers, fathers, grandfathers and grandmothers, friends, aunts, uncles, and cousins. They were children and grandchildren with their full lives ahead of them.

I can't imagine losing any member of my family like this, but the thought of losing one of my grandchildren is too painful to imagine. We mourn with these families, and our hearts break for them. We continue to pray for the Surfside community, the families and loved ones of those lost, and all of those working tirelessly to serve the Surfside community.

In the face of tremendous tragedy, our first responders ran into the danger. They are heroes. They immediately answered the call to serve, and firefighters, law enforcement officers, rescue and recovery crews, emergency medical technicians, physicians, nurses, and others from across the State of Florida and the Nation came rushing to save them.

When you meet with the first responders—I mean, they are working tirelessly trying to find somebody that has survived, and your heart goes out to them as they went from rescue to recovery. Miami-Dade Fire Rescue, the Miami-Dade Police Department, the Surfside Police Department, and others from around the area were there every step of the way.

Some of these responders lost family in the collapse; yet they still answered the call. We heard the absolutely devastating story of a Miami-Dade firefighter who carried the body of his own 7-year-old daughter, Stella, away from the rubble. You just can't even begin to imagine the pain and loss experienced by this father.

International rescue crews and emergency support organizations from Israel and Mexico also responded to the site to aid in the search and rescue efforts. Numerous volunteer organizations responded, including the Red Cross, as well as community leaders and individuals offering resources, support, and comfort to the survivors and community in Surfside.

Our Jewish community, particularly Orthodox Jews, have been especially affected by this tragedy, and we thank CSE, Hatzalah, ZAKA, and all those who have worked selflessly to support our Jewish community. We can never thank these brave men and women enough for their bravery and determination in the face of this terrible tragedy.

I know right now we all have a lot of unanswered questions. We are all going to work tirelessly to understand exactly what happened. And while we can't bring back the lives lost, I will always work to honor those lost and will be relentless in the search for an-

swers to make sure a tragedy like this never happens again.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 300, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 300) honoring the memories of the victims of the building collapse in Surfside, Florida, on June 24, 2021, and the bravery and selfless service of the individuals who responded to the building collapse.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that 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. 300) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I appreciate the unanimous support of my Senate colleagues passing this resolution to honor the lives lost in the horrific tragedy in Surfside, and I thank the many first responders for their incredible bravery in the search and rescue and recovery efforts.

Our hearts are broken, but we stand together. Florida is "Surfside Strong."

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my colleagues, it is not a coincidence that in 2020, gun sales in this country spiked by 40 percent. It is an extraordinary increase in gun sales. And homicides in this country increased by 30 percent. Violent crime is increasing in the country. You can't miss that if you turn on the news at night.

And there can be no doubt that our Nation's gun laws—the loosest and most loophole-ridden in the Nation—are a primary contributor to this spike in gun crime.

I want to spend just a few minutes this afternoon making sure that all of my colleagues understand that if we want to do something about violent crime in this country, then you cannot continue to close your eyes to the fact that we are allowing criminals all across this country to traffic dangerous weapons that are being used in gun homicides.

First, let's burst the bubble of the gun lobby. Their primary argument is that more guns keep people safer. Well,

that is not true. It has never ever been true. Study after study tells you what your common sense should already tell you. In fact, one study makes it very plain. On a nearly one-for-one basis, the more guns you have in your community, the more crime you are going to have.

One study said this. What they found was that for communities that saw a 1-percent increase in gun ownership—guess what they also saw. A corresponding 1-percent increase in gun homicides. Thus, it should surprise no one that as the number of guns increase in this country, the number of gun crimes increase in this country.

Now, there are a lot of reasons for that. But, again, you don't have to surge deep into the data to understand why. Let me give you just one example.

A family I am pretty close to in Hartford, CT, a young man named Shane Oliver was shot years ago right down the street from where I live in the capital city. And he was in an argument with some young men about things they said about his girlfriend, who happened to be with him. It just so happened that there was an illegal gun sitting in the front seat of one of these cars. An argument over a girl that in any other high-income nation in the world would have, at worst, resulted in some punches being thrown. In this neighborhood in Hartford, CT, it resulted in a gun homicide.

Shane Oliver doesn't live on this Earth any longer. He was taken from his parents, Pastor Sam Saylor and his wife Janet, when he was 20 years old because there was an illegal gun that just happened to be sitting in the front seat of a car. In almost any other country in the world, there is not a gun sitting in the front seat of another 20-year-old's car in the middle of Hartford, CT. Access to guns means more gun crime.

But here is the other problem. We know there has been a 40-percent increase in gun sales. But those aren't just the sales that are reported to the criminal background check system. What we know is that somewhere around 20, 30 percent of all gun sales in this country don't happen with a background check attached to it. Those are gun sales that very often are going straight to criminals and straight to gun traffickers.

So if there has been a 40-percent increase in background check transfers, there has likely also been a 40-percent increase in the number of guns that have been transferred to criminals and transferred to gun traffickers, the people who are selling them to the folks who are going to use them in gun violence.

Here is a study out of New York. The New York AG's office recently reviewed aggregate gun trace information for about 5 years, and what they found was that 74 percent of the recovered guns in New York—normally recovered because they were used in a crime—came with a known source

State that wasn't New York. That is interesting, right?

Three-quarters of the guns that are being used in crimes in New York aren't being bought in New York. There is a reason for that. You have to go through a background check in New York if you want to buy a gun. And if you are a criminal, you can't get a gun in New York at a gun store because they have background checks and because they don't have internet sales or gun show sales without background checks either.

What the AG's office also found was that half of the guns that came from outside of New York came from six States—all six States with really weak gun laws—meaning there is this very intentional iron pipeline of guns in this country coming from States with no universal background checks, places where gun traffickers can go and buy guns at gun shows or online, and then bring them to States like New York or Connecticut or New Jersey and sell them on the black market.

And what we also know is that there is a really short period of time between when these guns are being purchased and when they are being used in crimes, which shows an intentionality, which shows a very clear commercial market around the purchase of guns in places without background checks, the sale of those guns to potentially violent individuals, and the commission of crimes.

Of the 1 million crime guns that were traced in this country between 2015 and 2019, more than one-third were used in a crime within just 3 years of their initial retail sale. This short time-to-crime timeline is a strong indication that these guns were purchased with the intent to divert them for criminal use.

So every year that goes by that we choose, as a Congress, to not close these loopholes, to not simply say that if you are going to buy a gun on a commercial market in the United States, you just have to prove you are not a gun trafficker, is another year that we essentially endorse and facilitate the murder of thousands and thousands of Americans.

And there is a clear connection between this increase in gun sales and this increase in criminal activity. Why? Because along with those legal gun sales come all sorts of gun sales that do an end around on the background check system.

Now, thank goodness President Biden is doing something about this because there is a new loophole that criminals are taking advantage of, the ghost gun loophole. In California, today, 30 percent of the confiscated guns are unserialized. Think of that. Thirty percent of the guns being confiscated in California today by the ATF have no serial number on them. That is largely because of this new phenomena of ghost guns that are assembled from a kit, not guns that are purchased at a store.

In Connecticut, a convicted felon who couldn't have bought a gun at a gun store in Connecticut because he is a convicted felon used a ghost gun to shoot his girlfriend's 15-year-old daughter and 16-year-old son before turning the gun on himself. People who know they can't buy guns in gun stores or online in a place like Connecticut that has universal background checks are now assembling ghost guns and committing crimes.

The Biden administration is taking action, but so should we. I come to the floor to share this with my colleagues because our constituents are concerned about the rising rate of gun homicides in this Nation. They expect us to do something about it. And I am not saying that there is only one solution. I am not saying that changing our gun laws is the only step that we should take to try to do something about the rising rates of gun homicides in this country. There is a longer story as to why people have become so desperate as to resort to gun violence in order to mediate disputes or to project power.

But the prevalence of so many more guns in our country today than just a year ago, the prevalence of so many more illegal guns due to intentional choices made by this body is a big part of the story. And I hope that we will be able to bring before this body bipartisan legislation that will close those background check loopholes very soon to give this body a chance to do something about the rising rates of gun violence in this country.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM VANDEN HEUVEL

Mr. President, last month, the Nation lost a great patriot, and I lost a great friend, William vanden Heuvel, and I come to the floor today to honor his impressive legacy.

Bill vanden Heuvel grew up in a working-class family during the Great Depression, and his call to public service came early in his life. As a child, he listened to President Roosevelt's fireside chats, and he became obsessed with the idea that regular people can band together and build a just and compassionate country.

So upon learning of FDR's death, Bill hitchhiked alone to the Roosevelt estate to try to attend the funeral. He was 14 years old. Now, he was unsurprisingly, initially, turned away, but somehow he found his way to Eleanor Roosevelt, who was so impressed with the young man's passion for her husband's legacy that she welcomed the 14-year-old in.

In many ways, it is a story that is emblematic of Bill's life. He grew close to several prominent American leaders—from the Kennedys to Jimmy Carter—to diplomats and officials the world over—not by accident or thanks to any privilege that he was born into, but just because of his effectiveness; his tenacity; and his unbridled, infectious, contagious love for his country.

As a young attorney in the Kennedy Justice Department, Bill was given a really difficult task: help integrate

Prince Edward County, which at the time was blatantly flouting *Brown v. Board of Education* requirements. Robert Kennedy, then-Attorney General, personally tracked Bill's work, noticed his record of success in integrating Maryland's schools, and the two became close friends.

There was another leader, Jimmy Carter, who had asked Bill to represent America abroad as Ambassador to the European Office of the United Nations, which kicked off Bill's storied diplomatic career. His diplomatic accomplishments are too long to go through in one speech, but through his work, he became a vocal and prominent advocate for the United Nations and the work that it does to address pressing global issues.

Bill also remained committed to solving problems at home. He was a renaissance man, a true polymath, and a staunch civil rights advocate. For years, he helped lead the charge in New York City to reform its prisons. He became a crusader in the city. He tackled the squalid conditions of confinement, and he feared no one in his efforts to speak for the voiceless and make sure that even the most hardened criminals were treated like human beings. It is a big part of his legacy as well.

And in his later life, when I got to know him, he returned to his first love. Bill vanden Heuvel started and led the Franklin Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, and he championed the long fight to establish the Four Freedoms Park on Roosevelt Island. That park will stand forever as a testament to both the majesty of Franklin Roosevelt and the patriotism of Bill vanden Heuvel.

Finally, though an obituary of a great man like Bill is filled with public accomplishment, for his friends and family, it is his private accomplishment which defined his true greatness. His wife Melinda and his daughters, Katrina and Wendy, and his stepchildren, Ashley and John, know him as a kind and loving husband and father. And the literally thousands of young public servants and reformers and diplomats that he mentored over the years, they are grateful for the time he took to midwife the hopes and dreams of others.

I am one of these people. Bill took me under his wing early in my public service career. It is his advice I turned to over and over, especially in my early years in Congress, as I set my own course and picked my own battles. So, above all, Bill's family and friends will miss him dearly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, first I want to recognize my colleague from Connecticut, his moving tribute to a great American, and also thank him for his steadfast leadership on issues of gun safety in this country.

I am standing here with my colleagues today to talk about what is

going on in this country around empowering children. We have a big thing happening tomorrow with the vast majority of families with kids across the country.

As of tomorrow, they will start seeing more money in their bank accounts every year for the rest of the year. These payments are the result of changes that we have made to the child tax credit, which was signed into law by President Biden as part of the American Rescue Plan because of the changes we advocated for.

What President Biden made law, more families and children are going to benefit from the child tax credit. More than ever before in history, in fact, this will be the greatest cut in overall child poverty in the history of America for this coming year.

So starting tomorrow, 90 percent of kids in America—90 percent of their families across the country—will start to see these payments for the rest of this year, up to \$300 for every child in a household under 6 and \$250 for every child in the household ages 6 through 17. For families in suburbs and cities and rural areas, for families across the country, this policy is transformative.

For the family of people with essential workers in Florida, the grandmother raising three children in California, a single mom in Pennsylvania working the same job for 20 years, for a parent in Utah—you can go on and on and on—this is one of the most transformative policy changes made in our Nation in more than a century.

This policy means stability. It means help is on the way. It means hope is here.

In my home State, Margarita from Passaic, NJ, who is raising three kids on her own while working two jobs, one before sunrise, starting tomorrow, she will see hundreds of dollars a month to help her pay the electric bill, help her make rent, and help her children succeed in school.

For the family of two educators with kids in New York, tomorrow is transformative. Washington State, North Dakota, blue State, so-called red State—all over this country, we are seeing a transformation.

This is what a mom from Kansas said:

[This child tax credit] would help so much for single moms like me to be able to feel secure as a parent. If at any time something were to happen to me, such as a car repair, a doctor visit, even a book fair for my children, I am just not making enough to have any extra for anything other than bills. Shoes and coats, maybe a ball glove. Karate or dance lessons to improve social skills and athletic abilities and teach children teamwork would be possible; [and] maybe even at Christmas since they didn't get one in 2020.

For middle-class families trying to stay afloat, lower income families desperate to make ends meet, and families living in poverty struggling to put food on the table, tomorrow is a new start. For millions of Americans across the country, from this body, our President, tomorrow will begin a historically unparalleled moment.

Senator BROWN, Senator BENNET, Senator WARNOCK, and I, along with our House colleagues, are going to continue to do what must be done. This change for this year—cutting child poverty, empowering millions of families, 90 percent of whom with kids will see a benefit—we must make this permanent. I will fight alongside my colleagues to see that this is not a one-time benefit for 1 year but a permanent change that we—change our status. We are the 36th wealthiest Nation on the planet, and we are 4th from the bottom in child poverty. We are second to last in terms of child allowances. We in America have to make this country live up to its promise to every child that we are the cornerstone of the idea of the American dream; that we are the most fertile soil for which a child could thrive; that we love our children not just in words but in the policies we make. This is a historic moment.

The one thing I will say to anyone listening to my words, because, as my colleague knows, some families are eligible but might not benefit, please, we need to make sure that portal—that people know to go to childtaxcredit.gov to get the information. All of us have an obligation to help everyone avail themselves of this policy. I believe, God willing, we will make it permanent.

I now turn to my colleague Senator BENNET from Colorado, Mr. President, with your permission.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, we are all here today—I want to say on this floor how much I love my colleagues from New Jersey and from Ohio who are here with me today on the floor to celebrate this incredibly important milestone.

I love you for your commitment to the country and for your commitment to our kids.

I want to wish your brother well because I know that he is recovering from his stroke, and you are still taking time to be here on the floor to make sure that people who need it the most hear about this tax credit. I want to thank you for that.

I have heard the Senator from Ohio, just like the Senator from New Jersey, talk about the lives of real people in their States. I have sat in the chair where the Presiding Officer is, listening to Senator BROWN talk about families in Ashtabula or Zanesville or Dayton or Cleveland or Cincinnati or Toledo and what the policies that we pass in this body either—you know, the difference they make or very often the difference they don't make to real people at home, to the people you work for and represent in Newark.

I think about a mom, I say to my colleague from Colorado, the Presiding Officer, a mom in Rifle, CO, who was in an early childhood center there, and she was so happy to be there. The other

moms were happy to be there, too, because until they had that early childhood center, they had to drive 30 miles to Glenwood Canyon to get to Glenwood Springs to put their kid in daycare so they could work, and now they could actually have it in their community. What she said to me was this: I work so I can have health insurance. Every single dollar I make goes to pay for this early childhood center so I can work.

It is that triangle that so many Americans are caught in because we have had an economy that for 50 years has worked really well for the top 10 percent and not for anybody else in America. For too long, it seemed like Washington wasn't paying any attention to that. I mean, what was our solution to that? To spend \$5.6 trillion on two wars in the Middle East that lasted for 20 years? To come to this floor to cut taxes not for working people, not for the people who needed it, but for the wealthiest people in the country at a time when our income inequality was higher than it was at any time since before the Great Depression? It made no sense.

It was like if the mayor of Denver—who the Presiding Officer used to be, so let's just imagine that for a second—it is as if the mayor of Denver said to the people of Denver: We are going to borrow more money than we have ever borrowed.

I would say, as a concerned citizen of Denver, to the mayor: That worries me. I would like to know what you are spending it on. Are you spending it on parks?

Nope.

Mental health services? We certainly need those.

Nope.

Homeless?

Nope.

Our roads and our bridges?

No.

Schools?

No.

You are borrowing all this money. What are you spending it on?

The mayor would have said: Well, I am going to give the money we are borrowing to the two richest neighborhoods in Denver and expect that somehow it is going to trickle down to everybody else.

That sounds crazy, but that was the Bush tax policy. That is the Trump tax policy, sixty-five percent of that bill for what he called the middle class going to the top 5 percent in America. That is why this is such a new day.

I have said on this floor before that it is long past time that we started treating America's children like they are our children and that we wouldn't accept the conditions so many kids live in unless we thought they were someone else's children.

This country, as the Senator from New Jersey has said before, is 38 out of 41 industrialized countries in terms of childhood poverty. In other words, we have the 38th worst childhood poverty

in the industrialized world. Only three countries are worse than we are. The poorest population in America? Our children. And we have some of the lowest economic mobility of any country in the industrialized world. We tell ourselves we are the land of opportunity, but we haven't looked like that for a very long time, and the policies that have been passed here haven't helped. That is where the child tax credit comes into being.

We increased it to \$3,000, \$3,600 for kids under the age of 6. We made it fully refundable so the poorest kids, the millions of poor kids who have never benefited from the tax credit before because their parents made too little money, now have the benefit of it, and it is going to be paid out starting tomorrow on a monthly basis. So when families are making decisions about how to pay the rent, put a little food on the table, buy a few hours of daycare so that they can stay at work and earn a living, they will be able to do it. So they can work, as the Senator from Ohio so eloquently said, with dignity.

In my view, this should be just the beginning of creating an economy that, when it grows, grows for everybody, not just for the people at the very top. It strengthens our democracy by giving everybody a sense that they have a real stake in the economy and that their kids are going to be able to live a brighter life than the life they live. That is what it is supposed to be in America.

I am grateful to stand here today with my two colleagues and with the Presiding Officer to say that finally, finally, with this President, we are treating America's children like they are America's children, and we don't have to accept chronic childhood poverty as a chronic feature of our economy or our democracy. We can have an ambition that is greater than that for our country and for our children, and we can say to our kids: You are important to us. In some ways, you are all that matter to us, and the position we put you in to be able to get an education and contribute to society and help lead the country, participate in our economy, in our democracy, that is our priority, and that is what we care about.

I think that is President Biden's priority, and he has reflected it incredibly well in this policy.

