



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 2021

No. 105

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ALEX PADILLA, a Senator from the State of California.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who rules the raging of the sea, thank You for being our constant source of strength.

Lord, You know our limitations and how our weaknesses can distort the clarity with which we should see Your providence unfolding.

Continue to lead our Senators. Direct their steps to the destinations of Your choosing. Open their ears, O God, so that they can hear Your voice calling them to attempt great things.

Though Your path may take them through the night, empower them to persevere until the morning comes.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ALEX PADILLA, a Sen-

ator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Radhika Fox, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Senators are moving forward this week on two major legislative initiatives: infrastructure and voting rights.

Bipartisan infrastructure talks continue in our Senate committees and among our Members.

Remember, discussions about infrastructure, both physical and human, are proceeding along two tracks. The

first track is bipartisan, and I understand there has been some progress. The second track pulls in elements of President Biden's American Jobs and Families Plan and will be considered by the Senate even if it does not have bipartisan support.

Today, we are going to start moving the trains down the second track. I will convene a meeting with all the Members of the majority party on the Senate Budget Committee to begin the important work of producing a budget resolution for the Senate to consider. This is something we have planned for quite a while, but we are moving forward today after having individual discussions which I have had with many members of the Budget Committee.

It is a diverse committee. Senator SANDERS is the Chair. Senators WARNER and KAINE are on it as well.

There are many items to discuss, but one subject is not up to debate. I will instruct members to ensure that any budget resolution puts the United States on track to reduce carbon pollution at a scale commensurate with the climate crisis. We need significant reductions in emissions through clean energy and electric vehicles, as well as funding to help manufacturers and farmers be a part of the solution in fighting climate change.

The American Families Plan, as well, is essential to the forthcoming budget resolution and must be robustly funded.

The Senate will also vote on major voting rights legislation before the end of June.

Yesterday, the Democratic caucus hosted a group of Democratic lawmakers from Texas who led the dramatic walkout to prevent the Texas Republican legislators from passing one of the most draconian voting laws in our country. It was a powerful meeting. We heard moving testimony from five different lawmakers about the vicious, nasty, even bigoted attacks against voting rights in their State.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4557

The actions taken were totally partisan, just like those in all the other legislatures. So the idea that this can have some kind of bipartisan solution befuddles me, because every action taken in the legislature is done just with Republican State Senators, Republican assembly members, with no Democratic participation or input. In fact, the Texas legislators told us they were deliberately excluded from certain meetings and conference committee hearings.

Speaking for our caucus, we were all taken by the courage of the Texas legislators, their fortitude, and, most importantly, by their mission to defend the right of every American to be able to access the ballot, not just in Texas but across the country. These lawmakers in one State put everything on the line to protect voting rights in their State. The Senate should put everything on the line to protect voting rights in this country.

Now, tomorrow, Senate Democrats will hold another special caucus meeting to continue discussing the best path forward to achieve voting rights legislation.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. President, 2 days ago, the Biden administration became the first administration since the beginning of the Iraq war to support repealing the authorization for the use of military force in Iraq, passed in 2002 and now in effect for 19 years.

The Iraq war has been over for nearly a decade. An authorization passed in 2002 is no longer necessary in 2021. It has been nearly 10 years since this particular authorization has been cited as a primary justification for military operations. It no longer serves a vital purpose in our fight against violent extremists in the Middle East.

So I strongly and fully support repealing the 2002 authorization for the use of military force in Iraq. This is the first time I am formally announcing my support for repeal.

I want to be clear. In no way will America abandon our relationship with Iraq and its people as they rebuild their country after years of war in our shared fight against ISIS, but there are very good reasons to repeal the specific legal authority.

For example, it will eliminate the danger of a future administration reaching back into the legal dustbin to use it as a justification for military adventurism. At the beginning of last year, we saw that danger become frightfully real when President Trump ordered an airstrike against an Iranian target in Iraq without transparency, without proper notification to Congress, and without a clear strategy. President Trump cited the 2002 AUMF as partial justification, ex-post facto—a claim that legal scholars and foreign policy experts resoundingly rejected. There is no good reason to allow this legal authority to persist in case another reckless Commander in Chief tries the same trick in the future.

Tomorrow, the House of Representatives will vote on whether to formally repeal the authorization. Next week, Chairman MENENDEZ and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will mark up a resolution led by Senators YOUNG and KAINE which will repeal the Iraq war AUMF. It is my intention, as majority leader, to bring this matter to a floor vote this year, and we will discuss the precise timing with Chairman MENENDEZ.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, sometimes good news comes to those who wait. Other times, it comes rather quickly. Earlier this year, I recommended to President Biden a prominent voting rights attorney for a key position on the Federal Bench in New York.

Yesterday, President Biden agreed with my recommendation and announced his intention to formally nominate Myrna Perez for the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. I am very pleased that the President has chosen her and am proud to have championed her candidacy.

Ms. Perez is not only an accomplished attorney who has dedicated her career to equal justice under the law, but she is one of the Nation's foremost experts on voting rights and elections. With a national focus on voting rights now, it is a significant step to elevate Ms. Perez to the Federal Bench.

Beyond that important exercise, she would also be the first Latina to serve on the Second Circuit Court since now-Justice Sonia Sotomayor—who, incidentally, I suggested to President Obama that he put her on the Supreme Court. Ms. Perez is a perfect example of Democrats' desire to bring balance, experience, and professional and personal diversity back to the judiciary.

So far this year, I have made two recommendations to the Second Circuit in New York: Ms. Eunice Lee, a former Federal defender, and now Ms. Perez, a voting rights attorney.

The cupboards of the Federal judiciary have long been stocked with former prosecutors and corporate lawyers. It is about time that civil rights attorneys, voting rights attorneys, and Federal defenders like these two outstanding nominees join the ranks.

So, again, I applaud President Biden's decision. It is a very bright day for the future of the Federal Bench in New York.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr. McCONNELL. Key economic indicators continue to show that our Nation's recovery is still facing significant headwinds.

Last week, we learned that inflation has logged its steepest increase since the 2008 financial crisis. There are more unfilled jobs in America than at any point on record, and, when asked, more than 90 percent of the small business owners trying to fill them say they are having trouble finding qualified candidates.

So how did we get here?

When COVID-19 arrived last spring, emergency shutdowns put the brakes on what had become a roaring economy. The pro-growth agenda enacted by Republicans had helped drive unemployment to its lowest level in a half-century. Take-home pay was rising and rising fastest for lower earners, and millions of new workers were coming off the sidelines to join a competitive market for American talent.

The past year presented harsh new challenges, but thanks to the bravery of frontline workers, the genius of scientists, and targeted, bipartisan relief measures passed here in Congress, our Nation was beginning to turn the corner.

The Biden administration actually inherited the conditions for success. It had a bipartisan roadmap of how best to support our economic recovery.

Alas, but instead, the Democrats chose to ram through trillions of dollars in liberal pet projects—a relative pittance for actual pandemic relief and a massive expansion of Federal unemployment benefits that has made staying home the most sensible financial decision for literally millions of American workers.

As one pair of economists put it recently, "The stimulus bill stimulated unemployment, not employment." To be specific, their analysis found it created conditions in at least 19 States where a family of four could claim the equivalent of a six-figure salary by staying out of the workforce.

Let me say that again. One recent study found that in 19 States, a family of four, with two working parents, would have had to earn at an annual rate of more than \$100,000 from working for it to make financial sense not to stay home. In 19 States, it made more sense to stay home than to go back to work.

But burying American workers in incentives to stay home hasn't just hurt rehiring; it has also magnified supply shortages. A few months back, the recovery made possible by bipartisan action last year had our economy geared up for a rush of consumer spending, but today, short-staffed producers are having to pass the rising costs on to households just as this rush was set to ramp up.

A tough year forced American families to put off some big purchases, but now they are facing some of the worst sticker shock in a generation. Used car

prices are 30 percent higher than last year, and the cost of some home appliances has spiked nearly as much. Everyday essentials are getting pricier too. Milk is up 7 percent, and gas has jumped by more than 50 percent.

Consumers are feeling the real cost of what the White House Chief of Staff called “the most progressive domestic legislation in a generation.” But it didn’t have to be this way. These are exactly the conditions economists have been writing about and warning about for months.

Back in March, the Washington Post ran an ominous line:

For policy experts and even members of Biden’s own party, the improving picture is raising questions about whether the stimulus bill is mismatched—

Mismatched—

to the needs of the current moment.

Sure enough, not just any member of the President’s party but a top economist under both the last two Democratic administrations, Larry Summers, cautioned even earlier that a massive spending plan like the one Democrats were proposing could “set off inflationary pressures of a kind we have not seen in a generation.” Prescient, to say the least. That is exactly what has happened.

These exact fears have been realized, and experts are still clear about the source of the problem. “Labor shortages are the last thing that we need” with inflation on the rise. Until very recently, the White House has been unwilling to connect these dots.

