



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 2022

No. 3

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 6, 2022, at 12 p.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 2022

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for Your presence and blessings. We cling to Your promise to always be with us, keeping us secure in spite of life's dangers.

As we recall January 6, 2021, we ask You to stay close to our lawmakers. Use them to keep the enemies of freedom from succeeding.

Mighty God, have mercy upon this great Nation. Because of Your constant love and great mercy, wipe away our sins. Give us the wisdom to recognize our faults, particularly when we seem to forget that eternal vigilance is still the price we pay for freedom.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The 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 Anne A. Witkowsky, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

ELECTIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as 2022 gets underway, working Americans and their families are facing a steady stream of significant challenges: the fastest growing inflation in almost 40

years; violent crime rates continue to rise, with many of our largest cities setting new alltime records for murders; a southern border that remains in crisis; a new highly contagious variant of the virus that President Biden promised he would personally crush; too few tests and too slow new treatments on this administration's watch; and another rolling wave of school shutdowns, as Big Labor bosses continue to make hostages out of children's futures over a virus that leaves children largely—largely—unharmful.

Late last year, one poll asked Americans about the most important problems facing the country. Some were most worried about the high cost of living. Others said, not surprisingly, the pandemic. One-fifth of respondents, the most by far, said the biggest issue was poor leadership—at a time when the Democratic Party controls the entire government.

But do you know what wasn't on the list of concerns? It wasn't there at all—the fictional, scary stories the liberal activists keep repeating about how democracy is at death's door. The November 2020 election had the highest turnout in 120 years. Ninety-four percent of voters said voting was easy. Only 33 percent of Americans say it is currently too hard for eligible voters to vote. And a larger number than that actually say current laws are too loose—too loose.

The American people are not buying this nonsensical talk of "Jim Crow 2.0" or a voting rights crisis. Everybody, apart from leftwing activists and the press, understands this emperor has no clothes at all.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

A few months ago, even voters in blue New York rejected multiple ballot measures to soften up election laws the way liberal activists prefer. This fake outrage is just a predicate for Washington Democrats to do something they have sought to do literally for years: appoint themselves a nationwide board of elections on steroids.

This is the takeover that Democrats have sought for multiple years, using multiple different justifications. It is not a voting rights bill. It is a sprawling, sweeping takeover of our democracy. Our colleagues' bill would do things like forcing all 50 States—all of them—to legalize corrupt ballot harvesting. They would have the government send public funds directly to political campaigns.

The same Attorney General who has frivolously sued Texas just to placate the White House, whose Department of Justice tries to intimidate parents, would be handed new power to micro-manage election law.

Some early drafts of this bill tried to literally, openly turn the Federal Election Commission into an outright partisan body. Talk about tipping your hand.

These changes wouldn't bolster faith in our democracy or in our institutions. It would do exactly the opposite. It would be a civic wrecking ball. And, listen, that is before you consider that Senate Democrats want to destroy our own institution to ram this through.

The current Senate Democratic leader once said that nuking filibuster rules would be a "doomsday for democracy." Just a few years ago, more than 30 Senate Democrats joined a bipartisan letter supporting the legislative filibuster.

President Biden defended the principle in long, passionate speeches throughout his entire career. Just last year, as President, he repeated that destroying the filibuster would "throw the entire Congress into chaos." He certainly was right about that.

There is no partial or limited nuclear option on the table. As the Senator for West Virginia put it yesterday, whenever you start talking about carving things out, you end up eating the entire turkey.

No party that would trash the Senate's legislative traditions can be trusted to seize control over election laws all across America. Nobody who is this desperate to take over our democracy on a one-party basis can be allowed to do it.

Finally, it is beyond distasteful for some of our colleagues to ham-fistedly invoke the January 6 anniversary to advance these aims. Washington Democrats have been trying to seize control over elections for years. Their first draft of the legislation at hand was introduced in January of 2019. The fact that violent criminals broke the law does not entitle Senate Democrats to break the Senate.

It is surreal to hear sitting Senators invoke January the 6th to justify—lis-

ten to this—to justify breaking rules to grab outcomes they have not earned.

I am going to say that again. It is surreal to hear sitting Senators invoke January the 6th to justify breaking the rules to grab outcomes they have not earned.

It is surreal to hear sitting Senators invoke January the 6th to argue that institutions can be trampled because they would like a different result.

A year ago, the Senate didn't bend and it didn't break. We held strong. It is jaw-dropping for colleagues to propose to commemorate that by breaking the Senate themselves in a different way.

A year ago, there was a lot of talk on this floor about protecting the norms and institutions of our democracy by putting long-term bipartisan traditions ahead of short-term partisan power. Someday soon, it appears, we may learn which of us, actually, really meant it.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, now, on another matter, over the holidays, Russian President Vladimir Putin's insatiable and unreasonable demands only grew. So did Russia's threat to Ukraine, Europe, NATO, and our own interests. Putin cannot be allowed to use force or the threat of force to further erode Ukraine's territorial integrity. The West cannot be bullied into betraying our friends, forgetting our principles, or accepting a Russian sphere of influence.

Freedom's friends will either stand up to the bully while we have a chance or we will rue the day we did not, whether in Europe, Asia, or elsewhere. If Putin walks away from this self-created crisis feeling emboldened, he and others will run the same play again and again and again.

It is appropriate for the administration and our allies to seek to deescalate the situation, but not at the expense of deterrence and not by throwing our friends' security under the bus.

And if we don't make sure our allies and partners have a seat at the table, they may well end up on the menu. For Putin, this is not just about Ukraine. This is about breaking NATO and Europe and restoring Russian domination of its neighbors.

I support President Biden's stated desire to deter further Russian aggression against Ukraine. But—but—his administration must move faster to provide emergency military capabilities to help Ukraine defend themselves and deter attacks.

Time is of the essence. Moving at the speed of bureaucracy is simply not going to cut it. Neither will waiting until Russia escalates, at which point, of course, it would be too late. Because this is not merely about Ukraine, President Biden must also work with NATO allies to reinforce our collective military position on the continent.

We have to reassure our eastern flank NATO allies and deter any threats to the alliance by dem-

onstrating that 30 nations are both willing and able to uphold article 5. The Russians have to believe that.

The President, with bipartisan support, has threatened sanctions against Russia. European allies must show that they, too, will impose significant sanctions on Moscow for any additional aggression against Ukraine.

Even if this crisis abates, the long-term threat from revisionist powers like Russia and China isn't going anywhere. These countries literally want to redraw world maps and rewrite international rules through force or the threat of force. So this is why the United States must be as serious about modernizing our military as our adversaries are about modernizing theirs.

While the Biden administration talks a good game about competing with China, their first budget proposed to cut defense spending in real terms, especially significant given their runaway inflation. We cannot shirk on investing in our military.

And our friends and allies must also pull their weight. NATO's 2 percent pledge from 2014 is not sufficient for the threat we face in 2022. But key NATO partners have still not met even that commitment.

Europe must also reassess energy and environmental policies that have purchased a green veneer at the expense of more dependence on Russia and more leverage for Moscow. This should begin with abandoning the Nord Stream 2 pipeline. The United States, NATO, and all our partners can either act now or, believe me, we will live to regret it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ANNIVERSARY OF JANUARY 6

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, earlier this morning, I had the opportunity to join my colleagues in the Senate Rules Committee for a hearing on the progress our Capitol has made to increase the security of this complex in the aftermath of January 6.

We heard testimony from U.S. Capitol Chief of Police Thomas Manger, who in his first 6 months has done an outstanding job to make this building safer and better prepared for the sorts of horrors that befell this hallowed space only 1 year ago this week.

That day, on January 6, 2021, the men and women of our Capitol Police stood on the frontlines of the unimaginable: a violent assault upon the U.S. Capitol instigated by former President Trump and carried out by a mob of radicals looking to halt the peaceful transfer of power. That day, our Capitol policemen were outnumbered and underequipped. Yet their bravery and quick thinking saved many lives and prevented a violent riot from becoming something even worse. Today, we honor all those who stepped up that day, especially those whom we have lost in the aftermath.

In the year since that attack, we have gotten a lot of things done in the Senate to strengthen our Capitol Police Force, to ensure from a security

standpoint that the violence of that day never happens again. Thanks to this work and to the new leadership of the Capitol Police, the U.S. Capitol today is undoubtedly considerably safer than it was a year ago.

But let's be clear. Let's be very clear. January 6 was not merely a senseless act of violence; it was an attempt to reverse through violent means the outcome of a free and a fair election. And make no mistake, the root cause of January 6 is still with us today. It lives on through the Big Lie pushed by Donald Trump that is undermining faith in our political system and making our country and our democracy less safe.

A year after January 6, the biggest threat to our Capitol, our Capitol Police, and our democracy today is the Big Lie perpetrated by Donald Trump. Without addressing the root causes of the event of January 6, the insurrection will not be an aberration; it could well become the norm.

Just like the Senate has the power to pass legislation supporting our Capitol Police Force, we have the same power and obligation to pass legislation to address these root causes that brought the Big Lie to life. That is what my Senate colleagues and I are focused on and are committed to doing. We must act.

More than any other point in recent history, threats of political violence are on the rise. Election administrators are facing harassment and even death threats for just carrying out their duties. These are people who are sort of like civil servants. They are simply in charge of making sure the vote is counted fairly and accurately. In many States like mine, they are bipartisan. In some States, they are non-partisan. But they are simply doing a job to make sure that the vote is counted correctly. Yet there are death threats against them for doing just that. By one measure, nearly one-third of these election officials say they feel less safe on the job, and many are quitting in fear of their safety.

All of us have a role to play to protect our democratic system—everyone from our Capitol Police to the voting public, to those of us entrusted to serve in elected office.

Mr. President, just as the Capitol Police have taken the experience of January 6 to institute reforms for the future, every Member of the U.S. Senate is called to do the same, to reckon with the lessons of that terrible day and take action to cure America of the disease of the Big Lie. That means passing legislation to protect our democracy from subversion and safeguard the right to vote, including the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act and the Freedom to Vote Act.

Last year, Senate Democrats tried multiple times to get voting rights passed with bipartisan cooperation. Many of us—especially my colleague Senator MANCHIN—tried in good faith to bring the other side to the table. But every single time, Republicans

mounted a partisan filibuster to stop this Chamber from even having a debate on these measures.

By now, Republicans have made it abundantly clear that bipartisanship is not an option when it comes to voting rights. That is against the grand tradition where the Voting Rights Act had gotten the support of President Reagan and President H. W. Bush and President Bush and got large bipartisan margins when it was renewed in the past. That is not true anymore. This is a new Republican Party under Donald Trump, and they are opposing any attempt—any attempt—to strengthen voting rights.

If this continues, the only option left for Democrats is to explore and propose reasonable fixes to restore the Senate so we can get these critical pieces of legislation passed into law. We will consider proposals to restore the Senate on or before January 17.

The Republican leader has wasted no opportunity to criticize any discussion—even a discussion—on how Members of this body can act to restore the Senate to its proper function. Mere moments ago, the Republican leader strangely suggested that to make this Chamber better debate, compromise, and pass legislation somehow equates to breaking the Senate. He criticized the idea that Democrats would go at it alone. But I would remind everyone that when Leader MCCONNELL and Republicans were in the majority, they used their simple majority for almost every major initiative they wished to put in place: the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, passing a multitrillion-dollar tax break for the ultrarich, and installing three rightwing Supreme Court Justices. They were happy to change the rules if it meant getting their picks confirmed to the Court.

So let's stop the crocodile tears right here and right now. The asymmetry cannot hold. If Senate Republicans continue to abuse the filibuster to prevent this body from acting, the Senate must adapt. Just as Robert C. Byrd said, when circumstances change, the rules should change.

There is no better way to heal the damage of January 6 than to act so that our constitutional order is preserved for the future. We must do so by any means that we can, even if it means Democrats find alternative paths forward on our own. For the sake of the vision handed down to us by the Framers, Democrats are going to continue this work in the weeks to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, November 9, 2020, was the first day that the Senate was in session following the Presidential election that year. Six days had passed since the polls had closed. It had been 2 days since enough votes were tallied for the Associated Press and TV networks, including FOX, to conclude that Joe Biden was elected President of the United States. But in-

side the White House, former President Donald Trump was busy. He was tweeting a torrent of lies and conspiracy theories to deny the obvious. He was ready to pull the White House and the people's house, this U.S. Capitol, down around him in order to overturn an election he had lost.

Never before—never in the history of the United States—has a President or Presidential candidate shown such utter contempt for the will of the American people or for the peaceful transition of power in a democracy. Yet, when the Senate convened 6 days after the election, some of our Republican colleagues actually offered excuses for the poor feelings and the attitude and the demeanor of the former President and his incendiary actions.

The Republican Senate leader, who was on the floor a few minutes ago, defended President Trump at that time, saying that he was “100 percent within his right to pursue recounts and litigation.”

Never mind that the lawsuits were based on the same lies that former President Trump was spewing. Over the next few weeks, those lawsuits were initiated.

What was the final score? So 64 of the 65 legal challenges brought by the Trump campaign to dismiss the results of the election were dismissed themselves as meritless, many by judges that Donald Trump had appointed.

Also on November 9, a person identified only as “a senior Republican official” told a Washington Post reporter something that is chilling. Speaking about the defeated President Trump lashing out with poisonous lies and conspiracy theories, this nameless Republican asked: “Well, what's the downside for humoring him for a little bit of time? No one seriously thinks the results will change.”

This unnamed Republican official went on to say: “He went golfing this weekend. It's not like he's plotting how to prevent Joe Biden from taking power on January 20. He's tweeting about filing some lawsuits. The lawsuits will fail, then he'll tweet some more on how the election was stolen, then he'll leave.”

That was the Republican attitude toward President Trump after the election results were in. In fact, we know now that plotting to prevent Joe Biden from taking power on January 20 was exactly what Donald Trump was up to. He abused the powers of his office to exert extraordinary pressure on the Justice Department.

I know this because I was in the actual deposition in the Judiciary Committee, which I chair, when those in the Justice Department who were contacted by the President for this purpose testified under oath.

Politicians and elected officials in key States were also contacted by President Trump. And the Vice President was drawn into the President's plans to nullify an American election. We came perilously close to losing our democracy at that point.

It survives today only because men and women of conscience—Democrats and Republicans—refused to cooperate with the former President.

As it became apparent that he could not contort the bureaucracy to nullify the election, and it wasn't working in the courts either, Donald Trump turned to a weapon—a desperate weapon—seldom used in American history: political violence.

On December 19, 2020, Trump tweeted: “Big protest in DC on January 6. Be there. WILL BE WILD!”

That was one of the several tweets he sent out summoning his followers to Washington.

On January 5, 2021, a year ago today, Steve Bannon, once one of Trump's chief strategists, then discarded, then embraced—I can't keep track—he is now back in the Trump fold. He used his podcast on that day, a year ago today, to telegraph the chaos that was going to erupt the next day.

Steve Bannon told his listeners: “We're going into something that's never happened before in American history,” he said that a year ago, “It's not going to happen like you think it's going to happen. Okay, it's going to be quite extraordinarily different.”

Bannon said: “All I can say is strap in. . . . It's all converging, and now we're on the point of attack tomorrow.”

That is a quote from Steve Bannon, a year ago today, about January 6, 2021. I don't have to remind anyone what happened that day. Many of us lived it. Some may try to downplay it or deny it was any threat. They know better. They know the truth.

If you were sitting in this Chamber, with Vice President Pence sitting in your chair, preparing to count the electoral vote to determine the President of the United States, and you noted the Vice President's staff come roaring through that door, reach up and grab him by the arms, and pull him off the podium where you are now sitting—people were dumbstruck. They couldn't imagine what was going on here for a moment. And then to have a member of the Capitol Police come before us and stand where you are seated and to announce that this was going to be the safe room in the Capitol—they were going to start bringing staff members in to line the backs of the floor here because this was a safe place to be, and we should just sit tight and be quiet.

Well, then we started hearing the roar outside, as the mob was descending on this building. And within 10 minutes, another member of the Capitol Police stood where you are sitting right now and said: Evacuate the Chamber as quickly as possible. Leave through these doors in an orderly fashion.

That was the reality of life in the Capitol and the business of the Senate when the mob—the Trump mob—descended on January 6. We saw what happened. Many of us left and had to follow it by videos that were taken and

photos later of people who were assaulted. When it was all over, five people died, and 140 members of law enforcement were assaulted and victimized and physically attacked.

Those who dismiss it or don't want to talk about it on the floor have to accept the reality; the reality was there was death and violence against law enforcement officials that day. And the notion that somehow all of these people carrying Trump signs and banners were actually Democrats—what were they thinking? To believe that for a moment is to be totally deluded when it comes to the truth.