I will turn it over to the Senator from Ohio just by saying that now we have to do the very hard and important work of making this a permanent part of our Tax Code so that we cut childhood poverty permanently in half in this country. I would like us to end childhood poverty in the United States. I think that would be a very worthy aspiration for all of us to have.

With that, I yield the floor to my wonderful colleague from Ohio, who has been an incredible leader on this from even before I was in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. MICHAEL BENNET, thank you. You said this is a new day. I loved how you set that up. The mayor of Denver gets a tax cut or at least pours money into the richest neighborhoods in Denver, expecting that to trickle down or trickle out to help other neighborhoods and other people. It obviously doesn't work that way any more than the—I was going to say the Bush tax cut, but it has been their playbook for years. Whenever they get a majority, they give a tax cut to rich people, arguing it will trickle down. It never does. Senator BOOKER has been so articulate about that. As you say, Senator BENNET, it is a new day for this country.

I think the three of us think—and I think that Senator HICKENLOOPER, the Presiding Officer, has thought this, as have most Members of the Senate—that this is perhaps the most important thing we have done in this Senate in 25 years.

Tomorrow, parents across the country will check their bank accounts. Not all of them are going to know what CORY BOOKER, MICHAEL BENNET, and all of us did, but they are going to see, most importantly in many ways—maybe my religious faith teaches me this. It is almost better that these people have these—they get these checks in Cleveland and Akron and Mansfield, and they have no idea how they got them. They didn't know I had anything to do it as their Senator; they just know their lives are better.

Families will see \$250 or \$300 direct-deposited into their accounts every month for the next 6 months, and then they get the rest of the year in a lump sum. Then, as Senator BENNET and Senator BOOKER said, it is up to us to make this permanent.

In my State, 92 percent of the kids in the State are eligible. We have a great majority—at least, we think, 90 percent of them will see these checks this week either in their bank account or in their mailbox. We have to make sure we get the other children who are eligible. Their parents may not have filed a tax return, and those families need to go to [childtaxcredit.gov](https://www.irs.gov/childtaxcredit) to make sure they get this benefit.

Even before this pandemic, we all know hard work wasn't paying off for millions of workers. We have seen in the last 20 years that productivity has gone up. Corporate profits have exploded. CEO pay has soared almost unimaginably. Yet wages have essentially been flat. That has gone on for decades even though the cost of everything is up, especially the cost of raising children.

Our child tax credit recognizes the fact that raising children is work. It happens to be the most—maybe it is not compensated the same way, but it happens to be the most important work any family can do. But from childcare to health insurance, to transportation, we have seen that a hard day's work doesn't begin to cover expenses for so many parents, and even middle-class families don't feel stable.

As a result, 2 weeks ago, we were out of session, and I spent the week in Fremont, in Defiance, in Cleveland, and in Columbus, Dayton, Cincinnati, Youngstown, and Toledo talking to people about the child tax credit. The stories I heard from people—these were mostly parents who will benefit. These are some community activists whose kids may have been grown or don't have kids. But the stories I heard, things like—Senator BENNET and I had a discussion with people from Denver and Cleveland one day on Zoom a couple weeks ago, too, and we heard over and over that parents were saying: Every month we just have to figure out, during the last week of the month, how are we going to pay our rent.

Now those families will have a little more comfort in knowing and less anxiety knowing they will be able to make their rent payment.

I heard a number of parents say: Well, now I can send my son, for the first time, to scout camp or to day camp during the summer. Other parents said: I don't have to choose between the food we need to buy and buying diapers. I don't have to reuse diapers.

All the kinds of stories, we heard. People were saying: I don't have to work that second job and be away at night. I can get daycare on my regular job and get the benefits and have a little money so that I can do these things.

And the stories are as limitless as the number of people who are involved.

And maybe the best part of this—and MICHAEL and CORY and I have talked about it. Maybe the best part of this is we have SNAP benefits. We know that is important for hungry families. We know the hungry people and the children especially. We do the rental assistance, emergency rental. We know how important that is. But these dollars—this \$250 or \$300 a month, it goes to families, and they make the decision about what they need. I don't make it.

The senior Senator or the junior Senator—even though the junior Senator is older, right, than the senior Senator? I am confused.

But the Senators from Colorado don't make the decision. The Senator from New Jersey and I don't make the decision. These decisions are made by the mothers and fathers who go to their mailbox and get this check or see it in their direct payment.

So we know that this is not just good for those families. It means dollars in their pockets. It means they can make decisions they couldn't have made. It means they can build a foundation for their own children to have more opportunity—all of that. But this is also really good for the community. It means more dollars are spent at local restaurants, more dollars are spent at local stores. So that is an important part of this, too, that it will help to lift up our economy.

Families aren't putting this money in a Swiss bank account, unlike the tax

cuts that Senator BENNET talked about with the Trump tax cuts that every Republican supported, virtually, and that blew a hole in the budget. That money was put in Swiss bank accounts. It doesn't trickle down. This money is spent in the community.

This is how we grow the economy. This is how we invest in the people who make it work. We don't shovel tax cuts to the very top and hope it trickles down. We know it never does. With these tax credits, we show parents and workers: We are on your side.

We won't stop fighting until these tax credits are permanent. Senators BOOKER and BENNET have talked passionately and persuasively about that.

I would add a couple other thanks here. Two of my staff are sitting in the back of this hall, Katie Mulhall and Chad Bolt, who have made this tax, working with Senator BENNET's and Senator BOOKER's and Senator WARNOCK's staff—in making these tax cuts to reduce the poverty rate and making this happen this session with President Biden's active support.

I also would call out two staff people, one of whom is still in the office and one who is now working in the House of Representatives, Jeremy Hekhuis and Gideon Bragin, who began work on this in 2013, when we first started working with ROSA DELAURO and the work that she had done. I thank all of them for making this happen.

I especially thank my colleagues from Colorado and Georgia and New Jersey. We keep fighting to give these families the peace of mind that these tax credits will be there for them up until their children are 18 so they can raise their kids with a little less anxiety and a little more comfort and a whole lot more opportunity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I just was so inspired by—I am only going to be 1 minute—something Senator BROWN said in his remarks about his staff that I also want to mention Charlie Anderson, who is no longer with me because he quit me to go work for the administration. But if it hadn't been for him, I would be very surprised if we would all be here today. So I wanted to say thank you to Charlie for never giving up on this and for holding me accountable as we did the work together.

I also am not going to address the issue about junior versus senior Senators from Colorado, just to observe what a wonderful delegation it is we have from the State of Colorado.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

NOMINATION OF DAVID H. CHIPMAN

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to oppose the confirmation of David Chipman, President Biden's nominee for Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

Many Hoosiers are concerned about the nomination of Mr. Chipman, and

rightfully so. His statements have made one thing clear: If confirmed, he will fail to uphold the constitutional right to bear arms.

He has stated under oath that he supports mandatory Federal registration of common semiautomatic firearms and ultimately supports a ban on AR-15 rifles.

Semiautomatic sporting rifles can be found in the homes of millions of law-abiding Americans, Hoosiers included, who use them for hunting, recreational shooting, and defending their families.

The ATF has a responsibility to clearly articulate its decisions to the public. In his confirmation hearing, Mr. Chipman revealed that he is not able to articulate what an assault rifle even is. His beliefs represent, in my opinion, a direct attack on our Second Amendment rights.

It is no surprise that organizations that have never opposed an ATF nominee before are loudly opposing the nomination of David Chipman.

Mr. Chipman's nomination comes as the ATF is already in need of more accountability for politicized decisions. American gun owners, manufacturers, and small business owners deserve clarity and the right to appeal politicized decisions made by the ATF.

Currently, the ATF engages in a secretive, behind-the-scenes classification review process to decide if a firearm will be regulated by the National Firearms Act. No law-abiding American should have to wonder if they are going to suddenly be made a criminal by a bureaucratic decision. It doesn't make sense.

That is why I joined Representative DAN CRENSHAW in the House to introduce the ATF Accountability Act. Law-abiding gun manufacturers and small businesses should be able to appeal the legal status of classifications within a regular timeframe.

I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend and colleague Senator BRAUN for leading this important discussion on protecting Second Amendment rights for Montanans and for all Americans.

Today, President Biden and CHUCK SCHUMER are propping up yet another very controversial nominee, one who far from unites us as Americans—rather, another nominee who divides us further. Sadly, we are witnessing a complete disregard for our Constitution.

The Constitution could not be clearer. Now, I know my Democratic colleagues may want to say it otherwise, but it is clear—it is very clear when it says—and I have my pocket Constitution here. It says, "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." It is very strong and very clear language. Montanans and the American people are guaranteed this right, as protected in our Constitution.

Despite this, we have seen President Biden and far-left Democrats abandon

this right to fit their own gun-grabbing agenda. Their latest attack on the Second Amendment is the nomination of a registered anti-gun lobbyist, who has called for the ban of certain firearms, to lead the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. This is the very agency that oversees firearms.

It is unbelievable. Putting David Chipman in charge of the ATF is like putting an arsonist in charge of the fire department. He has a very hostile record toward the Second Amendment, and this hostile record against law-abiding gun owners speaks loud and clear.

It is interesting to look at the 2020 data that is coming in. Forty percent of the firearms sold in our country last year were to first-time buyers of a firearm—40 percent. Why? The American people want to be able to defend themselves.

As we are seeing the far left push to defund law enforcement, defund the police, and we see the anarchy going on across the cities of America, the lawlessness, the high murder rates, the violence, it is no wonder that more Americans now say: I want to own a firearm myself to protect myself.

If confirmed, Mr. Chipman would help the Democrats push their gun-grabbing agenda. We can't allow the left to continue this attack on our precious constitutional rights. David Chipman would be a disaster to the Second Amendment rights of Montanans and all Americans. The Senate must oppose Mr. Chipman's nomination for the sake of protecting our Second Amendment rights.

We must also pass some common-sense legislation that protects the Second Amendment, like what Senator BRAUN of Indiana is trying to do with his ATF Accountability Act. I support him in his efforts to pass this common-sense legislation.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in opposing Mr. Chipman's nomination to lead the ATF and encourage my colleagues to pass and support Senator BRAUN's ATF Accountability Act.

I yield back my time to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1920

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, here in a moment, I am going to ask for unanimous consent on the ATF Accountability Act and the Protecting the Right to Keep and Bear Arms Act.

Governor Cuomo has declared gun violence a public health emergency in New York. "We want to do with gun violence what we just did with COVID," Governor Cuomo says.

During the pandemic, Governor Cuomo and other elected officials used the public health emergency to infringe upon Americans' constitutional rights. They barred Americans from exercising their freedom of religion by closing churches. They infringed upon Americans' right to assemble by banning many gatherings, and now gun

control activist organizations are pressuring President Biden to declare gun violence as a public health emergency.

Doing so would allow the administration to take Executive action to hold up gun sales.

Declaring a public health emergency should not give the executive branch the right to infringe upon our Second Amendment. This is why I introduced the Protecting the Right to Keep and Bear Arms Act to stop this. This bill would prevent the White House from declaring an emergency for the purpose of imposing gun control.

I took an oath to represent Hoosiers and protect their Second Amendment rights. That is why I will oppose the nomination of David Chipman and why I will ask for unanimous consent to pass the ATF Accountability Act and the Protecting the Right to Keep and Bear Arms Act.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1920 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. I read this bill, and I am not sure the Senator from Indiana really wants to do what this bill says because the bill makes it a priority that this Agency, Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms—a priority if there is a request from a licensed manufacturer, importer, or dealer, a request of the Agency for information questions on regulatory matters, puts timelines on them, deadlines.

It says that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—the Attorney General shall—shall—not later than 90 days after the receipt of such a request or question make a ruling or determination.

Well, you think to yourself, if this Agency has very little to do with thousands of employees, then perhaps the timeliness of response from the industry would merit some 90-day deadline. But the Senator in introducing this completely overlooks the obvious. This legislation would force ATF to take resources and manpower away from their other activities and put them into answering regulatory inquiries with a 90-day deadline in his bill.

So what are the other duties that will be taking the ATF agents away from? Well, the Senator is from Indiana, my neighboring State, and I am sure when he goes to northwestern Indiana, he hears a lot about the city of Chicago. Well, it was last weekend, on the Fourth of July weekend, that there were 104 people shot in the city of Chi-

cago, 19 died. There were 13 children who were shot and two law enforcement agents.

What is the responsibility of the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Bureau when it comes to this kind of mass shooting that is taking place in the city I am honored to represent but breaks my heart to hear those numbers?

They are supposed to be investigating the gun violence. They are supposed to be gathering the information and evidence so they can work with the prosecutors to stop this mass shooting. Unfortunately, the Senator from Indiana said, no, that is not your priority at ATF; your priority is to answer regulatory questions from gun dealers and manufacturers. And you have 90 days to do it, no matter what else is going on. Oh, you may be going after somebody who is guilty in a mass killing and a mass shooting; put it aside. You have a bookkeeping question. That is one of the provisions in here. You have a bookkeeping question that should take priority over anything else you are doing. Stop preparing information and evidence for trial, answer the industry questions on regulations. That is your highest priority—at least that is what your bill says.

So I look at this, and I think, in the reality of gun violence and death and the crimes that are being committed, ATF has the most important role of keeping us safe. I want them to be efficient in dealing with the industry. But that is not their highest priority, as far as I am concerned. The highest priority is to keep America safe and to do something about gun violence. And for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The objection is heard.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, a quick response to that before I ask unanimous consent on the next item is that that is an argument I hear so often, that the city that supports some of the toughest State gun laws and local laws that ends up having the statistics that no one would want to have across our country and then would try to cast that blame on a neighboring State tells me that you are looking in the wrong place to solve the problem.

The ATF here, we are just wanting clarity—that is the purpose of this act, and I suggest that my friend from Illinois look at some of the more basic issues that might be underlying what is happening there.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1916

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1916 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me say, initially, I did not mention the issue of the source of crime guns in Illinois. The Senator from Indiana raised it. And since he did, I want to make a record of it.

When we trace the crime guns in Illinois, we find an alarming percentage of them coming from gun shows in your State right next to Illinois. The bad guys get on the Skyway, drive over to northwest Indiana gun shows and buy guns at those shows without background checks and come back and commit crime in Chicago and other neighborhoods.

That is a fact. You may not like it; I certainly don't like it. But we ought to be doing something about that instead of worrying about the gun manufacturers and the gun salesmen and whether or not they are going to get special treatment from this Agency.

But let me address the second matter that is before us, and this is Senator BRAUN's request for S. 1916, Protecting the Right to Keep and Bear Arms. I want to set the record straight at the outset. Current Federal law, the Stafford Act, prohibits the Federal Government from seizing lawfully owned guns during a period of a major disaster or emergency. It is on the books. That is the law.

The Stafford Act is also clear that during a major disaster emergency, the Federal Government is prohibited from creating new registration requirements for guns, new prohibitions on gun possession, or new prohibitions on the lawful carrying of firearms. That is on the books already. So current law already protects guns that people own legally during periods of disaster or emergency. But the Senator's bill goes much further than that.

Section 4 of the bill would amend the Stafford Act—get this—to say that the Federal Government also cannot prohibit the manufacture or sale or transfer of guns or ammunition during a disaster or emergency. There are several problems with this.

First, current law has exceptions that allow the government to continue enforcing laws already on the books during a disaster. This includes laws that prohibit convicted felons from possessing guns. Your bill does not make that exception. I am sure you don't want to do that. I hope you will look at your bill. In other words, under the bill, as I read it, during a major disaster or emergency, the government would be barred from any prohibition of gun sales, even from enforcing the current prohibition on the sale of guns to convicted felons.

That doesn't make sense. I am sure that is not what you want to do, but that is what your bill says. I hope it is not what you intended, and I am sure it is not. So please look at it carefully.

There are also legitimate reasons why the government might need to temporarily prohibit guns being sold in a disaster area. Here is something that is not outlandish. Suppose the background check system has been knocked offline in a disaster area. We wouldn't want felons taking advantage of that situation to walk into a gun dealer and buy guns that they are ineligible to buy.

Current law ensures that the government can't take anyone's lawfully owned guns away from them during a disaster, but there is no clear justification for granting untouchable status to gun sales during the disaster. This bill needs some work. I hope we will not pass it in a hasty manner. And in light of these and other concerns, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

NOMINATION OF DAVID CHIPMAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, David Chipman is the nominee for the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Agency. I know a bit about him because he went through the Agency process. He is a veteran of over 20 years working for this Agency. We need him. I will tell you why we need him.

In the history of the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Agency, there has only been one person who has served—I believe it is from your State of Minnesota. There is only one person who served as the confirmed Director of the Agency. Otherwise, over and over again, it goes without any leadership. You say: Well, is that just an accident that this Agency never has a Director? I don't think it is an accident at all.

You see, the gun lobby, when they want to make their case against new gun laws, always say the same thing: "Well, just enforce the laws on the books. You don't need new laws. Enforce the laws on the books."

If you bought that premise, then the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Agency is one of the agencies that does that. So if you can weaken this Agency—fewer agents, fewer employees, fewer supervisors, no Director—then the actual enforcement that is being done by this Agency is diminished.

So, now, President Biden brings us Mr. Chipman. There are two parts of his career that should be noted: Over 20 years at ATF, involved in some of the most serious investigations, and did an incredible job. After he left the ATF, he went to work for a gun safety group. He is the first one to tell you: "I own a gun, and I respect your Second Amendment rights and my Second Amendment rights, but I don't want guns to get into the hands of the wrong people, and that is how I would run the ATF."

I think that reflects what the majority of Americans think. Second Amendment rights—I honor them, I respect them, they are in the law, decided by the Supreme Court in the Heller deci-

sion, but when it comes to guns—and I look at the wanton violence taking place. I don't want guns getting into the hands of convicted felons. No, I don't. I don't think they have any Second Amendment right, neither does David Chipman. But the people behind the gun lobby, gun industry don't want an Agency that actually enforces those laws. They really don't. And so they are trying to stop his nomination.

It may be controversial, but I hope he gets this job. I am going to vote for him.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this morning, our friends in Europe claimed first place in the race against climate change. The European Union has laid out a plan to decarbonize Europe and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 55 percent at the end of this decade. It is an ambitious plan, and it is one that will, in the words of EU climate policy chief Frans Timmermans, "give humanity a fighting chance."

To our allies in Europe, I want to say: America stands with you in this effort, and we welcome the friendly competition to see who can move quickest to save our planet.

Earlier today, President Biden joined members of the Senate Democratic caucus to discuss our historic budget proposal that was unveiled last night. It is a proposal designed, first and foremost, to help working families and secondly—and not a distant second, right up with that—to secure our planet's future.