States have been on their own to turn off the perverse incentives driving the shortages. To date, 25 States have done so, announcing suspensions of excessive Federal unemployment supplements. But across the country, Main Street has already been feeling the pinch.

In my State of Kentucky, the consequences of Democrats’ misguided spending are growing more serious. Small business owners in particular are nearing a breaking point. One restaurant owner in Clark County wrote to me to say that “each week it gets harder to create a full schedule. Restaurants are already reducing hours of operation. Next will come closing.”

I have heard the same story from constituents all over the Commonwealth. A sign manufacturer in Woodford County had to ask his staff to work as many as 10 hours of overtime each week just to keep up with demand. An outdoor supplies maker in McCracken County saw shipping costs quadruple in the past year. He can’t find a prospective employee who will even show up for an interview. He can’t even find a prospective employee who will show up for an interview. After 25 years of production, he is facing the prospect that his company may not be able to stay afloat.

The Commonwealth still has 90,000 fewer workers than we did before the pandemic. In the past year, the Consumer Price Index in Kentucky and

surrounding States has increased by a whopping 7 percent. The recovery teed up by smart, targeted, bipartisan policies last year has been buried under an ill-advised, self-inflicted avalanche—avalanche—of spending. Folks in Kentucky know all too well what happens when Democrats get carried away here in Washington. They know who ends up footing the bill back home.

Higher prices at the gas pump and the grocery store, just as families were hoping to put a year of sacrifices in the rearview mirror—these are the real-world effects of the Biden administration’s multitrillion-dollar economic debacle. These are the effects that Republicans and nonpartisan experts have warned about literally for months.

The American people are, nevertheless, resilient. Job creators, innovators, and skilled workers are ready. But as our economy slowly gets back up to speed, it certainly won’t be because Democrats stroked an outsized check; it will be in spite of it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RUSSIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today President Biden had the first of his meetings with Russian President Vladimir Putin. He certainly has many important messages to convey to Mr. Putin about ongoing cyber attacks against us and our allies, the murdering of peaceful political opponents, and potential areas where we may be able to work together to deal with nuclear proliferation. The important discussion comes after several days where President Biden reaffirmed our relationship with our most important allies, those in the G7 and NATO. There were important announcements about leading the global COVID vaccine effort and standing up to the outrages perpetrated by nations around the world. But perhaps what was most important was that President Biden reasserted America’s role as a leading champion of democracy, security, and international norms.

I hope this spells an end—and I believe it does—of the unimaginable events that occurred in the previous administration: Coddling a foreign dictator such as Putin, dismissing our closest allies, and threatening the critical North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

President Biden knows that America’s leadership and its example are critical in leading shared efforts to stop this pandemic, tackle climate change, push back on rogue nations, and maintain global norms of behavior. President Biden also knows that how we manage our democracy here at home affects our ability to lead abroad.

The last administration bullied our allies, who watched in disbelief as it cozied up to the autocrats around the world. I have often said that a great deal of America’s influence around the world comes from the power of its ideals and values—critical and precious assets that we must nurture and never take for granted.

Our historic peaceful transfer of power has been a marvel for generations for much of the world. I will never forget the power and emotion felt walking with my friend the late Senator John McCain through Ukraine’s Maidan square, looking at the makeshift memorials to those who lost their lives hoping for a free and democratic Ukraine.

John McCain once said:

America’s greatest strength has always been its hopeful vision of human progress.

I couldn’t agree more. I couldn’t be more proud that President Biden is reaffirming this belief on the world stage this week. So let me take this moment to commend the President and his team for a timely, critical, and important visit with international allies and adversaries in recent days. It won’t solve all the problems we face, but we can be proud of this example of American leadership, generosity, and decency.

JUNETEENTH

Mr. President, this Saturday is Juneteenth, the oldest nationally celebrated commemoration of the end of slavery in America. Our Founders were brilliant and brave about many, many things, but they lacked the wisdom, perhaps the courage, maybe even the resolve, to face a poisonous contradiction at the heart of our new Nation. How could this Nation, founded on the belief that all people are created equal, condone and allow human slavery? Many of our Founding Fathers owned slaves themselves.

Eighty-five years after our founding, that unresolved contradiction plunged America into civil war. Halfway through that war, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, declaring that all persons held in bondage in rebellious States “are, and henceforth shall be free.”

His action meant little to most enslaved people in America. Most of those held in bondage didn’t gain freedom for another 2 years after the Civil War ended. For the 250,000 men, women, and children enslaved in the State of Texas, the wait was even longer. They learned of their freedom on June 19, 1865, 2 months after the Civil War ended, when Army MG Gordon Granger and 2,000 Union troops marched into Galveston, TX, with orders to enforce the Emancipation Proclamation.

One year later, African Americans in Galveston held America’s first Juneteenth celebration to commemorate that moment when they knew of the end of slavery in America. Formerly enslaved people wore their finest clothes, read the Emancipation Proclamation, and prayed together.

Later, as African Americans in Galveston and other parts of the South joined the great migration north, they carried that Juneteenth memory with them, giving the celebration new roots in Chicago, Los Angeles, and scores of other cities.

Today, Juneteenth is celebrated as a State holiday or day of observance in 47 States, including my State of Illinois and in the District of Columbia.

Yesterday, this Senate approved unanimously the resolution honoring Juneteenth as a national day of reflection and celebration. In this moment in time in our divided Nation, that unanimous recognition of the importance of Juneteenth is a balm to our national soul.

FILIBUSTER

As America prepares to celebrate Juneteenth 2021, we must also remember that the “absolute equality,” promised at that first Juneteenth in 1865, has too often been denied to African Americans.

Just a year after the Civil War ended, Southern States enacted the “Black Codes,” State laws meant to preserve White supremacy. In response, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution, guaranteeing African Americans due process of law and Black men the right to vote.

Unbowed, Southern States invented Jim Crow laws, creating new hurdles to voting and participation that made it nearly impossible for many African Americans to exercise their voting rights and other basic rights of citizenship.

As the great activist W.E.B. DuBois wrote in his essay “Black Reconstruction in America,” “The slave went free; stood a brief moment in the sun and moved back down again toward slavery.”

This betrayal of the promise of freedom for African Americans was possible, in part, because of misguided Court decisions by the Supreme Court, especially the infamous 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson ruling, which enshrined the concept of “separate but equal.” That odious decision stood for more than 50 years as the law of the land, making racial discrimination both legal and enforceable.

The betrayal of equality for African Americans also was abetted by southern segregationist Senators who wielded the filibuster as a weapon for decades to stop civil rights measures in Congress.

I know our Senate minority leader and some of his colleagues on the other side get upset when anyone utters the words “filibuster” and “Jim Crow” too close together. They insist that the filibuster has nothing to do with race. Well, history, in fact, proves otherwise.

Historian Sarah Binder is a leading expert on the filibuster. According to her analysis, of the 30 measures between 1917 and 1994 that were killed on this Senate floor by the filibuster, “exactly half addressed [the issue of] civil

rights . . . including measures to authorize Federal investigation and prosecution of lynching, [banning] the imposition of poll taxes, and [prohibiting] discrimination on the basis of race and housing.” That total doesn’t count other major civil rights measures, such as the Civil Rights Acts of 1967 and 1964, which passed only after lengthy filibusters by segregationist Senators.

Today, Senator MCCONNELL is vowing to use the filibuster, if necessary, to protect a flood of new State voting laws that are as racially discriminatory as we have seen since the Voting Rights Act of 1965 officially barred Jim Crow from American elections. After record numbers of Americans braved a deadly pandemic to vote in the 2020 elections, Republican-controlled State legislatures are rushing to pass new laws to make it harder—not easier, harder—for millions of Americans to vote, especially people of color.

Supporters of these new voter suppression laws cite the Big Lie as their justification, Donald Trump’s dangerous, discredited claim that the 2020 Presidential election was somehow stolen from him. That Big Lie has been rejected by State election officials of both parties, by our Nation’s top election security experts, and by every Federal judge it has faced, including several appointed by President Trump himself. Sixty times President Trump went to Federal courts with his Big Lie, and 60 times he lost.

Despite all of that, Senator MCCONNELL and many of our Republican colleagues have vowed to filibuster our measure, known as the For the People Act, which includes provisions to protect voting rights, defend the integrity of elections, prevent billionaires from buying elections, and strengthening ethics.

Their opposition to protecting the right to vote doesn’t end there. Senator MCCONNELL has also said he will oppose the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, a bill that Senator LEAHY and I are working on in the Senate Judiciary Committee, that would restore and strengthen the protections of the Voting Rights Act.

I will say this. In all fairness to the minority leader, his use of the filibuster is not limited to matters of civil rights and racial justice. Senator MCCONNELL has transformed the filibuster from a rarely used tactic to a weapon of frequent mass obstruction.