So what has happened since? The largest criminal prosecution in the history of the United States has ensued. All of those videotapes that were taken by the participants and others in the course of this insurrectionist mob have been used to establish evidence to bring criminal charges against more than 700 individuals, some of whom are already serving time in prison for what they did that day, and it is not over. It is anticipated that another 300 will be charged, some with even more serious crimes.

This was no minor incident or, as a Republican Congressman from Georgia said, “just tourists visiting the Capitol.” No, it was a deadly moment. People died as a result of what happened that day. People have been changed forever as a result of what happened that day. It was for real.

Today, the windows and furniture that were shattered by the rioters have been replaced. The National Guard members have gone home. Thank goodness the security fence around the Capitol is finally down, but there are many invisible scars from January 6. Five police officers who battled the mob died. More than 140 were wounded.

And the Big Lie of the stolen election that Trump used to summon his mob continues to metastasize. Over the last year, Republican lawmakers across the country have used this Big Lie as a pretext to pass laws to make it more difficult for Americans to vote.

The Republican leader came to the floor and said 94 percent of the people who voted in the last Presidential election said it was easy. Well, I am sure that is true. It was the largest turnout since 1900.

But what has happened in almost 20 states since then? Those State legislatures controlled by the Republican Party have tried to make it more difficult in the next election for the same people to vote. That is a fact.

And Americans now distrust our elections. More now believe that political violence is acceptable, and that has to change. Our democracy cannot endure with these cancers spreading.

Abraham Lincoln called American democracy “the last best hope on Earth.” This last year has taught us that it may be the last best hope, but it is fragile. Our generation—every generation—has to be willing to fight to protect it. For the sake of our

forbearers, who gave us this democracy, and for our children and grandchildren, who will inherit its future, I am begging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to condemn what happened in this Chamber on January 6, 2021, and to make it clear, once and for all, on a bipartisan basis that we stand together, united, for this democracy to succeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks before the vote gets underway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I had hoped we had put the idea of changing the Senate filibuster rule to bed when two Members of the Democratic Party in the Senate pledged to oppose any attempt to abolish the filibuster, but, unfortunately, the Democrat leader has revived this idea and has said that he plans to hold a vote on changing the filibuster rule on or before January 17.

Democrats have offered a lot of bad ideas over the past year—a lot of bad ideas. But it is possible that abolishing the filibuster is by far the worst. Abolishing the filibuster would mean fundamentally changing the character of the Senate and removing one of the most significant protections for minority rights in our system of government.

Our Founders recognized that it wasn't just Kings who could be tyrants. They knew majorities could be tyrants, too, and that a majority, if unchecked, could trample the rights of the minority.

And so the Founders combined majority rule with both representation and constitutional protections for the minority. They established safeguards, checks and balances throughout our government, to keep the government in check and ensure that the rights of the minority were protected. And one of those safeguards was the U.S. Senate.

In the House of Representatives, majority rule is emphasized, and the Founders could have left it at that. They could have stuck with a single legislative body. But they didn't. Why? Because they were worried about the possibility of tyrannical majorities in the House endangering the rights of the minority.

The author of Federalist 62 notes:

A senate, as a second branch of the legislative assembly, distinct from and dividing the power with, a first, must be in all cases a salutary check on the government. It doubles the security to the people, by requiring the concurrence of two distinct bodies in schemes of usurpation or perfidy. . . .

Secondly. The necessity of a senate is not less indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies, to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions, and to be seduced by factious leaders, into intemperate and pernicious resolutions.

That is from the author of Federalist 62.

So the Founders created the Senate as a check on the House of Representatives. They made the Senate smaller

and Senators' terms of office longer, with the intention of creating a more stable, more thoughtful, and more deliberative legislative body to check ill-considered or intemperate legislation in attempts to curtail minority rights.

As time has gone on, the legislative filibuster has become perhaps the key way the Senate protects minority rights. The filibuster ensures that the minority party and the Americans it represents has a voice in the Senate. It forces compromise. It forces bipartisanship. It encourages a greater level of stability and predictability.

Even in the rare case when a majority party has a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate, the filibuster still forces the majority party to take into account the views of its more moderate or middle-of-the-road Members, thus ensuring that more Americans are represented in legislation.

Removing the filibuster would erase this protection and allow the majority, including an incredibly narrow or merely technical majority, as Democrats have right now, to trample minority rights.

In the words of one former Senator, "We should make no mistake. . . . It is a fundamental power grab by the majority party. . . . Folks who want to see this change want to eliminate one of the procedural mechanisms designed for the express purpose for guaranteeing individual rights, and they also have a consequence, and would undermine the protections of a minority point of view in the heat of majority excess."

That is former Senator, now President, Joe Biden, one of the many Democrats who has opposed abolishing the filibuster, because, of course, Democrats were singing a different tune on the filibuster just a couple of years ago.

When President Trump urged Republican Senators to abolish the legislative filibuster—and, I would add, dozens of times—Democrats were strongly opposed. In 2017, 32 Democrat Senators, including now-Vice President HARRIS and a majority of the current Democrat caucus, signed a letter urging that the legislative filibuster be preserved, and Republicans agreed and refused to abolish the legislative filibuster despite the former President's repeated urging.

It is not because we didn't have a lot of legislation that we wanted to pass; we did. And we knew that abolishing the filibuster would make it a whole lot easier to advance our agenda, but we also knew that the Senate wasn't designed to let a slim majority of Senators push through whatever agenda it wanted and that abolishing the legislative filibuster would quickly come back to haunt us when we were in the minority again. And so we resisted our own President's urging and preserved—preserved—the legislative filibuster.

Now, however, many Democrats, who not only supported but actively—actively and repeatedly—used the fili-

buster during the previous administration to block major coronavirus relief legislation and police reform legislation, have apparently decided that rules protecting the minority should only apply when Democrats are in the minority.

Apparently, Democrat minorities deserve representation, but Republican minorities do not.

It is a particularly outrageous position when you consider the fact that, right now, Democrats have nothing more than a technical majority in the Senate. The Senate is currently divided 50–50. The only reason Democrats have a deciding vote in the Senate is because the Vice President is a Democrat. That is hardly the kind of majority that should make Democrats feel free to steamroll minority rights.

And let me put aside the question of minority rights and Democrats' hypocrisy on this issue for just a moment.

I want to talk about two things: One, my Democrat colleagues should be very sure that abolishing or amending the filibuster will come back to haunt them. That is simply the way of things. They only have to look back at Democrats' decision to abolish the filibuster for judicial nominations.

I think I can speak for most of my Democrat colleagues when I say that it came back to haunt them and probably sooner than they expected. More than one Democrat, faced with President Trump's judicial nominees and his Supreme Court appointments, openly regretted their party having abolished the judicial filibuster. I would urge my Democrat colleagues to remember that.

And I would urge them to remember that if they regret having abolished the judicial filibuster, they are likely to regret abolishing the legislative filibuster even more.

I would also urge them to remember that they barely have a majority now, and that even the strongest majorities eventually end up back in the minority. Sooner or later, abolishing or amending the legislative filibuster will come back to haunt them.

I get that my Democrat colleagues want to accomplish big things. Well, I would just like to remind them that it is possible to accomplish big things in a bipartisan fashion. I know, because we did it at the Commerce Committee when I was the committee chair, but it does require a real willingness to compromise and an acceptance of the fact that the Senate is not designed to let a narrow majority unilaterally impose its will.

Finally, I urge my Democrat colleagues to think about what abolishing the filibuster would mean for ordinary Americans. Of course, it would mean decreased representation for any Americans whose party was a minority, but it would also mean highly unstable government policy and a resulting lack of confidence in government as well as a sharp increase in partisanship, which, I venture to say, is not what we need around here right now.

In his discussion of the importance of the Senate as a stabilizing body, the author of Federalist 62 notes that "a continual change even of good measures is inconsistent with every rule of prudence, and every prospect of success. . . . In the first place, it forfeits the respect and confidence of other nations, and all the advantages connected with national character. . . . The internal effects of a mutable policy are still more calamitous. It poisons the blessing of liberty itself. It will be of little avail to the people that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is to-day, can guess what it will be to-morrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known, and less fixed?"

Abolish the filibuster, and we will end up in exactly the situation the author of Federalist 62 feared—with an inconsistent and ever-changing set of laws.

An all-Democrat government will quickly push through whatever measures it judges to be the best, and an all-Republican government, when it takes power, will do the same.

And again, neither party should be so arrogant as to think that the opposing party will never again gain control of government. The government was in unified Republican hands just 3 years ago; today, it is narrowly in Democrat hands, and it will continue to shift.

Abolish the filibuster, and policy will shift sharply with it: social policy on abortion, religious freedom, and other issues; regulatory policy; tax policy; foreign policy, and the list goes on.

In short, to quote Federalist 62, the laws would "undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is to-day, can guess what it will be to-morrow."

And such incessant changes of national policy would unquestionably heighten partisanship in this country.

As the laws became more extreme, the tension between Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, would only heighten—here in Congress, yes, but, most importantly, throughout the country among ordinary Americans.

Our government would no longer be perceived as government of the people and for the people. It would now be perceived as government of and for Democrat Americans or Republican Americans, depending on the party in power.

Democrats may think that some of the bills that they are advancing will serve the American people.

Well, something else that will serve the American people is moderation and predictability in our government, and that is something that we will lose if we turn the Senate into the House of Representatives and abolish protection for minority rights.

When Republicans were repeatedly faced with the prospect of abolishing the legislative filibuster during the previous administration, we said no, not because there wasn't important legislation we wanted to pass but because we knew that the best thing for our country and for our future representation in the Senate was to preserve this essential protection for the minority.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to think of their future and our country and make the same decision.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). 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. 327, Anne A. Witkowsky, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations).

Robert Menendez, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Catherine Cortez Masto, Christopher A. Coons, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Angus S. King, Jr.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Anne A. Witkowsky, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 1 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Baldwin	Grassley	Rosen
Bennet	Hassan	Rounds
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Schumer
Booker	Hirono	Shaheen
Brown	Hoeven	Smith
Burr	Kaine	Stabenow
Cantwell	Kelly	Sullivan
Capito	King	Tester
Carper	Klobuchar	Thune
Casey	Leahy	Tillis
Collins	Lujan	Toomey
Coons	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cornyn	Markey	Warner
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Warnock
Cramer	Merkley	Warren
Crapo	Murphy	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Padilla	Wicker
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Fischer	Reed	Young
Gillibrand	Romney	

NAYS—24

Barrasso	Ernst	Marshall
Blackburn	Hagerty	Moran
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lee	Shelby
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—14

Cardin	Menendez	Risch
Feinstein	Murkowski	Rubio
Graham	Murray	Sanders
Hawley	Ossoff	Sinema
Inhofe	Portman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 62, the nays are 24.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senate recess until 2 p.m. and the postcloture time on the Witkowsky nomination expire at 2:15 p.m.

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

TRIBUTE TO HARRY REID

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and memory of former Senate Majority Leader Harry Mason Reid. To some in this Chamber, Senator Reid was a colleague, a mentor, a friend. To me and to so many Nevadans, he was also a source of inspiration and pride. His life, coming from the humblest of beginnings, is the definition of the American dream.

During his decades of public service, from the State assembly to the Lieutenant Governor's Office, to chairing the Nevada Gaming Commission, he became the most powerful leader in Congress. This former boxer from a tiny town called Searchlight always put Nevada first.

Senator Reid served five terms in this very Chamber, and what he accomplished during those decades here, particularly as majority leader, is remarkable. Senator Reid stopped Yucca Mountain. He made sure Nevada would not become the Nation's nuclear waste dump. He is the reason we passed the Affordable Care Act into law, providing quality, affordable healthcare to tens of millions of Americans. He did more than anyone to rescue Nevada's econ-

omy from the depths of the great recession. He passed crucial Wall Street reform to hold the big banks accountable for that economic crisis and prevent a future one. He established Nevada's first national park, Great Basin National Park. He saved Social Security from being privatized. He was a fearless champion for bold action to stop climate change, and he was a tireless fighter for comprehensive immigration reform and the Dream Act.

Because Senator Reid celebrated our State's diversity and recognized its importance, Nevada is an early State, the first in the West when it comes to choosing each party's nominee for the White House. No matter the issue, if it impacted Nevada, you can be sure Senator Reid would do anything to deliver for our State. He was a voice for all Nevadans, and if you ever went to an event for Senator Reid, he would remind you by making sure "Home Means Nevada"—that is our State song—was sung in honor of our beloved State.

This is how he got things done. He was blunt. He was direct. He was a real straight shooter. He didn't mince words. When he identified a problem, he would work relentlessly to find a solution. As so many of us here know, you could try as hard as you wanted to, but you could never leave the conversation or hang up the phone before he did. He said what he needed to and was on to his next piece of work.

I want to share the best advice Senator Reid gave to me. He said this: Take every call. Listen to every person, whether you agree with them or not, and then tell them when you are with them and tell them when you are not. Be open and honest in your conversations.

These are words I try to live by here every day. They were things Senator Reid was respected for.

Senator Reid also knew that the constituent services, the work we do with our teams, literally saves lives and directly helps families, and it touches so many people. It is the most important and personal work we do and, through that work, can often become the foundation for legislation at the Federal level.

When I was thinking about whether or not to run for the Senate, Senator Reid invited me and my husband Larry over to his home to talk to him about making that decision. Well, in Senator Reid's style, instead of taking the lead to tell us what to do and give us advice, he actually asked his wife Landra to talk to us about her experience.

Well, anyone who has met Landra Reid knows what an incredible woman she is. Senator Reid was a family man, and he adored her and their children, of course, grandchildren, and I believe even great-grandchildren so very much. As my friend Brian Greenspun wrote the other day in the Las Vegas Sun, "To Harry Reid the greatest accomplishment he had was his family."

Anyway, in Senator Reid's living room, Landra told me and my husband

how she juggled being a mom of not one, not two, not three, not four, five kids—five kids—while Harry was working as a Capitol Police officer to put himself through law school while running tough campaigns and while serving long days and nights in Washington. Needless to say, there is not much that can top that. So the Reids provided my family with the inspiration I needed as I was considering what a life in the public view would look like.

Their love for each other, their journey and ability to make it work over six decades—raising kids, keeping their love strong—showed me how important it was to have a strong family, of course, and friends as the foundation for this work of public service.

You know, we spend a lot of time here in Washington talking about politics every day, but it is the personal things at the end of the day we all know really matter, and that is the work that Senator Reid did for Nevadans. He fought to make families' lives just a little bit easier, whether they knew it or not, so that they could focus on what matters, what was most important to them.

I want to honor Senator Reid for his lifetime of fighting the good fight for our State. He helped make Nevada what it is today—a world-class destination and truly a great place to live, work, and raise a family.

I want to thank Landra and the entire Reid family for sharing their husband, their father, and their grandfather with Nevada and with the Nation. The American people have benefited so much because of their sacrifices and his willingness to serve. Thank you.

Thank you, Senator Reid.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:07 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.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, on Monday, the United States set a new pandemic record with more than 1 million new cases in 24 hours. I am sure you and I and everyone who is thinking about this would have hoped we would be in a very different place right now than we are, but it is pretty significant, 2 years into the pandemic, to set that kind of record.

What is most concerning about this is many people who are concerned with catching the virus or who think they may already have it can't get access to tests. I just heard earlier today on a

call where the administration was providing information that they have asked for a request for information about who could provide a test and then made a request for proposals about who might be able to provide tests.

But we are way down the road to be asking about who can provide tests. Congress has provided more than \$80 billion for COVID testing. If you look at the size of the defense budget, this is a pretty big percentage of the defense budget.

We have lost track, I think, of how much money \$1 billion or \$1 trillion or \$80 billion is, but the administration has had \$80 billion. Over half of it, \$47 billion, they got in March in the American Rescue Plan. This is supposed to cover everything from research and development of new rapid tests to manufacturing and purchase of these tests, to funding for State and local governments to distribute these tests. Here we are 9 months later, and we are concerned that we don't have tests because we don't have enough tests.

For the last month, Americans have faced long lines at testing centers. They have gone to places where they thought they could purchase a rapid test to find empty shelves.

The question I really have is the same that many Americans have, which is what went wrong? Why are we facing such a shortage of tests now? How could we possibly have had \$80 billion available for a minimum of 9 months and now we are back in a testing problem?

I think the answer surely is not a lack of funding but, I think, more fundamentally, a lack of strategy, a lack of priority, and a failure to anticipate the ongoing testing needs by the administration.

When this administration came into office, their COVID-19 policy could have been called "Vaccines First." And while I have been vaccinated and while I have urged all Americans to get a vaccine unless your doctor tells you not to, it has always been clear to me that the vaccine was only one part of the process.