Climate change impacts every single one of us. It doesn't care about our borders or national identities. It does present an opportunity for us to lead the world in saving this planet, literally, for our kids and grandkids.

I am glad we have a President who understands this issue. The budget resolution we discussed with him today will pave the way for that to happen.

VOTING RIGHTS

Madam President, more than 156,000 Allied troops stormed the beaches of Normandy on D-day. Among them were 2,000 African-American soldiers. Within that group was an even smaller band of brothers: 700 members of the 320th Barrage Balloon Battalion, the only—all Black combat unit to take part in D-day.

Ten days ago, on the Fourth of July, Henry Parham—the last known living member of that historic African-American battalion—died at a veteran's hospital in Pittsburgh. He was 99 years old.

He was one in a million, literally. He was one of the 1 million African-American men and women who served in the

branches of the military that were still segregated for U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. Many of these Black patriots believed they were fighting for a double victory, to beat fascism and to beat segregation and racism at home.

Another African-American soldier who took part in the Normandy invasion left high school at 17 to enlist in the Army. He served 2 years in France and Germany.

When he returned to Mississippi, Jim Crow was waiting for him with “Whites only” water fountains, segregated public schools, discriminatory poll taxes, and literacy tests when you showed up to vote. So this veteran of the U.S. Army, this Black veteran of the U.S. Army who risked his life to fight for democracy, had to return to America and fight for it again.

In 1954, he became the first Mississippi field secretary for the NAACP. One of his first assignments was the 1955 killing of Emmett Till. He was asked to look into that for the NAACP. He organized boycotts of segregated businesses, and voter registration drives were established to help African Americans. For his efforts, he received countless death threats. His home was fire-bombed, and they tried to kill him more than once.

On June 12, 1963, he arrived home after a midnight meeting, got out of his car, took a few steps, and was shot in the back by a White supremacist Klansman. The bullet pierced his heart and killed him. He was 37 years old.

I remember the news reports on this. I was just a kid in college. The victim's name was Medgar Evers. When he was murdered, he was carrying in his arms NAACP T-shirts that read “Jim Crow Must Go.”

Sixty years later, I am afraid Jim Crow is still around. The invidious voting discrimination that Medgar Evers, John Lewis, Fannie Lou Hamer, and so many others sacrificed so much to end has not just returned in Mississippi, is not just returning to the South but across America. We are witnessing a coordinated, relentless, nationwide attack on voting rights and on free and fair elections in America.

Already this year, 17 States have enacted 28 new laws to make it harder for Americans—especially people of color—to vote. A total of nearly 400 bills eliminating the right to vote have been introduced in 48 States. These new voter suppression laws and proposed laws are the poisonous fruit of a dangerous, discredited lie, the Big Lie, the same one that brought a murderous mob from a Trump rally to this Capitol on January 6.

An angry, insecure man with a fragile ego can't bear the thought of losing. He can't stand the notion of public rejection, so he summoned the mob to the Capitol on January 6 to try to overturn the Presidential election. They were on a mission for the President. As a result of their storming this Capitol, more than 140 Capitol Hill and other police officers were injured. One died defending this Capitol, defending us.

The fact is, the 2020 election was free and fair, and Donald Trump lost. Despite all of his protests and lawsuits, there is no evidence other than that.

A record number of Americans in that election braved a deadly pandemic to cast their votes. The Department of Homeland Security called the election “the most secure in American history.” More than 80 judges, including many conservatives appointed by President Trump himself, threw out his claims in court that the election was stolen.

When a voting machine company sued one of those lawyers for defamation over false claims of switched and stolen votes, the defense her lawyer offered was that “no reasonable person” would believe his client's voter fraud lies. Yet Republican lawmakers in nearly every State are now using those same lies and the Big Lie to wage a sweeping assault on voting rights.

These new voter suppression laws would make it harder for millions of Americans to cast their votes. Many who are eligible to cast their votes would lose the opportunity because of these new laws. Even more alarming, in many States, new laws would make it easier for partisan election officials to simply throw out election results they don't like.

Donald Trump used all the powers of his Presidency to try to force State election officials to overrule the will of their State's voters and he failed. The rule of law won. Remember the recording he had with the election official in Georgia? He did everything but threaten him with criminal action if he didn't change the final official vote tally. Now some Republicans State legislators want to change the laws to make voter nullification schemes legal. Never before in American history have we allowed anything like that.

This is not democracy, and it must not be allowed to happen. This week, 51 lawmakers from the State of Texas took the extraordinary step of leaving their State to deny the Texas House a quorum and prevent it from passing yet another State voter suppression law. The Texas law, among other things, would end the very practices that made it possible for historic numbers of Americans to vote safely and securely last November, things like drive-through voting, 24-hour polling places, ballot drop boxes. Each one of these changes would make it harder for poor people and minorities to vote, and that is what this is all about.

In fleeing their State and traveling to Washington, the Texas lawmakers are sending an SOS for American democracy. They are sending a distress signal for voting rights. They are pleading with the Senate, our Senate, to act, to end the Republican filibuster of the For the People Act and update and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Act now. Only Federal action and Federal protections can stop this assault on America's voting rights.

Madam President, there are solutions. This onslaught of attacks on

voting rights and election independence would not be possible without two rulings from the conservative majority of the Supreme Court that have gutted the Voting Rights Act.

Earlier today, the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on what it takes to restore the Voting Rights Act after the misguided Shelby County decision and Brnovich decision this month. I want to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for chairing that important hearing.

I want to commend President Biden for speaking out so forcefully about protecting voting rights in his speech yesterday in Philadelphia. Like President Kennedy nearly 60 years ago, President Biden reminded us that voting rights are not just a political issue; they are a moral issue. It is not just merely a legal concern; it is a concern that goes to our values as Americans. I also strongly support Attorney General Garland's decision to double the size of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division after years of attrition.

But the only way to truly end this unprecedented assault on voting is for Congress to step up. It is our responsibility. The Big Lie that brought a deadly insurrection into this Chamber on January 6 has American democracy in its crosshairs. We have to act, and now is the time.

The Senate must end the Republican filibuster of the For the People Act, stop voter suppression in States, get dark money out of politics, prevent billionaires from buying elections, and end partisan gerrymandering. We cannot stand on ceremony and tradition while the pillars of our democracy are destroyed. If we lose free and fair elections, we lose our democracy. We must also introduce and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act to restore and expand those rights and prevent voter suppression. I am working with Senator LEAHY to that end.

The right to vote is an American ideal. It shouldn't be a partisan battle. John Lewis told us so often—“The vote is precious,” he said. “It is almost sacred. It is the most powerful non-violent tool we have in a democratic society. And we have to use it.”

I will close with this story. Every year, John Lewis led a group of Congress Members and others on what he called a pilgrimage to some of the sacred places of the American civil rights movement. I had the privilege of attending one of those pilgrimages.

In 2014, John Lewis led the pilgrimage to a different hallowed ground in American history. That year, the 50th anniversary of the Freedom Summer, John Lewis led groups to Money, MS, to the place where Emmett Till was murdered. Remember Emmett Till, the teenager from Chicago who was brutally murdered in the South in Mississippi? They went to Philadelphia, MS, as well, where three young civil rights activists—names well known to my generation—James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner,

were kidnapped and murdered during Freedom Summer because they were there to register Black voters. Then they traveled to Jackson, MS, to the house where Medgar Evers was cut down by an assassin's bullet.

Standing on the spot where Medgar Evers fell, John's voice caught as he said:

The night this man was shot and killed, something died in all of us in the [civil rights] movement.

John Lewis led his pilgrimage to Mississippi that year because he wanted us to never forget the terrible sacrifices of so many to fulfill the promise of our Nation and secure voting rights.

This Saturday will mark the 1-year anniversary of John Lewis's passing. I miss him. He was a real friend. When he left us, something in all of us wept. We can keep the spirit of John Lewis alive by defending the greatest cause of his life, the cause for which he nearly died as a young man on that bridge in Selma: the right of every American to vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I complete my remarks before the vote is called.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, this is my fourth speech this year arguing how we are going to have to match our defense resources to our national defense strategy. And this is a reminder—this is the National Defense Strategy. People seem to be forgetting about this. It was put together in 2018. Here are the names of the individuals. One was a former colleague; it was Jon Kyl. So we had 12, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats. Everyone agreed that this is what we need to do, not just for 2018 but for each year afterwards. For this year, for example, they actually have in here that we should be increasing the defense budget by between 3 and 5 percent. I show this because we all adhered to these, Democrats and Republicans, up until this year.

This is the first time I have had a chance to talk about this budget in the Biden administration where we now have a lot of the details actually released in terms of the budget and what it does to our military.

Remember, our expert, bipartisan NDS Commission Report said that we need 3 to 5 percent real growth in the defense budget each year to actually execute this strategy. The defense budget the Biden administration sent us does not achieve this goal. In fact, it is really a cut, in this administration.

Even worse, just last week, the Fed predicted that inflation next year will be bigger than predicted. If that continues, this budget will mean even bigger cuts than expected and will hamstring our troops even more than we thought.

A lower defense top line than last year is just the first problem. The de-

tails of this budget are also worse than we forecasted. We have a flow chart here that shows that the budget puts shipbuilding on a starvation diet. The Navy tells us that we need 355 ships, probably more than the 400 that we have—that we are talking about right now. Right now, we are under 300 ships, and the trend is down, not up. What is the administration's answer? They joke around about having a 355-ship Navy with only tugboats, but we don't have the luxury of jokes.

The people don't know this out there. The people don't realize that China is ahead of us and that Russia is ahead of us in some of these areas. They assume that we are always like it was right after World War II for so many years.

The Chinese Navy already has 355 ships. They already have them. That is not something they are looking for like we are right now. We are at 300 ships and looking for 355. They already have them. Then there are the Russians to add to that. That is another 223. So we are talking about far more that they have right now than we have, and nobody understands that. It is as if we have only one opposition out there, one adversary. We don't. We have several. The two prime adversaries are China and Russia, and they are up right now to 595 ships, and we are at 300. So what does that tell you?

I am not the only one who is concerned about this. A lot of people say: Well, the Republicans are the only ones who are concerned about our military.

And that is not true. Democratic Congresswoman ELAINE LURIA said it well. She said: The Navy budget is not a serious budget for great power competition.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD her recent article about the Navy's fleet.

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

[From the Texas National Security Review, June 14, 2021]

WAR ON THE ROCKS—LOOK TO THE 1980S TO INFORM THE FLEET OF TODAY (By Rep. Elaine Luria)

When I was a naval officer, my ships always had a plan when we left port for where we were going, how we would get there, and what we would do when we arrived. While that remains true of individual ships in the Navy, it's not true of the Navy as a whole today. The Navy lacks a comprehensive maritime strategy that defines what the Navy needs to do, how it needs to do it, the resources required, and how to manage risk if those resources aren't available. The Navy had a strategy that did these things in the past. The maritime strategy of the 1980s articulated a clear vision for the Navy's purpose and how Navy leaders planned to achieve it. The nation would be well-served by the Navy's developing such a strategy again.

I entered the U.S. Naval Academy in 1993 and was part of a new generation of officers who assumed the watch after the fall of the Soviet Union. We were the beneficiaries of a nation that had a clear and defensible maritime strategy, an administration that pro-

vided the vision, a Congress that funded it, and a Navy that executed it. Throughout my career, I deployed on both the Navy's oldest and newest ships, but they were all designed for the Cold War against the Soviet Union.

With China, the world has seen the meteoric rise of a maritime power that threatens U.S. and allied interests as well as free access to the maritime common. The United States and like-minded nations are engaged in a new great-power competition. As the Navy focuses almost exclusively on future capabilities, it risks overlooking the immediate threats posed by that competition today. A Battle Force 2045 plan does little to ensure a ready battle force in 2025. Today, no longer in uniform, but as the vice chair of the House Armed Services Committee, I believe the constitutional role of Congress "to provide and maintain a navy" should be based on something more than future hopes in technology and budget expectations. We need to be prepared now for any contingencies that may occur on our collective watch.

UNDERSTANDING THE 1980S MARITIME STRATEGY DURING GREAT-POWER COMPETITION

In August 1982, Vice Chief of Naval Operations Adm. William Small ordered the development of a document "to connect national strategy with defense programming." Developed in just three weeks using briefing slides and speaking notes, this document birthed the Navy's first global maritime strategy, which was designed to inform the Navy budgeting process.

The authors developed the briefing using then-current war plans, contemporary directives on national defense policy, and intelligence estimates of the Soviet threat, brought together with Secretary of the Navy John Lehman's concept of a 600-ship navy. Over 18 months, the briefing evolved until it was finally signed by the chief of naval operations and issued as the Navy's 1984 Maritime Strategy. As Lehman noted, "Once we had established the maritime strategy, we set about relating and conforming everything else we did in the Navy and Marine Corps to it." Because of the global reach and strength of the strategy, the Navy's stated need for a 600-ship fleet was defensible, and clearly tied to the numbers and types of ships needed to win in conflict. With the full support of the president, this strategy launched the nation on a trajectory to a massive Navy build-up, which nearly realized this fleet before the conclusion of the Cold War. The strategy clearly showed why the Navy needed 600 ships and indicated exactly where they would be deployed in global wartime operations. Additionally—and often overlooked when discussing the strategy—the strategy articulated the requirement for a peacetime presence to fill deterrent roles, reduce response times, and provide policymakers with naval crisis-response options. One-third of the ships needed for wartime missions in each theater would always be forward deployed under the strategy. Ensuring force-structure assessments have lacked this clear strategic vision for the role of naval forces.

BACK TO THE FUTURE

Lehman recently noted, "In some previous and current periods, naval strategy (if you could call it that) has been derived from predicted budgets. During the 1980s, the process was reversed: first strategy, then requirements, then the [Program Objective Memorandum], then budget." The difference between strategy preceding budget or budget preceding strategy is the difference between going to the store with a shopping list to make a specific meal, and going to the store, looking in your wallet, and asking, "What could I buy with that?" According to Lehman, a good strategy is a living document

that must be tested, refined, and tested again. Most importantly, however, the strategy should be simple, logical, achievable and focus on the enemy's vulnerabilities above all else.

The Navy's most recent strategy document, the tri-service maritime strategy issued in December 2020 known as Advantage at Sea, correctly acknowledges the maritime nature of the United States as a nation whose security and prosperity depends on the seas, and highlights the great-power competition faced today. It acknowledges the current world environment and gives guiding principles for prevailing in long-term strategic competition. But this document is not a strategy. It is a vision. One cannot design a fleet to meet current challenges, develop a naval force structure for the future, or create a budget input solely from a vision—these require a global maritime strategy to fight and win against a peer competitor, while simultaneously deterring other malign actors.

U.S. maritime leaders need to answer the question: How would the U.S. Navy deter or defeat Chinese naval aggression, which may perhaps be compounded and complicated by other states such as Russia, Iran, or North Korea acting opportunistically while U.S. Navy forces are engaged elsewhere? How can the U.S. Navy make a strategic difference? Irv Blickstein served in the senior executive service in the Navy's programming office in the 1980s. In a recent interview, he said, "If you look at the vision the Navy has today, nobody quite understands what they want to do . . . the Congress is not convinced, and they would like to better understand what the Navy's plan is." As Lehman noted, "A critical lesson from the Maritime Strategy is that the Navy must restore credibility with Congress and the public that it knows what kinds of ships, aircraft, and technologies are needed." What is missing is a concept of operations, broadly stated.

Today's national security climate is different than that of the 1980s when the United States and Soviet Union faced off at the Cold War's apex. The Navy does not have the decades-long at-sea experience with China that it did with the Soviet Union after the World War II. Today, the Navy has fewer than half the ships that it had in the 1980s. While modern U.S. Navy forces are more capable than those of the 1980s, the same is true of America's competitors' forces, especially China's. In the 1980s, the F-14 program was less than a decade old, as new programs like the F-18, Aegis, Vertical Launch System, and Nimitz-class carriers matured. These were state of the art platforms and systems developed to counter specific Soviet threats and tactics. By comparison, the platforms the Navy has today are either (like the littoral combat ship) designed for a low-threat, post-Cold War environment, or designed to counter the same Soviet threats and tactics, as the Zumwalt-class destroyers are. Meanwhile, the Chinese have designed platforms and weapons, such as the DF-26 "carrier killer" missiles, to counter the heart of the U.S. fleet.

Not only does the Navy have a problem with lagging technology, the Navy also has a numbers problem. China is outbuilding the U.S. Navy at a rate the United States has been unwilling as a nation to match. Three-quarters of U.S. surface combatants are more than a decade old, while three-quarters of Chinese naval vessels are less than a decade old.

In addition to growing in size, China's naval forces have grown their sea legs. Since 2009, more than three dozen Chinese anti-piracy flotillas have deployed to the Indian Ocean and elsewhere. These flotillas from the North, East, and South Sea Fleets have

gained nearly as much experience as have U.S. Navy deployed strike groups over the same period.

THE LOST GENERATION

Meanwhile, the U.S. Navy has lost a generation of shipbuilding to failed programs. For example, the DD-21 program office (which resulted in the Zumwalt-class destroyer) was established in 1998. Originally scheduled for a 32-ship production line, but pared down to just three, the Zumwalt and her two sister ships have not deployed. One of the game-changing weapons those ships were to use, the electromagnetic railgun—which had been under development since 2005—was abandoned in the Navy's current budget. Similarly, the CVN-21 program executive office, which was set up to produce what became the Gerald Ford-class aircraft carrier, was established in 1996. The USS Ford has not yet deployed.

To put this in perspective, I graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1997—between the years in which these programs were established. I retired four years ago after a full naval career and have since twice been elected to Congress. Yet in all of that time, neither ship class has deployed. America cannot afford for it to take multiple decades to design, build, and deploy the next generation of warships.

Even new shipbuilding programs that have resulted in deployed ships have been troubled. Multiple challenges with the Littoral Combat Ship program have resulted in some of those ships being slated for decommissioning only a few years into their intended lifespan. The Constellation-class frigates, intended to provide a more capable alternative to the lightly armed littoral combat ship, will not be present in the fleet in significant numbers for a decade or more.

In its Fiscal Year 2022 budget request the Navy proposes decommissioning almost twice the number of ships it plans to build this year. Among the ships the Navy wants to retire are seven cruisers, some of which were only recently modernized at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. The Navy has argued that the maintenance costs on these decades-old ships would be better spent on new, modern programs and capabilities. This is one example of the broader "divest to invest" strategy reflected in this year's budget, which does not instill confidence in the likelihood of fielding a capable fleet in a timely manner. Just as the planned railgun in the Zumwalt class did not come to fruition, history shows that reliance on hopes and dreams for "game-changers" is a poor substitute for forces and strategy.