When Barack Obama was elected President in 2008, our Nation was teetering on the edge of a second Great Depression, and Senator MCCONNELL said his top priority was to make President Obama “a one-term President.” Not to rescue the economy—no, that wasn’t his top priority. Not to help people who had lost their homes or business. Senator MCCONNELL’s No. 1 priority was to make President Obama a one-term President. He would do that by dramatically increasing the use of filibusters in order to deny the new President every possible achievement.

Fast-forward to this year. President Biden is sworn in during an epidemic that has killed hundreds of thousands of Americans and sent our economy into deep recession, and Senator MCCONNELL was quoted again saying: “100 percent of our focus is on stopping this new Administration.” Not stopping the virus nor the economic devastation we are facing, but stopping the new administration. Again, the weapon of choice for Senator MCCONNELL is the filibuster.

Three weeks ago, 42 Republican Senators stood with Senator MCCONNELL and filibustered a bill to create an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate the deadly January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. This independent Commission’s mission would have been to examine the attack on the Capitol and the events leading up to it. Fifty-six Senators, a clear majority, supported creation of the January 6 Commission. It wasn’t enough. We needed 60 votes. Senator MCCONNELL’s filibuster prevailed again.

For those who argue that the filibuster encourages bipartisan cooperation, let me tell you: The January 6 Commission bill was the result of intense bipartisan compromise. Negotiations were worked out by top Republicans and Democrats in the House, and it was filibustered by Senator MCCONNELL regardless.

The Commission would have been more comprehensive and less political than the inquiries into the insurrection being conducted by congressional committees. Like the 9/11 Commission, the January 6 Commission would have subpoena authority to get to the truth.

For a short while, Senator MCCONNELL said he would keep an open mind about whether to support the bill. The night before the House voted to create the Commission, however, former President Donald Trump posted a screed on his blog denouncing the Commission as a “Democratic Trap.” That was all Senator MCCONNELL needed to hear. The former President demanded that Republicans reject the Commission and added: “MITCH MCCONNELL and KEVIN MCCARTHY, I hope you’re listening.” Well, it turns out that they were.

The next day—after 35 House Republicans joined Democrats to create this January 6 Commission—Senator MCCONNELL announced that he was going to filibuster it and oppose it. He asked members of his caucus, as a personal favor, to support his filibuster of the January 6 Commission.

This is where the abuse of the filibuster has brought us. We aren’t able to break through the partisan gridlock even to investigate the worst attack on the Capitol of the United States of America in more than 200 years. How can anyone believe, after that shameful vote, that protecting the filibuster as it is currently misused is protecting our democracy? Cynical, overuse of the filibuster imperils our democracy. There has got to be a better way.

Contrary to Senate myth, the filibuster is not in our Constitution—just the opposite. The man who wrote that Constitution knew well how requiring supermajorities for routine bills had doomed the Articles of Confederation. They deliberately rejected a supermajority requirement for common legislation when they wrote the Constitution.

Defenders say the filibuster encourages bipartisan compromise. Look around you. Does anyone really believe for a minute that this is the new golden age of bipartisan compromise in the Senate?

There are proposals to mend the filibuster. We could bring back a talking filibuster. We all remember the movie “Mr. SMITH Goes to Washington,” where he withered and fell to the floor at his desk carrying on an endless filibuster. It isn’t that way any longer. Senators now can start a filibuster with a phone call and head home for the weekend. That is not what the filibuster was designed for. If a Senator feels strongly enough about an issue to grind the Senate to a halt, they should be willing to stand up and speak their mind and stay on the Senate floor.

Some have proposed changing the number of votes needed to end debate, possibly lowering the 60-vote requirement for cloture to 55. That is a precedent that at least is consistent with historical trends, but leaders of both parties need to agree on it.

I am willing to consider any reasonable plan that promotes genuine bipartisan cooperation and ends the tyranny of the minority. What we cannot do is nothing.

After a minority of Senators used the filibuster to prevent—for now—the creation of the January 6 Commission, we all went home for a long Memorial Day weekend. On my flight home and all that weekend, I thought of the young men who stormed the beaches of Normandy on D-day, running straight into enemy fire, knowing well that they might die to preserve democracy. And many of them did. Now we see Members of the Senate routinely abusing the filibuster because they are afraid to face an unpleasant vote or an angry insult from Donald Trump. Surely, we are better and braver than this.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 148, Radhika Fox, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Charles E. Schumer, Thomas R. Carper, Jacky Rosen, John Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Raphael Warnock, Chris Van Hollen, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan.

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 Radhika Fox, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

(Mr. DURBIN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 234 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—2

Booker Peters

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 55, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 173, Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Jacky Rosen, John Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Raphael Warnock, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan.

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 Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, 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 New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 235 Ex.]

YEAS—57

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

NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—2

Booker Peters

(Mr. BENNET assumed the Chair.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 57, and the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to the nomination of Tommy P. Beaudeau, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, occur following the disposition of the Griggsby nomination.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, this means that there will be three rollcall votes beginning at 3:15 p.m. this afternoon.

NOMINATION OF LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY

Mr. President, today I rise to speak on the nomination of U.S. Court of Federal Claims Judge Lydia Griggsby to be U.S. district judge for the District of Maryland. We just invoked cloture, and we will be voting on that nomination this afternoon.

Judge Griggsby was favorably reported by a bipartisan vote of the Committee on the Judiciary on June 10. I had recommended Judge Griggsby, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN, to President Biden, and I strongly support this nomination.

Judge Griggsby has been nominated to fill the current vacancy created when Judge Catherine Blake, appointed by President Clinton in 1995, announced her intention to take senior status on April 2. President Biden nominated Judge Griggsby to this position on March 30, and the Judiciary Committee held her confirmation hearing on May 12.

Shortly after the November 2020 elections, I worked with Senator VAN HOLLEN to establish a judicial selection committee in Maryland. We used an open application process with a public advertisement and communicated and worked closely with the State, local, and specialty bar associations in Maryland.

In particular, we sought out a highly qualified and diverse application pool. Our committee interviewed everyone who submitted an application, which involved several dozen interviews. Senator VAN HOLLEN and I then personally interviewed several finalists before recommending names to the White House.

The White House Counsel asked Senators to propose talented individuals who would bring to these critically important roles a wide range of life and professional experiences, including those based on their race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, veteran status, and disability.

I would call my colleagues' attention to a recent Washington Post article en-

titled "President Biden Has Nominated as Many Minority Women to Be Judges in Four Months as Trump Had Confirmed in Four Years." Having judges with a broad range of backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives makes our Federal bench more diverse and better representative of the communities they serve, which builds greater public trust in the judiciary.

Instead of giving a formal introduction to my colleagues of Judge Griggsby today, we should really say "welcome home" to Judge Griggsby. When I first was elected to the Senate, I served on the Judiciary Committee, and my staff and I were pleased to work with then-Chief Counsel Griggsby.

She was born in Baltimore and went to high school in Baltimore.

At that time, Judge Griggsby served, when she was here, with Chairman PATRICK LEAHY's Judiciary Committee staff as his expert on privacy and information policy.

Judge Griggsby went on to serve for 7 years as a judge on the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, which has national jurisdiction to hear complex monetary damages claims against the Federal Government. Judge Griggsby was confirmed to her current position by a voice vote of the Senate in 2014.

Judge Griggsby is a lifelong Marylander who was born in Baltimore, a graduate of the Park School, and she has been a mentor at the Baltimore Leadership School for Young Women. She received her B.A. from the University of Pennsylvania and her J.D. from Georgetown Law School. She was an associate at DLA Piper before beginning her government service as a trial attorney in the Civil Division at the U.S. Department of Justice.

She then became an assistant U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia. Judge Griggsby later transitioned to Capitol Hill, serving as a counsel on the Senate Select Committee on Ethics before beginning her work with Senator LEAHY on the Judiciary Committee. I am so pleased that Judge Griggsby brings such a wide array of professional experience from the first two branches of government as she prepares to assume a new role in our third branch of government.

In particular, I would note that as an assistant U.S. attorney, she helped secure a \$20 million settlement against Toyota for selling vehicles that violated the Clean Air Act. She also held two of Washington, DC's largest property managers accountable for failing to disclose lead-based paint hazards in the buildings.

If confirmed by the Senate, I would note that Judge Griggsby would be the first Black woman and first woman of color to serve as a Federal judge on our bench in Maryland in our State's history, and it is about time. The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave Judge Griggsby its highest rating—unanimously "well qualified"—after

evaluating her integrity, professional experience, and judicial temperament.

I was delighted to recommend the nomination of Judge Griggsby to President Biden, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN.

Judicial nominees must meet the highest standards of integrity, competency, and temperament. Judge Griggsby will safeguard the rights of all, uphold the Constitution and rule of law, and faithfully follow the judicial oath to do equal right to the poor and to the rich.