In fact, if you remember, from the very first, the vaccines were at a level that indicated that roughly 1 out of 10 people that had a vaccine would also get COVID. What we know now is that person who gets COVID that had a vaccine is not going to be incredibly affected by it, in all likelihood, but it shouldn't have been a shock that many people who got a vaccine would also get COVID and would also want to know if they had COVID.

Yet, for a full year, the administration has focused almost exclusively on one thing and testing and treatments have not had the attention they should have had or now that they must have. That failure has come at a steep cost. Today, Americans can't find over-the-counter tests, and the Nation lacks a comprehensive reliable testing infrastructure.

Early in the pandemic, former Senator Lamar Alexander and I were on the phone nearly every day with officials from the Department of Health and Human Services to get a better understanding of how to fight the virus. He was the chairman of the appropriating committee. I was the chairman of the authorizing committee. We thought we had come up with a plan that, if carried out, would work just right. In fact, the result of those conversations was a twofold testing response.

First, we started a program at the National Institutes of Health we called RADx, which we kind of based, roughly, on the TV program "Shark Tank," where people brought ideas in about how they could produce a test in ways those tests were not being produced. Over \$1 billion was invested directly with a dozen different companies that are producing today almost all of the tests that are available in stores.

But, obviously, being sure that they were producing them at the volume that they needed to be produced was something we should have been paying attention to. We wanted to bring more tests to the market. We wanted to do it as quickly as possible and provide the necessary government intervention to do so.

In the first 6 months of the RADx Program, at the end of that 6 months, they were delivering 2 million tests a day and 100 percent of all of the tests that were available for at-home testing.

Secondly, Senator Alexander and I thought that testing should be widespread and easily available, easy to take. As we pushed to reopen schools and keep them open, we want to do the things that have a test that is frequent, that is inexpensive, and makes sense. We went on and appropriated more than \$30 billion for testing activities in the first five bipartisan bills to deal with COVID.

Later, in the American Rescue Plan, an additional \$47.8 billion for testing activities was made available. Now, remember this is legislation that was partisan in nature. No Republican voted for it. It had easier transfer authority from category to category than any appropriations bill in the last 10 years, and, frankly, we sent a letter to the Secretary of HHS this week—Senator BURR and I did—asking exactly what did this money get spent on. I am afraid we are going to find out not nearly all of it got spent on testing.

The lack of funding has not been a problem, and I think we need to know what happened to the money and what we need to do to make the kind of investment now that we thought that \$80 billion would surely have made.

When people asked last month about the difficulties in getting tests and why the administration wasn't making tests free and available, the White House Press Secretary said—she just dismissed the idea out of hand. Then, less than 3 weeks later, they did an

about-face and announced they would distribute rapid tests to any American who wants one. That is a bold idea, one Europeans have been using throughout the pandemic.

Let's look at what the administration actually did. They will spend \$3 billion for 500 million rapid tests. That would be about 1½ tests per person. They are also saying right now that really to have faith in the rapid tests, you probably need to take two of them, so the 1½ per person doesn't do quite what it needed to do.

The approach to the answer to our testing shortage is not to spend to send 500 million tests to the American people. These tests haven't been purchased yet. They haven't been produced yet. They haven't been distributed yet. And what do we do in the next weeks as we wait for even that to be done?

Finally, the administration says that the at-home tests are "less sensitive" to the omicron variant than they need to be. I hope that is not the case.

It is time the administration began to recognize that vaccines are a powerful weapon, that we need to continue to focus on them, but we also need to have a broader strategy. That strategy has to include people finding out whether they have COVID-19 or not. This is a wake-up call. I hope we wake up.

VOTE ON WITKOWSKY NOMINATION

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall vote be announced.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Witkowski nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California, (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Ex.]

YEAS—61

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Rosen
Bennet	Grassley	Rounds
Blumenthal	Hassan	Schatz
Blunt	Heinrich	Schumer
Booker	Hickenlooper	Shaheen
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Burr	Hoeven	Stabenow
Cantwell	Kaine	Tester
Capito	Kelly	Thune
Cardin	King	Tillis
Carper	Leahy	Toomey
Casey	Lujan	Van Hollen
Collins	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Markey	Warnock
Cornyn	McConnell	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Cramer	Murphy	Wicker
Crapo	Padilla	Wyden
Duckworth	Peters	Young
Durbin	Reed	
Fischer	Romney	

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Hagerty	Moran
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—13

Feinstein	Murkowski	Rubio
Graham	Murray	Sanders
Inhofe	Ossoff	Sinema
Klobuchar	Portman	
Menendez	Risch	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The senior Senator from Delaware.

ANNIVERSARY OF JANUARY 6

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, 1 year ago tomorrow, a violent mob attacked our Capitol—this Capitol. Five Americans died, and hundreds sustained injuries in what has been described as the worst attack on our Capitol since the War of 1812 and the worst attack on our democracy, literally, since the Civil War. The mob assaulted and maimed police officers, desecrated our beacon of democracy, and in using force, sought to obstruct the peaceful transfer of power in this Nation.

One year later, as we recall the chaos and the bloodshed of that day, more than ever, I am convinced that we must fully understand what happened and make sure that it never happens again.

The 2020 election was hard fought, but it was not especially close. Not one example of widespread fraud was found nor was any evidence presented that would have altered the outcome. Let's take a moment and look at the facts.

There were 81.2 million votes for Joe Biden last year—81.2 million. There were 74.2 million votes cast for Donald Trump—74.2. That is about 51.3 percent of the vote for Joe Biden and 46.8 percent of the vote for Donald Trump; 306 electoral votes for Joe Biden, 232 electoral votes for Donald Trump.

Ironically, Joe Biden earned the same number of electoral college votes as Donald Trump did in 2016. Why is

that relevant? Well, in 2016, Donald Trump declared that his 232 electoral votes was a—no, his 306 electoral votes. Joe Biden got the same number of votes in 2020 as Donald Trump did in 2016. When Trump won with 306 electoral votes, he said it was a landslide. When Biden wins by the same number of electoral votes, Donald Trump says: No, it is not a landslide; it is a theft. You have stolen the election.

Despite these facts, Donald Trump pressed ahead with legal challenges in several States. Many of these claims were downright bizarre, and many were unfounded. More than 60 Federal and State courts, involving more than 90 judges, many of whom were nominated by Republican Presidents, including Donald Trump, all agreed that no evidence of widespread fraud, wrongdoing or other irregularities were uncovered subsequent to the 2020 election—none. Allow me to quote one of them.

Judge Bibas is a longtime member of the conservative Federalist Society, whom Donald Trump actually nominated to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. In ruling against Donald Trump's baseless claims of fraud in Pennsylvania, Judge Bibas said: "Calling an election unfair does not make it so." Let me repeat that. "Calling an election unfair does not make it so."

Rather than accept defeat at the ballot box and in the courtroom, the former President embraced conspiracy theories and outright lies. The January 6 insurrection occurred because these lies—and let me repeat: lies—were a call to action for White supremacists and other domestic extremists.

As someone who grew up in Danville, VA, the last capital of the confederacy, I have seen Confederate flags before—a lot of them—but I never expected to see any of them in this Capitol or in this Chamber.

On January 6, the former President incited a mob at the National Mall, and he sent them to attack this Capitol. He lit a match, fanned the flames of violence, and did nothing to extinguish the fire. He was deservedly impeached for the second time for this heinous offense against our Constitution, which he was sworn to defend.

One year later, I am standing in this sacred Chamber, thanks in large part to the heroism of countless officers from the U.S. Capitol Police and the DC Metropolitan Police Departments. Over 150 police officers were injured that day—over 150. Tragically, five police officers have subsequently lost their lives in connection to the January 6 attack, including, tragically, four by suicide.

Many of the officers who defended our Capitol will carry the wounds of that day, both physical and mental, with them for years to come. In response, we must remain committed to their health and safety for years to come. They showed remarkable courage that day. They risked their lives—an unyielding to commitment to the oath that they took to protect our Constitution and this Capitol.

One of those officers was Officer Eugene Goodman. Officer Goodman is a U.S. Army veteran who was raised right here in the District of Columbia, not far from where we are gathered. He saw combat in the Iraq war, fighting with the 101st Airborne Division, until he returned home and signed up to serve with the Capitol Police in 2009.

He had shown valor in uniform previously—that was in a war zone—and I am certain that Officer Goodman never imagined that he would be called on to fight a battle to defend our Constitution in the U.S. Capitol, not far from his own backyard. Just outside these doors, Officer Goodman distracted the mob and helped to save 100 U.S. Senators and many of our staff members from harm, as well as Members of the House of Representatives and their staff too.

The brave men and women of law enforcement, like Officer Goodman, put their lives on the line that day to protect not just the Members of Congress inside the House and Senate Chambers but our very Constitution.

Ultimately, the insurrectionists and the former President failed to overturn the election because Democrats, Republicans, and a Republican Vice President, Michael Pence, returned to the House and Senate Chambers. After order was restored, we did not accept mob rule; instead, we certified the votes of millions of Americans because that is what our democracy and our allegiance to it demanded of us.

We have learned a lot over the past year that puts that day into better context. There is still much to learn. But January 6 was far from a random event. It was a premeditated, coordinated, and, in the end, violent effort to overturn an election. In other countries, we would call this an attempted coup.

One year later, I am alarmed and appalled by the attempts to rewrite the history of January 6 as a peaceful protest. These conspiracy theories and lies continue to fuel the same misinformation and hatred that led to January 6.

Colleagues, we need to lead by our example. We must choose truth over the Big Lie. We must choose the Constitution over the mob. We must choose the rule of law and mutual respect for one another over hatred and division.

Thomas Jefferson once said—this is a paraphrase, but something along these lines—he said: If the people know the truth, they won't make a mistake.

I love that. If the people know the truth, they won't make a mistake.

Well, we returned that day to this very Chamber to certify the votes of millions of Americans because we wanted the American people to know the truth: Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS won the 2020 election fair and square. We must now make sure that every American knows the unvarnished truth related to January 6.

Over the past several years, I have mentioned time and again the wisdom

of the Framers of our Constitution. In the hot summer of 1787, they gathered and debated a new form of government, a constitutional republic with an intricate system of checks and balances. Little did they know that that document, first ratified by Delaware, would become the longest running experiment in democracy that the world has ever known.

I have sworn an oath no fewer than 12 times to protect the Constitution of our country: first as a 17-year-old Navy ROTC midshipman at Ohio State; 4 years later when I was commissioned as an ensign in the Navy to become a naval flight officer during the Vietnam war; again as I relinquished my regular commission and assumed a Reserve commission; and then another, gosh, eight times as a House Member and here as a Senator. We have a sacred obligation to protect our Constitution from enemies both foreign and domestic.

In his second inaugural address at the end of the Civil War, President Lincoln addressed a deeply divided nation. All told, more than 600,000 Americans would die in the bloodiest conflict in our Nation's history. Still, President Lincoln called on the Nation to come together, to bind up our wounds, and to begin to heal. I believe that these words, which were etched inside the Lincoln Memorial just a few miles from where we gather today, can guide our Nation in this moment.

Colleagues, in order to truly bind up our wounds related to January 6 and heal a deeply divided nation, we must continue seeking the truth and holding those responsible to account. More than 700 individuals have already been charged with crimes related to the attack on our Capitol.

Moreover, the bipartisan House Select Committee must finish its important work that it has begun and provide us with the facts of that day and the days that preceded it. Armed with those facts, many of us who serve in this Congress must make sure that the American people know the truth and that everyone responsible for the plotting, for the planning, and for the execution of an attempt to overturn an election in the United States of America is held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. Our democracy demands no less.

Thank you.

I yield the floor at this time to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, earlier this week, the majority leader sent a letter to our Democratic colleagues, which has been widely distributed in the press even though he didn't send it to folks on this side of the aisle. We have all now had a chance to read it. He has outlined what the next few weeks on the Senate floor might look like.

Now that the so-called Build Back Better—or what some have called the

reckless tax-and-spending spree—bill has been sidelined due to lack of support, Senator SCHUMER has shifted his focus to another dangerous and unnecessary bill. This time, rather than an attempt to spend trillions of dollars and to raise taxes on the American people, he is proposing that we overhaul the very foundation of our democracy.

Our colleagues on the Democratic side don't trust their own State legislators to pass voting laws that are in compliance with the Voting Rights Act and the laws of the land. The reason I say that, as shocking as it may sound, is, why in the world would they want to preempt their own State voting laws by passing a national law which would, under the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution, preempt their own State laws? Well, this power grab would give the Federal Government unprecedented power to make decisions about how elections are run in all 50 States.

This isn't the first time our friends across the aisle have shown an interest in hijacking America's elections. We have seen various versions before, each one relying on a slightly different marketing strategy. At one point, it was touted as a necessity of election security. Then, when that didn't work, they said: Well, this is about instilling in the voters confidence in our election laws. Then, when they failed to muster the political support necessary to pass that bill, they tried to figure out another way to sell it, and they said: Well, really what we need to do is remove obstacles that prevent people from voting.

Well, the 2020 election saw an unprecedented turnout. In my State, there were 11.3 million people who cast their ballots. Hispanics, African Americans, and other minorities voted in historically high numbers. Sixty-six percent of registered voters in Texas voted in the 2020 election, making it the highest voter turnout in 120 years when you look across the great expanse of this country. So now our colleagues across the aisle are going to have to come up with a new sales pitch.

As we know, in the wake of the 2020 election and concerns about some of the irregularities in those various States, States have passed legislation to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. I can't imagine why we wouldn't all embrace that approach: Make it easier to vote and harder to cheat.

Senator SCHUMER has described these State laws as "reprehensible" and "the most sweeping attack on the right to vote since the beginning of Jim Crow." Based on those extraordinary statements, you might think that the States have restored literacy tests. You might think the disgusting and subjective determination of "good moral character" before someone was allowed to vote—the kind of prohibitions that existed after the Civil War—had been reinstated.

The truth is different than Senator SCHUMER would portray. Many of these

changes in State laws were designed to reduce opportunities for fraud or roll back temporary protocols that were put in place during the pandemic.

The new Texas law, for example, requires voting systems to be tested before an election is held to ensure there are no technical difficulties. It is not unheard of that voting machines break or need to be repaired. That just makes sense.

The new Texas law also requires that voter rolls be kept up-to-date; in other words, people who are no longer alive—their names would be removed from the voter rolls.

Texas is no stranger to voting irregularities. In fact, the story of Box 13 in Jim Wells County, TX, was supposedly the reason why Lyndon Baines Johnson beat Coke Stevenson in the race for the U.S. Senate many, many years ago. Strangely enough, the votes on the voting rolls tended to go through the local cemetery and go in alphabetical order, providing LBJ the votes he needed in order to beat Coke Stevenson in that election. So removing dead voters from the voter rolls strikes me as a pretty good idea.

Other changes the State legislature made in Texas expanded voting access. We already offer 2 weeks of early voting in person, and the new law didn't make any changes to that, but it did extend voting hours in more than 60 Texas counties and clarified that voters who were in line at the polling place before polls closed will still be able to cast their ballots.

The Texas law was not the only one to actually improve voter access. Georgia, for example, expanded early voting in person to 17 days, which is more generous than what is offered in many Democrat States.

In New Jersey, by contrast, early voting only lasts 9 days—9 days in New Jersey, 17 days in Georgia. Has the Attorney General sued New Jersey for somehow suppressing the right to vote? No, he hasn't. He has sued Georgia, and he has sued Texas. And I will make a prediction right here today that he will lose both of those lawsuits because the facts simply don't support the litigation.

If you are from New York, you have 10 days before early voting in order to cast your ballot—less than you see in Georgia and Texas.

And this year, for the first time in President Biden's home State of Delaware, you can have 10 days before election day in which to cast your ballot. Before that time, including the 2020 election, in Delaware, if you wanted to cast your ballot before the election—like you can in Texas, Georgia, New Jersey, and New York—you couldn't even do it because in President Biden's home State of Delaware, they did not allow early in-person voting until this year.

Well, contrary to what Senator SCHUMER said, these changes are far from reprehensible; they are common sense. You don't hear Senator SCHUMER claim

that Delaware is trying to suppress the right to vote by not having any early in-person voting before this year.

So it is very politically convenient for the majority leader to attack those States where Democrats aren't doing quite so well in the elections because it doesn't align with their goals here.

What are their goals? Well, it is purely partisan political advantage. Our Democratic colleagues have tried to spin this narrative of a blatant attack on the right to vote. How you could make that claim in terms of the historic turnouts in the 2020 election is beyond me.