With flat or reduced budgets, the Navy has no good options. It can sacrifice readiness, sacrifice research and development, or sacrifice fleet size. Those are the Navy's only options—and they are all bad. I empathize with the position that Navy leadership finds themselves in today, as they have inherited a scenario created by decades of their predecessors' failed shipbuilding efforts—a scenario that has no real solution without the commitment of significant additional resources. Regardless of administration, the United States has been unwilling as a nation to prioritize shipbuilding, much to its eventual detriment with regard to Chinese aggression and control of the maritime commons. China isn't waiting until 2045 to realize its fleet. Neither should the United States. America needs a ready Navy that can credibly deter a potential conflict with a confident and overwhelming opponent.

A NEW MARITIME STRATEGY

For the past three years—in numerous hearings and through information requests—I have sought to determine the Navy's current global maritime strategy. What I have

discovered is that it does not exist. There is not a clear plan similar to the 1984 Maritime Strategy that can inform and clearly articulate the fleet needed today to deter Chinese aggression, fight and win a war with China if required, and also employ naval forces globally in response to other malign actors such as Russia, Iran, and North Korea. I have heard many buzzwords, acronyms, and platitudes, but as naval strategist Sir Julian Corbett said, "Nothing is so dangerous in the study of war as to permit maxims to become a substitute for judgement."

Former Acting Secretary of the Navy Thomas Modly confirmed as much to me when we spoke recently. According to him, "We've had oscillating and unrealistic shipbuilding goals, and a variety of operational warfighting plans designed for fairly static contingencies. Neither of these have been the byproducts of a coherent national maritime strategy that addresses our biggest threats, the broader geographies we must protect, or the unpredictable nature of the future. The national maritime strategy we need today must be an agile one that allows for rapid development and adaptation. The force structure it defines should also have the same characteristics. The strategy must be developed with a sober look at our adversaries and global responsibilities. Further, it must be implemented with a national consensus because such implementation, without a doubt, will be costly to the taxpayers."

The United States needs a Navy capable of maintaining maritime superiority and preserving free trade and freedom of the seas for America and its allies and partners. The Navy immediately should develop a bold global maritime strategy, which will clearly define the fleet required today. This global strategy should focus on Chinese vulnerabilities, of which there are many, including dependence on access to shipping lanes to fuel their economy. The U.S. Navy should be ready to target critical mainland infrastructure and close maritime chokepoints to strangle the Chinese economy. American forces should be agile and unpredictable, using geography to their advantage with mobile capabilities. This type of strategy will require a larger Navy in concert with the other services. Day to day, the U.S. Navy should be present in the East and South China Seas, exercising with allied navies, testing the strategy, and refining it. From this new maritime strategy will flow an informed force structure that will compellingly spell out to lawmakers and the American public the essential and urgent need to invest in a larger Navy to deter Chinese aggression and hold at bay other malign actors who may seek to take advantage of any future conflict in the Pacific. As Lehman notes in discussing the development of the 1984 Maritime Strategy, 90 percent of the deterrent power of this buildup could be achieved in the first year. This was done by publicly declaring and explaining the strategy, especially its naval component, and taking actions that left no doubt among friend and foe that it would be achieved. Those actions included [the need] to submit a revised Defense budget to Congress that fully funded the buildup.

Today, U.S. Navy leadership should heed the words of Lehman: "First strategy, then requirements, then the POM, then budget." The global situation and America's competitors and adversaries may have evolved, but the process by which the U.S. Navy designs and builds the fleet should take a valuable lesson from the 1980s. If the United States is to remain a global power, it needs a Navy fit for the purpose and the United States, as a nation, needs to make the commitment to prioritize national defense and make this investment.

Mr. INHOFE. This budget also fails to make any progress in a growing or modernizing Air Force. Instead, the Biden budget procurement actually decreases by almost 15 percent across the entire military. The Air Force is 20 percent. President Biden's own nominee for the Secretary of the Air Force told us that one of the best things that we could do is to accelerate the buying of additional F-35s, but this budget doesn't do that. The fleet just gets older and smaller.

Perhaps the greatest casualty of the Biden budget is the Army. I guess I am used to that by now. I was a product of the Army, and all my Army friends remember what happened back in 1994. I was in the House at that time and on the House Armed Services Committee. At that time, I can remember when someone who was in a hearing—an expert—predicted that, in 10 years, we would no longer need ground troops. Of course, we know what has happened since that time. The greatest casualty is always the Army. Instead of investing, it deeply cuts the Army across the board in its modernization, procurement, force structure, and readiness.

I can't understand why we decreased full spectrum training just as we have started to get healthy after the readiness crisis of 2017, and we all remember what happened in 2017. That was the last 5 years of the Obama administration, and they were the years that cut our military substantially. They actually did reduce our budget in the last 5 years by 25 percent, the military budget. At the same time, China was increasing theirs by 78 percent. This is the problem that we had back then, and it is still going on.

Don't take my word for it. General McConville told us last week that most of the Army's weapons systems are 1980s vintage. Yet the Biden administration is slow-walking the Army's modernization efforts while our adversaries are relentlessly advancing—and they are. Secretary Wormuth, who is the Secretary of the Army, said the service is still under stress in some areas, including defense, which is a critical priority, and that is unacceptable.

Additionally, while Secretary Austin kept his promise to fully fund nuclear modernization, this is an area I can't blame anybody for because this has been going on for a long period of time, since after World War II, that being that our nuclear modernization program has not been substantial. Others have been catching up with us slowly but surely, and that is where we are today. So he kept his word. His promise was to fully fund nuclear modernization.

I remain concerned about the \$600 million cut in the NNSA's deferred maintenance budget. Now, with the NNSA, we are talking about nuclear now, our nuclear capabilities. It would have fixed crumbling infrastructure that is necessary to keep the nuclear weapons program on track.

Now, you can't see this very well, but when you look closely, it is worth coming up to look. We see some of the oldest equipment here, and it is obvious just by looking at it that it doesn't work. So not only are other countries catching up and passing us, but our equipment has not been modernized. That is what we were going to do, and this is what Secretary Austin wants to do, but we have not been able to pay for it yet. We have to get that done. It would have fixed crumbling infrastructure that is necessary to keep nuclear weapons on track.

The reality of this budget cut is on display in the unfunded priorities list that was put together by military services and the combatant commanders. No one knows more than the combatant commanders about our state of readiness. In total, we are looking at \$25 billion in key equipment weapons—and more that our services could use—but this budget can't support it.

Many people call these wish lists. I call them risk lists. The reason we don't hear a lot about people who are talking about the risks, the military people, is that "risk" means lives. When military people talk about risk, they talk about losing lives. People don't like to talk about that, but we are now in the position whereby we have to talk about it. We can only kick the can down the road so far, generating more and more risk. We don't talk about risk. We never do. We just demand that our military do more with less. We keep divesting, but the investments never follow. This trend of increased risk has only accelerated. It is already clear that the administration is signaling they want to cut the military even deeper next year.

Earlier this month, I read in the press about a memo by the Acting Secretary of the Navy as he tried to minimize the damage and risk of his sailors resulting from the significant budget cuts. He was very sincere about this. He said the Navy is forced to choose between modernizing ships, subs, and aircraft. Does anyone in here believe that the Chinese are choosing between ships, subs, and aircraft?

Recently, our Nation's highest ranking military officer, General Milley, told us that the Chinese and Russians combined actually spend more than we on defense. Now, think about that for a minute. You don't hear that. Nobody is talking about this. We have been told for so many years that we don't need to spend more on defense because we already spend more than our competitors. It turns out that this is just not true, and the American people are not aware of this.

Now, part of the difference is that the Chinese and the Russians don't take care of their people. I have talked a lot about the fact that we don't do that. Do you remember all of the housing problems that we were all concerned about? Are we spending enough on housing for our people? Communist countries don't care about that. They

just give them the guns and say: Go out and kill people. They don't care about people. The greatest expense that we have in supporting the military is the expense that we have for housing and for the quality of life of our troops.

By the way, I am drawing out a couple of Democrats when I talk about the problem and the fact that this is a concern. It is not just a concern of the Republicans. These are Democratic Members, and they are concerned. Democratic Congressman ANTHONY BROWN made this point recently, and I agree with him.

He wrote:

We spend \$1 billion more on Medicare in the defense budget than we do on new tactical vehicles. We spend more on the Defense Health Program than we do on new ships.

Now, that came from a Democratic Member of the House.

He concluded:

In total, some \$200 billion in the defense budget are essentially for nondefense purposes—from salaries to health care to basic research.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Congressman BROWN's article because I think it gets it exactly right, and this is coming from the other side.

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

[From Defense News, May 14, 2021]

THE CASE FOR A ROBUST DEFENSE BUDGET

(By Rep. Anthony Brown)

The United States is confronting a multitude of complex domestic and global challenges brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic (<https://www.defensenews.com/coronavirus/>), disruptive technologies, severe weather events (<https://www.defensenews.com/smr/energy-andenvironment/>), systemic racism, and great power competition with China and Russia. Now more than ever, Congress has a responsibility to ensure that we robustly fund our national security, even as the cost of doing so rises every year.

We maintain our national security not only by the military dollars we spend, but also by the resources we dedicate to international diplomacy and development, and the investments we make at home in infrastructure and education, in climate change mitigation, and in health care, public safety and our democratic institutions.

With ample defense and nondefense spending, we are better able to secure our nation, revitalize our economy, defeat the pandemic and restore U.S. global leadership.

The American Jobs Plan and the American Families Plan are bold initiatives that will strengthen our nation. They comprise long-overdue investments in infrastructure, innovation and our workforce, and they meet the equitable needs of our children and families. They promote American competitiveness and security. Yet, we should not irresponsibly cut defense spending as a way to offset the costs of these necessary investments. We cannot "rob Peter to pay Paul."

We need a well-funded military because we ask the men and women in our armed forces to do more today than ever before.

Our military deters aggression from China and Russia. China seeks to exert more control over trade and resources (<https://microsites-livebackend.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/territorial-disputes->

south-china-sea) in the Pacific and to challenge the security of our critical infrastructure (<https://www.Cdisrnet.com/critical-infrastructure/2019/11/22/how-the-fccs-new-ban-on-huawei-benefits-the-military/>) while investing (<https://media.defense.gov/2020/Sep/01/2002488689/-1/-1/2020-DOD-CHINA-MILITARY-POWER-REPORT-FINAL.PDF>) significantly in its military. Russia threatens (<https://www.militarytimes.com/flashpoints/2021/04/22/russia-orders-troop-pullback-but-keeps-weapons-near-ukraine/>) our European partners and allies, increasingly tests (<https://www.airforcetimes.com/news/your-air-force/2021/04/28/spike-in-russian-aircraft-intercepts-straining-air-force-crews-in-alaska-three-star-says/>) the boundaries of our air defenses and interferes (<https://www.npr.org/2021/03/16/977958302/intelligence-report-russia-trying-to-help-trump-in-2020-election>) in our elections.

Our armed forces defend the homeland against threats from North Korea, which has tested missiles (<https://missilethreat.csis.org/country/dprk/>) capable of striking our capital, and Iran, which funds terrorism in the Middle East and attacks our institutions through cyber operations (<https://www.csis.org/programs/technology-policy-program/publicly-reported-iranian-cyber-actions-2019>). And through it all, our military maintains watch against terrorism.

The threats are real and increasing, and we must rise to meet these challenges—not simply because we have an interest in our own security and the international order, but because the United States has a greater interest than any other nation.

While we are less than 5 percent of the world's population, we generate 20 percent (<https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/economy-trade>) of global economic production. We are the leader in international trade, with over \$5 trillion in commerce crossing our borders annually, including smartphones, cars and the medicines that we need.

Securing the global economy on which we rely demands that we field an expeditionary force capable of deploying to where it is needed most. Whether securing the 60 percent (<https://chinapower.csis.org/much-trade-transits-south-china-sea/>) of maritime trade transiting the Indo-Pacific region, or partnering in Africa to provide security for development, or checking Russia's Arctic expansionism (<https://www.defensenews.com/smr/frozenpathways/2021/04/12/russian-military-buildup-in-the-arctic-has-northern-nato-members-uneasy/>) for newly accessible resources, our military must be able to operate anywhere and everywhere around the world.

Success in these varied regions and missions requires us to train and equip our forces to prevail over any adversary, both in competition and in conflict. It means investing in fighter jets that can counter Russian advanced aircraft and developing submarines to avoid detection by Chinese sensors; modernizing our Army so soldiers have 21st century technology to fight and survive; and ensuring sufficient troop levels to limit back-to-back deployments so our military has time at home with family to maintain morale and readiness (<https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2020/02/14/why-we-should-grow-the-active-duty-army-115042.html>). Having a global force that is ready and lethal provides the necessary presence to deter war and maintain peace in the global commons.

At the center of this worldwide mission are the men and women who serve.

Two million service members and civilians devote their lives to our defense, and the Pentagon's budget funds the everyday needs for them and their families: health care to 10 million Americans (<https://health.mil/News/>

Gallery/Infographics/2017/05/01/MHS-Facts-and-Figures), child care for 200,000 children (<https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45288/7>), retirement for 1.5 million veterans (<https://media.defense.gov/2019/May/14/2002131753/-1/-1/o/MRS-STATRPT-2018%20V5.PDF#page=7>) and K-12 education in about 160 schools (<https://www.dodea.edu/aboutdodea/demographics.cfm>) worldwide.

The benefits of defense spending reach beyond the military and our contribution to the international order, returning the investment through domestic dividends. During Hurricane Katrina, the National Guard rescued over 17,000 people and airlifted almost 22 million pounds (<https://www.nationalguard.mil/Features/2015/Remembering-Hurricane-Katrina/>) of cargo to the flooded areas. The Pentagon's \$8 billion annual spend on research invigorates our academic and tech sectors, resulting in technologies like GPS and Google Maps, which were first invented by Navy scientists. Defense innovations like radar are now in civilian use, and they power the weather stations that detect increasingly severe storms amid climate change. And the internet, the backbone of the global economy, began as a Defense Department program.

We spend \$1 billion more on Medicare in the defense budget than we do on new tactical vehicles. We spend more on the Defense Health Program than we do on new ships. In total, some \$200 billion in the defense budget are essentially for nondefense purposes—from salaries to health care to basic research.

In no place are these domestic benefits of defense spending clearer than in the current pandemic. The Moderna vaccine, developed in record time, was originally seeded by a Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency investment in 2013, and a subsequent Pentagon request to rapidly produce a human ready antibody contributed to the delivery of multiple vaccines in under a year. And 50,000 National Guard members are assisting (<https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/08/covid-vaccination-crisis-national-guard-is-being-mobilized.html>) in coronavirus testing and vaccinations across the country, strengthening our nation against a grave threat to our collective health.

We should neither view the nondefense and defense budgets as opposite sides of the same coin, nor accept them as a false choice between two competing options.

This nation was founded to form a more perfect Union, and in doing so to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare. For 233 years, Congress has endeavored to balance these responsibilities, and in doing so has often found a way to secure our democracy and freedoms while at the same time investing in America as the land of opportunity. It is imperative that we in Congress meet these challenges and fulfill our responsibilities.

Our national security depends on it.

Mr. INHOFE. We can disagree sometimes about how we compete with China on nondefense areas. It is important. That is an important debate. We want to do that, but we have to be on the same page when it comes to national security.

Some people would say that my criticism of cutting the military is because President Biden is a Democrat. I want to be really clear that this is not about politics; it is about protecting this Nation and making sure our men and women in uniform have the training and the resources and the equipment they need to compete and complete their missions and come home safely. I

mean, this is what we are supposed to be doing, and that is what we are doing.

I told President Trump, back when he sent his initial budget up when he became President of the United States, that it was not adequate at that time. I called up Secretary Mattis, and we met the President at the White House. We showed him why it was inadequate, and it was inadequate. So we were able to get something done at that time, and that is something that we are concerned about today.

I happen to think President Trump wanted to spend even more on his troops, but I think he got some bad advice from his advisers. I think the same is true with President Biden. I think he wants a strong military when he is up against our adversaries. I know this President believes that a strong military underpins all of our other tools and national power, including diplomatic efforts. I know the President believes in America's role in the world and in the value of deterrence. I know the President believes in the importance of our allies and the partners who look to us for commitments and for investments to know that we are very serious. Our President knows that. President Biden knows this, but we don't have the budget to support it.

The President needs to be coming forth with adequate budgets to take care of the problems that we are faced with today. We all know how painful Obama's readiness crisis was as flight training hours were slashed, and we didn't know all of the things that happened during the last 5 years of his administration. This administration should remember how dangerous that was not just for our deterrence but also because there was a human cost. That is one of many reasons I am struggling to understand the administration's cuts to the defense budget.

One thing we have been told is that anything more than this defense budget is just not affordable. We have been told by the Pentagon that we have to live more fiscally. That is one way to tell the military that you don't care about them. This administration wants to spend trillions in taxpayers' dollars on everything you can think of except on the military, and this comes through very clearly when the amount of increase they are having right now is between 16 and 20 percent and ours is 1.6 percent.

In reality, the investments we need to strengthen our military in the decades to come are minimal when compared to overall Federal budgeting. Defense spending compared to our GDP is half of what it was in the Cold War, and we live in a much more dangerous world now. We have been told that the Pentagon must make hard choices as if hard choices are a substitute for strategy-based budgeting. Yet we are not making hard choices; we are just making bad choices.

All of our current military and senior DOD officials agree that we have a

good military strategy for China and Russia, but the budget doesn't support that strategy. As a result, I am worried that deterrence will fail maybe today or maybe 5 years from now, and when it does, the cost will be much higher than any investment we would make today.

We have made a sacred compact with our servicemembers. We tell them that we will take care of them and take care of their families. We do that very well, but we also tell them that we will give them the tools to defend the Nation and to come home safely, but we are not holding up that end of the bargain. With this proposed budget and the prospects of further cuts, we are failing to give them the resources they need.

We can't simply spend our way out of our military problems, but we can spend too little to give ourselves a chance. We have seen the high cost of underinvesting in the military. Underfunding in the military tempts our adversaries, raises doubts in our allies, and makes war more, not less, likely.

So we need to make a generational investment in our defenses so that our children and grandchildren don't have to, and we are not doing that now.