So I urge my colleagues to vote to confirm Judge Griggsby, who I believe will be an outstanding member of the Federal bench. She is already a sitting Federal judge on the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, and I look forward to her continued public service, serving all the people of our Nation as a Federal district judge.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JUNETEENTH

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Maryland. I rise today in gratitude because last night the Senate put us one step forward to finally making Juneteenth a Federal holiday.

Juneteenth is our Nation's oldest celebration of emancipation, and it should have been established as a Federal holiday long ago. So I am glad that yesterday the Senate passed our bill, with Senator MARKEY and Senator BOOKER, the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act, by unanimous consent.

The end of slavery in this country is a central milestone in our history, and Juneteenth should be commemorated nationwide as a day of celebration and reflection and rededication to the cause of racial justice in this country.

I am forever grateful to the generations of activists who made this possible, and, in particular, I want to thank Ms. Opal Lee, who at 89 years old walked halfway across this country to rise in support of Juneteenth as a Federal holiday.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to call Ms. Lee, now in her nineties, after this bill cleared the Senate, and I wish you could have heard the sound of joy in her voice when I told her the good news. This is a memory that I know I am going to treasure for the rest of my life.

So to Ms. Lee, if you are listening here today, I want to tell you that I have been honored to support your moral cause here in the Senate, and I hope to celebrate Juneteenth as an official Federal holiday with you soon.

I also want to thank my colleagues, especially Senator MARKEY and Senators BOOKER and WARNOCK, for their

leadership on these efforts, as well as Senator CORNYN and Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for their work to get this over the finish line. When it passed last night, we had over 60 bipartisan cosponsors, and I am grateful to all of them and all of you for your support.

So commemorating Juneteenth as a Federal holiday is an encouraging and meaningful step, but we have so much farther to go on the path toward justice. Let's use this victory to build momentum for the systemic change that we need—protecting voting rights and safeguarding our democracy, passing meaningful policing and criminal justice reform, pursuing economic and environmental justice, and working toward a more just and equitable world.

There will be plenty of times when this path seems impossibly long because the scale of the injustice is overwhelming. But when this happens, I will be thinking of Ms. Opal Lee, of her long walk to Washington, DC, and the joy in her voice when she heard the news that the Senate had taken one more step toward her dream of Juneteenth. May we all draw inspiration and strength from her example.

I am proud to walk this path with you, Ms. Lee, and with all of you. Let's keep this going.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

NOMINATION OF RADHIKA FOX

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the nomination of Radhika Fox to be Assistant Administrator for Water at the EPA. I certainly appreciate her willingness to serve, and I have found her to be quite personable and friendly. So this is not a personal statement.

But even though she is not yet confirmed, she is already in place as the lead political appointee in the Water Office of the EPA. In that capacity, her recent announcement of overreaching regulatory proposals under the Clean Water Act cemented my opposition to her nomination.

Ms. Fox's position on the appropriate scope of the Clean Water Act was not clear last month when I voted on her nomination in the EPA committee, of which I am the ranking member. At that markup in May, I noted that I could not support Ms. Fox at that time because she would not commit to maintaining the navigable waters protection rule issued in 2020. As I noted at the time, she would also not state that the 2015 waters of the United States rule was overreaching. So I really couldn't pin her down on any opinion on this very important rule.

I now know why she would not commit to maintaining the navigable waters protection rule when she testified before the committee and avoided providing direct responses in her written responses to my followup questions. The administration did not support the rule and, apparently, the EPA opposed it completely.

Last week, Ms. Fox and EPA Administrator Regan, as well as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, announced their plans to repeal and replace the rule in its entirety. EPA and the Corps of Engineers are going to completely rewrite the regulations that determine whether a business, a farm, or a citizen needs to obtain a Federal water permit. The Federal Agencies announced that they had decided they are not going to keep any part of that rule and that they are going to start from scratch.

That was at odds with what Ms. Fox conveyed to me in a phone call that she did make the previous day to inform me they were going to be making an announcement. She was just very incomplete, and it was extremely disappointing to me and to the many States and businesses that support the navigable waters protection rule, which—unlike the 2015 waters of the United States rule it replaced—is the law presently. The navigable waters protection rule is the law of the land in all 50 States. That made it clear when Federal permits would be needed, and it gave States more control over how to permit water bodies in their borders.

Throughout her nomination process, when I asked Ms. Fox about the administration's plans, she expressed a desire to hear from stakeholders in order to create a “durable” rule. Ms. Fox did not conduct any formal public stakeholder process before announcing the decision that was made to repeal the navigable waters protection rule.

The administration has said it plans to repeal the rule and then put in place guidance from the 1980s while we wait and while they come up with a replacement. Changing the regulations three times in a short period of time—2015, 2020, and now 2021—simply does not meet her commitment to develop a “durable” definition.

Instead, ever-changing rules create a game of regulatory ping-pong across administrations. These are big far-reaching rules. That permitting uncertainty hurts our economy at a time when we need growth, and it does so without additional environmental protection in my home State.

We often forget that the Clean Water Act allows States to regulate their waters as much as they like. The definition of “waters of the United States” only determines Federal jurisdiction. In fact, that is the keystone of the Clean Water Act.

The administration's promises of transparency and creating regulatory certainty simply are not reflected in these actions, and their goals, stated to a briefing of congressional offices during a briefing call, are particularly troubling. They pointed to the prior converted cropland exemption and treatment of ditches under the current rule as “implementation challenges” that they want to address.

It doesn't take much to understand what that means. The administration intends to require more Federal permits for prior converted cropland and

ditches on private land. That is a gross overreach of the Federal Government's authority under the Clean Water Act, and it is questionable whether the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers could even vet the sheer volume of permit applications that would come their way.

I encourage Ms. Fox to engage with stakeholders from agriculture to mining, to construction, to home building before issuing the official proposal to repeal the navigable waters protection rule, and I urge Ms. Fox to make that engagement meaningful. Simply checking the box that these stakeholders have had the opportunity to talk to members of the administration is not meaningful engagement.

If officials of the administration truly engaged in a transparent process where they took stakeholder feedback into account, they would learn that the best way to provide regulatory certainty is to keep that navigable waters protection rule in place. I cannot support Ms. Fox's decision to undo such a foundational rule without any public engagement and to do so in a way that appears to be more expansive than the overreaching Obama rule called the “waters of the United States rule.”

So I urge my colleagues to vote against Ms. Fox's nomination on the basis of what she has already done and in most probability will do in the future surrounding this very, very important topic.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk for a few minutes about nuclear energy. President Biden, of course, as we both are aware, has called climate change the “existential threat.” He says it is the “number one issue facing humanity today.” Secretary Kerry, who, as we know, is President Biden's climate envoy, has said that climate change is a “life and death” issue. President Biden's National Climate Advisor, the Honorable Gina McCarthy, believes that saving the environment is the “fight of our lifetimes.”

If you ask many Members of Congress, not all of them—I don't want to paint with too broad a brush—but if you ask many Members of Congress what they think the solution to our environmental issues is, they will probably respond: renewable energy. But if we are really worried about the climate—and I know we all are; we all want clean air, and we all want bright water—I suggest that we also embrace nuclear energy. Nuclear energy is not only safe, but it is clean and, frankly, it can produce more power than renewables.

Nuclear energy, as you know, creates little or no carbon emissions. Let me say that again. A lot of people don't realize it. Nuclear energy creates little or no carbon emissions. It also creates very little waste—an extraordinarily small amount of waste. All the nuclear waste that America's commercial nuclear industry has ever produced—ever,

in the history of ever—can fit into a single football field to a depth of fewer than 10 yards. Now, you compare that with solar panels, for example—solar panels create 300 times more toxic waste than nuclear plants in order to yield the same exact amount of energy—or compare the waste from nuclear power production with wind turbine blades. Wind turbine blades are very hard to recycle, and they usually end up in landfills.

These facts are underreported, but the fact is that solar and wind power do have their own harmful impacts on our environment. There is no free lunch, as you know, and you don't get one now. There are pros and cons of everything.

Solar and wind can't hold a candle to nuclear power when it comes to efficiency. That is just a fact. It takes more than 3 million solar panels or more than 430 wind turbines to produce the same amount of energy as the average nuclear plant. Let me say that again—3 million solar panels, 430 wind turbines to produce the same amount of energy as the average nuclear powerplant. And these numbers do not take into account that solar panels, as we know, are useless when the Sun doesn't shine, and wind turbines are nothing more than expensive paper waste when the wind doesn't blow.

Also underreported, in my judgment, is how safe nuclear energy is. Despite what some people may think, Homer Simpson does not run America's nuclear powerplants. The industry is constantly evolving to make nuclear powerplants safer, to make them more efficient. In fact, we have all read a lot about small modular reactors. I will just use that as an example. These small modular reactors are part of a very promising new generation of advanced reactors that can automatically—automatically—prevent overheating. And, frankly, they produce even less nuclear waste.

Now, I want to be clear. I still believe in fossil fuels. I am an "all of the above" energy advocate, but leading that pack is fossil fuels.