I will just give you one personal example. When I was last on the ballot in 2014, there were 4.8 million voters. In 2020, when I was next on the ballot—that actually was the last time I was on the ballot, 2020—there were 11.3 million voters. So we more than doubled the number of people who cast their ballot in Texas in 6 years.

And the story could be told in other parts of the country, like Florida and others, where more and more people are voting, which is certainly something we endorse and we embrace. But we also want to make it harder to cheat.

Our colleagues have tried to spin this narrative of voter suppression. But the myth of widespread voter suppression in 2022 is a myth. Well, why is that?

Well, in 1965, Congress passed something called the Voting Rights Act, which was a historic piece of legislation that said you cannot deny people access to the ballot on the basis of race or ethnicity.

And the good news is, over the intervening years, the Voting Rights Act has worked magnificently. In fact, many States that previously were subject to preclearance requirements under the Voting Rights Act because of historic discrimination actually now have greater participation by minorities in their elections than other States that were not so covered.

And right now, the law of the land is, under section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, if any State or political subdivision tried to suppress people's right to vote based on race or ethnicity, they would be sued by the Attorney General, as they should be, and it would be declared illegal.

That law, section 2, has been part of the Voting Rights Act for more than a half a century, and no one is proposing to change it because it has worked exactly the way Congress intended when we passed it in 1965.

The Democrats are falsely claiming assaults on the right to vote for one reason and one reason only, and it is to achieve political ends because the facts simply do not support their arguments or their proposals.

Now, it shouldn't be of any surprise that Republicans don't want to turn over their elections to Washington, DC, and to the Biden Department of Justice. So the path forward for the majority leader is to try to eliminate the 60-

vote requirement known as the filibuster in order to pass legislation.

In his letter earlier this week, Senator SCHUMER concedes that the Senate was designed to protect minority rights, but those rights, he said, have been "warped and contorted to obstruct and embarrass the will of [the] majority."

I can tell you from experience that the majority is always frustrated by the 60-vote cloture requirement known as the filibuster, but it is designed for a very specific purpose. It is designed to force us to do what maybe does not come naturally, which means to work together on a bipartisan basis to build consensus legislation that will stand the test of time.

But what Senator SCHUMER is proposing to do, because we have a 50-50 Senate, is to change the rules so that Democrats, and Democrats alone, can dictate what these new laws will look like. That is it. It is not any more complicated than that.

Senator SCHUMER is frustrated, no doubt, by everything that he and the Democratic colleagues in the Senate have been unable to accomplish, what they have promised and what they have delivered. But this is by his own design. He sets the agenda. He knows if he brings a bill to the floor like the infrastructure bill that passed earlier this year or the national defense authorization bill, that there is broad bipartisan support, and the chances are that they will pass with large bipartisan majorities, as both of those did.

But when they try to jam through things like so-called Build Back Better, which has zero support on the Republican side and actually doesn't even have unanimous support on the Democratic side, it should be no surprise that they are unable to get that passed, as we have seen in recent weeks.

So Senator SCHUMER sets the agenda. If he decides to continue to set the agenda on partisan legislation that doesn't even enjoy majority support of his own political party, he can expect the same results over and over again.

He himself is the reason why the President's agenda has not succeeded because he has given up on bipartisanship and consensus building in a 50-50 Senate.

The reason why it is important to build bipartisan consensus when it comes to legislation is because they will endure no matter what happens in the next election or the next election or the next election. This is good policy so people can plan.

It also assures that the States that elect Senators who happen to be of the minority party will have their views listened to and accommodated, where possible, as part of that consensus-building process.

The filibuster, which the American people probably did not widely hear much about before but have heard a lot about, was designed to ensure that each of these things occurs—bipartisan consensus building, legislation that

will stand the test of time, and legislation that will not change with each fleeting majority. That is what the 60-vote requirement known as the filibuster is designed to address.

Now, what has been so remarkable to me is how Senator SCHUMER's views on the filibuster have changed. Back in 2005, he said eliminating the filibuster would be the "doomsday for democracy." He was in the minority then. He said eliminating the filibuster would be the "doomsday for democracy."

More recently, when it suited his political interests, he argued to protect it and said that we should—well, this is before he was in the majority. He argued that we ought to "build a firewall around the legislative filibuster."

During his days in the Senate, President Biden, who served a long time in this institution, said:

This nuclear option—

That is what he called eliminating the 60-vote requirement to close off debate known as the filibuster.

He said:

This nuclear option is ultimately an example of the arrogance of power. It is a fundamental power grab by the majority party.

That is what he called what Senator SCHUMER is trying to do today. He called it "the arrogance of power," and he called it "a fundamental power grab by the majority party."

Our friends across the aisle used the filibuster numerous times to block majority-proposed legislation when they were in the minority. They filibustered countless bills on everything from pandemic relief to police reform.

Now, when it is politically convenient and expedient, they flip-flop. They have gone from defending this consensus-building rule to declaring it public enemy No. 1.

I could use a lot of examples, but I will just use this one from our colleague Senator DURBIN, the majority whip.

Just a few years ago, Senator DURBIN, a distinguished Member of this body and part of the Democratic leadership, said that if the filibuster were eliminated, it "would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to our Founding Fathers." That was just in 2018.

Last year, he said the filibuster is "not the guarantor of democracy. It has become the death grip of democracy."

I guess we can be forgiven if we get whiplash trying to reconcile those two conflicting positions in a short period of 3 years.

The truth is, this isn't about some noble endeavor saving our democracy. This isn't about just policy differences. This is about gaining permanent partisan political advantage by nationalizing our State-run election laws, which, by the way, I believe would be unconstitutional.

Democrats simply think it is in their best interest to eliminate the 60-vote consensus-building rule and to secure an easy path for legislation, and that may be true—for now.

But what we have learned from hard experience is that there are inherent consequences to changing rules in a place where your power, where your majority is never guaranteed. Elections happen. Majorities come and go. Presidents change political parties.

In less than a year's time, Republicans could hold the majority in either or both Chambers. In 3 years, a Republican could be in the White House as well.

Ask yourself this: Would our Democratic colleagues still support eliminating the filibuster were that to occur? If Republicans were in the majority in the House and the Senate and there was a Republican in the White House, would they support eliminating the filibuster? Not on your life. Would they believe that the minority party should be silenced, as they apparently are arguing for now? Not on your life.

We don't have to speculate on hypotheticals because we have seen this scenario before. Less than a decade ago, our Democratic colleagues went "nuclear." That is using the terminology that President Biden used when he was in the Senate, the "nuclear option"—the rule change to breaking the rules in order to change the rules.

Less than a decade ago, Democrats went "nuclear" and eliminated the 60-vote threshold for judicial nominees. This was a precedent that they themselves had established. At the time, Leader MCCONNELL said—who has been here for a while, who has seen majorities come and majorities go—he said:

You will regret this, and you may regret this a lot sooner than you think.

Unsurprisingly, he was right. Under the previous administration, a Republican-led Senate, with a Republican in the White House, confirmed more than 230 Federal judges—all thanks to the Democrats' nuclear option rule change.

If Senator SCHUMER were able to convince Senator MANCHIN and Senator SINEMA to blow up the Senate and to break the rules, along with others—and that is a big if—it might clear the way for the legislation they want right now. But when the balance of power shifts, as it surely will, this rule change they are proposing today could make it easier for Republicans to pass legislation that our Democratic colleagues simply abhor—legislation that protects the right to life, legislation that secures the border and controls illegal immigration, legislation that balances the Federal budget, protects our Second Amendment rights, or—take your pick—any other changes Democrats would certainly oppose. That would be possible if they were to get their way temporarily.

Now, I have heard this argument about, well, this is just going to be a carve-out. There is no such thing as a carve-out under the Senate's rules and precedents. This would be applied broadly and allow Republicans to turn the tables and to pass legislation Democrats dislike by a simple majority if they were to eliminate the 60-vote filibuster requirement.

The truth is that in the Senate, the shoe is always on the other foot, eventually, which is why no party has ever been so shortsighted as to eliminate the legislative filibuster in the history of the U.S. Senate.

Fortunately, the Senate is designed to allow for deliberation and debate, and cooler heads usually prevail. I hope the Senators who, along with Senator MANCHIN and Senator SINEMA, will remain steadfast—and I do believe there are other Senators who are of similar views, that it would be shortsighted and foolish to eliminate the filibuster, but simply haven't attracted attention to themselves and let Senator MANCHIN and Senator SINEMA take all the slings and arrows. But I hope those who oppose changes in the legislative filibuster will remain steadfast in their opposition to such a dangerous change.

A completely partisan overhaul of America's elections is hardly an effective way to improve public confidence in our elections. It is just the opposite. A partisan change in our election laws, by nationalizing them, won't lead to improved public trust or more secured elections. It is a recipe for fraud, abuse, and partisan distrust.

This rules change in the legislation would fast-track and may make some activists in the Democratic base happy, but it would instill lasting instability and distrust in our institutions, including our elections.

I would simply encourage our Democratic colleagues to reconsider their current position based on their past position and to consider the grave consequences before leading our country down this dangerous path.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LATE SENATOR JOHN "JOHNNY" HARDY ISAKSON

Mr. WARNOCK. Madam President, I come to the floor today to honor a friend, our late Senator from Georgia, my predecessor, Senator Johnny Isakson.

I mourn this great loss with the rest of Georgia and people all across our Nation, and since his passing, I know I have joined many of you in reflecting on the countless memories and moments that we shared with Johnny Isakson.

Without a doubt, Senator Isakson cared deeply for Georgia, and he cared deeply for our country. He was a patriot, a public servant, and there are members of my staff, I am proud to say, who used to work for Johnny, and they will tell you that he never hesitated to show up.

I often talk in my other job about the ministry of presence. Sometimes, half a job is to show up, and he knew how to show up for people, whether it was paying a visit to an ill patient, the ill parent of a staffer, or seeing a disabled veteran.

Senator Isakson dedicated years of service to our beloved State, to our veterans, our families, and our children.

He always made it a point to join us at the Ebenezer Baptist Church for the annual service and commemoration of Martin Luther King, Jr. I always smile when I consider the fact that he showed up. A lot of politicians showed up. He always stayed for the whole service, and, I will tell you, it is no short service. But Senator Isakson was there the whole time as we recognized and celebrated Georgia's greatest son, Martin Luther King, Jr.

Johnny Isakson was my friend. In fact, when this country elected its first Black President, he recognized the historic significance, although he was in a different party. He called me on the phone. He thought I might want to be there. So I witnessed in person the inauguration—the first inauguration—of Barack Obama as a guest of Johnny Isakson.

And then, a few years later, when we were at a flash point—a flash point of division in this country—and there were some, as we were approaching a State of the Union Address, who were saying we should not have the same kind of partisan scene where one side stands up and the other one sits down, that we ought to try to find the ways in which we are connected, and the folks who work here will all try to find somebody. You all might remember that. Johnny Isakson reached out to me, and I was his guest sitting in the House, witnessing for the first time in person a State of the Union address. And the very first time I stood on the floor of this Chamber, I came as Johnny Isakson's guest, as Chaplain of the day, opening the Senate in prayer.

He was my friend, which is why I was not surprised when he called me up and he said: RAPHAEL, I am retiring. I want to say good-bye, and I want to come by your church.

So on a Sunday morning, Senator Isakson and his wife and other members of his family came by. We enjoyed conversation in my office, and then I shortened my sermon that morning so he could say hello to the people of Ebenezer. He left a gift to support our ministry to veterans because he was so committed to those who give so much for our freedom.

Johnny Isakson always showed up, and he was unafraid to work across ideological differences, political differences, in our State and our country. I will never forget that example of public service.

So this morning, with great appreciation and admiration for Senator Johnny Isakson—for a friend—I introduced a bipartisan resolution with Senator OSOFF, honoring the life and the legacy of Senator Isakson, that is cosponsored now by all of my 99 Senate colleagues.

He brings us together in death the same way he did in life. He is a model of public service, an example to future

generations of leaders on how to stand on principle to make progress, while also governing with compassion and a heart for compromise.

I hope we can all remember the lessons of Senator Isakson's service, always looking for ways to make friends, to move our State and Nation forward, and, when that doesn't work, looking for how we can make, as he called it, "future friends."

I bring these lessons and other advice Senator Isakson gave me to my work for Georgia here in the Senate. I am already looking forward to next year's bipartisan barbecue which Senator Isakson started and we carried on this year in his honor.

I look forward to continuing to work with all of my colleagues—all of them—for the love of the people we serve and the spirit of our beloved friend, Senator Johnny Isakson. May my predecessor and friend live forever in our hearts and spirits. He was an upstanding elected official and an even better man.

Blessed are they who die in the Lord's sense of spirit, for they rest from their labors, and their deeds do follow them.

God bless his memory and bless his family with the peace of God that surpasses human understanding.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 484, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 484) honoring the life and legacy of late Senator John "Johnny" Hardy Isakson.

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

Mr. WARNOCK. Madam 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. 484) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2895

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, last month I was proud to see the Senate come together in a bipartisan effort and pass a Congressional Review Act measure to overturn President Biden's unconstitutional Federal vaccine mandate on private businesses. In that bipartisan vote, a majority of U.S.

Senators sent a clear message that these job-killing mandates are wrong and have no place in our country's fight against COVID-19.

Then, just days after Christmas, President Biden said something very interesting. While he was talking with Governors about the COVID-19 pandemic, he admitted:

Look, there is no Federal solution. This gets solved at a State level.

This is President Biden's message: States should be leading the effort. Now, that doesn't mean there isn't a role for the Federal Government. But what we have seen from the Biden administration is no progress, just worsening cases, and the horrible job-killing consequences of his unconstitutional mandates on private businesses.

I want to be clear: His unconstitutional mandates are job killers. Back in October, the Federal Reserve reported that vaccine mandates were widely cited by businesses as a reason for low labor supply and hiring and retention issues. It was a finding my Republican colleagues and I have been warning about for months before their report, and it is directly tied to inflation.

When the labor supply is reduced, prices go up, and families, especially those on low and fixed incomes, suffer. Restaurants, grocery stores, gas stations, and small businesses all have to charge more.

I heard about a restaurant owner in St. Petersburg, FL, who had to take certain items off the menu because they simply cost too much, and he can't pass the cost on to his customers. He has even seen the price of oil and to-go boxes more than double.

I talked to an operator of a food bank in Osceola County, FL. She used to see 15 families each day, and now she is seeing upward of 70 families. Food prices have gone through the roof. It is more expensive for her to get food to give to people hurting at the very time demand is up. This is the reality for families and small businesses all across America, and vaccine mandates do nothing but make these problems even worse.

I can't imagine why, just when our country is working to get back on its feet, the President of the United States would be pushing policies that kill jobs, but that is exactly what he is doing. Now lockdown-loving Dr. Fauci and President Biden want to double down on their insane mandates and are considering forcing every American who wants to fly to show proof of vaccine before boarding an airplane. This is just another Orwellian response from the Biden administration and radical Democrats that does nothing to protect the American people.

Providing information about the virus, providing tests, supporting vaccine and therapy developments, and getting the economy back on track should be the only role of the Federal Government in this pandemic.

Congress has to take a stand and protect the American people from these

communist China-style policies that are meant to divide us. That is why a few months ago, I introduced the Prevent Unconstitutional Vaccine Mandates for Interstate Commerce Act. The bill would prevent Federal Agencies, like the Department of Transportation and Department of Commerce, from requiring proof of vaccination for companies trying to do business across State lines.

Importantly, it would block the Federal Government from making airline passengers show proof of vaccine before catching a flight, which is exactly what Dr. Fauci wants to do.

This bill also protects truckers and will ensure that the Biden administration can't ruin our supply chains even more. Our truckers are the key to fixing Biden's supply chain crisis, and we should do everything we can to protect them.

President Biden has continually showed us his track record of failed policies and a mandate for domestic airline passengers would only add to his growing failures and blame shifting. We saw it in his failed and deadly withdrawal from Afghanistan. We have seen his administration's complete failure to handle the crisis across the southern border. We see it every day in President Biden's inability to fight inflation by stopping reckless spending. We continue to see his failure and complete void of leadership in how this administration is fighting COVID-19.

Now, I am sure my Democrat colleagues will say that this legislation isn't needed because at this exact moment, there is not a vaccine mandate to fly on a plane, but they said the same thing last year when we tried to preemptively block vaccine mandates for private businesses. They claimed the President has committed not to do that. We know the President broke that promise.

The American people deserve better than politicians who continue to mislead them on the Federal Government's failures to fight COVID properly. The back-and-forth has to end.

We must end these ridiculous, unconstitutional vaccine mandates and focus on getting our economy back on track. That is why, as I mentioned earlier, the U.S. Senate passed a Congressional Review Act measure to invalidate President Biden's vaccine mandate on a bipartisan basis. The Senate, along with the majority of Americans, doesn't believe that the Federal Government should force people to choose between taking the vaccine and losing their job. That is why I am again demanding that the Federal Government stop trying to force the American people to follow draconian, job-killing mandates that hurt families.