We have a lot of impatient people right now who want to vote.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 171, J. Nellie Liang, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Charles E. Schumer, Mazie K. Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Jon Ossoff, Tim Kaine, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Patrick J. Leahy, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Amy Klobuchar, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of J. Nellie Liang, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Baldwin	Blunt	Burr
Bennet	Booker	Cantwell
Blumenthal	Brown	Capito

Cardin	Johnson	Romney
Carper	Kaine	Rosen
Casey	Kelly	Rounds
Cassidy	King	Sanders
Collins	Klobuchar	Schatz
Coons	Leahy	Schumer
Cornyn	Lujan	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sinema
Crapo	Marky	Smith
Daines	McConnell	Stabenow
Duckworth	Merkley	Tester
Durbin	Moran	Thune
Feinstein	Murkowski	Toomey
Fischer	Murphy	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murray	Warner
Grassley	Ossoff	Warnock
Hassan	Padilla	Warren
Heinrich	Peters	Whitehouse
Hickenlooper	Portman	Wicker
Hirono	Reed	Wyden
Hyde-Smith	Risch	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Hawley	Paul
Blackburn	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Inhofe	Sasse
Braun	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Lummis	Sullivan
Ernst	Marshall	Tillis
Hagerty	Menendez	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

(Mr. HEINRICH assumed the Chair.)

(Ms. SMITH assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). On this vote, the yeas are 72, the nays are 27.

The motion is agreed to.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 154, Donald Michael Remy, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Mazie K. Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Jon Ossoff, Tim Kaine, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Patrick J. Leahy, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Amy Klobuchar, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Donald Michael Remy, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 263 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Risch
Blunt	Hirono	Romney
Booker	Hoeven	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Braun	Inhofe	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Sasse
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lee	Sinema
Cassidy	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Lummis	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Sullivan
Cornyn	Marky	Tester
Cortez Masto	Marshall	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	Menendez	Toomey
Crapo	Merkley	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Van Hollen
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Fischer	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Paul	Young

NAYS—8

Blackburn	Hawley	Shelby
Ernst	Lankford	Wicker
Hagerty	Scott (FL)	

NOT VOTING—2

Graham Johnson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 8.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1652, which was received from the House and is at the desk, and that the only amendment in order be the following: Toomey No. 2121; further, that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided between the leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the Toomey amendment; that upon the disposition of the Toomey amendment, the bill, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time; that the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with a 60 affirmative vote threshold required for passage; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; finally, that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote in the series.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I rise today to call for every Senator to have a chance to consider and cast a vote on the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act. This bill would ensure that people in the military who

have been subject to sexual assault or other serious crimes get the justice they deserve.

I know that my colleague from Oklahoma, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, reached out to our military chiefs for their thoughts on this bill. While there was, as Army GEN James McConville wrote, recognition “that there are concerns with the way our current process pursues justice for major crimes,” I understand that they also have concerns about this legislation, and I would like to allay those concerns today.

More broadly, the service chiefs’ letters all seem to indicate a misunderstanding of how fundamental this change would be. Marine Corps Gen. David Berger, for instance, wrote that the bill “appears to create a more complex system that could potentially slow the military justice process.” Space Force Gen. John Raymond wrote that “the proposed changes add a layer of complexity that needs to be fully understood.”

This bill would streamline, not complicate, the military justice process. The lawyers who would be making these prosecution decisions under our legislation are already working on these very cases.

Navy ADM Michael Gilday expressed concern that “large scale removal of commanders’ authority could cause sailors to doubt the capabilities of their commanders or to believe that their commanders operate without the full trust of their superiors.”

That worry is unfounded. Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America surveyed their members—recent veterans—and 77 percent said that moving a serious crime like sexual assault out of the chain of command would have no impact on their view of the commander’s authority. Nearly 1 in 10 said that the change would lead them to view their commander as more of an authority figure.

I would point out that the IRC Chairwoman, Lynn Rosenthal, said:

The IRC rejects the motion that, by moving legal decisions about prosecution from the command structure, that commanders would have no role. It’s simply not the case. Commanders are responsible for the climates they create. They’re responsible for working to prevent sexual assault and sexual harassment, and they’re responsible for making sure that victims are protected when they come forward to report. So, the idea that they won’t have an interest in solving this problem if they are not making those technical legal decisions, we think, is simply false.

I trust that our commanders will be able to maintain their authority and maintain their investment in the welfare of the troops without being responsible for deciding these serious crimes.

General Berger put it well. He wrote:

I expect commanders to always bear responsibility for their Marines; changes like those in this bill will never relieve commanders of their duty to care for and lead their Marines, including when certain mili-

tary justice processes are removed from their control.

There were also questions about whether or not these changes were needed for all serious crimes. Admiral Gilday wrote that he had “seen no evidence that there is a lack of trust among victims for all crimes for which the punishment exceeds one year of confinement.”

There is evidence. The Department of the Air Force inspector general conducted a survey in 2020 which found that one in three Black servicemembers said they believe the military discipline system is biased against them and that three in five Black servicemembers believe they do not and will not receive the same benefit of the doubt as their White peers if they get in trouble. That level of distrust must be addressed.

General Raymond also suggested a more limited reform, writing that beyond sexual assault, “the other offenses are not as complex and do not require specialized training.” On the contrary. Crimes included in our bill, like murder, manslaughter, fraud, and extortion, all present complex cases, and they deserve to be put in the purview of trained legal experts.

As you know, Mr. President, our bill has a bright line at felonies. To be a felony, it has to be a complex crime. Our bill does not include misdemeanors.

The service chiefs’ letters also included calls to put an emphasis on preventing, rather than prosecuting, these crimes. I, too, would rather see these crimes not happen, which is why this bill includes various provisions on prevention efforts. But given the current reality, prevention is not enough. We must prosecute these serious crimes and show that there are real consequences for anyone who commits them. Doing so not only changes the culture, it will remove recidivists from the ranks, preventing them from committing more crimes.

Right now, there is a deep lack of trust in the current system and whether or not it can or will deliver justice. That is detrimental to our armed services. As General Raymond wrote, “Lack of trust and reluctance to seek justice are, in themselves, readiness issues.”

I remind my colleagues that our job is to provide oversight and accountability over the executive branch, including the armed services, and to ensure that those who serve our country in uniform are being well served by their government.

As Berger noted, if the Uniform Code of Military Justice does not adequately “promote justice” or “assist in maintaining good order and discipline,” then it must change. The current system does not adequately promote justice, and it must change. It is our duty and our obligation to do the work to change it, and this body and every Senator in it deserves to have a vote.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be

determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form; and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald Michael Remy, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this is a critical time for America. It is a moment in which the actions we take or don’t take will affect the very design of our government for generations to come.

Our Founders had a vision that we all are created equal. In our initial Constitution, it wasn’t fully manifested, but we have worked through several hundred years to come to that point that we recognize that every American should be able to participate in the direction of their country. We had some key moments in that national debate.

I was always fascinated that when my father was born in 1919, women couldn’t vote in America. We had all kinds of other barriers for communities of color—for Black Americans, for Native Americans—and those barriers we struck down time after time after time.

Then we came to 1965, and we said there are still so many ways that communities are trying to keep every citizen from participating in voting, and we are going to make sure that ends from this point forward.

President Johnson said that the power of the vote is the most significant tool ever developed to strike down injustice. It is a powerful tool. It is really the beating heart of our Republic, that ballot box, the ability to say: This is what I like, and this is what I don’t like. This is who I like, and this is who I don’t think will carry the policies I believe in.

At its heart, this is a vision of power flowing up from the people, not down from the powerful, but here is the problem: The powerful don’t like that vision of America, so they have many, many strategies designed to try to override that founding vision of participation. They have legions of lawyers, and they have legions of lobbyists. There are three drug lobbyists for every single Member of Congress. They

have the ability to fund mass media campaigns to try to change the way that issues are framed. They have the ability to participate with dark money in elections that manifests itself in those endless attack ads you see on social media and on television.

They have all of these abilities, but the thing they really fear is the ballot box, and right now in America, they are going after the ballot box. We have to decide if we are going to defend it or not. That is the challenge that faces us, and it is a challenge that shouldn't be that difficult because every single one of us in this Chamber took an oath to the Constitution. The Constitution lays out the power, the vision of government of, by, and for the people. It starts off in the Constitution "we the people," not "we the powerful"—"we the people."

This assault has now spread to 18 States and 35 new, restrictive voting laws. These laws attack the ability to vote, and they are targeting Black Americans, communities of color, poor Americans, and college students. They make it harder to register. They make it easier to purge voters off the voting rolls. You can't vote if you are not on a voting roll. They attack early voting. They attack vote by mail. They attack curbside voting. They make it hard to drop off your ballot. They make it hard for people with disabilities to fill out their ballots.

In some cases, they are creating a strategy of voter intimidation by allowing poll watchers to essentially hover over you as you vote and challenge your legitimacy to vote. They have even decided, in some cases, to make it so that, if you are in line to vote and it is a hot day, nobody can give you a drink of water. All of these strategies are about biasing America in its process so the powerful will run this place rather than the people.

I would love to hear a Senator come to this floor and defend these attacks on the right to vote because, if you are not defending the right to vote, you are not defending the Constitution, and every one of us took an oath to that Constitution.

We also have a challenge with the courts. It is the Supreme Court that said that it is OK to have hundreds of millions of dollars of dark money—and nobody knows where it came from—in our elections. Now, if you or I donate \$100 to someone, it has to be disclosed. Everyone knows I made that donation. Yet if a powerful corporation or a billionaire puts \$1 million or \$100 million into an election, he can do it and remain in complete secrecy. That is why it is called dark money, and that is what the Court unleashed with its *Citizens United* decision.

Then the Court said: That is not enough. We are going to go after voting rights by undermining the 1965 Voting Rights Act, even though this Chamber has reauthorized that act on a bipartisan basis time after time after time.

First, the Court said in *Shelby County v. Holder* that preclearance no

longer applies. So a State that had been routinely attempting to block citizens from voting no longer had to have new changes in its voting laws precleared to make sure it did not have a prejudicial effect against a targeted group of voters. Within days, chambers in this country were plotting about how to stop people from voting. The Supreme Court was maybe just so idealistic that they said nobody would ever do this again in America and that no chamber would ever do this in America. If that were right, if that were their thought, they were wrong because, within days, those plots unfolded.

Then we have the most recent Supreme Court decision of *Brnovich v. DNC*, and Alito says that making voting inconvenient doesn't make access unequal. Well, let's just explain to this Justice, who apparently knows nothing about how voting really works, that when you make it inconvenient for a targeted group, you make access unequal. It is exactly the intent of these laws to make access unequal. Elena Kagan, in her dissent, said of the equal chance to participate in our democracy—referring to the 1965 Voting Rights Act—that this law, of all laws, should never be diminished by this Court.

Section 2 is the most recent section attacked by the Supreme Court, and it bars procedures that result in the denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of one's race or color. Well, one of the issues was from Arizona. It was a situation wherein you had no easy places to drop off your ballot in large Native American reservations. So by banning the ability of people to collect ballots and drop them off, you essentially make it extraordinarily difficult for this targeted community to vote, and that was the intent. That was the intent.

Now, this law, section 2, didn't say anything about intent. It said the result. It didn't say it had to be a denial. It said an abridgement—in other words, an infringement—on the ability to cast a ballot, but Alito doesn't care. The majority on the Supreme Court doesn't care about defending the right to vote, the pulsating heart of our Republic.

So where does that leave us? It leaves us as the critical factor to defend the Constitution. The Supreme Court won't do it. The States are undermining it. It is our responsibility—our responsibility—to set out those basic standards that defend the ability of every American to vote. That is why I am here on the floor tonight, talking about the For the People Act.

It is called S. 1. Why? Because defending the right to vote is our No. 1 responsibility. That is the challenge we face, and if we fail in this challenge, then across this country, in State after State after State, communities are being targeted to make it hard for them to vote, and it will be harder for them to vote. It will change the out-

come, and it will destroy the idea of equal representation. We cannot let that happen.

Today, I met with members of the Texas Legislature. They have come here in order to stop the Texas House of Representatives from passing these types of laws that are targeted at stopping specific groups from voting.

What are the types of laws that are being considered by the Texas Legislature right now? One is they don't like the idea of Christian communities voting on Sundays and getting in buses to go to the polls together. They call it *Souls to the Polls*. So they said: Do you know what? It will be against the law for more than three of you to get in a car and drive together to the polls. Are you kidding me? Has anybody heard of the right of association? Are any Senators here caring about defending the right of association in our Constitution?

Can you imagine something so diabolical as to say: "All three of you can get in a car but not four," and "Do you know why? Because we want to stop you from using vans or buses to go vote"? That is crazy. It is as crazy as the Georgia effort to stop people from passing out water in long voter lines.

What else is the Texas Legislature trying to do?

It is infringing on overnight voting, voting for people who have long hours, who are working during the day. Overnight voting really made the ballot accessible.

They are attacking drive-through voting. They are attacking online registration. They are attacking assistance to disabled Americans. They are making it easier to purge voters off the lists of voters, the registration lists.

They even have in that bill stopping election workers from sending out absentee ballot applications. Is it a crime to be able to help your fellow citizen apply for a ballot? Yes, if Texas passes that law.

They are also engaged in a process of voter intimidation by allowing partisan poll watchers to freely intimidate voters. That is wrong on so many levels. Intimidation is something that has a long history in our country. It is a very racist history. I remember one of the stories after the Civil War. You had a situation wherein you formed a group of horses surrounding a ballot poll place to prevent Black Americans from being able to get to the polls to vote.

There are all kinds of other voter intimidation strategies. They were racist strategies. These efforts to stop Black Americans from voting are racist strategies. It is simply, simply wrong, and we have the responsibility to end these practices. The effort to silence the voices of the American people, to stop them from having a say through their votes, is just fundamental to the vision of a government of, by, and for the people.

Citizens wonder why it is they are hearing that billionaires don't pay any taxes and that some of the most profitable corporations in America don't pay

any taxes. Well, it goes back to the many advantages the wealthy have in influencing the outcomes. Those reams of liars, those platoons of lobbyists, those media campaigns, that dark money, and now the effort to block the ballot box, that is how afraid the powerful are that the voice of the people will say: Invest in American families rather than tax breaks for billionaires. Tackle healthcare and housing and education. Create living-wage jobs rather than new tax cuts for the already wealthy and influential.

What we have is a battle between the powerful and privileged holding onto their lever of power, trembling at the idea that American voters can get to the polls and determine to block it. They are afraid that, if voters can get to the polls, they might elect people who are fighting for Main Street rather than Wall Street. They are afraid they might invest—those elected individuals—in quality, affordable healthcare—and healthcare should be a right, not a privilege—that we might invest in housing because there is a tremendous housing shortage across America and that we might invest in education because education is the path to success in our complex society.

So how do we address this? We pass S. 1, the For the People Act. We do it by following the example of men and women who sat in this Chamber half a century ago and used their power to pass the 1965 Voting Rights Act to give every American a full opportunity to vote.

Once again, this more than half a century later, we are called upon to fight to defend our Constitution, to defend the “we the people” vision and ensure that every American can freely and fairly cast a ballot.

This bill sets out basic national standards for how elections are conducted in accordance with the constitutional power specifically stated for Congress to be able to so set such standards to ensure that every American has equal freedom to vote, equal opportunity regardless of who they are, the color of their skin, or where they live. It ensures this access by protecting vote-by-mail, early voting, and fairness on ballot drop boxes.

Why are early voting and vote-by-mail so scary to the powerful? Here is why. On election day, there are so many ways to stop people from voting. First of all, you reduce the number of precincts in the communities you don’t want to vote, so there are fewer places to vote. Then you put them in places where there is no parking. That makes it harder. Then you reduce the number of precinct workers in those locations, so there are really long lines. You have heard about those lines—3 hours, 4 hours, 5 hours, 6 hours, 7 hours. Then you tell people you can’t even give people a glass of water to those who are waiting in those lines. Then you intimidate people by allowing partisan poll watchers to hover over people while they vote or one single person to

challenge the legitimacy of the right to vote of every single person who walks in that door, because that is another one of the bills that is being passed in State after State.

Election day can be easily manipulated, and there are even more ways to do it. One is—and this happens—you send out false information about what day is election day. You send out texts that say: So sorry you missed the election last Tuesday. Hope you make it to the polls next time.

So people think they missed the vote. They are, like, well, I thought it was next Tuesday, but I got this text, so it was last Tuesday.

You put out false information about where the voting location is. You proceed to make sure you change the location from the previous time so people get confused about where to go and vote in the wrong precinct, and then you make it illegal for their vote to be counted if they voted in the wrong precinct.

Election day is easy to manipulate. The antidote is early voting and vote-by-mail, and that is why the powerful are attacking early voting and vote-by-mail.

Now, my State, Oregon, was the first State to adopt vote-by-mail. It did so when we had a Republican house and a Republican senate in my State. Utah was a major early State to do vote-by-mail. It is considered a red State, a Republican State. This isn’t blue or red. This is American. This is our Constitution.

A second thing that the For the People Act does is stop billionaires from buying elections with dark money. You know, no matter if you poll Republicans, Independents, or Democrats, they all believe billionaires shouldn’t be able to buy elections with dark money. They know that if a billionaire can create the equivalent of a stadium sound system that drowns out the voice of the people, that that is just wrong.

Think about how Americans thought of those early debates in the town square. Everyone got their chance to stand up and have their say. You didn’t allow someone to erect a big sound system to drown out the people you didn’t want to speak. No. Give everyone—that is kind of the heart, isn’t it, of our First Amendment? Free speech. Everyone should be able to have their voice heard and not be drowned out by advertisements by anonymous billionaires buying elections.

The third thing this act does is it ends partisan gerrymandering. It creates independent Commissions—equal numbers of Republicans, Democrats, Independents—and therefore fights for the vision of equal representation.

Now, I have heard some folks salivating over increased gerrymandering, hoping to influence that other institution down the hall, saying: Hey, we have an extra 15 votes we shouldn’t have right now. Let’s get 25 with increased gerrymandering.

Well, it is just wrong to attack the principle of equal representation. You don’t have equal representation if the system is rigged so that politicians choose their voters rather than voters choosing their politicians.

The fourth thing the For the People Act does, it takes on ethics reforms and targets corruption. Again, whether you ask Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, they want the corruption out of our system. They want to ensure that public officials serve the public, not some private cause or serve themselves; that we are going to do the people’s business, not the business of some outside billionaire or some outside corporation.

These principles are widely supported across the country. The people sometimes say: Why don’t you have any Republican sponsors on this bill? Why don’t Republicans support this bill?

Across this Nation, Republicans overwhelmingly support these four principles in this bill. It is incredibly bipartisan. But not here in this Chamber because here is where the powerful speak, and the minority leader has said: I am going to lock down my Senators from supporting these efforts to defend our Constitution.