America's economy is the largest in all of human history, and it can't run without oil and gas. Louisianans know this, and most Americans know this. The people of Louisiana serve our country pretty well by contributing to our energy independence, and I am very proud of that.

Last year, Louisiana supplied 9 percent—9 percent—of America's marketed gas. And Louisianans understand, as do, I think, most Americans, that giving up on fossil fuels would not only destroy jobs; it would ruin the economy.

But I want America to use every advantage that it has. I want America to use every energy tool at its disposal. Now, that is why nuclear energy—I see nuclear energy as supporting oil and gas, not replacing it. I want to be clear about that, as supporting oil and gas, not replacing it.

Since nuclear energy holds such promise—and it does—I am hoping that my Democratic friends in Congress and my Republican friends in Congress—because I see this as a bipartisan issue—will lend their full-throated support to nuclear energy.

I am not saying that renewables don't have their proper place in America's energy policy—they certainly do—and I am not saying we should get rid of them—I am certainly not—but we need to acknowledge that renewables have limitations. They have limitations, and nuclear energy does not. There are disadvantages to renewables. As I said, there is no free lunch, and you don't get one now.

Now, for some people, that is a lesson that needs to be repeated. I take note. I say this gently, but the Democratic Party platform, for example, calls for installing 500 million solar panels—500 million solar panels—and 60,000 wind turbines over the next 5 years. This will occupy a lot more land and actually create less energy than building new nuclear reactors. And that is a fact.

Some small modular nuclear reactors are roughly twice the length of the average schoolbus—twice the length of an average schoolbus. Wind farms, on the other hand, can eat up more than 19 square miles. That is about half the size of Disney World—half the size of Disney World, compared to twice the length of the average schoolbus. If we succeed in blanketing our land with solar panels and wind farms, it is going to create more waste, occupy more green space, and ultimately weaken our economy.

Again, I am not saying no to solar and wind. I am not at all. I am saying yes to explore the possibilities of nuclear energy.

President Biden, as we know, has a \$2 trillion infrastructure plan. And I think, if nothing else, his infrastructure plan establishes the Biden administration's priorities. His plan does call for \$61 billion in initiatives that include investments in advanced nuclear technology. I am not sure I agree on the amount, but I like the concept, and I find that to be prudent. But it also asks for three times that amount—\$174 billion—to support electric vehicles, electric cars. I suggest that nuclear energy has more place in energy's future, and it is something that we ought to talk about.

Other spending bonanzas in President Biden's plan include a \$213 billion investment to give 2 million buildings a Green New Deal makeover and \$100 billion to make our schools greener. These are not going to have a more meaningful impact on our environment than exploring nuclear energy. They are just not.

I know that nuclear energy sounds too good to be true, and I don't want to oversimplify the circumstances. Nuclear energy has its drawbacks, but nuclear energy is powerful. Nuclear energy is safe. Nuclear energy is clean.

And by building up our nuclear power capabilities, the United States can create more jobs; the United States can strengthen its economy; and the United States can ensure its place as a world leader on energy. And we can do all that while reducing carbon emissions.

I hope my colleagues will come to embrace nuclear energy as the efficient green energy source that it is and that the U.S. Congress can work with the White House to improve America's standing as an energy juggernaut.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

RODRIGUEZ V. PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to express significant concern about the Biden administration's decision to file an amicus brief in the case of Ramona Matos Rodriguez v. Pan American Health Organization.

This case involves serious allegations that the Pan American Health Organization facilitated human trafficking and regrettably places the administration in a position in which it is undercutting efforts by the victims of the Cuban dictatorship's forced labor schemes.

Now, let me be clear, I am a strong advocate for the Pan American Health Organization and its mission strengthening health systems across Latin America and the Caribbean. Given the significant impact of COVID-19 on the region, PAHO's efforts are needed now more than ever, and I have fought to ensure that the Pan American Health Organization has the resources it needs to carry out its lifesaving work during the pandemic and throughout a good period of time of my congressional career. However, I also firmly believe that the Pan American Health Organization must be held accountable for its past transgressions, including the unacceptable role that it played facilitating a program that subjected more than 10,000 Cuban medical professionals to forced labor conditions in Brazil.

From 2013 to 2019, the Pan American Health Organization profited from its participation in Brazil's Mais Medicos Program, an initiative that allowed Cuba's dictatorship to earn income from trafficking doctors.

The Cuban regime's so-called foreign medical missions are nothing more than human trafficking. In November of 2019, the United Nation's Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery and the United Nation's Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons raised concerns that the Cuban regime's trafficking of medical professionals constitutes forced labor and modern slavery.

In fact, the Department of State's last "Trafficking in Persons" report found the Cuban regime garnishes the wages of its medical professionals that serve overseas, surveils them, confiscates their passports so they can't

leave anywhere, and retaliates against family members in Cuba if they leave from the program. So if you send me abroad, don't pay me, get money from the country that you send me from, take away my passport, and retaliate against my family, that is the ultimate forced labor. Cuba's dictatorship generated more than \$6 billion in profit from its forced labor schemes in 2018 alone as it trafficked tens of thousands of Cuban medical professionals to some 60 countries.

The Pan American Health Organization's participation in the Cuban dictatorship's human trafficking programs cannot be overlooked, and accountability is urgently needed.

It is against this backdrop that I have reviewed the Biden administration's amicus brief in *Rodriguez v. Pan American Health Organization*. And while the brief addresses some of the technical aspects of the case, it effectively does nothing—nothing—to condemn Cuba's dictatorship for human trafficking or the Pan American Health Organization's participation in those programs that were human trafficking.

For over two decades, the United States has led the international community in combating human trafficking. In 2000, the United States enacted the Trafficking Victims Protection Act—something I was involved with in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—which has set a standard for countries around the world to strengthen efforts to prosecute traffickers, increase protection for victims, and expand foreign assistance programs. We have built a range of financial tools to combat the human trafficking industry and its illicit profits. We have spearheaded efforts to ensure that slavery-free supply chains—slavery-free supply chains—that respect workers' rights and prevent against forced labor conditions around the world become more and more a reality.

The Biden administration squandered an opportunity in this brief, an opportunity to support Cuban trafficking victims and an opportunity to advance our extraordinary American leadership in combating all forms of human trafficking and modern slavery. It is a major disappointment.

I urge the President and the Secretary of State to redouble efforts to pressure Cuba to end this medical trafficking program and the many other abuses it perpetrates against the Cuban people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. TUBERVILLE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2079

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. TUBERVILLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have been told by the majority party that soon we will be having a vote on an 800-page bill to change 50 State voting laws to 1 Federal law. This bill is called the For the People Act. It was compiled after the 2018 elections to call into question the legitimacy of democratic elections for partisan political purposes.

If it had been a serious attempt at legislating, there would have been some outreach to some Republicans because it takes 60 votes, a bipartisan vote, to get anything through the U.S. Senate.

In that process, there would have been consultation also with local elected officials—the election officials who conduct the State elections—to make sure it was workable. There would have been hearings in the Congress. There would have been revisions from the bill originally introduced.

The fact that back in 2018, when it was introduced, is the fact that it was intended as political propaganda, and that betrays the absurdity of the title, the "For the People Act."

Also, despite Senator SCHUMER's using Senate rule XIV in the last Congress to bypass the committee and put the bill directly on the Senate calendar, Senator SCHUMER never used his right to force a vote on moving to the bill. At that time, the Democratic narrative was that Republicans were not doing enough to secure the election so the results might end up being in doubt. Now, what we know from happening in the last election, that argument is out the window now.

Since the Democrats got the results they wanted, they endlessly quote the Trump administration's top cyber security official declaring the 2020 election the most secure ever in history.

I assumed last Congress that Senator SCHUMER would wait until right before the 2020 election to force a vote so he could accuse Republicans of blocking an election bill for their campaign narrative questioning election security. Instead, they repeatedly, dishonestly, blamed the Republican leader for blocking the bill, ignoring the fact that the Democratic leader had reserved the possibility of forcing a vote.

The For the People Act is a misleading bill. The bill has now been reintroduced and recast as a response to a few State election security laws. A

handful of relatively modern reforms at the State level have been shamelessly and falsely characterized as voter suppression, even considering the fact that in the last election, the winner got the highest number of votes of any winner for President in the history of the United States, and the loser got the highest number of votes of any candidate for President of the United States throughout our history.

As I have mentioned before, the claim by some Trump supporters that a certain brand of voting machine switched votes, I pointed out that that was lifted entirely from the Democrats' 2004 playbook. And President Trump's questioning of his loss in Georgia was simply following in the footsteps of the losing candidate for Governor of Georgia 2 years before. The Georgia Democrat lost by over 50,000 votes in 2018 and has never even bothered to try to prove voting irregularities on that scale.

Foreign adversaries like Russia and China cast doubts on the soundness of our democratic system, both to weaken us from within and to justify their own repressive regimes. American politics should not do these repressive regimes propaganda jobs for them, but too often we tend to be doing that.