This is the second time I have come to the floor to try to pass this bill and protect the rights of American families and businesses. I would like to thank Senators CYNTHIA LUMMIS, RON JOHNSON, MIKE LEE, and ROGER MARSHALL for joining me in introducing this im-

portant and urgently needed legislation. This is a commonsense bill, and I hope all my colleagues will support it.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 2895 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The junior Senator from Washington. Ms. CANTWELL. Reserving the right to object, my colleague is right—he has been to the floor to talk about this issue, and I don't think, though, that he has all the facts right.

We just had a major transportation hearing in the Commerce Committee before we left for the holiday recess, and we heard from airline executives—some who had implemented their own vaccines, some who had implemented other mandates and systems on their own, and others who basically responded to the Federal Government's desire to say that passengers would be required to wear masks. All of them said that this was a big success. All of them said that this, along with the Federal dollars that went into preserving the airlines, allowed us and our economy to recover better than other nations had; basically that when the upswing in transportation got to the point where people felt it was safe to travel, that those mechanisms themselves helped us have an airline sector and industry that could respond so that we literally, by Thanksgiving, were up to 85, 90 percent of where we had been the previous year.

So my colleague, I think, would like us to predetermine today exactly everything we are going to do on this issue; that we would prohibit the President, the Department of Transportation, Amtrak, and the Transportation Security Administration from making these decisions in the future.

Now, I can just tell you, I get up every day and I read the press. I also went to the gym today, and the first thing they said is, Where is your vaccination card or we are not letting you in? So there is the fact that businesses—the airlines and small businesses—are using this as a tool. Even though DC has the highest explosion of COVID cases in the Nation as a percentage right now—I understand that in the neighborhood I live in, there was a pretty hearty New Year's Eve, but everybody had to show a vaccination card to get into those businesses. Those businesses decided they were going to stay open. Those consumers decided they were going to participate—not the choice I would have made, but they decided to do that, and they showed their vaccination card.

So these businesses, the ones that the Federal Government is involved

in—Amtrak and our transportation system—they also might have further issues in the future that they want to look at, so why pass a bill today that restricts them from showing proof of COVID vaccine in order to travel?

The proposals that were made at the time—we didn't really know 2 years ago now what was going to happen. But I can say—and that is why we had our most recent hearings—that we were right that the transportation sector was going to be critical to helping us fight the pandemic, that it was going to be critical for us to respond in our economy, and that it was going to be critical to providing essential services to some areas of the United States. The things we did allowed that air service to respond, and those business leaders showed up. In fact, one of them made a little mistake and said: Oh, you know, I think HEPA filters have really, really good responses, and maybe we don't need anything.

Well, he corrected that the next day. He corrected it the next day. He said: Oh, yeah, yeah, by the way, I believed in the mask mandate and still do.

An airline executive was questioned by some of my colleagues, who said: Why did you implement your own vaccine mandate of your employees?

He said: Because I wanted to have a workforce, and this is the best way I could get this workforce.

So this isn't a clear-cut issue, but I know, right now, why should we prohibit Amtrak or anybody from a decision that some of these small businesses are making right in this neighborhood, here in DC or probably Baltimore? My colleague has just joined us on the Senate floor. These people are making these decisions, and all we are saying is that the Federal Government, instead of passing Senator SCOTT's bill, should also have that decision in the future in their toolbox if they so choose. Why? Because the movement of commerce and transportation is so important to our infrastructure. It is so important to us as a nation to keep it going. I don't want to preclude any of the tools in the toolbox at this moment.

So therefore, Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The objection is heard. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. First off, I want to make sure my colleague understands what this bill would do. This bill would prevent Federal Agencies, like the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce, from requiring proof of vaccination for companies trying to do business across State lines.

So what this bill does is say that the Federal Government is not going to mandate this. If a private business wants to say that you have to have a vaccine to come in, that is a decision that private business gets to make. But government shouldn't be in the position to tell a new business that they have to require a vaccine. I mean, that is not what you do.

What this does do is it is killing jobs. It is killing people and killing the jobs of people who worked their tail off in the prior 12 months.

Now, I don't know why this is controversial. The Senate, on a bipartisan basis, just passed a Congressional Review Act measure striking down President Biden's vaccine mandate. On a bipartisan basis we already decided we don't believe in what the President is doing.

We have got families and businesses all across this country that are struggling to keep up with the cost of inflation, and the government should be doing everything it can to reduce inflation and get the economy going.

Look, I know what it is like to go hungry because groceries cost too much. I watched my mom and my dad struggle for years. When prices rose, my mom took in odd jobs. When she struggled, we didn't have as much food on the table.

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to improve the economy and help families get ahead. We know the vaccine mandates are absolutely causing prices to rise. When prices rise, people are getting hurt, and they are making interstate commerce much more difficult.

So instead of taking action to help families and curb inflation, the Biden Administration is taking every possible step to make it harder for them to put food on the table and afford to live in this country.

The President has already said that this must be handled at the State level. I agree. And the Federal Government can take a step in this direction by ensuring vaccine passports won't be required for interstate commerce.

They shouldn't be required to get on a plane. They shouldn't be required to carry goods across State lines.

Even our Nation's healthcare providers know that mandates don't work. They stopped doing it in most cases. Just last month we saw hospitals across this country delay or suspend their vaccine mandates because they knew it was killing jobs.

We know that Biden's unconstitutional mandates are going to make it more difficult to retain staff and deliver quality care to their patients. I don't understand why my colleague wants to give the government more power, more power, more power—upholding regulations that are causing prices to rise and forcing people to choose between keeping their jobs and getting a vaccine.

We ought to give people the freedom to live their lives, to do exactly what my colleague just said: If a business wants to require a vaccine, they should require that. But if they don't, the government shouldn't be doing that. Our government should be giving people information, and let them make the decisions they want to make.

I trust American families. I trust American businesses. They are smart enough to make informed decisions

about their health. But my colleague's objection is bad for American families and bad for business owners, and I hope she will reconsider her objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

ANNIVERSARY OF JANUARY 6

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, tomorrow will mark the first anniversary of one of the darkest moments in our Nation's history. One year ago tomorrow, a mob attacked this building. A mob of Americans, incited by a sitting U.S. President, was determined to prevent the peaceful transition of power that is the hallmark of our representative democracy. A mob of Americans savagely attacked and overwhelmed the men and women of the U.S. Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police departments, smashed their way into this sacred space, and disrupted the joint session of Congress fulfilling its constitutional duty to count the electoral college ballots awarding the Presidency to Joe Biden.

January 6, like December 7 and September 11, is a date which will live in infamy.

I refer to the U.S. Capitol as a sacred space because it is so much more than a building where the Senate and House of Representatives meet and conduct business. It is the embodiment of our ideals, our aspirations and hopes, not just to Americans but also to all of humanity.

In the 1960 essay on "national purpose" for the New York Times and LIFE magazine, Archibald MacLeish wrote:

There are those who will say that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is the American Dream.

Insurrectionists desecrated this sacred space and everything it stands for, including liberty, self-government and the rule of law. The Architect of the Capitol can measure the damage they did to this building in millions of dollars. The damage they did to our moral standing in the world is inestimable.

I want to take this moment to acknowledge and pay tribute to the thousands of people who work in Congress or cover it for the press and continue to suffer from the trauma of January the 6th. I am talking about the brave police officers who protected us. They engaged in a battle that one officer described as "medieval."

And 140 of them, including Metropolitan Police Department officers, suffered physical injuries. One of them, Officer Brian Sicknick, died. I imagine all the officers who defended the Capitol bear the psychological scars of the attack.

Four officers—Howard Liebengood, Jeffrey Smith, Gunther Hashida, and Kyle DeFreitag committed suicide in the aftermath. But I am also talking about the staff who work here in the Capitol, in the Senate and House Chambers: the doorkeepers, the Parliamentarian's office, the bill clerk, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD staff, the floor

and cloakroom staff, and so many others. Many of them had to shelter in place. They had to barricade themselves in offices, hoping the police would get to them before the insurrectionists did.

I am talking about the committee and legislative staff in our DC offices and back in our State and district offices, who watched the attack in horror and disbelief and feared for the safety of their friends and colleagues, who answer the phones and hear death threats and obscenities.

I am talking about the food service workers, custodial staff, and other Architect of the Capitol and Sergeant at Arms employees who were caught in the mayhem and then immediately went to work cleaning up the mess, repairing the damage, and providing other essential services, all in the midst of a raging pandemic.

I am talking about those reporters who documented the insurrection at great personal peril after Donald Trump spent the previous 4 years calling them the enemies of the people and openly encouraged his supporters to attack them at his rallies.

Congress could not function without this community of patriotic and hard-working Americans. This community is hurting. On New Year's Day, the Washington Post ran an article entitled "Shaken by the Jan. 6 attack, Capitol workers quit jobs that once made them proud." "Quit jobs that once made them proud"—what a terrible thing, what a loss to our Nation.

The danger our Nation faced on January 6 has not dissipated. As the New York Times editorial board stated a few days ago, "the Republic faces an existential threat from a movement that is openly contemptuous of democracy and has shown that it is willing to use violence to achieve its ends."

The leader of this movement, of course, is Donald Trump. The organizing principle is the Big Lie that Democrats "stole" the election. The mindset is what historian Richard Hofstadter called "the paranoid style in American politics," which "produces . . . strivings for evidence to prove that the unbelievable is the only thing that can be believed."

The response to nearly nonexistent voter fraud is to engage in massive voter suppression. The objective is not election reform; it is election repeal.

It is important to understand that the insurrection on January 6 was not a spontaneous event. As Ed Kilgore wrote in a New York magazine article entitled "Trump's Long Campaign to Steal the Presidency: A timeline," "The insurrection was a complex, years-long plot, not a one-day event. And it isn't over."

Rightwing media personalities and QAnon conspiracy followers feverishly and cynically stoke the movement for their own gain. Elected Republican officials, fearful of Donald Trump's wrath or eager to curry favor with him, enable it.

In 1950, Republican Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine issued her “Declaration of Conscience” in response to another authoritarian bully, fellow Republican Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin. Senator SMITH was no fan of the Truman administration, but she said the following:

[T]o displace it with a Republican regime embracing a philosophy that lacks political integrity or intellectual honesty would prove equally disastrous to the nation. . . . I do not want to see the Republican party ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear. I doubt if the Republican party could do so, simply because I do not believe the American people will uphold any political party that puts political exploitation above national interest. Surely we Republicans are not that desperate for victory.

I do not want to see the Republican party win that way. While it might be a fleeting victory for the Republican party, it would be a more lasting defeat for the American people. Surely it would ultimately be suicide for the Republican party and the two-party system that has protected our American liberties from the dictatorship of a one-party system.

I urge my Republican colleagues to follow the example of Margaret Chase Smith. There is nothing conservative about advocating force over the rule of law. There is nothing conservative about pledging loyalty to a man over upholding the U.S. Constitution.

I understand that many Americans are disinclined to believe that the President of the United States would blatantly lie to them, but it is exactly what Donald Trump has been doing since he claimed that millions of people who voted illegally cost him the popular vote majority in the 2016 election. In fact, his lies go back even further, to his vile birther claims about President Obama.

We have the opportunity and the imperative for a course correction to save our Republic, and that is to restore, expand, and protect voting rights.

The Senate must consider S. 2747, the Freedom to Vote Act, and S. 4, the bipartisan John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

On multiple occasions, Senate Democrats voted unanimously just to begin considering these bills to protect people’s right to vote, which has come under sustained assault. Each time we have tried to proceed to these measures, every Republican Senator has voted to sustain a filibuster. Senate Republicans put gridlock and partisanship before the rights of voters. They are blocking the Senate from having a chance to consider options and amendments and do what the Founding Fathers intended us to do: debate and legislate.

Within the next few days, our Republican colleagues in the Senate will have yet another opportunity, a chance to do the right thing. Many Senators have worked diligently to come up with compromise legislation that still

preserves the essential elements of S. 1, For the People Act, that the House of Representatives has already passed.

And President Biden is absolutely correct that we need to enact voting rights legislation to repair the damage the Supreme Court did to the Voting Rights Act. President Biden rightly calls efforts to limit ballot access across the country as a 21st century Jim Crow assault. He warned Americans that the Republican efforts to restrict voting rights as a result of their selfish challenge of the 2020 election results represent “the most significant test of our democracy since the Civil War.”

In many States, Republican legislatures and Governors have responded to the falsehoods of the 2020 election by restricting voting accessibility. Donald Trump’s Big Lie has directly led to disenfranchisement and suppression of the right to vote of millions of Americans.

I urge my colleagues and my fellow American citizens to reflect on the state of our democracy and the rights we hold so dear. A blatant attempt to falsify an election and persistent efforts to deny the American people access to the ballot box has eroded American democracy to a dangerous level and undermined the freedom and liberty that so many Americans have fought to defend and advance.

After elections are over and we win, we celebrate. We celebrate the fact that we have garnered the support of the majority of the voters. If we don’t win—I think many of us have been involved in campaigns where our candidates have not been successful—we go to work and try to attract more voters in the next election so we can celebrate a victory. That is what participation in a free society is all about. That is what democracies are about.

And repressive, autocratic regimes never accept the will of the people so they look at ways in which they can undermine the voting record, what the voters want, and the voters’ will.

We should all celebrate the record number of people who cast their ballots in the 2020 Presidential election. More Americans cast their votes for the Presidential candidate than ever before.

After the election, both Democrats and Republicans conducted numerous reviews at the Federal, State, and local levels. Those reviews verified the simple fact that there was no widespread corruption or election fraud; that the will of the people prevailed; and Joe Biden and Kamala Harris were duly elected.

Congress and Vice President Pence counted the electoral votes for President and Vice President and did their duty under the Constitution on January 6, notwithstanding the armed insurrection at the Capitol.

But that did not stop Donald Trump from promoting the Big Lie, and that, in turn, has prompted Republican-led States to make it harder for people to cast their votes. The Brennan Center

has pointed out that we are in the middle of the worst assault on voting rights since Jim Crow.

So what are these laws doing? They are making it more difficult for people to register to vote. They are making it more difficult to vote by mail. They are making it more difficult to vote in person. Republicans apparently believe that demographic trends will prevent them from winning elections so they are surgically attacking the voting rights of people—mostly people of color—they believe will not vote for them.

We have States that have 100 percent voting by mail. There has been no indication of fraud in voting by mail. But now, some States have shortened the time for requesting mail-in ballots, making it more difficult for individuals to vote by mail. They are making it more difficult for people to deliver their ballots by limiting the availability of ballot drop boxes, all because they think that will be utilized more by people who will not vote for them.

The Republicans in charge of these States want to make it harder for people to vote in person too—stricter signature requirements, reducing the number of places where people can vote, purging voter rolls simply because a person didn’t vote, and the list goes on and on and on; all of these making it more difficult for people to register to vote or be eligible to vote who are more likely to vote for their opponents. Some of these States are even opening up the possibility that election officials can substitute their judgment for the will of the people.

The Freedom to Vote Act provides a basic Federal floor on protecting the right to vote. The legislation includes commonsense items such as automatic and online voter registration, uniform early voting, same-day voter registration, voting by mail and drop box standards and uniform national standards for voter identification.

The Freedom to Vote Act ends political gerrymandering by creating non-partisan redistricting commissions, requires voter-verified paper ballots and reliable audits, and ends the dominance of Big Money in political systems by increasing disclosure and transparency.

S. 2747 includes two provisions I authored: First, it includes the Democracy Restoration Act, which deals with laws that many States passed at the end of the Civil War that are still on the books that disqualify a person convicted of a felony from voting for the rest of his or her life. The definition of “felony” can be quite general in many States so the impact of these laws fall disproportionately on people of color, which was its intent. There are States where one out of five Black Americans have been disqualified from voting because of a felony conviction, even when that individual has served his or her sentence and has returned to society. We need to remove that disqualification on voting.

I am proud that S. 2747 also includes my Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act. Spreading false or misleading information or intimidating the electorate remain regularly employed and effective methods to keep individuals, particularly Black Americans and racial minorities, from voting. Advancements in communications, including the rise of social media platforms, have made it easier for bad actors to use these strategies. My provisions prohibit individuals from knowingly deceiving voters about the time, place, eligibility or procedures of participating in a Federal election. It criminalizes intentional efforts to hinder, interfere with, or prevent another person from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote or register to vote.