I would be embarrassed—I would be embarrassed if a leader of a caucus said it is going to lock me down to prevent me from defending the Constitution. I would be more than embarrassed; I would be alarmed. I would be outraged, as should every Member of this body across the aisle—should be outraged that they are being told they are locked down from defending the Constitution.

Next month, America will celebrate the 56th anniversary of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, the most powerful, significant advancement this Nation has ever made to realize that “we the people” vision of America.

Lyndon Johnson called August 6, 1965—the day he signed that law—“a triumph for freedom as huge as any victory that has ever been won on any battlefield.” He said: “The heart of the act is plain. Wherever, by clear and objective standards, States and counties use regulations, or laws, or tests to deny the right to vote, then they will be struck down.”

Well, that is our job, to do what President Johnson thought was accomplished when he signed the Voting Rights Act—to strike down regulations, laws, or tests designed to deny the right to vote to targeted groups of Americans across this country. So let’s do our job. Put this bill on the floor, and get it passed.

Thank you, Mr. President.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to legislative session for 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 DETECTIVE GREG FERENCY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, Hoosiers have one less hero. On July 7, Detective Greg Ferency died in the line of duty in Terre Haute, IN. This is a tragic loss for his community and our State. Greg's life was dedicated to protecting people, pursuing justice, and preventing violence.

For 30 years, he served Terre Haute, the town where he was born and raised, as a police officer; during 10 of those, he doubled as a member of a Federal Bureau of Investigation task force.

Greg broke drug rings, battled the evil of human trafficking, and helped defend places of worship from terrorism. He was constantly on the frontlines in the fight against crime, leading and securing over 550 methamphetamine lab investigations. He was a teacher, too, training teammates, leading community forums, and authoring a book on drug enforcement.

A father of two, Greg was admired by his police peers and valued by the Federal agents he worked with. "You'll never meet a finer person," remembered a colleague. The hundreds of friends and fellow officers who paid tribute during his funeral bears witness to this.

We mourn his loss, we celebrate his life, and we keep his loved ones in our hearts and prayers. And we remember this: What we call bravery, the men and women who wear the badge simply call duty. They willingly stand in the way of threats to decency and order. They face grave dangers so other Americans do not have to.

Greg Ferency was one of these guardians. There are no words to adequately express our gratitude to him. I ask my colleagues, though, to join me in extending our sympathies to his family and pledging to never forget his sacrifice.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MONIQUE LAMOREAUX-MORANDO AND JOCELYNE LAMOREAUX-DAVIDSON

• Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the newest recipients of the North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Rough Rider Award, who are being honored in their hometown of Grand Forks today. They are Monique Lamoureux-Morando and Jocelyne Lamoureux-Davidson, better known as the Lamoureux Twins.

Before the rest of the world knew them, these identical twins made a name for themselves in North Dakota.

Those of us with children their same age who competed with them on soccer and hockey teams were well aware of their talents.

Monique and Jocelyne grew up in a hockey family. Their father was a goaltender for the University of North Dakota team, and they joined their four older brothers in learning the sport at an early age. Girls' hockey was not well developed in the 1990s, so they played on boys' teams, leading one of those teams to a State championship when they were 12 years old.

While playing hockey at Shattuck-St. Mary's Prep School in Minnesota, they were named to the U.S. Four Nations team as high school juniors in 2006. Three years later in 2009, the hockey world became more aware of these twin powerhouses from North Dakota. While playing collegiate hockey for the University of Minnesota, they made the World Championship team that won the Gold Medal in Finland. They then transferred to the University of North Dakota to finish their college hockey careers and that December were named to the 2010 Olympic team.

They have played on three Winter Olympics women's hockey teams, the first two in Vancouver, Canada, in 2010 and Sochi, Russia, in 2014, where the U.S. team won Silver Medals against Canada. It was on February 18, 2018, in PyeongChang, South Korea, when the sisters were at the center of what is considered one of the greatest moments in U.S. Olympic history.

With 21 seconds remaining in regulation play, Monique scored the tying goal—again against the Canadian women. Jocelyn then sealed the win in the sixth round of the tie-breaking shootout. Her now famous "Oops, I did it again" shot scored the goal and brought the women's Olympic Gold Medal home to the United States for the first time in 20 years.

After 14 years as members of Team USA hockey, in February they retired from their golden careers. While on Team USA, Monique skated in 135 games and scored 143 points, and Jocelyne skated in 137 games and scored 138 points. From 2009 to 2018, they played in every major International Ice Hockey Federation event. They have brought home an impressive number of medals, including one Olympic Gold, two Olympic Silver, six World Championship Gold and one World Championship Silver. They made history in North Dakota in 2014 for being the first State athletes to win multiple Olympic medals.

The Lamoureux Twins have been widely praised by teammates and coaches for their perseverance and adaptability. Often noted when describing them are their work ethic, focus, grit, determination, attention to detail, class, respect, and integrity. They have been called humble, tough, and generous. They have a clear sense of right and wrong and are always challenging each other to be better. One

sportswriter described the Lamoureux Twins as "having work ethics that would put a combustion engine to shame."

These young women have been witness to and instrumental in the growth of women's hockey on and off the ice. Today, with women's hockey much more prominent than it was 20 years ago, they sponsor and conduct hockey camps to better train girls and women players. In 2017, they were among those on the U.S. national team who threatened a boycott before the Women's World Championship to highlight the need for better financial support and benefits for women team players.

Today, Monique and Jocelyne live in Grand Forks with their husbands and young families. They published a book, "Dare to Make History," earlier this year, and they have established a charitable foundation to support underprivileged children through education and by promoting gender equality and internet access for low income families.

The North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Rough Rider Award was established in 1961. It recognizes North Dakotans who have been influenced by the State in achieving national recognition in their fields of endeavor, thereby reflecting credit and honor upon North Dakota and its citizens. It was named after President Theodore Roosevelt, who credited his time living in North Dakota for influencing his success later in life. We can only imagine what his reaction would be to the accomplishments of Monique and Jocelyne. As only the 45th and 46th recipients, at age 32, they are the youngest to be honored with this highest award given by the State, and they have a lifetime ahead of themselves for even more impressive achievements.

Mr. President, on behalf of the citizens of North Dakota, I congratulate Monique Lamoureux-Morando and Jocelyne Lamoureux-Davidson on receiving the North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Rough Rider Award today. You are true champions.●

TRIBUTE TO RON PISANESCHI

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator Jim Risch and Representatives MIKE SIMPSON and RUSS FULCHER, I congratulate Ron Pisaneschi on his remarkable more than 35-year career with Idaho Public Television.

Ron is retiring after serving as Idaho Public Television's general manager since August 2013. He joined Idaho Public Television in 1985 and served in numerous positions for the station prior to his managerial role. This includes serving as director of content, director of programming, director of public information, and director of marketing and development. We understand under his leadership of the station, Idaho Public Television has been one of the most watched and best supported Public Broadcasting Service, PBS, stations

per capita in the Nation. Douglas Bal-four, president of the Friends of Idaho Public Television, wrote, “With his leadership, IdahoPTV has focused on the wonderful people and places we have in the Gem State, with local productions like Idaho Reports, Outdoor Idaho and Idaho Experience. Ron will be missed, but we will carry on in the tradition he established.”

Ron has also contributed extensively of his time and talents to serving in various roles throughout the community, State, and Nation. This includes his service as vice chair of the NETA board of directors, chair of the Idaho State Broadcasters Association, and member of the board of directors of American Public Television. Ron dedicated more than 25 years to serving on the PBS Children’s Advisory Committee. He also served on the board of directors of the Public Television Programming Association from 2002–2007, serving as president in 2006. From 2002–2012, he served on the board of directors of the Idaho Humanities Council, where he served two terms as chairman. These are just a few examples of his longtime involvement in numerous leadership roles and advisory panels. His dedicated work has earned recognition, including Ron being named the 2005 Programmer of the Year by his colleagues in the PBS system.

Ron, thank you for your commitment to advancing public discussions in Idaho for all these years. Your curiosity, ingenuity, and thoughtful advocacy for Idaho interests have no doubt contributed significantly to broadening understanding, educational opportunities, and public discourse across Idaho and well beyond our State’s borders. We will miss you at the helm of Idaho Public Television but wish you all the best in a well-earned retirement.●

RECOGNIZING GLAUBER’S SPORTS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize Glauber’s Sports, a family-owned small business in Carrollton, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 1863, a young shoemaker, John Glauber, established Glauber’s Shoes in Carrollton, KY. Opening up shop on Main Street, the business provided quality footwear to residents of Carroll County and the surrounding area. Over the next 140 years, Glauber’s Shoes became the oldest shoe store in Kentucky and over time expanded its offerings to include hunting supplies. Passing through multiple generations, by the early 2000s, John Glauber, a fourth-generation descendant of the original owner, ran the business alongside his son, Randy, who started helping out around the shop when he was in the sixth grade. After graduating from

high school, Randy worked in the store full time and learned how to run the family business. He later took over when his father retired in 2005. Since taking over, Randy further expanded the store’s hunting inventory and re-named the store to Glauber’s Sports to more accurately reflect its inventory.

Today, Glauber’s Sports is lauded as a one-stop-shop for hunting and shooting sports enthusiasts in Northern Kentucky. Praised for great customer service, Randy has demonstrated a dynamic approach to managing the store, actively responding to local market demands by expanding its stock and ensuring the needs of the community are met. To accommodate its growing inventory, Glauber’s Sports moved locations from Main Street to Fourth Street in 2007. With over 1000 firearms in stock, the store carries a wide range of rifles and shotguns. Additionally, Glauber’s Sports sells other supplies like muzzle loaders, crossbows, outdoor wear, hunting blinds, and scopes. Looking to the future, Randy is committed to continuing the family tradition of serving Carrollton and is training his son, John, to take over the 158-year-old business for decades to come.

A pillar of the community, Glauber’s Sports is actively involved with various local organizations. Over the decades, Glauber’s has supported area schools’ sports teams and events like the Carroll County Fair. Furthermore, Randy regularly volunteers with local shooting sports organizations by coaching the Carroll County High School trap club and 4-H shooting sports clubs and by doing so passes on a lifelong passion for shooting sports, gun safety, and his support for the Second Amendment. Additionally, like many other small businesses, Glauber’s Sports is a member of the National Federation of Independent Businesses and the Chamber of Commerce.

Glauber’s Sports is a remarkable example of the resilience and adaptability of family-owned small businesses. Small businesses, like Glauber’s Sports, form the heart of towns across Kentucky by regularly stepping up to support the needs of their communities. Congratulations to Randy, the Glauber family, and the entire team at Glauber’s Sports. I wish Glauber’s Sports the best of luck and look forward to watching this family-business’ continued growth and success in Kentucky.

TRIBUTE TO RENEE LIMOGRE REEVE

● Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I would like to recognize a critical member of my staff, my former State Director Renée Limogre Reeve, who left my office in June to become the vice president of Government & Community Relations at Cruise Lines International Association, or CLIA, Alaska. It is a big and important job for Alaska, and all of us with Team Sullivan are confident she will do a great job.

As a student at the University of Vermont, Renée explored her passions for government and English. After graduation, Renée left Vermont to start a new journey in Alaska.

Renée’s work in Alaska began over a decade ago as an aide for the State legislature. In Juneau, Renée honed her skills for communication and leadership—fostering a fun and collaborative team environment.

I was honored when Renée joined Team Sullivan in 2018. As the director of my State office, Renée was the boots on the ground where our presence matters most. Enthusiastic and sharp, Renée was the ultimate liaison between Federal, State, and Tribal governments, and, most importantly, the people of Alaska, to whom she was ultimately committed.

Leadership is the measure of how we connect with people, empathize, and make others feel welcome. Renée is an outstanding leader. She has a keen political perspective and unrivaled wit.

Renée’s talents for communication and humor culminated in her famous get-togethers. Renée is known for gathering people from all walks of life around good food, occasional adult prom parties, and always, laughter.

We wish her the best as Renée sets sail on her new adventure.

While she is no longer on my staff, Renée will always be a member of the Sullivan family. Please join me in wishing Renée success in her future. She will be missed.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1314. A communication from the Deputy Undersecretary for International Affairs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Progress in Implementing Chapter 16 (Labor) and Capacity-Building under the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1315. A communication from the Principal Deputy Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual Eligibles: 2021”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1316. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, seven (7) reports of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee (CPAC) from 2020 relative to memoranda of understanding and cultural property agreements; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1317. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to action taken to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Chile Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Categories of Archaeological Material of Chile; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1318. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress: Efforts to Improve the Quality of Health Care for Children and Adults Enrolled in Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), 2017-2019"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1319. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report entitled "2020 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1320. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1321. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule of Fees for Consular Services - Fee Change for Certain Border Crossing Cards" (RIN1400-AF15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1322. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1323. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary/Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1324. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Formula Grants Program" (RIN1121-AA83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1325. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Research and Engineering), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Telecommunications Security Program Implementation Plan for Department of Defense 5G Infrastructure"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1326. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1327. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 772. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 Minnetonka Avenue South in Wayzata, Minnesota, as the "Jim Ramstad Post Office".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Alejandra Y. Castillo, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

*Jane Toshiko Nishida, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

By Mr. SCHATZ for the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Bryan Todd Newland, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

*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. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2337. A bill to prohibit the imposition of mask mandates on public transportation; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 2338. A bill to improve fairness in political speech, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. THUNE, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ERNST, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 2339. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid vapor pressure limitations under such Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2340. A bill to improve the safety and security of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BURR, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2341. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the treatment of moving expenses to employees and new appointees in the intelligence community who move pursuant to a change in assignment that requires relocation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2342. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration of disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2343. A bill to require the head of each agency to establish a safety plan relating to COVID-19 for any worksite at which employees or contractors are required to be physically present during the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 2344. A bill to award grants for the creation, recruitment, training and education, retention, and advancement of the direct care workforce and to award grants to support family caregivers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 2345. A bill to require the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center to submit a report on the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2346. A bill to codify Executive Order 13950 (relating to combating race and sex stereotyping), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2347. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a rebate program to promote the purchase and installation of electric vehicle supply equipment for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2348. A bill to establish within the Office of Entrepreneurial Development of the Small Business Administration a training curriculum relating to businesses owned by older individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2349. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 300. A resolution honoring the memories of the victims of the building collapse in Surfside, Florida, on June 24, 2021, and the bravery and selfless service of the individuals who responded to the building collapse; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 301. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Fulbright Program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 302. A resolution congratulating and honoring Argonne National Laboratory on 75 years of scientific excellence; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 382

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to establish the Office of the Ombudsperson for Immigrant Children in Government Custody, and for other purposes.

S. 452

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 452, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 565

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 565, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation-exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 576

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 699, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 701

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide equal coverage of in vitro specific IgE tests and percutaneous tests for allergies under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 775

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing-related misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 958

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 958, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the allowable use criteria for new access points grants for community health centers.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to prohibit certain business concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1068, a bill to direct the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue an occupational safety and health standard to protect workers from heat-related injuries and illnesses.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1255

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1255, a bill to require the Minority Business Development Agency of the Department of Commerce to promote and administer programs in the public and private sectors to assist the development of minority business enterprises, to ensure that such Agency has the necessary supporting resources, particularly during economic downturns, and for other purposes.

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to appropriate an additional amount to improve the Navy shipyard infrastructure of the United States.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure access to water and food for voters waiting in line at polling stations in Federal elections.

S. 1613

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1613, a bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a grant program for certain fitness facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1692

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1692, a bill to provide better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related to dementias and their caregivers, while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

S. 1858

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1858, a bill to prohibit and prevent seclusion, mechanical restraint, chemical restraint, and dangerous restraints that restrict breathing, and to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint in schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1872, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and for other purposes.

S. 2023

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator

from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2023, a bill to provide loan forgiveness for certain borrowers of Department of Agriculture direct farm loans, and for other purposes.

S. 2057

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2057, a bill to appropriately limit the size of the population required for urban areas of metropolitan statistical areas.

S. 2161

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2161, a bill to modify the restriction in section 3326 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the appointment of retired members of the Armed Forces to positions in the Department of Defense to apply to positions at or above the GS-14 level.

S. 2294

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2294, a bill to require an independent assessment with respect to the Arctic region and establishment of Arctic Security Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 2304

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2304, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include an appropriate disclosure of pricing information.

S. 2315

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2315, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a program to provide health care coverage to low-income adults in States that have not expanded Medicaid.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 182

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 182, a resolution recognizing the late Gilbert Metz, the last Holocaust survivor who lived in Mississippi, and commending all educators who

teach about the Holocaust and all genocide.

S. RES. 183

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 183, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 2344. A bill to award grants for the creation, recruitment, training and education, retention, and advancement of the direct care workforce and to award grants to support family caregivers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. With a growing number of older adults and people with disabilities in the U.S., our Nation is becoming increasingly reliant on the direct care workforce and family caregivers who support older adults and people with disabilities. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated this need.

The direct care workforce, such as direct support workers, home care workers, personal care workers or other paid workers who support older adults and people with disabilities in their homes and communities, has long experienced staffing shortages in part because of low wages and high turnover. Currently, 4.5 million workers—including nearly 2.3 million home care workers—make up the direct care workforce, and this industry is expected to grow by more than a million jobs by 2028, not including the jobs that will need to be filled as existing workers leave the field or exit the labor force. The shortage of direct care workers often puts pressure on family caregivers. The number of American caregivers providing unpaid caregiving has increased over the past 5 years, and 23 percent of caregivers say that caregiving has made their health worse.

Today, I am pleased to introduce the Supporting Our Direct Care Workforce and Family Caregivers Act along with my colleagues Senators BOB CASEY, MAGGIE HASSAN, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, JACK REED, RON WYDEN, KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, and JACKY ROSEN. Our legislation would direct the Department of Health and Human Services, through the Administration on Community Living (ACL), to award grants to states or other eligible entities for initiatives to

build, retain, train and educate, and promote the direct care workforce, including self-directed workers and direct care supervisors or managers, and to provide education and training support for family caregivers to help ease stresses associated with caregiving. Grants could be used for preapprenticeship and on-the-job training opportunities, apprenticeship programs, career ladders or pathways, specializations or certification or other activities to recruit and retain direct care professionals in the field. Additionally, the bill creates a technical assistance center at ACL to bolster coordination across Federal agencies, provide consultation to States, and make policy recommendations to support the direct care workforce and family caregivers.