This bill is being called democracy reform. I support our American democratic system. All Americans should be proud of it. We can and should have confidence in our elections. Our democracy does not need a fundamental rewrite because our democracy works.

Let's stop casting doubt on American elections, stop casting aspersions on the commonsense election security measures supported by Americans of all backgrounds. Let's work together to boost the confidence of all Americans in our elections.

This bill would register illegal aliens. It would do away with State voter ID laws. It would have taxpayer-funded elections.

I remember what our colleague Senator CRUZ said. In the first quarter of this year, he raised—it must have been in the neighborhood of about \$5 million from contributors of under \$200. So if you get that kind of money, under this bill, from people under \$200, for every dollar you get, you get \$6 from the taxpayers. So Senator CRUZ, I am told, would get about \$34 million of taxpayer funds to use for political purposes. We don't need to replace 50 State voting laws as this 800-page bill would.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, you and I, as we sit on the Rules Committee, saw the debate on this bill—the bill that the sponsors call the For the People Act. I think it really more accurately could be called the "For the Politicians Act." S. 1 was marked up in the Rules Committee last month, a markup that I certainly raised a number of concerns about the bill and others did too. It is more than 800 pages

that contains policies relating to election administration, to campaign finance, to redistricting, and much more.

Now, the truth is, we don't know what bill will come to the floor because this bill couldn't get out of committee. And apparently we are going to not use the committee process but, in fact, we will bring a different bill to the floor that nobody has seen yet. But this bill seems to get bigger over time, not smaller over time.

It includes the overwhelmingly bad idea that Congress should impose a Federal takeover of elections and force a one-size-fits-all approach on the more than 10,000 voting jurisdictions in the country.

There are very few things that you can develop a formula that works just right in 10,000 places. In fact, in our States and in the District of Columbia, we have a pretty significant problem coming up with 51 different structures that work for everywhere in every jurisdiction that is impacted by that.

This bill also has some deadlines that are so short that if it became law, it would create chaos in next year's elections and make the election process less trusted, not more trusted.

We should be focusing on Federal laws and State laws that make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. I think this bill makes it easier to cheat and harder to figure out whether anybody cheated or not.

S. 1 undermines the popular State voter identification laws. The majority of our States now require some kind of identification. And an overwhelming number of voters believe that voter identification at the polls is a good thing.

This bill allows political operatives to fan out across a community and collect an unlimited number of ballots. In fact, it says States can't even stop that process of ballot harvesting. Those ballot harvesters can collect ballots from you. They can collect ballots from your neighbors, from vulnerable voters like people in nursing homes. And, frankly, who knows if they turn them in or not? Who knows if they put them in the post office box or not? If they never show up, the ballot harvester, who may very well know that your ballot is a ballot they don't agree with, could just say, "Well, I don't know what happened. It must have been lost in the mail," and who would ever know whether it was lost in the mail or not?

In addition to undermining voter identification laws and making it possible for complete strangers to take your ballot, S. 1 disrupts States' long-made efforts to maintain an accurate list of eligible voters. Voter rolls are the foundation really of election administration. I was the chief election official in our State. I was a local election official in our State.

Accurate lists of who can vote that people can look at before the election, during the election, and after the election create great confidence in the process.

Accurate lists ensure that voters are able to cast a ballot—and the ballot they should cast—in the districts they actually live in. That can be pretty complicated sometimes, and really only the election authority can be aware of that when they know exactly where you live.

Election officials, when you have accurate lists, know who has voted, and, frankly, they know who hasn't voted. So if the same person comes in or at least a person pretending to be the same person comes in a second time, they know that.

Accurate voter lists allow voters to check in more quickly to get that efficient and quick exercise of democracy done.

One of the things everybody constantly talks about is, well, we make it too hard to vote. If you really want to make it hard to vote, make it hard to figure out who the voters are who are supposed to be voting at a given precinct.

The right to vote is a bedrock principle in our democracy. The right to vote wherever you want to vote is not a bedrock principle in our democracy. You can't just decide: Well, this year I think it is going to be pretty competitive in some other State. I will just drive over there on election day and vote. Frankly, you can't just decide: You know, that congressional district next door to the one I live in looks more competitive than the one I live in. I think I will go over there and vote this year instead of in the district that the census tract would have put me in.

The right to vote is a bedrock principle. The right to vote wherever you want to isn't. Some of our great local administrators figured this out. In St. Louis County, the biggest single election jurisdiction in Missouri, you can vote anywhere in the county, but at the place where you go vote—the ballot for you individually is generated at the place you go vote, and it is counted in the races that are generated for you to vote in. That is pretty innovative. I don't think we could probably have ever figured that out at the national level.

But the point is, you are voting for the people who you are living in the district that person will represent, whether it is on the local school board or in the Congress or in the State legislature. That is a very complicated set of things that benefit totally from voter rolls and benefit from you voting where you live.

This bill prohibits States from putting in place really just reasonable election security measures that have been upheld by court. It takes away the guardrails that prevent fraud from happening and ensures that when you do have fraud, you have ways to figure out that fraud occurred and what to do about it. You pile up all the ways this legislation actually increases the likelihood of fraud, and you think about whether you really need a strong reason to change the system when, as Sen-

ator GRASSLEY said, the system appears to be working pretty well.

Democracies benefit from local responsibility. One political party, however, thinks this bill will give it an electoral advantage. They have thought that for about 20 years. This is the compilation of 20 years of Democrats in the Congress thinking, what could we do to change the election law that would be helpful for us? That is where we are in this legislation. It was written by one party alone. It has been steered through Congress by one party alone. It has not actually been seen by anybody in the other party yet, and the majority leader says this bill, which probably still is going to be about 800 pages, will come to the floor next week. In both Chambers of Congress, there has been bipartisan opposition to the bill and no bipartisan support for this bill.

The danger of those kinds of sweeping changes really can do a lot to negatively impact our election system, but it doesn't stop there. It would turn the Federal Election Commission into a partisan tool where the party of the President has a majority. There is a reason that six-member Commission was equally divided when it was set up, just like there is a reason the Senate Ethics Committee is equally divided.

This bill would send Federal money to campaign coffers at the rate of \$6 for every dollar raised for every contribution under \$200. I think the number my friend Chairman GRASSLEY was talking about was if you raised \$5 million of under \$200, you would get \$30 million from the Federal Government—\$30 million of government money that could clearly be used for something else. In fact, the current Members of the Senate would be eligible under the total restrictions of the bill to get \$1.8 billion in Federal money. Talk about a conflict of interest when you vote for this bill.

The bill also changes redistricting established in the Constitution for the States and basically ensures that all congressional redistricting would be done by Federal courts. That doesn't affect the Senate much, but it affects the government a lot. It places heavy burdens on free speech and impacts every branch of the Federal Government.

I have heard proponents of this bill say that it is necessary to push back recently passed State voter laws and protect the voting rights of Americans. This bill has nothing to do with voting rights. It doesn't protect the right of a single American to cast a ballot. It doesn't bring new people into the system as the constitutional amendment did on women and other people who have been added, people who had been held in a terrible way in slavery, people who had been prevented from voting because of their sex or race, and people who were prevented because of age at one time. This bill does nothing of that.

This is a Federal takeover of elections. It should be rejected by the Senate. I believe it will be rejected by the Senate. We look forward to seeing the other side defend this bill next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT, for his leadership on this issue.

We had the hearing and the markup in the Rules Committee. I think that we could tell from the debate that the amount of holes and misinformation that is contained within S. 1 is the reason that I call it the so-called For the People Act.

Ronald Reagan famously said that the nine most terrifying words in the English language are "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help." This can be applied to many examples of what we do here.

What seems more pertinent, I think, now is this latest partisan attempt to federalize one of America's most sacred functions, and that is our elections. Advocates claim that this sweeping effort, which comes in the form of legislation ironically called For the People Act, is to get more people to vote. Let's be clear. Everyone—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—we all want to see more people voting. The good news is that we have already been doing that across the country and in my home State of West Virginia.

Remember, last year we were voting under a pandemic, under incredibly difficult situations for everybody. Our State of West Virginia ran a very successful election suited to our State. We had thousands more people vote in 2020 than they did in 2016. In fact, the total number of ballots cast in 2020 was more than any other election in West Virginia's history, with the exception of the 1960 election. The 1960 election, remember, was the Presidential election that President Kennedy won after he had a very successful and a pivotal victory in the primary in West Virginia as the first Roman Catholic running for President. More than 158 million ballots were cast in 2020. That is a 7-percent increase since 2016. This is under a pandemic.

Every State decided the best way to get maximum participation. Last November, every single State saw higher turnout rates compared to the previous Presidential election. If more people are, in fact, voting, what is this Democratic-proposed legislation really about? And that is where it is about the federalization of elections and election power grab. I believe it lacks credibility. It is really about a way to implement absurd and downright un-American provisions in the bill that prioritize power over the will of the people.