The late John Lewis of Georgia was a dear friend and a former colleague. We first won election to the U.S. House of Representatives on the same day. Representative Lewis recalled an important lesson that he learned from the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., when he said that “each of us has a moral obligation to stand up, speak up, and speak out. When you see something that is not right, you must say something. You must do something. Democracy is not a state. It is an act. And each generation must do its part.”

Well, we need to follow Congressman Lewis’ admonition. We can do our part by passing the bipartisan John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, S. 4. Congress has a historic and bipartisan tradition of coming together across party lines to safeguard and strengthen the right to vote, which is the bedrock of our democracy.

Congress passed and the States ratified the 15th Amendment after the Civil War, which declared that “the rights of citizens of the United States to vote should not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

The 15th Amendment also states that Congress—Congress—has the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

That is exactly what the Senate is trying to do with the John Lewis legislation. The bill would restore key provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that the Supreme Court severely weakened in its *Shelby County v. Holder* decision.

Fifty-seven years ago, Congress designed the Voting Rights Act to protect equal access to elections for all eligible Americans and passed the measure to respond to widespread disenfranchisement—particularly of racial and language minorities—between the post-Civil War period and the 1960s.

S. 4 would require the Federal pre-clearance for certain changes to voting laws and procedures. It would block changes that restrict the right to vote, particularly changes that disproportionately disenfranchise minority communities. The bill would allow plain-

tiffs and the Justice Department to bring lawsuits that deny or abridge the voting rights of minority voters and restore legal tools needed to enforce nationwide, permanent Federal bans on voter suppression efforts targeting minorities.

We cannot pass voting rights legislation as long as the Senate Republicans continue to filibuster even just to proceed to S. 2747 and S. 4. Inaction on voting rights is not an option as we prepare for our 2022 elections, which must be free and fair so that the American people have faith in our elections and their outcomes, particularly after the insurrection at the U.S. Capitol on January 6.

We need to change the filibuster rule. As President Biden just said before the holidays, “If the only thing standing between getting voting rights legislation passed and not getting it passed is the filibuster, I support making the exception of voting rights for the filibuster.”

I agree with President Biden. We cannot take action to safeguard voting rights if we don’t start right now. States are already drawing their 2022 political boundaries to comply with population changes from the 2020 census, and we cannot start our work unless my colleagues allow us to proceed to this issue on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I urge my colleagues not to filibuster the right of the U.S. Senate to start the debate on protecting voter integrity, where each Member will have the opportunity to debate the issue and offer amendments. Many Senators have offered suggestions about how we can improve these two voting rights bills. Collectively, we have a chance to come together for the American people, something they elected us to do.

We will not reach a consensus if we cannot even proceed to the bills. I will support changing the Senate rules, returning the Senate to its historic role of debating and voting on critical issues.

Voting rights legislation needs to be debated in the Senate and voted upon by a majority vote in the U.S. Senate.

Our noble experiment representing democracy is in grave danger. Let us come together and protect the integrity of the Senate, respond to the threat we saw on January 6 of last year, and take up and pass voting rights legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

ANNIVERSARY OF JANUARY 6

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, January 6, 2022, marks 1 year since the attempted coup at our Nation’s Capitol.

I am deeply grateful for the Capitol Police for their heroic acts on that dark day. The American people will always remember the sacrifices they made to protect our democracy.

But marking this date has another purpose, too. The January 6 insurrection made painfully clear that Amer-

ican democracy is seriously at risk. In November of 2020, American citizens braved a deadly pandemic to cast their ballots. But following that election, the defeated President refused to commit to a peaceful transfer of power.

Instead, he falsely sowed doubt about the legitimacy of the election and inflamed his most dangerous supporters to attack this Capitol. His attempts to cling to power through lies and violence were a violation of his oath of office and a grave abuse of power that can never be tolerated in a free and democratic society.

We mark this anniversary not only to reflect on that dereliction of duty, but also to call out the ongoing efforts to undermine our democracy.

Threats to our democracy are not new. For years, in State after State, Republican legislatures have passed laws making it harder to vote, all on a purely partisan basis with simple majority votes. They have imposed strict voter ID requirements and purged voter rolls to disenfranchise minority voters. They have made it harder to vote by mail and register to vote. They have gerrymandered districts for partisan political gain.

Over the past year, these shameless efforts have become even more brazen. Just as the former President was clear that he wanted to overturn the results of the 2020 election, Trump and his allies are entirely transparent about their goal of overturning future elections. Today, Republican opponents of democracy are exploiting every possible avenue to allow their party to maintain control, even if that means overturning the will of the American people.

Rather than putting a stop to these attacks on voting rights, the Supreme Court has enabled them. The Roberts Court gutted the core of the Voting Rights Act, which is why Republican legislatures right now can pass anti-voter laws with ease.

Last year, they destroyed what was left of the country’s landmark voting rights law, making it nearly impossible to block laws with racially discriminatory effects. They twice overturned key protections against dark money in our elections, and they gave a green light to partisan gerrymandering.

The Senate must not turn a blind eye while the Federal judiciary and State legislatures lead an all-out assault against free and fair elections in America. It is clear that Donald Trump’s Republican Party is embracing an increasingly authoritarian movement.

In 2006, the Voting Rights Act was reauthorized unanimously in the U.S. Senate. And yet today, only one Republican supports the Voting Rights Act, and none have endorsed the Freedom to Vote Act. The Senate filibuster means that MITCH MCCONNELL gets a veto and Congress cannot protect the sacred right to vote unless Republican politicians agree, all while they are actively undermining our democracy in State after State.

My view on this is simple: We did not swear an oath to protect a procedural rule like the filibuster, which has been the tool of racial segregation and Jim Crow. No, we swore an oath to defend the Constitution. When the Senate rules stand in the way of voting rights legislation, then those Senate rules must change.

A year after an insurrection at our Nation's Capitol, we must do more than speak up about the importance of democracy. Now, we must act. It is time to end the filibuster, time to protect voting rights, and time to defend our democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, all the Republican members of the Senate Judiciary Committee sent Attorney General Garland two letters about the Justice Department's involvement in local school board matters.

The first one was in October. Then in December, we asked why the FBI's counterterrorism division was getting involved in parents' expressing their concerns at school board meetings.

Now, just to be crystal clear, there is no excuse for real threats or acts of violence at school board meetings, but if there is such threats, these should be handled at the local level, and the Attorney General should withdraw his memo that started this whole thing off.

Well, a couple days before Christmas, the Justice Department responded to us Republican members of the Judiciary Committee with a single-page letter. In that letter, the Department of Justice had nothing to say about why the FBI's counterterrorism division was involved in local school board matters. The Department of Justice just simply said "We're not going to withdraw the memo."

So the Feds may be keeping track of school board meetings, even if it creates a horrible chilling effect at those meetings and maybe even discourages people from coming to those meetings. And, of course, the FBI looking over your shoulder would then have a chilling effect.

Now, next week, the Senate Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing on domestic terrorism, and I hope the committee will be focusing on the serious threats facing our country, and I hope no one thinks the focus is going to be on our Nation's parents.

School boards have to be accountable to the parents and the taxpayers that they serve. Some school boards across the country are still shutting down classes, even though vaccines have been available for a long time and dramatically reduce the chances of major illness to teachers.

Meanwhile, millions of kids across the country are struggling to catch up. They are under enormous stress from being separated, one kid from their friends in the classroom or in the school building. Schools are seeing far

more behavioral problems than they ever have before.

Parents, then, are right to be concerned about these situations in their local schools, and it is their right to ask questions. They should be telling their school board districts that they want to see changes. But will they see changes or will they be afraid to speak up at school board meetings? Will the FBI's counterterrorism division be keeping track of them as parents ask for changes from their school boards?

The Department of Justice owes the American people a better answer than just a single-page letter that says nothing about why the FBI's counterterrorism division is involved in local school board matters.

Now, more than ever, parents should be their kids' strongest and their kids' best advocates. They have a God-given right to do so. And, of course, the Justice Department ought to be doing everything it can to protect that constitutional right, not scare these parents out of exercising their constitutional right.

Attorney General Garland should withdraw his memo, and he should take Congress' oversight and concerns for parental rights more seriously.

VIOLENT CRIME

Mr. President, on another matter and the last issue I am going to speak to, I want to visit with my colleagues on the continuing rise of violent crime across the country.

We have all heard about the unprecedented 30-percent spike in murders that began in the summer of 2020. It continues to this very day. Over a dozen cities set new homicide records in the year just passed.

The rise of violent crimes coincides with the defund the police movement and widespread de-policing. Cutting police budgets combined with an antipolice sentiment fostered by local elected officials has led to violence against our police officers, so we have seen a dramatic increase in on-duty deaths in the last year.

I want to quote the Fraternal Order of Police. That organization says that 63 officers were murdered and 346 officers were shot. This organization also reported ambush-style attacks on law enforcement officers spiked 115 percent from 2020. The FBI has reported that unprovoked attacks against officers in which the officers had no official contact with the offender prior to the attack "continued to outpace all circumstances of felonious officers' death."

Other forms of violent crime are also up, as police are forced to retreat from the streets, including carjackings. Chicago saw 1,646 carjackings, compared to 603 incidents in 2019. Minneapolis Police report that carjacking shot up by 537 percent. Carjackings in New Orleans have doubled since 2019. Oakland Police say carjackings increased by 85 percent. Washington, DC, reports a 141-percent increase from last year. In Louisville, KY, carjackings have in-

creased 185 percent. And similar reports come out of cities across the country.

So, you see, criminals are emboldened by what is going on in our country, either through not showing respect for law enforcement or from efforts to cut the budgets of police departments.

Flash mobs—another sort of new lingo that is just new because of the increase in crime—flash mobs have made large organized smash-and-grab robberies a way of life in many cities. You have seen this on television—break down the doors, go in with the hammers, steal everything you can, do it within 2 or 3 minutes, and get out of there. So in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, New York, Boston, Houston, Atlanta, Sacramento, Baltimore, Las Vegas, and Seattle, groups of dozens make off with hundreds of thousands in merchandise.

I requested a briefing from the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security on these organized retail crime groups.

This rise in violent crime ought to be unacceptable to everybody, and I am stepping up to find solutions to these issues.

This past December, Chairman DURBIN of the Judiciary Committee held a field hearing in Chicago concerning gun trafficking and violent crime. I submitted questions for witnesses concerning the crisis level of carjackings, the terrible attacks on police, like the murder of Chicago Police Officer Ella French, and failed policies in blue cities that allow violent crime to continue.

I hope the Judiciary Committee will hold a full committee hearing here in Washington on the spike in violence and the challenges that law enforcement is facing, including ineffective bail policies, the cumbersome restraint on police officers, and the impact of the progressive prosecutor movement. Every minority member of the committee, led by myself as ranking member, has written to the chairman to request that we do have this hearing. I look forward to working with him on setting that up.

I hope my colleagues will join me in looking for ways that we can do more to combat violent crime—from carjackings, to organized retail crime, to an unspeakable rise in murders and the murders of police officers. Let's have a hearing where we can learn more about these trends and how we can support police officers. Let's look for ways that we can strengthen Federal criminal laws and Agencies to fight this violent crime. We can't continue down this path or it is going to lead to vigilante law enforcement.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 612.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alan Davidson, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 612, Alan Davidson, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

Charles E. Schumer, Maria Cantwell, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Jeanne Shaheen, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, Thomas R. Carper, Mazie Hirono, John W. Hickenlooper, Edward J. Markey, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Baldwin.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 465.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Amitabha Bose,

of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 465, Amitabha Bose, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

Charles E. Schumer, Maria Cantwell, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Jeanne Shaheen, Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Thomas R. Carper, Mazie K. Hirono, John W. Hickenlooper, Edward J. Markey, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Baldwin.

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, January 5, be waived.

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

The Senator from Kansas.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, it was 2 years ago this month that I stood on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives and was the first person to speak about a novel coronavirus, soon to be called COVID-19. Two years ago, I had been reading about this virus for several weeks, and something in my gut as a physician told me this was not going to be a common cold. I chatted with the CDC, and I implored them to start doing research on the origins of the virus, asking "Was it from nature or from a laboratory?" and that we needed to work on vaccines, therapeutics, and testing.

As we all know, the development of an American vaccine, thanks to Operation Warp Speed, was successful. As for the testing, we know the CDC fumbled it, but the private sector saved us. And therapeutics? Not so much. Therapeutics have never been a priority for this administration.

As we return to our Nation's Capital, I would venture to say that very few Americans didn't have somebody in their families catch Omicron, and my family was no different. We shared the same experience as millions of other Americans did. Despite being vaccinated, one of my loved ones with underlying healthcare conditions caught the Omicron virus. As I saw my loved one start having asthma, wheezing, and become short of breath, I did what every spouse would do and said: Well, we need to go get tested. We need to talk to a doctor.

So we drove to several testing sites, and we had the option of standing in line for 3 or 4 hours with sick people. If we didn't have the Omicron, we cer-

tainly would have by the time we left. We called around and finally were able to get an appointment the next day for testing.

I am not sure if you have ever seen a person with asthma, but you can see the distress in their face as they wheeze, as they become short of breath. This is something with which I am all too familiar. I have taken care of thousands of women, pregnant women, with asthma. I have been in the emergency room with them, having to admit them to the ICU, and I knew that was the road that we were headed to.

I called around, hoping to find some monoclonal antibodies—a place where we could go and we could get monoclonal antibodies. Then there is this new miracle of biotherapeutics out there. I thought, well, maybe we could get those, but none were to be had.

In watching my wife continue to suffer, I decided, you know, I think we need to do some type of telemedicine. So we called a doctor and set up a telemedicine visit—someone who had taken care of thousands of patients with the coronavirus. We did the appointment, and he prescribed Ivermectin for her. After the first tablet, it was a miracle. Within an hour, her labored breathing had settled down. By the next day, her second dose, she was almost completely better right before my eyes.

Again, I remind everybody it has been 2 years since this pandemic started, and we still have limited access to therapeutics. Again, as we all know, the Biden administration's approach to this is to put all of their eggs in one basket. They believed in a one-size-fits-all approach. Vaccine mandates, masks, and testing was their prescription to getting us through this pandemic. All of those have had a place, and all of them have had some successes, but when a million people in 1 day are testing positive, it is not surprising we can't keep up with the testing, and that is why we need therapeutics.

In fact, the Federal Government has allocated over \$80 billion for testing—\$80 billion for testing—and only \$15 billion for therapeutics. This is simply unacceptable. We are 2 years into this pandemic, and we have only spent \$15 billion on therapeutics. The Biden administration should have already established an Operation-Warp-Speed approach to the development, manufacturing, and distribution of therapeutics.

It just always seems like this administration has been a day late and a dollar short. For example, in mid-2021, we saw the Delta wave coming. We all knew it was coming, and we had real-world evidence in the summer of 2021 to suggest that a booster shot would be helpful for seniors and at-risk individuals. It was in June of 2020 that I asked the CDC and the FDA to consider letting physicians meet with their patients and prescribe a booster ahead of

the Delta wave—again, in the summer of 2020.

Unfortunately, the FDA waited until September 22 to approve the booster. Between June and September, more than 11,000 seniors died from breakthrough infections, while more than 230,000 people tested positive. No doubt, a booster and/or therapeutics could have made a big difference in these seniors' lives.

It is easy to talk about the mistakes we have made with this virus. I want to spend a moment talking about solutions, though.

We need to unleash our community health centers and our county health departments in this COVID-19 fight. They have been the backbone of vaccination and treatment for communicable diseases for decades.

Once the Biden administration agrees to prioritize therapeutics, we need community health centers and county health departments to take over the telemedicine visits with trained nurses and implement treatment protocols across the United States.

In Kansas alone, we have over 200 community health centers and clinics funded with Federal dollars, along with over 100 local health departments that are accustomed to dealing with infectious diseases on a daily basis. These folks can implement these protocols based upon triaging at-risk individuals and starting early treatment. This will prevent many trips to the ER, as well as hospitalizations. Early treatment is what works.

Finally, and this goes without saying, I trust these nurses to make necessary referrals to the emergency room. They can do this. How do I know it? I have worked with these nurses for 30 years. I helped sponsor—was the medical director for three county health departments for almost 30 years. They do an incredible job. They are well equipped to handle this effort, but they need the Biden administration to move on therapeutics and move fast.

The medicines you could get for less than \$100 can oftentimes prevent hospitalizations and ICU visits. We need to give doctors the options of using therapeutics, along with steroids, anti-inflammatories, and other standard protocols that have been developed by these physicians who have treated literally thousands of COVID-19 patients.

Certainly, if we have better access to monoclonal antibodies or if these new miracle antiviral agents were available, we could use them as well. But, please, let's empower physicians and these health departments and community health centers, these experienced nurses, to do their job.