The bill aligns with President Biden's American Jobs Plan, which calls for substantial investments to meet the demand for home and community-based services and invests in our country's care infrastructure. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to see the Supporting Our Direct Care Workforce and Family Caregivers Act as an opportunity to invest in the direct care workforce and family caregivers—both critical pieces of the care team who provide support for millions of Americans every day, ensuring they can live their lives independently and with dignity.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2348. A bill to establish within the Office of Entrepreneurial Development of the Small Business Administration a training curriculum relating to businesses owned by older individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, American entrepreneurship and innovation is the backbone of the American economy. American entrepreneurs provide new job opportunities for millions, bring new technologies to the marketplace, and drive forward our shared American Dream. Small businesses account for half of our gross domestic product, more than half our jobs, and three-fourths of new jobs created each year. Contrary to popular belief, not all of America's entrepreneurs are young tech-focused individuals starting companies in their garages.

In fact, millions of older Americans represent a powerful and growing share of American entrepreneurs. Today, the average age of successful entrepreneurs in America is 45, and in 2018, 3 in 10 entrepreneurs were over the age of 50, an increase of 50 percent since 2007. Today, entrepreneurs ages 55 and over represent 55 percent of all small business employers. Not only do seniors represent the majority of small business employers, but their life experiences help drive their businesses to the top 0.1 percent of the highest growth startups in the country based on growth in the first 5 years of operation.

In my conversations with older entrepreneurs in South Carolina. I have learned how they combine their years of experience, networks, and dreams to start countless successful small businesses. I have also learned that older entrepreneurs often face unique challenges in today's economy. Those challenges include the need for enhanced digital and technical skills, mentorship opportunities, business growth and hiring training; along with resources for estate and retirement planning for their businesses. These obstacles can prevent small businesses owned by older Americans from reaching their full growth potential. This untapped business growth potential leaves capital on the sidelines and slows innovation and job creation.

That is why today I am introducing the Golden-preneurship Act. The Golden-preneurship Act would take a meaningful step in helping catapult senior-owned small businesses into the next level of success by establishing a new training program for "Golden Entrepreneurs" at the Small Business Administration. The newly developed "Golden Entrepreneurs" training program would equip proven senior entrepreneurs with the necessary tools to increase their business's market share and help bring jobs and capital to communities around the country. "Golden Entrepreneurs" would be a 7-month training program with two years of benchmark check-ins to fill the market gap and bridge the knowledge divide in digital and technical skills, business growth and hiring training, estate and retirement business planning, and provide new mentorship opportunities. The Golden-preneurship Act also requires the Small Business Administration to track the loans and grants provided to older Americans, valuable information we need to ensure America's older entrepreneurs are receiving the help they need.

With the Golden-preneurship Act we will ensure that today's Golden Entrepreneurs have the tools and resources to create tomorrow's jobs, new technologies, and opportunities.

Thank you.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2349. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. 2349

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 "Protecting Consumers from Unreasonable Credit Rates Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) attempts have been made to prohibit usurious interest rates in America since colonial times;

(2) at the Federal level, in 2006, Congress enacted a Federal 36-percent annualized usury cap for servicemembers and their families for covered credit products, as defined by the Department of Defense, which curbed payday, car title, and tax refund lending around military bases;

(3) notwithstanding such attempts to curb predatory lending, high-cost lending persists in all 50 States due to loopholes in State laws, safe harbor laws for specific forms of credit, and the exportation of unregulated interest rates permitted by preemption;

(4) due to the lack of a comprehensive Federal usury cap, consumers have paid as much as approximately \$14,000,000,000 on high-cost overdraft loans, \$9,000,000,000 on storefront and online payday loans, \$3,800,000,000 on car title loans, and additional amounts in unreported revenues on high-cost online installment loans;

(5) cash-strapped consumers pay on average approximately 400-percent annual interest for payday loans, 300-percent annual interest for car title loans, 17,000 percent for bank overdraft loans, and triple-digit rates for online installment loans;

(6) a national maximum interest rate that includes all forms of fees and closes all loopholes is necessary to eliminate such predatory lending; and

(7) alternatives to predatory lending that encourage small dollar loans with minimal or no fees, installment payment schedules, and affordable repayment periods should be encouraged.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL MAXIMUM INTEREST RATE.

Chapter 2 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 140B. MAXIMUM RATES OF INTEREST.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no creditor may make an extension of credit to a consumer with respect to which the fee and interest rate, as defined in subsection (b), exceeds 36 percent.

"(b) FEE AND INTEREST RATE DEFINED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the fee and interest rate includes all charges payable, directly or indirectly, incident to, ancillary to, or as a condition of the extension of credit, including—

"(A) any payment compensating a creditor or prospective creditor for—

"(i) an extension of credit or making available a line of credit, such as fees connected with credit extension or availability such as numerical periodic rates, annual fees, cash advance fees, and membership fees; or

"(ii) any fees for default or breach by a borrower of a condition upon which credit was extended, such as late fees, creditor-imposed not sufficient funds fees charged when a borrower tenders payment on a debt with a check drawn on insufficient funds, overdraft fees, and over limit fees;

"(B) all fees which constitute a finance charge, as defined by rules of the Bureau in accordance with this title;

"(C) credit insurance premiums, whether optional or required; and

"(D) all charges and costs for ancillary products sold in connection with or incidental to the credit transaction.

"(2) TOLERANCES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a credit obligation that is payable in at least 3 fully amortizing installments over at least 90 days, the term 'fee and interest rate' does not include—

"(i) application or participation fees that in total do not exceed the greater of \$30 or,

if there is a limit to the credit line, 5 percent of the credit limit, up to \$120, if—

"(I) such fees are excludable from the finance charge pursuant to section 106 and regulations issued thereunder;

"(II) such fees cover all credit extended or renewed by the creditor for 12 months; and

"(III) the minimum amount of credit extended or available on a credit line is equal to \$300 or more;

"(ii) a late fee charged as authorized by State law and by the agreement that does not exceed either \$20 per late payment or \$20 per month; or

"(iii) a creditor-imposed not sufficient funds fee charged when a borrower tenders payment on a debt with a check drawn on insufficient funds that does not exceed \$15.

"(B) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—The Bureau may adjust the amounts of the tolerances established under this paragraph for inflation over time, consistent with the primary goals of protecting consumers and ensuring that the 36-percent fee and interest rate limitation is not circumvented.

"(C) CALCULATIONS.—

"(1) OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.—For an open end credit plan—

"(A) the fee and interest rate shall be calculated each month, based upon the sum of all fees and finance charges described in subsection (b) charged by the creditor during the preceding 1-year period, divided by the average daily balance; and

"(B) if the credit account has been open less than 1 year, the fee and interest rate shall be calculated based upon the total of all fees and finance charges described in subsection (b)(1) charged by the creditor since the plan was opened, divided by the average daily balance, and multiplied by the quotient of 12 divided by the number of full months that the credit plan has been in existence.

"(2) OTHER CREDIT PLANS.—For purposes of this section, in calculating the fee and interest rate, the Bureau shall require the method of calculation of annual percentage rate specified in section 107(a)(1), except that the amount referred to in that section 107(a)(1) as the 'finance charge' shall include all fees, charges, and payments described in subsection (b)(1) of this section.

"(3) ADJUSTMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Bureau may make adjustments to the calculations in paragraphs (1) and (2), but the primary goals of such adjustment shall be to protect consumers and to ensure that the 36-percent fee and interest rate limitation is not circumvented.

"(d) DEFINITION OF CREDITOR.—As used in this section, the term 'creditor' has the same meaning as in section 702(e) of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691a(e)).

"(e) NO EXEMPTIONS PERMITTED.—The exemption authority of the Bureau under section 105 shall not apply to the rates established under this section or the disclosure requirements under section 127(b)(6).

"(f) DISCLOSURE OF FEE AND INTEREST RATE FOR CREDIT OTHER THAN OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.—In addition to the disclosure requirements under section 127(b)(6), the Bureau may prescribe regulations requiring disclosure of the fee and interest rate established under this section.

"(g) RELATION TO STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt any provision of State law that provides greater protection to consumers than is provided in this section.

"(h) CIVIL LIABILITY AND ENFORCEMENT.—In addition to remedies available to the consumer under section 130(a), any payment compensating a creditor or prospective creditor, to the extent that such payment is a transaction made in violation of this section, shall be null and void, and not enforceable by

any party in any court or alternative dispute resolution forum, and the creditor or any subsequent holder of the obligation shall promptly return to the consumer any principal, interest, charges, and fees, and any security interest associated with such transaction. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or repose, a violation of this section may be raised as a matter of defense by recoupment or setoff to an action to collect such debt or repossess related security at any time.

“(i) VIOLATIONS.—Any person that violates this section, or seeks to enforce an agreement made in violation of this section, shall be subject to, for each such violation, 1 year in prison and a fine in an amount equal to the greater of—

“(1) three times the amount of the total accrued debt associated with the subject transaction; or

“(2) \$50,000.

“(j) STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—An action to enforce this section may be brought by the appropriate State attorney general in any United States district court or any other court of competent jurisdiction within 3 years from the date of the violation, and such attorney general may obtain injunctive relief.”

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE OF FEE AND INTEREST RATE FOR OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.

Section 127(b)(6) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1637(b)(6)) is amended by striking “the total finance charge expressed” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting “the fee and interest rate, displayed as ‘FAIR’, established under section 141.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 300—HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE BUILDING COLLAPSE IN SURFSIDE, FLORIDA, ON JUNE 24, 2021, AND THE BRAVERY AND SELFLESS SERVICE OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO RESPONDED TO THE BUILDING COLLAPSE

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 300

Whereas, on Thursday, June 24, 2021, portions of the Champlain Towers South condominium building in Surfside, Florida, catastrophically collapsed;

Whereas, in the aftermath of the devastating collapse—

(1) one of the largest rescue and recovery operations in the history of the United States commenced to locate scores of residents who were unaccounted for and believed to be in the collapsed building;

(2) first responders from across the State of Florida immediately answered the call of duty, including firefighters, uniformed police officers, rescue and recovery crews, emergency medical technicians, physicians, nurses, and others rushing to save the lives of individuals trapped in the building;

(3) international rescue crews and emergency support organizations from Israel and Mexico responded to the site to aid in the search and recovery efforts;

(4) National Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces from Florida, Virginia, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, as well as emergency specialists from California, deployed to Surfside, Florida, to provide critical support;

(5) numerous volunteer organizations and individuals from across the United States and around the world responded to Surfside, Florida, to support the community and provide aid, resources, and assistance to individuals in need; and

(6) teams worked tirelessly around the clock to rescue survivors and recover the remains of individuals killed in the tragic collapse;

Whereas the building collapse in Surfside, Florida, led to significant injuries and the heartbreaking loss of life; and

Whereas this devastating building collapse has been met with an overwhelming outpouring of support from the people of the United States and people throughout the world, who continue to pray for the victims, their families, and all individuals affected by this tragedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the bravery and selfless service demonstrated by the local, State, national, and international teams of first responders deployed in the aftermath of the collapse of the Champlain Towers South condominium building in Surfside, Florida, on June 24, 2021;

(2) commemorates the lives lost in the tragic building collapse and offers heartfelt condolences to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims; and

(3) expresses sincere gratitude to the countless organizations and individuals offering resources, support, and comfort to the survivors and community in Surfside, Florida.

SENATE RESOLUTION 301—RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 301

Whereas August 1, 2021, marks the 75th anniversary of President Harry S. Truman signing into law the Act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 754, chapter 723) (commonly known as the “Fulbright Act of 1946”);

Whereas the Fulbright Program was established by Senator James William Fulbright of Arkansas for the “promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science”;

Whereas the Fulbright Program is sponsored by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State;

Whereas the Fulbright Program provides approximately 8,000 grants annually and, as of 2021, operates in more than 160 countries, including 49 that have established cost-sharing binational commissions;

Whereas approximately 1,300 institutions of higher education in the United States, both public and private, host students at home and send scholars abroad;

Whereas current Fulbright students and scholars hail from all 50 States and 2 United States territories, and approximately a quarter are from minority or underrepresented populations;

Whereas approximately 400,000 individuals from across the globe have benefitted from this unique opportunity;

Whereas alumni of the Fulbright Program include 60 Nobel Prize laureates, 75 MacArthur Foundation fellows, 89 recipients of the Pulitzer Prize, 39 current or former heads of state or government, 16 Presidential Medal of Freedom recipients, 5 members of

Congress, and a former Secretary General of the United Nations;

Whereas, on April 21, 2016, an American elm was planted on the grounds of the United States Capitol in recognition of the 70th anniversary of the Fulbright Program; and

Whereas the Fulbright Program promotes United States higher education abroad and remains a valuable diplomatic tool: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the Fulbright Program;

(2) encourages the President and the Secretary of State to work with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State to support the work of the Fulbright Program;

(3) congratulates all past and present recipients of Fulbright awards; and

(4) calls on students, scholars, and professionals around the world to seek out opportunities to engage with each other and promote international good will.

SENATE RESOLUTION 302—CONGRATULATING AND HONORING ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY ON 75 YEARS OF SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 302

Whereas, in 2021, Argonne National Laboratory celebrates the 75th anniversary of the date on which the Laboratory was chartered on July 1, 1946;

Whereas Argonne National Laboratory accelerates science and technology by empowering pivotal discoveries, supporting innovative collaborations, and managing powerful facilities and tools, all of which help drive the prosperity and security of the United States;

Whereas Argonne National Laboratory pioneered the peaceful use of nuclear energy starting in 1942, revolutionized medical diagnostic tools with the first ultrasound in 1957, designed safer energy sources, such as the Integral Fast Reactor in 1982, and drove electric vehicle development with the nickel-manganese-cobalt oxide cathode battery in 2001;

Whereas Argonne National Laboratory manages for the Department of Energy 5 Office of Science user facilities and 1 Office of Nuclear Energy facility, serving approximately 6,700 researchers from across the country and around the world;

Whereas development of advanced energy storage technology at Argonne National Laboratory will assist the United States in achieving the goal of a carbon-neutral economy by 2050;

Whereas Argonne National Laboratory will help maintain the scientific leadership of the United States with the upgrade of the Advanced Photon Source and installation of the Aurora exascale supercomputer;

Whereas research of quantum information science at Argonne National Laboratory will increase communication advancements and create new economic and national security opportunities;

Whereas domestic and international industry come to Argonne National Laboratory to collaborate with its diverse, world-class community of talent on cutting-edge science and technology;

Whereas over 475 students annually pursue science, technology, engineering, and mathematics internships at Argonne National Laboratory, contributing to the next generation of scientists and engineers for the United States; and

Whereas Argonne National Laboratory has a distinguished legacy of discovery upon which it continues to build future innovations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors Argonne National Laboratory on the 75th anniversary of its charter; and

(2) wishes the Argonne National Laboratory continued success in helping the people of the United States unlock new scientific and technological frontiers that secure its energy future.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2121. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1652, to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2121. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1652, to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . POINT OF ORDER.

Section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c)(1) Sums deposited in the Fund shall remain in the Fund and be available for expenditure under this chapter for grants under this chapter without fiscal year limitation, in accordance with paragraph (2). Notwithstanding subsection (d)(5), all sums deposited in the Fund in any fiscal year that are not made available for obligation by Congress in the subsequent fiscal year shall remain in the Fund for obligation in future fiscal years, without fiscal year limitation.

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (C), it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider a provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for all or a portion of a fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that would cause the amount of annual disbursements from the Fund below the annual average amount that was deposited into the Fund during the 3-fiscal-year period beginning on October 1 of the fourth fiscal year before the fiscal year to which the disbursement level applies.

“(B) If a point of order is raised by a Member under subparagraph (A), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, the provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

“(C) A point of order shall not lie in the Senate or the House of Representatives under this paragraph if the difference between the amount in the Fund as of September 30 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year to which the annual disbursements described in subparagraph (A) relates and the amount available for obligation

through the annual disbursements described in subparagraph (A) is not more than \$2,000,000,000.

“(3) Paragraph (2) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (2).

“(4) This subsection is enacted by Congress—

“(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supercedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with those 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.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant 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 ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination of Michael Connor to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 9:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 2:30 p.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 Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Responsibility and Economic Growth of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE THE CONSTITUTION

The Subcommittee the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Gary Tromblay, a detailee in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges today, July 14, 2021: Tanner Conley, Karryn MacDonald, Payton McEndree, and Madison Stoddard.

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

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILING

The filing date for the 2021 second quarter Mass Mailing report is Monday, July 26, 2021. An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable PDF document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states “none.”

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically at http://webster.senate.gov/secretary/mass_mailing_form.htm or e-mailed to OPR_MassMailings@sec.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224-0322.

UYGHUR FORCED LABOR PREVENTION ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 87, S. 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 65) to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China has, since April 2017, arbitrarily detained more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, and members of other persecuted groups in a system of extrajudicial mass internment camps, and has subjected detainees to forced labor, torture, political indoctrination, and other severe human rights abuses.

(2) Forced labor, a severe form of human trafficking, exists within the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region's system of mass internment camps, and throughout the region, and is confirmed by the testimony of former camp detainees, satellite imagery, and official leaked documents from the Government of the People's Republic of China as part of a targeted campaign of repression of Muslim ethnic minorities.

(3) Researchers and civil society groups have issued reports documenting evidence that many factories and other suppliers in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region are exploiting forced labor, on July 22, 2020, the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce added 11 entities to the Entity List set forth in Supplement No. 4 to part 744 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, after determining the entities had been “implicated in human rights violations and abuses in the implementation of China's campaign of repression, mass arbitrary detention, forced labor and high-technology surveillance against Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, and members of other persecuted groups in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region”.

(4) Since October 2019, the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce has added a total of 48 entities of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the Entity List set forth in Supplement No. 4 to part 744 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, in connection with their implication in human rights abuses in the implementation of China's campaign of repression, mass arbitrary detention, forced labor, and high-technology surveillance against Uyghurs, Kazakhs, and other members of Muslim minority groups in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. As a consequence of their addition to the Entity List, comprehensive restrictions apply to the export, reexport, and in-country transfer of most United States-origin items to those 48 entities. Audits and traditional due diligence efforts to vet goods and supply chains in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region are unreliable for identifying the absence of forced labor in the production of goods because of interference by the Government of the People's Republic of China, including through intimidation of potential witnesses and concealment of relevant information.

(5) Reports cited by the Department of Labor estimate that hundreds of thousands of ex-de-

tainees who are Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, or members of other persecuted groups in the People's Republic of China may be working in conditions of forced labor following detention in re-education camps. Moreover, nongovernmental organizations estimate that more than 80,000 Uyghurs were transferred out of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region to work in factories across the People's Republic of China between 2017 and 2019, and some of them were sent directly from detention camps.