I am glad to say that some of my Democratic colleagues are finally acknowledging the concerns with this

bill. During the Rules Committee markup, Republicans and Democrats offered a number of amendments, some of which were adopted on a bipartisan basis. That is what we are supposed to do—work it through committee. These amendments have been heralded by some of my Democratic colleagues as an example of how we can work together on this issue.

Despite the bipartisan amendments in the Rules Committee—despite this—the version that the majority leader may bring up for a vote does not include any of the amendments that were adopted during the markup even though they had bipartisan support. To me, that is a clear sign that the majority is not trying to cooperate in good faith but, rather, trying to ram through a partisan bill that will encroach on the States' abilities—my State's ability—to ensure a free and fair election and a well-attended election at the same time.

The legislation would strip States of their constitutional authority to run elections and allow the Federal Government to determine what is best.

It would ban voter ID laws, which are adopted in many States, mine included, which maintain the integrity of elections in my State and the majority of others. Quite frankly, I haven't heard one person in my State complain about having to take an ID to the polls or to submit an ID with their vote.

The bill would also force States to administer same-day voter registration—a cumbersome mandate that many States won't be able to comply with for dozens of reasons. In my State, it is internet connectivity. Many of our polling areas wouldn't be able to accept same-day registration because they can't connect, unfortunately, to the bigger system to find out if this person is fraudulent or not.

It would also require that States mandate the unpopular and dangerous practice of ballot harvesting, which is ripe for fraud. Now, I will tell you, some States have made ballot harvesting legal. Some States have same-day voter registration. Good for them. They decided what is good for their State through the constitutional duty of States to run elections.

Speaking of fraud, this bill would mandate absentee ballot boxes, drop boxes, and force county clerks to accept regular ballots filed in the wrong precinct without proof of residency, both of which leave the door open to voter fraud.

If that is not enough, if signed into law, West Virginia's e-voting system and others like it—this is the e-voting system that allows our Active military who are deployed overseas to be able to vote safely by their mobile phone, and the legislature opened that up to people with disabilities to be able to use an e-voting system. This bill would severely curtail that and negate it in many cases. That is an expansion of voting rights that this bill would take away.

This legislation would allow government funding of congressional campaigns, with small donations being matched with Federal funds. Now, we heard from our friend Senator CRUZ in our committee. He talked about, if his contributions were matched for the first 3 months of this year, he would get millions of dollars, over \$20 million of public financing for his campaign. I highly doubt my Democratic colleagues would want the Federal Government to help Senator CRUZ in the financing of his campaign. As a matter of fact, he himself, Senator CRUZ, said he doesn't want that at all either.

The bill also would make the FEC, the Federal Election Commission, which oversees our elections and our finances, which is now a neutral three Republicans, three Democrats on the Commission, as it always has been—it would make it into a partisan majority vote. Well, if you are going to be making decisions on my colleague from Florida's election or my election on financials, or the Presiding Officer's election, do we really want a political organization making those? Not when we have had a nonpartisan FEC for years and have enforced our campaign laws and put them above party politics. But remember, this is only about getting people to vote, so don't worry.

The disaster doesn't stop with politicizing the FEC; it would also remove the authority of States to draw district maps and would mandate how you do that. Our States can figure out how best—some of them have commissions. Some of them do it by the legislature. Some of them do it by the supreme court. Let's let the States make that decision.

I just think that the biggest demonstration of opposition to this bill has come from the West Virginia County Clerk's Association. It adopted a resolution in opposition to S. 1 that 54 of the 55 county clerks in my State signed. These are Republican and Democratic county clerks.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter from the West Virginia County Clerk's Association.

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

JUNE 10, 2021.

WVCCA RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PASSAGE
OF H.R. 1 & S. 1

Whereas, the United States Constitution recognizes the authority of the legislatures of each State to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding federal elections; and

Whereas, election administrators and county officials were not given an opportunity to provide input on the drafting of H.R. 1 and S. 1 prior to the introduction of the legislation, unlike previous bipartisan federal election reforms; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law that currently restricts ballot harvesting for the prevention of fraud, by expressly providing that states "may not put any limit on how many voted and sealed absentee ballots any designated person can return to the post office, a ballot drop-off location, tribally designated building, or election office"; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by mandating same-day registration, regardless of the severe lack of internet service and broadband in rural areas: an impossible feat in West Virginia; and

Whereas, Same-day registration provisions in H.R. 1 and S. 1 lack proper security protections, multiplied by the lack of internet capability in polling locations in West Virginia, which undermines the integrity of our elections by making it impossible for election officials to confirm any new voter's eligibility prior to them casting any ballot or from guaranteeing that no voter both registers and votes more than once in an election on Election Day; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by prohibiting requirements for physical proofs of identification for regular in-person and absentee voters, and requiring states to accept just a voter's signature affidavit as proof of eligibility and proper registration; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law and adoption of voting systems by requiring decertification of current, federally certified voting systems, and forcing states to purchase new voting equipment—none of which currently comport with the most recently adopted voluntary voting system guidelines (adopted Feb. 2021 by EAC)—wasting millions of dollars in recent upgrades purchased with HAVA funding across West Virginia and requiring new manufacturing by vendors and purchases by counties to the tune of tens of millions of dollars in WV alone; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 creates multiple so-called “private rights of action” that would lead to election administrators being targeted for lawsuits all across the country for both real and imagined violations, and causing county clerks to spend more time defending themselves in court than preparing to make sure that elections are run smoothly and securely; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 places dozens of additional mandates on county clerks while providing no ongoing operational funding to fulfill the requirements, causing potential cuts in county budgets to law enforcement and public safety; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by forcing county clerks to accept regular—not provisional—ballots of voters who vote in the incorrect precinct, without sufficient evidence of eligibility or proof of residence; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 fatally contradicts the reliability and security of electronic transmission by permitting voters to cure signature deficiencies electronically (see Sec. 1621) but prohibiting UOCAVA, voters living with disabilities, and first responders called away for service from transmitting absentee ballots securely using extensively tested procedures and methods; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 lump dozens of state agencies and educational institutions into “voter registration agencies,” and requires them to integrate into an automatic voter registration system without regard to current systems, data collection practices, or security creating more opportunities for voters' registrations to be mishandled and mistransmitted, and likely resulting in security lapses for agencies currently not covered under the Critical Infrastructure designation of the Department of Homeland Security; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by mandating new dates for the early in-person voting period without regard to state-specific success and voter participation under current election calendars; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by requiring absentee ballot drop boxes and increasing security concerns for absentee ballots that currently do not exist under state laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the West Virginia County Clerk's Association opposes the passage of H.R. 1, S. 1, or any other legislation that impedes the state's ability to administer elections in an overreaching, one-size-fits-all approach out of Washington D.C.

Adopted the 10th day of June, 2021 in Canaan Valley, WV
Expires: June 2026

CONNIE KAUFMAN,
Barbour Co. Clerk.
ROGER TONEY,
Boone Co. Clerk.
ELAINE C. MAUCK,
Berkeley Co. Clerk.
SUE ANN RUTHERFORD,
Braxton Co. Clerk.
KIM BARBETTA,
Brooke Co. Clerk.
JEAN SIMERS,
Calhoun Co. Clerk.
CATEE SLATER,
Doddridge Co. Clerk.
JEAN BUTCHER,
Gilmer Co. Clerk.
ROBIN LOUDERMILK,
Greenbrier Co. Clerk.
GEORGE FOLEY,
Hancock Co. Clerk.
JOHN SPIRES,
Harrison Co. Clerk.
JACQUELINE C. SHADLE,
Jefferson Co. Clerk.
CYNTHIA S. ROWAN,
Lewis Co. Clerk.
JOHN A. TURNER,
Logan Co. Clerk.
PHYLLIS SMITH,
Cabell Co. Clerk.
CONNIE WORKMAN,
Clay Co. Clerk.
MICHELLE Z. HOLLY,
Fayette Co. Clerk.
BUD FISHER,
Grant Co. Clerk.
ERIC W. STRITE,
Hampshire Co. Clerk.
GREGORY L. ELY,
Hardy Co. Clerk.
CHERYL A. BRIGHT,
Jackson Co. Clerk.
VERA MCCORMICK,
Kanawha Co. Clerk.
DIREL G. BAKER,
Lincoln Co. Clerk.
JULIE KINCAID,
Marion Co. Clerk.
JAN PEST,
Marshall Co. Clerk.
DONALD L. HICKS,
McDowell Co. Clerk.
LAUREN ELLIFRITZ,
Mineral Co. Clerk.
DONALD J. EVANS,
Monroe Co. Clerk.
ROBERT PAINTER,
Nicholas Co. Clerk.
ELISE M. WHITE,
Pendleton Co. Clerk.
MELISSA BENNETT,
Pocahontas Co. Clerk.
BRIAN WOOD,
Putnam Co. Clerk.
BRENDA WISEMAN,
Randolph Co. Clerk.
DIANA N. CROMLEY,
Mason Co. Clerk.
VERLIN T. MOYE,
Mercer Co. Clerk.
LARRY CROAFF,
Mingo Co. Clerk.
KIMBERLY NICKLES,
Morgan Co. Clerk.
MICHAEL E. KELLY,
Ohio Co. Clerk.
EVELYN DAVIS,
Pleasants Co. Clerk.
LINDA HUGGINS,