Time is precious. We cannot afford additional delays. We can't afford more confusion, more mixed messaging, and more mixed management. The Biden administration must let patients and physicians decide what is best in their unique healthcare situation, not somebody who is sitting on a throne in Washington, DC, who seldom sees patients in the real world.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Presiding Officer from Minnesota.

RECOGNIZING JANUARY 6 WORKERS

Madam President, I want to start by thanking my colleagues Leader SCHUMER and Senator KLOBUCHAR for their work to honor the police officers who risked their lives to protect this country 1 year ago tomorrow.

In the year since that dark day, we have learned more about all that those officers endured from the terrorists who stormed the Capitol—the racist slurs, the physical abuse, the mental injuries. We know things were so much worse than they appeared in the original reporting as more and more details have come out. These terrorists gouged someone's eyes out. They killed a Capitol Police officer and injured 140 others. They threatened to kill the Vice President. They brought a noose to the Capitol and paraded symbols of White supremacy. In fact, the people who broke into the office upstairs from my office in the Capitol—we have this on film—used flagpoles with Confederate flags and Trump flags attached to them. They brought equipment to take hostages.

It wasn't only Capitol Police officers who endured this attack and put their lives on the line serving our Republic on January 6. Workers throughout the Capitol risked everything that day, workers who do the radio and television broadcast and work in the media center, workers who work the floor, workers who clean up, and workers who do food service. They often don't get noticed, like the Capitol support staff. Every day, Capitol janitorial and maintenance and other workers, essential workers, do their jobs with skill and dedication and dignity. They have shown up for work during this pandemic.

Those workers were here on January 6 doing their jobs when the insurrectionists, when the rioters, when the—call it what you want—traitors stormed this building, barging into this Chamber, acting as if no one would ever hold them responsible or accountable for their violence, for their disregard for American values and for U.S. laws.

When the rampage was over, we know it was the largely Black and Brown custodial maintenance workers who were left to restore dignity to the Capitol. Their work, first of all, allowed us to come back and continue our work at 8 that night certifying the electoral votes and securing our democracy. As we know, domestic terrorists destroyed; Black and Brown custodians cleaned up; and maintenance workers, carpenters, painters, and union members rebuilt. Today, we honor them.

Some of the most enduring and moving images of that day are the pictures of these workers sweeping up the mess that terrorists made in the people's houses.

That night, after we voted—the Senator from Minnesota was there. We were all here voting in this Chamber. After the police and the National Guard—the DC Police, the Capitol Police, and others—after they cleared the terrorists out of this building, we came back at 8 and voted. I spent the night in the basement in my office. I live a 20-minute walk away. I really didn't want to walk home that night. But I walked around about midnight, walked around this building, over in the House and the Senate. I saw the destruction. I saw the window right upstairs from me, the half-moon window that terrorists, with their flagpoles with their Confederate flags and their Trump flags attached, broke through.

When I was back there at midnight that night, already the cleanup from the custodians had started, cleaning up after they had been threatened. After they had been called names as Black women, as immigrant women, after they had been called names by the terrorists, they were back there cleaning up. Already, a carpenter had cut a half-moon piece of plywood and nailed it to that window to keep this building safe and keep the elements out.

We honor those people today. It is what service looks like. It is what love of country looks like. It is what the dignity of work looks like. It tells you a lot about what is wrong with our economy. These essential workers—the people who prepare the food, the people who clean up, the people who provide security—the essential workers, like so many of their fellow service workers around this country, don't make a lot of money. They don't get much attention. They don't get much reward. They don't have much power. We simply don't value and respect all work the way we should.

I think of the words of Dr. King. One of my favorite Dr. King quotes is this:

If a man is called to be a street sweeper, he should sweep streets even as Michelangelo painted, or Beethoven composed music, or Shakespeare wrote poetry. He should sweep streets so well that all the hosts of heaven and earth will pause to say, "Here lived a great street sweeper who did his job well."

Dr. King said:

No work is insignificant. All labor that uplifts humanity has dignity and importance.

He later said that no job with adequate compensation is menial.

Look at the words of Pope Francis a few days ago in his Christmas Eve address or think back 100 years, 120 years, to Pope Leo, the labor Pope, in *Rerum Novarum*, where he first introduced—at least in my view—first introduced the term, I assume in Latin, "dignity of work."

Pope Francis, in his Christmas Eve address just a few days ago, said:

[God] reminds us of the importance of granting dignity to men and women through [their] labour, [and] also . . . granting dignity to human labour itself.

Those are Pope Francis's words.

No work is insignificant. All labor has dignity. We ought to treat it that

way, starting with honoring these workers.

Last year, I joined my colleagues in a resolution to honor all the workers who risked their lives that day: custodians, maintenance workers, Capitol Police officers, journalists, the floor staff, the workers in our offices. All of them served this country. All of them risked their safety to preserve our democracy. All of them deserve our gratitude.

Today, though, or tomorrow, actually, but I will ask tonight because my colleagues—because of Senator Isakson's funeral, many will be there tomorrow. I ask my colleagues to join me and Senators KLOBUCHAR and SCHUMER and Senators CASEY and BOOKER in a resolution honoring specifically the Capitol janitorial and maintenance staff—all essential workers—for their bravery and service to our country on January 6.

One of my favorite parts of this job—and the Presiding Officer knows this because we have had these conversations and because of her appreciation for work and for the people who work so hard and get so little—one of the joys of this job is to do what Abraham Lincoln used to do. When staff wanted him to stay in the White House and win the war and free the slaves and preserve the Union, Lincoln said: No, I have to go out and get my public opinion bath.

One of the joys of this job is to talk to the workers here just about their lives or about what happened on January 6. One custodial worker and I were talking. She has been in this country for 30 years. She has been a citizen for 20 years, and she has worked in this job for 30 years. She has been a citizen for 20 years. She and a number of others were locked in a room where terrorists were pounding on the walls and were screaming racial epithets and were screaming anti-immigrant utterances, all of that. Yet she still works here. She was one of the ones who had to clean up after them.

As I said, the terrorists destroyed; the Black and Brown maintenance workers cleaned up; and the union trades people rebuilt.

This resolution that I am going to offer tomorrow reaffirms the Senate's commitment to strengthening their rights as workers and providing support and resources to ensure their health, well-being, safety, and protection from further attacks. Their support should include higher pay. It should include collective bargaining rights for all of them. It should include paid sick leave and vacation leave. It should include comprehensive health insurance with mental health resources.

Don't think that many of these—you all understand that many of these police officers, many of these custodial workers, many of the movers and the plumbers and the others who were locked in their rooms or offices or buildings during this—I am not a men-

tal health expert at all, but many of them, I am sure, suffer from issues of nightmares and other kinds of anxieties that we need to help them with.

I hope my colleagues will join me, not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans, as Members of this body. These workers serve us all. They allowed us to do our work for America that night. After we essentially were run out of this room and were safe for several hours, they allowed us, because of their work, to come back here and be safe and do our jobs that we took an oath of office on January 3, 2021, to do. This building wouldn't function without them.

No one should have to endure what they did at the hands of domestic terrorists.

To all of the Capitol custodians and service workers who come to work in this building each day to ensure our democracy functions, thank you, thank you, thank you.

I have this resolution honoring the Capitol's essential workers, applauding them for their service. I had intended to try to pass this resolution by unanimous consent tomorrow, but I recognize that many of my colleagues are out of town at the funeral honoring one of the really good men who served in this body, Johnny Isakson from Georgia.

I hope we can take this resolution up and pass this commonsense resolution next week when we return.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am really pleased and honored to follow my colleague from Ohio and to join in supporting the resolution that he is offering to pay homage and to express gratitude to the essential workers in this building, in the Capitol Complex, in this temple of democracy, for all they have done, not only on January 6 but in the aftermath of that brutal assault on our democracy.

We talk in abstract now about the institution and the assault on this institution, but the lasting and enduring trauma for those workers that we will recognize in this resolution is tremendously important. It is important to them, but it is important to us as well that we recognize our duty and our obligation to them for the dignity of their work and what they did to enable us to come back on that evening, January 6, and do our duty—and do it in a bipartisan way, coming together on that day.

We were all witnesses to a brutal crime. We were all witnesses to an insurrection and a riot that stands as a dark and terrible milestone—the anniversary tomorrow of probably the most abhorrent attack on our democratic institutions. And all of us who were witnesses can never forget the horror of that day—the sheer physicality of the attack, the blood in the hallways, the sights and sounds of rioters with bats and pipes bearing Trump banners and

Confederate flags and seeking to do physical harm to us and to kill the Vice President. That kind of physical, brutal, cruel attack, with the hope—in fact, intent—of killing and injuring, had its effect. In fact, people died.

Our Capitol Police bravely defended us, with determination and courage, and so did many other heroes that day—the National Guard and the DC Police. But let us never forget that mob was called here to this very Chamber by the former President in a cynical bid to keep himself in power through a coup that would subvert the will of the people on election day. And we were here—we were all standing and then sitting at our desks when we were rushed from the Chamber because of the threat of physical assault on us.

In the end, their efforts were thwarted. Congress certified the election result that night as planned. We were undeterred, undaunted by the violent and deadly attack on the Capitol and our democracy.

But that day was not a one-off. It was not an isolated or aberrant incident. In fact, it was a symptom and a symbol of a deeper, destructive violence of violent extremism—a virus of domestic terrorism that continues to infect our Nation; in fact, the most persistent and lethal threat to our national internal security.

According to the intelligence community and the FBI, it is violent extremism and White supremacy. That attack left scars and wounds that remain unhealed, the lives that were lost, and many of our staff, many of those maintenance workers, many of the cafeteria and janitorial staff struggle with lingering trauma from the violence that they faced on that day.

The attack reminded us of how fragile and in danger our democratic institutions are when our leaders, when we as leaders, fail to protect them. The mob that assaulted our Capitol was fueled by the Big Lie—the baseless falsehood that massive fraud occurred during the 2020 election.

That Big Lie was propagated and supported by the President and his enablers, and they have continued to fuel those delusions. Donald Trump has incited continually the kind of falsehoods that lead to a sharp rise in threats against lawmakers in the Capitol here and a higher comfort level with violence at every level—in school boards, in statehouses.

The Big Lie has now become a pretense. It has become a pretense for some Republican leaders and State governments across the country to pass legislation making it harder to vote—meaning that fewer people have fewer times and fewer places to cast their vote.

At least 19 States have passed 34 new laws that restrict voting rights based on that Big Lie—the bogus, false claim of fraud. And Republicans in a number of States are vesting the power to overturn election results—literally, to deny the results of the vote count rather

than respecting the will of the people, whether it is the vote canvass boards or legislative committees or other State officials having the power to strike down and overturn the results by refusing to certify them or literally disregarding them.

All of this voter suppression is poisonous. It is toxic to our democracy. And we have an obligation, on this solemn anniversary of that horrific attack, to recommit ourselves to holding accountable those domestic terrorists and violent extremists who stormed the Capitol and hunted us—lawmakers and others—ransacked the halls that we regard with so much reverence, defaced and debased not just the building but the concept of democracy. And we should pursue not only prosecutions against the 700 or 1,000 people who can be held criminally responsible for defacing the Capitol or illegally entering or other acts of violence but everyone who aided and abetted them. They must be held accountable, no matter what their rank or their office, no matter how high the facts and the law will go. I urge the Department of Justice to pursue them, to prosecute them, to make sure that they are held accountable.

We also need to fortify those institutions. And that is why passing the Freedom to Vote Act and the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act have to be among our priorities and changing the rules to make that possible.

My colleagues and I will bring to the Senate floor for a vote in the coming weeks, no later than January 17, those measures in an effort to change the rules to enable their passage. We need to do whatever is necessary to pass those measures, including limiting the filibuster.

There is a direct through line from the Big Lie in the January 6 assault, incited by Donald Trump, to violent extremism and domestic terrorism, to voter suppression and the overturning of elections, eventually to the destruction of our democracy. During the peaceful transition of power that eventually did take place last January, President Biden reminded us that a better world is not something that is given to us; it requires hard work. Unity is not inevitable; it is achievable through what we do to make it possible. Democracy is not a spectator sport.

The values and norms and institutions of our democracy are fragile, as threatened now as they are precious, and they depend on people fighting for them in times of adversity. And truly now we are in a time of adversity.

What haunts me, as I think back on January 6, is how close we came to losing our democracy, how close we came to shattering the traditions and norms—much as the windows of this building were shattered—and how a few people continue to believe they could demagogue and enable Trump to stage that coup.

There is no forgetting what some of our colleagues did. There is no denying it. But we have sought to work together because we come here and we are sent here for a common purpose, which is to meet the needs of Americans, especially in a time of pandemic and economic hardship.

This past year has truly been one of hardship and heartbreak for so many. And as we think back to that day, a year ago, we need to redouble our determination to hold dear the democratic values and institutions that mean elected representatives truly represent the people. That is what elections do. That is why every vote should count and every vote must count. And that is the purpose of the Freedom to Vote Act and the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

We have our part to do. We need to do it. And I hope my colleagues will not only relive and remember but act on it—the common purpose of that day when we came back to count the vote—to make sure that we can come together again not just to honor the people who enable us to do it but also to honor the people of America who elect us to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

JANUARY 6

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, why January 6? Why were thousands of Trump supporters here in Washington on that specific date, January 6? They were here on January 6 because that was the last possible day that Donald Trump and his followers could overturn the election in which Joe Biden had just beaten the sitting President soundly—81 million votes to 74 million votes. The gap in the electoral college was much bigger on a percentage basis, 306 to 232.

But Trump and his followers decided that they were not going to just give up power just because their candidate lost an election. And their decision to put power ahead of the rule of law is, frankly, totally understandable.

Over the course of human existence, thousands of second-place finishers, either through election or by the dynamics of power succession, have refused to bend to the rules.

Most recently, Russia briefly flirted with democracy until Vladimir Putin and his cronies rigged the rules to set him up in power permanently. And throughout history, many slighted Princes or Generals have just chosen to seize power, through force or coercion, if they couldn't get it through the standing rules. Wanting power and willing to do anything to get power is as old as civilization. And that is why all those people broke into the Capitol a year ago tomorrow. They were called to Washington by President Trump to pressure Congress and State legislators and Vice President Pence to suspend the rules of succession, void the election, and install Donald Trump as President, even though he lost. Let's

not pretend that anything else happened that day.

Senators CRUZ and HAWLEY and many, many other Republicans were, on January 6, trying to get Congress to delay the certification of electors to give Trump more time to overturn the will of the voters. The rioters came to the Capitol to use violence as a last resort to try to pressure Congress to adopt the Cruz-Hawley plan. They stormed the building, and many of them were explicit when they were here that day, that they were inside the building to support President Trump, to support Senator CRUZ. By the end of the day, dozens were killed or badly injured.

It wasn't a spontaneous random act of mass violence. It was a coordinated attempt to use violence, or at least the threat of violence for many, to void the 2020 election and install Donald Trump as an unelected leader of the United States of America.

History has seen this play a million times before.

But I think here in the Senate, we often get lulled into a little bit of a sense of complacency because the last vestiges of the pre-Trump era of the Republican Party still exist here in the Senate. In the Senate, only seven Republicans voted for Senators CRUZ and HAWLEY's attempt to void Joe Biden's victory. And Senator MCCONNELL and some others here said the right thing that day and the days afterward.

Behind closed doors, many of our veteran Republican colleagues often whispered to us how awful and vulgar the Trump rioters are and how dearly they support the rule of law. But almost never do those Republican colleagues say those things out loud because the new mainstream of the Republican Party—the Trump Republican Party—does not believe that Joe Biden won the 2020 election. Pick your conspiracy theory, but 7 out of 10 Republicans—literally, tens of thousands of Americans—believe that somehow Pakistani intelligence operatives or Italian satellites or Venezuelan communists were involved in secretly switching millions of votes from Donald Trump to Joe Biden.

But maybe more importantly, what leads these Republicans to believe these wild conspiracy theories is a more insidious belief, a belief that if a Democrat wins an election, it must be, by definition, illegitimate. That is why this many Republicans believed Joe Biden didn't win, even though they have zero evidence to back up this claim. They don't need evidence because they just believe the Democrats are evil, that Democrats are illegitimate in governance. And if Democrats win, it just cannot be allowed to stand. Defeating Democrats is, to the Trump Republican Party, more important than maintaining democracy.

We know this because some of the most popular and revered national Republicans are calling openly for the suspension of democracy if democracy

keeps electing Democrats. Congresswoman MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE called for States with Republican Governors to disallow people from voting if they showed an inclination to support Democrats. Our colleague, Senator RAND PAUL, said efforts to convince people to vote—if those votes resulted in Democrats winning—should be illegal.