(6) The Department of State's June 2020 Trafficking in Persons Report found, “Authorities offer subsidies incentivizing Chinese companies to open factories in close proximity to the internment camps and to receive transferred detainees at satellite manufacturing sites in other provinces. Local governments receive additional funds for each inmate forced to work in these sites at a fraction of minimum wage or without any compensation. The government has transported tens of thousands of these individuals to other areas within Xinjiang and to other provinces for forced labor under the guise of poverty alleviation and industrial aid programs.”.

(7) U.S. Customs and Border Protection has issued 11 withhold release orders on goods suspected to be produced with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. Goods subject to the withhold release orders include all cotton, cotton products, tomatoes, and tomato products, as well as certain garments, hair products, apparel, computer parts, and other goods.

(8) In its 2019 annual report, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China found that goods reportedly produced with forced labor by current and former mass internment camp detainees included textiles, electronics, food products, shoes, tea, and handicrafts.

(9) Under section 1091(a) of title 18, United States Code, a person commits genocide if the person “whether in time of peace or in time of war and with the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in substantial part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group as such—

“(1) kills members of that group;

“(2) causes serious bodily injury to members of that group;

“(3) causes the permanent impairment of the mental faculties of members of the group through drugs, torture, or similar techniques;

“(4) subjects the group to conditions of life that are intended to cause the physical destruction of the group in whole or in part;

“(5) imposes measures intended to prevent births within the group; or

“(6) transfers by force children of the group to another group.”.

(10) As a direct result of the campaign of targeted and coercive population control of the Government of the People's Republic of China's against Uyghurs, the birthrate of the Uyghur population in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region plummeted by 24 percent from 2017 to 2018, with birthrates in the Uyghur majority regions of Hotan and Kashgar decreasing by more than 60 percent from 2015 to 2018.

(11) The policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China are in contravention of its human rights commitments and obligations, including under—

(A) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(B) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the People's Republic of China has signed but not yet ratified; and

(C) the United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children (commonly known as the “Palermo Protocol”), to which the People's Republic of China has been a state party since February 2010.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to strengthen the prohibition against the importation of goods made with forced labor, including by ensuring that the Government of the

People's Republic of China does not undermine the effective enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307), which prohibits the importation of all “goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by . . . forced labor”;

(2) to lead the international community in ending forced labor practices wherever such practices occur through all means available to the United States Government, including by stopping the importation of any goods made with forced labor, including those goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(3) to actively work to prevent, publicly denounce, and end human trafficking, including with respect to forced labor, whether sponsored by the government of a foreign country or not, and to restore the lives of those affected by human trafficking, a modern form of slavery;

(4) to regard the prevention of atrocities as a priority in the national interests of the United States; and

(5) to address gross violations of human rights in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region—

(A) through bilateral diplomatic channels and multilateral institutions in which both the United States and the People's Republic of China are members; and

(B) using all the authorities available to the United States Government, including visa and financial sanctions, export restrictions, and import controls.

SEC. 4. STRATEGY TO ENFORCE PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF GOODS MADE THROUGH FORCED LABOR IN THE XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION.

(a) PUBLIC COMMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly, and in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Labor, publish in the Federal Register a notice soliciting public comments on how best to ensure that goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor in the People's Republic of China, including by Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, and members of other persecuted groups in the People's Republic of China, and especially in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, are not imported into the United States.

(2) PERIOD FOR COMMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the public with not less than 60 days to submit comments in response to the notice required by paragraph (1).

(b) PUBLIC HEARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the close of the period to submit comments under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Labor, the United States Trade Representative, and the Secretary of State shall jointly conduct a public hearing inviting witnesses to testify with respect to the use of forced labor in the People's Republic of China and potential measures, including the measures described in paragraph (2), to prevent the importation of goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor in the People's Republic of China into the United States.

(2) MEASURES DESCRIBED.—The measures described in this paragraph are—

(A) measures that can be taken to trace the origin of goods, offer greater supply chain transparency, and identify third country supply chain routes for goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor in the People's Republic of China; and

(B) other measures for ensuring that goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor do not enter the United States.

(c) **DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGY.**—After receiving public comments under subsection (a) and holding the hearing required by subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly, and in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence, develop a strategy for preventing the importation into the United States of goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor in the People's Republic of China.

(d) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy developed under subsection (c) shall include the following:

(1) A comprehensive assessment of the risk of importing goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor in the People's Republic of China, including from the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region or made by Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, or members of other persecuted groups in any other part of the People's Republic of China, that identifies, to the extent feasible—

(A) threats, including through the potential involvement in supply chains of entities that may use forced labor, that could lead to the importation into the United States from the People's Republic of China, including through third countries, of goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor; and

(B) what procedures can be implemented or improved to reduce such threats.

(2) A comprehensive description and evaluation—

(A) of “pairing assistance” and “poverty alleviation” or any other government labor scheme that includes the forced labor of Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, or members of other persecuted groups outside of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region or similar programs of the People's Republic of China in which work or services are extracted from Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, or members of other persecuted groups through the threat of penalty or for which the Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, or members of other persecuted groups have not offered themselves voluntarily; and

(B) that includes—

(i) a list of entities working with the government of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region to move forced labor or Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, or members of other persecuted groups out of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(ii) a list of products mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part by entities on the list required by clause (i);

(iii) a list of entities that exported products described in clause (ii) from the People's Republic of China into the United States;

(iv) a list of facilities and entities, including the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps, that source material from the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region or from persons working with the government of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region or the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps for purposes of the “poverty alleviation” program or the “pairing-assistance” program or any other government labor scheme that uses forced or involuntary labor;

(v) a plan for identifying additional facilities and entities described in clause (iv);

(vi) an enforcement plan for each such entity, which may include issuing withhold release orders to support enforcement of section 5 with respect to the entity;

(vii) a list of high-priority sectors for enforcement, which shall include cotton, tomatoes, and polysilicon; and

(viii) an enforcement plan for each such high-priority sector.

(3) Recommendations for efforts, initiatives, and tools and technologies to be adopted to ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection can accurately identify and trace goods made in

the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region entering at any of the ports of the United States.

(4) A description of how U.S. Customs and Border Protection plans to enhance its use of legal authorities and other tools to ensure that no goods are entered at any of the ports of the United States in violation of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307), including through the initiation of pilot programs to test the viability of technologies to assist in the examination of such goods.

(5) Guidance to importers with respect to—

(A) due diligence, effective supply chain tracing, and supply chain management measures to ensure that such importers do not import any goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor from the People's Republic of China, especially from the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(B) the type, nature, and extent of evidence that demonstrates that goods originating in the People's Republic of China were not mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(C) the type, nature, and extent of evidence that demonstrates that goods originating in the People's Republic of China, including goods detained or seized pursuant to section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307), were not mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor.

(6) A plan to coordinate and collaborate with appropriate nongovernmental organizations and private sector entities to implement and update the strategy developed under subsection (c).

(e) **SUBMISSION OF STRATEGY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, the United States Trade Representative, and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) in the case of the first such report, sets forth the strategy developed under subsection (c); and

(B) in the case of any subsequent such report, sets forth any updates to the strategy.

(2) **UPDATES OF CERTAIN MATTERS.**—Not less frequently than annually after the submission under paragraph (1)(A) of the strategy developed under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees updates to the strategy with respect to the matters described in clauses (i) through (vi) of subsection (d)(2)(B).

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex, if necessary.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The unclassified portion of each report required by paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public.

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the application of regulations in effect on or measures taken before the date of the enactment of this Act to prevent the importation of goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor into the United States, including withhold release orders issued before such date of enactment.

SEC. 5. REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION THAT IMPORT PROHIBITION APPLIES TO GOODS MINED, PRODUCED, OR MANUFACTURED IN THE XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION OR BY CERTAIN ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall, except as provided by subsection (b), apply a presumption that, with respect to any goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China or produced by an entity on a list required by clause (i), (iii), or (iv) of section 4(d)(2)(B)—

(1) the importation of such goods, wares, articles, and merchandise is prohibited under section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307); and

(2) such goods, wares, articles, and merchandise are not entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The Commissioner shall apply the presumption under subsection (a) unless the Commissioner determines that—

(1) the importer of record has—

(A) fully complied with the guidance described in section 4(d)(5) and any regulations issued to implement that guidance; and

(B) completely and substantively responded to all inquiries for information submitted by the Commissioner to ascertain whether the goods were mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor; and

(2) the good was not mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part by forced labor.

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not less frequently than every 180 days, the Commissioner shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a report that lists all instances in which the Commissioner declined to apply the presumption under subsection (a) during the preceding 180-day period.

(d) **REGULATIONS.**—The Commissioner may prescribe regulations—

(1) to implement paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b); or

(2) to amend any other regulations relating to withhold release orders in order to implement this section.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section takes effect on the date that is 300 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY TO ADDRESS FORCED LABOR IN THE XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a United States strategy to promote initiatives to enhance international awareness of and to address forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The Secretary shall include in the report required by subsection (a) the following:

(1) A plan to enhance bilateral and multilateral coordination, including sustained engagement with the governments of countries that are partners and allies of the United States, to end the use of Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, and members of other persecuted groups in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region for forced labor.

(2) A description of public affairs, public diplomacy, and counter-messaging efforts to promote awareness of the human rights situation, including with respect to forced labor, in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(3) A plan—

(A) to coordinate and collaborate with appropriate nongovernmental organizations and private sector entities to raise awareness about goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) to provide humanitarian assistance, including with respect to resettlement and advocacy for imprisoned family members, to Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, and members of other persecuted groups, including members of such groups formerly detained in mass internment camps in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(c) **ADDITIONAL MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The Secretary shall include in the report required by subsection (a), based on consultations with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of the Treasury, the following:

(1) To the extent practicable, a list of—

(A) entities in the People's Republic of China or affiliates of such entities that use or benefit from forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) foreign persons that act as agents of the entities or affiliates described in subparagraph (A) to import goods into the United States.

(2) A plan for working with private sector entities seeking to conduct supply chain due diligence to prevent the importation of goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor into the United States.

(3) A description of actions taken by the United States Government to address forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region under existing authorities, including—

(A) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.);

(B) the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-441; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note); and

(C) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

(d) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex, if necessary.

SEC. 7. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO FORCED LABOR IN THE XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 6(a)(1) of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 (Public Law 116-145; 22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) Serious human rights abuses in connection with forced labor.”.

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.*—The amendment made by subsection (a)—

(1) takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) applies with respect to the first report required by section 6(a)(1) of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 submitted after such date of enactment.

(c) *TRANSITION RULE.*—

(1) *INTERIM REPORT.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the committees specified in section 6(a)(1) of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 a report that identifies each foreign person, including any official of the Government of the People's Republic of China, that the President determines is responsible for serious human rights abuses in connection with forced labor with respect to Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, or members of other Muslim minority groups, or other persons in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(2) *IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.*—The President shall impose sanctions under subsection (c) of section 6 of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required by paragraph (1), subject to the provisions of subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of that section.

SEC. 8. SUNSET.

Sections 4, 5, and 6 shall cease to have effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 8 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a determination that the Government of the People's Republic of China has ended mass internment, forced labor, and any other gross violations of human rights experienced by Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, and members of other persecuted groups in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.*—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee

on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(2) *FORCED LABOR.*—The term “forced labor”—

(A) has the meaning given that term in section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307); and

(B) includes convict labor and indentured labor under penal sanctions.

(3) *FOREIGN PERSON.*—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) *PERSON.*—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(5) *UNITED STATES PERSON.*—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 65), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARCH 11, 2011, EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI IN JAPAN

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 92, S. Res. 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 107) expressing the sense of the Senate relating to the 10th anniversary of the March 11, 2011, earthquake and tsunami in Japan.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 107) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 11, 2021, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH AND NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 289) designating June 2021 as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month” and June 27, 2021, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day”.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 289) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 24, 2021, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 15, 2021

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 15; 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; further, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Liang nomination; further, that at 11 a.m., all postcloture time on the Liang and Remy nominations expire in the order in which cloture was invoked; that the cloture vote on the Cunningham nomination occur at 1:45 p.m.; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. 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 BLACKBURN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I do want to respond to my colleague and his comments about the For the People Act, which the Democratic Party is continuing to push.

Now, I will say that I am pleased to learn that many of my Democratic colleagues are standing up against the Jim Crow-era policies that their party put in place, the work that their party did with the KKK and other entities to block and obstruct access to the voting booth. And I will remind him also that the 1965 Voting Rights Act was a very solidly bipartisan effort that took place here in this Chamber.

And in regard to their S. 1, H.R. 1, For The People Act, it is anything but the For the People Act. What this would do is make it easier to cheat and harder to vote. We should be working to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. That is what election integrity is all about, and that is what the American people would like to see.

What this bill would do, their S. 1, H.R. 1, would federalize elections. Now, many in this Chamber may have served on an election commission or been the secretary of state in their State, and they fully appreciate and understand it is the constitutional duty—the constitutional duty—of the States to set the time, place, and manner of elections, and that the voter rolls are maintained there in your local county by citizens who serve on the election commission and who work those polls. But this bill that the Democrats are wanting to pass would, in essence, do away with voter ID.

Do you know what? Recent polling of various and different groups, numerous groups, have shown 80 percent of the American people really support showing a voter ID, showing an ID in order to cast that ballot. Prove that you are who you are. Their legislation would also institutionalize ballot harvesting, something that really offended so many thousands of citizens this year because with mail-out ballots, which they want to institutionalize, some people got three, four, five ballots. You can go online on social media, see pictures or videos of people holding up multiple ballots. That is not election integrity. That is not something that will ensure trust in the system. That would cause more doubt.

We should agree—we should agree, as Members of this Chamber, that we will

work together to ensure that our local and State officials can carry forward with their elections.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, now, one of the most important duties we take on as Members of this Chamber is the confirmation of the President's Cabinet and other top executive branch issues.

Mr. MERKLEY. Would my colleague yield for a question?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Not until I finish my remarks, but I thank the gentleman.

A Senate confirmation hearing is probably the world's worst job interview, but there is a good reason for that. The various candidates who come before our committees are asking to take on some of the most important challenges that we face as a country. And so when the President sends us these nominees for consideration, it is our job to vet their resumes, to vet their records. To go through the motions is not enough. We need to meet with them and review their history.

So imagine our shock when the Biden administration began to send us candidates that made it clear the President expects the Senate to act as a rubberstamp for some of the most controversial and unqualified nominees in recent memory.

His choice for Health and Human Services, Secretary Xavier Becerra, had no meaningful experience in healthcare before his very first day serving as the country's chief healthcare officer. He did, however, have quite a long history of weaponizing the full force of government against people whose views differ from his own.

Alejandro Mayorkas, Biden's choice to lead the Department of Homeland Security, boasted a proven record of corruption from his time serving in the Obama administration. An investigation by the inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security revealed that Mayorkas abused his position as the Director of USCIS to help politically powerful friends violate immigration laws.

Associate Attorney General Vanita Gupta's record as a radical, liberal activist was so diametrically opposed to the beliefs of most Americans that she tried to "evolve" her positions on drug crime and defunding the police just to avoid scrutiny during her confirmation hearing. Of course, by "evolve," I mean she outright lied about her position. And there have been many, many, who have stood on this floor and have challenged her nomination.

Another, David Chipman—this is Biden's pick to lead the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. He is so anti-Second Amendment, he has endorsed policies that would effectively ban all sporting rifles in the United States. He has no respect for the constitutional right to bear

arms, no respect for the nearly 20 million Americans who hold a concealed carry permit, or the 15.5 million Americans who hold hunting licenses. President Biden chose the anti-gun lobby over the American people when he nominated Chipman for this post.

President Biden's parade of genuinely unacceptable nominees continued this week. Today, the majority leader has decided to move forward with the nomination of Donald Remy to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs. If that name sounds familiar to you, it is because you have heard about Mr. Remy's work in other controversial context. He served as the NCAA's COO and chief legal officer and was the architect of that organization's restrictive policy against name, image, and likeness compensation.

Between September 2018 and August 2019, the NCAA spent more than \$26 million defending an NIL business model that the Supreme Court recently described as "patently and inexplicably stricter than . . . necessary." It was a 9-to-0 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The \$26 million, where does the NCAA get that money? From colleges, from universities, from student athletes. That is where the money came from, and it was used to defend this lawsuit.

But let's not focus on this one policy governing the NIL compensation. We need to keep in mind that Mr. Remy was comfortable using his training as a lawyer and his considerable power as a top NCAA official to maintain the culture of exploitation that defines modern college athletics. I am not sure what led President Biden to believe that Mr. Remy could help lead an agency notorious for its own brand of careless exploitation, but whatever the reason, we have a duty to get in his way.

For our veterans, decisions can be life or death. I have objected to his nomination since I came through the committee. And, quite frankly, I think it is a shame that President Biden refused to nominate someone who could demonstrate an ability to earn back the trust so many veterans have lost in the VA system.

Our veterans who have served this Nation honorably deserve better choices. They deserve at least that much from their Commander in Chief.

This nomination is just one more unserious shot in the dark from an administration that is yet to focus its energy on any one of the long list of problems they say they came to Washington to solve.

A quick scan of the morning newsletters on any given day show a complete lack of direction on the part of the White House and the Senate majority. Will we be working on infrastructure in the next few weeks or are we just going to be handling nominations? Are the most radical elements of the American Families Plan on the table or are we going to pivot to election law? Well, we won't have to flip a coin on that last one.

We know that over the next few weeks, we will waste time and energy resurrecting the Democrats' failed election takeover bill. As most everyone has seen, this week, Washington is playing host to a delegation of Texas Democrats' intent on holding election integrity legislation hostage in their very own State. They have come all the way to Capitol Hill to try and convince their Federal counterparts to go nuclear on behalf of a bill that has failed in various forms so many times that the objections write themselves. This political stunt is part of a larger movement within the radical American left to destroy the concept of one person, one vote and replace it with an unconstitutional, centralized election system that invites fraud and encourages donor intimidation. This foolish attack on ballot integrity has seized

hold in Texas, Georgia, and other States attempting to protect the vote for all eligible voters.

Ballot integrity is a foundational concept in our Republic. It should be easy to vote. It should be hard to cheat. State and local officials should feel empowered to grow and tailor elections in a way that meets the needs of the community, not the demands of power-seeking politicians.

I think I speak for all of my Republican colleagues when I say that we will not legitimize this hysteria that has gripped the Democratic Party. Instead, we will defend the constitutional prerogative of one person, one vote through however many objections it takes to relegate this scheme that the Democrats have been trying for 20 years to relegate this to the dustbin of history.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:57 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 15, 2021, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 14, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SEEMA NANDA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

JOCELYN SAMUELS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2026.