Sensible Senate Republicans—the ones who whisper the sensible things quietly to us here on the floor of the Senate Chamber—will claim that MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE is an outlier, a fringe character, but she is exactly the opposite. She is the mainstream. She doesn't believe Joe Biden won the 2020 election, just like 7 out of 10 Republican voters. The fact that she is willing to say the quiet things out loud, it doesn't make her fringe; it makes her royalty. The best attended Republican event in my State since the 2020 election was an event headlined by MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE.

She and RAND PAUL and their ilk are the Republican Party right now. They are the healthy trunk of the tree. Sensible Senate Republicans who believe Joe Biden is a legitimate President are the dead limbs, bound to fall off soon in a slight wind.

The mainstream of today's Republican Party believes that beating Joe Biden and other Democrats is just more important than preserving democracy. So that is why they are methodically working to clean up their mistakes from 2020. They couldn't declare Joe Biden's win illegitimate because they just weren't ready on January 6. That is what January 6 was about, an attempt to postpone the certification of electors so they could get ready.

Well, in 2022 and 2024, they are going to be ready. At the heart of this plan is an attempt to just make it a whole lot harder for Democrats to vote by eliminating voting sites in Democratic neighborhoods or eliminating days to vote—days that typically Democrats vote on.

But Republicans are also preparing a secret weapon—a backup plan—if on election night, their attempts to depress Democratic turnout don't work out and a Democratic candidate for Governor or Senate or President still wins. And this backup plan is all about changing who counts the votes. It used to be that even in Republican-majority States, Democrats had a role in counting the votes, either through bipartisan panels or through the ability for cities and counties to choose their own election officials, which often meant that in Democratic counties you had Democrats in charge of counting votes and in Republican counties you had Republicans in charge of counting votes. This has been a longstanding foundation of our democracy, making sure that no one party had the monopoly on vote counting.

If both parties are engaged in the process, there is a lot more incentive

for both sides to play it safe and play it straight—but no more. In Republican-controlled State after State, the rules are being changed to put Republicans and only Republicans in charge of counting the votes and, more consequently, deciding which votes count.

Trump and his followers are making sure that only Republicans who are 100 percent loyal to Trump will be the chosen few Republicans in charge of vote counting.

Everybody has heard that phone call from 2020 in which President Trump personally lobbies the Georgia secretary of state to disqualify just enough Democratic votes in order to shift the State's electors to Trump. "I just want to find 11,780 votes," Trump pleads in that phone call. During that hour-long call, he makes it exactly clear what he wants. He wants 11,780 or more Democratic votes to be disqualified through vague made-up claims of fraud in order to flip the election. He tells you exactly what he wants on that phone call: votes to be disqualified on zero basis of fraud in order to flip the election to him.

The new State laws and the purge of straight shooters like the Georgia secretary of state from the party will make sure that in 2022 or 2024, if an election is close enough to flip to Republicans, the obstacles that were in place in 2020 will be gone.

Now, I know that every Republican Senator, and even a few Democratic Senators, think this scenario that I just outlined is hyperbolic. They think it is a scare tactic. But why would you think that? Trump and his allies aren't even trying to hide what they did or what they are doing. Trump lost the election. He lost the election by 7 million votes, and he didn't care. He did everything in his power, including using violence, to try to stay in power, despite the fact that he lost. Since then, he has cheerled all these changes in State laws.

Do any of you really think that he is doing this because he believes in good governance or clean elections? Of course, not. He has told you in words, in deeds, over and over, what his goal is, and his goal is to achieve power, whether or not he actually wins the election. He is not hiding it. His supporters, leaders of the Republican Party, are now openly calling for States to strip from Democrats, and Democrats only, the right to vote or the right to campaign for election.

This is all happening in front of your eyes, out in the open, right now. And only we—the 100 of us—have the ability to stop this. January 6 was just a preview. It was what happens because Trump and his minions hadn't done the necessary planning ahead to steal the election. They panicked, and they brought violence upon this building.

They may not need a physical rebellion in 2022 or 2024 because they will have changed the rules to make sure that Republicans loyal to Trump are installed in power, regardless of whether they win or lose the election.

None of us are helpless here in the U.S. Senate. We can pass laws that take away from States the power to disenfranchise any voters or the ability to put only one party in charge of vote counting.

A few of my Democratic Senate colleagues think that they are saving the Senate by preserving Republicans' right to stop these reforms. They are wrong. If we don't take steps right now to stop Trump's plan, there won't be a Senate left to protect. That is not hyperbole. If the loser of an election for the U.S. Senate gets seated as a Member of this body in 2023, then our democracy is effectively dead.

It is time we started actually listening to what Trump Republicans are telling us over and over again, out loud, that they are getting ready to do. They have made their choice, and they have chosen power over democracy.

I get it. It is always easier to do nothing and hope that the threat will just go away—just shut the door, box your ears, cover your eyes, and hope for the best. But we are the U.S. Senate. We are the ones that are put on the watch. We are the ones that are supposed to meet the threat head-on and stop it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, had there been a recorded vote, I would have voted no on the confirmations of Executive Calendar No. 489, Armando O. Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years and No. 490, Carolyn N. Lerner, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TOMMY WILLIAMS

• Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Tommy Williams of Baton Rouge, LA, on his retirement from the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, LCTCS.

Serving as the executive director for governmental affairs of LCTCS for 13 years, Mr. Williams made monumental

strides for the system, including one of his major legislative accomplishments: ACT 360, which appropriated \$500 million in capital improvements to all 12 LCTCS campuses throughout the great State of Louisiana.

Prior to his service at LCTCS, Mr. Williams wore many hats during his tenure at BellSouth, which spanned almost four decades. Serving as the company's executive director for legislative affairs in Louisiana, he represented the interests of BellSouth before the Louisiana State Legislature in numerous regular and special sessions. He served as BellSouth's Houma and Baton Rouge district manager, as well as vice president for regulatory and external affairs from 2003–2006.

In addition to the lengthy list of professional accomplishments, Mr. Williams and his wife of 56 years, Ms. Bonnie Williams, devoted countless hours of their time volunteering for community-based nonprofit organizations. Mr. and Mrs. Williams are the proud parents of four, grandparents of eight, and great-grandparents of three.

The State of Louisiana and all who have benefited from Mr. Williams's impressive efforts thank him for his diligent work. There is no doubt that his legacy will live on in the years to come and will serve as an inspiration to the next generation of community builders and leaders.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

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 Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3441. A bill to amend the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 to reauthorize and improve the community development financial institutions bond guarantee program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNOCK:

S. 3442. A bill for the relief of Michael Janssen and Steven Passantino; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 3443. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the MOWA Band of Choctaw Indians,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3444. A bill to ensure that facilities of the Indian Health Service, facilities operated by an Indian Tribe, Tribal organization, or inter-Tribal consortium, and facilities operated by an urban Indian organization receive items from the strategic national stockpile and qualified pandemic or epidemic products directly from the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 484. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of late Senator John "Johnny" Hardy Isakson; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Con. Res. 25. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the lying in state of the remains of the Honorable Harry Mason Reid, Jr., a Senator from the State of Nevada; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Con. Res. 26. A concurrent resolution providing for the use of the catafalque situated in the Exhibition Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the rotunda of the Capitol for the Honorable Harry Mason Reid, Jr., a Senator from the State of Nevada; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 190

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 190, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 675

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 675, a bill to provide for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1698

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1698, a bill to allow for hemp-derived cannabidiol and hemp-derived cannabidiol containing substances in dietary supplements and food.

S. 1861

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1861, a bill to provide high-skilled non-immigrant visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

S. 2005

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2005, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 2036

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2036, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters, and for other purposes.

S. 2675

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2675, a bill to amend the American

Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to increase appropriations to Restaurant Revitalization Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2710

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, a bill to promote competition and reduce gatekeeper power in the app economy, increase choice, improve quality, and reduce costs for consumers.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2736, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3215

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3215, a bill to amend the Act of August 10, 1956, to provide for the payment of pay and allowances for certain officers of the Army who are assigned to the Corps of Engineers.

S. 3382

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3382, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Small Business Administration from directly making loans under the 7(a) loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 3418

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3418, a bill to provide emergency assistance to States, territories, Tribal nations, and local areas affected by substance use disorder, including the use of opioids and stimulants, and to make financial assistance available to States, territories, Tribal nations, local areas, public or private nonprofit entities, and certain health providers, to provide for the development, organization, coordination, and operation of more effective and cost efficient systems for the delivery of essential services to individuals with substance use disorder and their families.

S. RES. 141

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 141, a resolution recognizing the critical importance of access to reliable, clean drinking water for Native Americans and Alaska Natives and confirming the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure such water access.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 484—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LATE SENATOR JOHN “JOHNNY” HARDY ISAKSON

Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 484

Whereas John “Johnny” Hardy Isakson (referred to in this preamble as “Johnny Isakson”) was born on December 28, 1944, to Edwin Andrew Isakson and Julia (Baker) Isakson in Atlanta, Georgia;

Whereas Johnny Isakson served in the Georgia Air National Guard between 1966 and 1972, leaving service as a staff sergeant;

Whereas, in 1966, Johnny Isakson earned a bachelor’s degree in business administration from the University of Georgia before starting a successful career in real estate;

Whereas, in 1979, Johnny Isakson became president of Northside Realty, a post he held for 22 years, during which Northside Realty became the biggest independent real estate company in the Southeast and one of the largest real estate companies in the United States;

Whereas, in 1976, Johnny Isakson was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives, where he served until 1990 and served as Republican Minority Leader between 1983 and 1990;

Whereas, in 1993, Johnny Isakson was elected to the Georgia Senate, where he served until 1996;

Whereas, in 1997, Johnny Isakson was appointed chairman of the Georgia Board of Education;

Whereas, in 1999, Johnny Isakson was elected to the House of Representatives,

where he served on the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and worked on legislation, including the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–110; 115 Stat. 1425);

Whereas, in 2004, Johnny Isakson was elected to the Senate for the first time, becoming the only Georgian to have ever been elected to the Georgia House of Representatives, the Georgia Senate, and both Houses of Congress;

Whereas Johnny Isakson served the people of Georgia honorably in the Senate for 15 years, including service on the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and service as the Chair of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate;

Whereas, during his tenure as a Senator, Johnny Isakson developed a reputation as a bipartisan leader who sought common ground and successfully advanced pension legislation to save jobs in Georgia, legislation to invest in the Port of Savannah, legislation to allocate disaster relief funding in Georgia, and bipartisan legislation to overhaul the health care system for veterans of the United States;

Whereas, prior to his resignation from the Senate in 2019 due to health reasons, Johnny Isakson strongly advocated for bipartisan compromise and cooperation in the Senate, hosting the annual bipartisan barbecue lunch for colleagues on both sides of the aisle and once stating, “I’m big on bipartisanship. Whether you’re Black or white, Republican or Democrat, whatever it might be, find a way to find common ground. Give it a chance to work. . . Bipartisanship is a state of being.”;

Whereas after stepping down from the Senate, Johnny Isakson launched the Isakson Initiative to raise money for research into Parkinson’s disease and other neurocognitive diseases;

Whereas Johnny Isakson was beloved and respected by his colleagues and once described the only division he saw as between “friends and future friends”;

Whereas, on December 19, 2021, at the age of 76, Johnny Isakson died, leaving behind his wife Dianne Davison, his 3 loving children (John, Julie, and Kevin), 9 grandchildren, and a legacy of steadfast love for and service to the people of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life and legacy of the late Senator John “Johnny” Hardy Isakson (referred to in this resolution as “Johnny Isakson”) for his—

(A) accomplishments as a patriot and an example for future generations of leaders;

(B) unwavering dedication to Georgia as a Senator, a member of the House of Representatives, and a public servant; and

(C) steadfast commitment to legislating with principle, compassion, and a heart for compromise and cooperation;

(2) proclaims that Johnny Isakson represented the best of Georgia and honorably embodied friendship and decency during his more than 40 years of public service to Georgia and to the United States;

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

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

(B) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Johnny Isakson; and

(4) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of Johnny Isakson.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 25—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR THE LYING IN STATE OF THE REMAINS OF THE HONORABLE HARRY MASON REID, JR., A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered to the Nation by Harry Mason Reid, Jr., a Senator from the State of Nevada, his remains be permitted to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take all necessary steps for the accomplishment of that purpose.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26—PROVIDING FOR THE USE OF THE CATAFALQUE SITUATED IN THE EXHIBITION HALL OF THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER IN CONNECTION WITH MEMORIAL SERVICES TO BE CONDUCTED IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR THE HONORABLE HARRY MASON REID, JR., A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 26

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to transfer the catafalque which is situated in the Exhibition Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center to the rotunda of the Capitol so that such catafalque may be used in connection with services to be conducted there for the Honorable Harry Mason Reid, Jr., a Senator from the State of Nevada.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have 2 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development

of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 25, which was received today.

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

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the lying in state of the remains of the Honorable Harry Mason Reid, Jr., a Senator from the State of Nevada.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

PROVIDING FOR THE USE OF THE CATAFALQUE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 26, which was received today.

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

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) providing for the use of the catafalque situated in the Exhibition Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the rotunda of the Capitol for the Honorable Harry Mason Reid, Jr., a Senator from the State of Nevada.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 2022

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Thursday, January 6; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Bose nomination; further that at 12 noon, there be a moment of silence in observance of the events of January 6, 2021; and finally, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, January 10.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order under the provisions of S. Res. 484 and do so as a further mark of respect for the late Johnny Isakson, former Senator.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 6, 2022, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL E. KURILLA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CRAIG S. GATZEMEYER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT B. BRODIE
COL. MICHAEL A. BROOKS, JR.
COL. KEVIN G. COLLINS
COL. FRIDRIK FRIDRIKSSON
COL. MAURA M. HENNIGAN
COL. GARRETT R. HOFFMAN
COL. STEPHEN J. LIGHTFOOT
COL. ANDREW T. PRIDDY
COL. JAMES A. RYANS II
COL. DAVID C. WALSH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANK D. WHITWORTH III

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTHEW V. CHAUVIERE
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JASON W. MEDSGER
IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

JONATHAN T. BUTLER
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

TAMAR N. WILSON
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOSEPH B. BULWINKLE
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

KURTIS S. MACIOROWSKI
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DOMINIC C. SEWELL
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ANDREW M. WADE
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

LATASHA N. TURNER
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRANDI N. ATCHISON
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK P. O'NEILL, JR.
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

JONATHAN B. LUNDY
IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL A. CAP
KEVIN J. CONANT
KEITH B. DILLARD
KEITH M. MONTGOMERY
RYAN S. MURATA
ELIZABETH A. PERAZZO
CATHERINE M. SUMRULD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

GEORGE H. FORBES III
ROSS A. HRYNEWYCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANTHONY C. SICILIANO
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RAFAEL E. MASALBALADEJO
CURTIS B. MILLER
MICHAEL R. RUIZ
JEREMY J. WILLOUGHBY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

EDDIE M. HOWLAND
NICKY J. JONES
PATRICK J. LEOPOLD
STEPHEN M. MANKUS
BILLY J. QUINN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ANDREW M. ADKINS
MELOVEN J. BROWN
DAVID A. CONRAD
CASEY L. DURST
IAN P. PAQUETTE
JOSHUA E. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

IAN M. COLE
JARED L. COLEMAN
CHRISTOPHER T. FREITAG
CHRISTOPHER L. JUNKINS
RYAN J. MARTIN
JOHN D. OWENS
CHRISTOPHER T. SILLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ELI J. BRESSLER
JONATHON R. CAPE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JESSE C. TALLMAN
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JON C. PETERSON
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER M. DILPORT
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANDREW E. CHEATUM
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JOHN F. BATHON
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER L. JOHNSON
ERIC J. MCCOY
MATTHEW E. MCNEW
BRAD C. SWANSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER J. VOSS
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DUSTIN E. GUERPO

STEVEN A. SCOTT
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SERGIO ABREU
MATTHEW P. HOLLAND
RANDY L. HOWELL
CARLILE PAGE, JR.
CHRISTOPHER J. REQUEJO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

TERMAINE R. BABERS
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

VICENTE FREGOSO
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL E. CATES
RUSSELL H. GREENE, JR.
ANDREW L. SMITH
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DARRYL L. ELLIS
WILLIAM J. MUELLER
THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ARLIE L. MILLER
IN THE NAVY
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ANASTASIA S. ABID
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MARIYA V. GEORGE
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

TAKERU A. TAJIRI
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be captain

DAWN C. ALLEN
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DAVID J. FAUSTE
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

SCOTT T. WILBUR
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

RITCHIE L. TAYLOR
IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E):

To be captain

PETER F. BOSMA

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 5, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ANNE A. WITKOWSKY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONFLICT AND STABILIZATION OPERATIONS).