Preston Co. Clerk.
DANNY MOORE,
Raleigh Co. Clerk.
TRACIE McDONALD,
Ritchie Co. Clerk.
CHARLES B. WHITE, JR.,
Roane Co. Clerk.
GEORGIANNA THOMPSON,
Taylor Co. Clerk.
NEIL ARCHER,
Tyler Co. Clerk.
RENICK C. BOOTH,
Wayne Co. Clerk.
CAROL HAUGHT,
Wetzel Co. Clerk.
MARK RHODES,
Wood Co. Clerk.
MARY B. MERRITT,
Summers Co. Clerk.
SHERRY SIMMONS,
Tucker Co. Clerk.
CAROL SMITH,
Upshur Co. Clerk.
EVA R. GREEN,
Webster Co. Clerk.
MAROLYN BALDRIGE,
Wirt Co. Clerk.
JEWELL AGUILAR,
Wyoming Co. Clerk.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, they raise numerous grievances, many of which I have talked about. They talk about the voting machines they have right now, which they have spent a lot of money on, that would all be taken offline. You would have to fully replace all of that. They also fully reject the usurping of what is their constitutionally based responsibility to run elections safely, securely, and on time. So I appreciate the letter from our clerks and certainly understand their deep, deep concerns. The right to vote is a constitutional right, and on that, we are in agreement.

I got to go to a citizenship ceremony wherein 20 new citizens joined our country after having waited to get into our country. After becoming citizens, the best and most precious right they get is that right to vote. Yet S. 1 is merely a partisan power grab that includes all kinds of unrelated, harmful provisions. It strips the States of their authority to run their elections. To put it simply, States do not need the Federal Government to strip them of their authority and impose burdensome requirements to fix problems that do not exist. That is exactly what this bill does, and it is why the For the People Act does not live up to its name.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, the United States is a beacon of democracy in the world, and our Nation was founded on free and fair elections, but if the American people don't have confidence in our elections, we don't have a sustainable democracy.

Right now, unfortunately, many people do not have confidence. People across the country are mad when they look at the blatant power grab by the Democrats to fundamentally change our democracy. Do you know what? They should be mad. We are talking about the sacred right to vote.

If we want to continue as a thriving democracy, we have to take action so

that Americans trust in free and fair elections. That is why I introduced the Save Democracy Act so as to restore faith in our Federal elections and guarantee that voters decide the outcomes of elections, not the courts.

I also introduced the Promoting Election Integrity by Proving Voter Identity Act so as to require voter ID. It is pretty simple. If you want to vote in person, you will need to bring your current and valid ID. If you want to vote by mail, you will need to provide a copy of your ID. Like I said, it is pretty simple and straightforward. If we want, and we do—we want 100 percent participation in our elections, and we want zero fraud. We want it to be easy to vote and very hard to cheat. Voter ID helps us meet that goal.

Of course, the Democrats will do anything to fight against these commonsense reforms. Instead, the Democrats are pushing S. 1, otherwise known as the Corrupt Politicians Act. S. 1 is the most ridiculous legislation I have seen since I have come to the Senate. I would need hours to go through all of it. For our purposes here today, I want to highlight just one piece of this lunacy: using taxpayer dollars to pay for political campaigns.

The Democrats want to use your tax dollars to subsidize their political campaigns. Think about how anti-democratic it is to allow public servants to use the people's money to manipulate the people themselves. Just to be crystal clear, here is what is exactly being proposed by the Democrats in this anti-democratic bill: Public officials—the government—take money from you. Then they use that money to pay for their campaign ads in order to manipulate you.

This bill is nothing but a political power grab by Washington Democrats. New Hampshire Democrat Secretary of State Bill Gardner even said recently that S. 1 was a power grab by the Federal Government that would “trample New Hampshire's state constitution.”

Under the Democrats' plan, a candidate for the Senate in California could spend \$80 million in taxpayer dollars to run attack ads and fund his campaign—\$80 million. In Georgia, a Senate candidate could get as much as \$25 million in taxpayer money. Candidates in Arizona could get almost \$19 million. New York candidates would get more than \$44 million. That doesn't make any sense.

What kind of return on investment are the American people getting when their hard-earned tax dollars are funding attack ads? Why is the Federal Government in the business of funding campaigns? Because my Democratic colleagues want the government to take your money and spend it on trying to manipulate your vote.

Only in Washington would a bunch of politicians look at the challenges from recovering from the pandemic and decide the most important thing we can do is make taxpayers fund campaign ads.

This is the most radical piece of voting legislation this Nation has ever seen at a time when restoring confidence in our elections has never been more important.

I was sent to the U.S. Senate to fight for Floridians and Americans against corrupt politicians. Here is my promise to every American family: I am going to fight every day to make sure the Democrats do not try to take your money to manipulate your vote.

If we are serious about working together to move our country forward, restore public trust in our elections, and protect democracy, we need to reject the insanity of S. 1 and look to commonsense reforms like voter ID. We will continue to fight the Democrats' election power grab and combat their efforts to prevent measures that protect the integrity of our elections.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, it has been so interesting to talk with Tennesseans over the past couple of weeks, and it is interesting in the vein that they are beginning to really question some of the proposals that my Democratic colleagues are bringing forward and items that they are pushing from the left side of the aisle.

I have to tell you that I honestly can't blame them. After all, when they promised COVID relief, they delivered a blue State bailout, which was something that was not popular in Tennessee. They said that they were going to be all for some much needed infrastructure projects. In Tennessee, we like to talk about this in terms of roads and railways and runways and rivers. Yet what did the people from Tennessee hear? They heard all about the Green New Deal, they heard about incentives for electric vehicles, and they heard about alternative energy. They looked at that infrastructure bill and said: This is fantasyland.

Then, when they promised to support families and children, what did you get from the left side of the aisle? You got support for expanding the welfare state.

Now Senate Democrats have promised to vote on legislation that they claim is going to make our elections more transparent. Hmm. That is interesting. Surprising no one, the bill the Democrats are trying to sell to the American people will do exactly the opposite.

Of course, in typical fashion of the House, what did it do? It gave it a friendly sounding name—the For the People Act—but in actuality, this is a bill that would take away rights and responsibilities from the American people.

They are saying: This is going to be about transparency. Well, when we think of transparency, we think of things that are going to be seen, of things that are going to be easily understood. We think of things from which the activity within is going to be

made available so that people can see this. It should follow, then, that a bill that is promising transparent elections would be there to help voters understand the rules, trust the people in charge, and cast their votes of confidence. It would not be a bill that would seize control from local officials and place it in the hands of unelected Washington bureaucrats, and it would not be a bill that would make it literally impossible to stand up polling places. It certainly would not be a bill that would erode confidence in ballot integrity, but that is what we have. It just doesn't make sense what they are trying to do when it comes to voting.

Even with all of this, my Democratic colleagues have spent most of this year trying to sell the American public on a bill that would centralize power, that would impose burdensome rules on State and local governments, and that would take away constitutional responsibilities and rights and all but ensure rampant voter fraud. That is correct. A piece of legislation that would do—what?—make it easier to cheat.

So, in the interest of the transparency my Democratic colleagues have promised, let's take a closer look at the legislation they are pushing forward.

Like most proposals they have tried to force through this year, this latest, brazen political power grab is built on a foundation of unreasonable mandates—mandates from the Federal Government to the State and local governments. Yet, rather than simplifying the process, these new rules would throw your local elections into chaos.

If passed, the provisions in this bill would mandate the use of ballot casting technology and voter registration systems that don't even exist yet. That is correct. What is being mandated is not in existence, but when it does come to exist, you can bet that it will cost a fortune, that it will come with a steep learning curve, and that there will be buddies of the Democratic Party that will make a bucket of money.

The same automatic registration procedures that failed voters in California and Illinois will fail voters in every State in this country.

It would force States to stand aside for activists running ballot harvesting schemes—and, indeed, ballot harvesting is a scheme. Anyone who has ever watched one of these campaigns in action knows that forcing officials to tolerate them is an invitation for these activists to engage in a little sleight of hand, if you will.

In fact, this bill truly outdoes itself when it comes to encouraging fraud. Its hallmark provision would ban meaningful voter ID laws and stop State and local officials from cleaning up their voter rolls. This bill strips away every commonsense defense against voter fraud.

It would also inject fear into the process by mandating donor disclosure and weaponizing a partisan FEC against minority political parties.

The American people know there is only one reason you would work this hard to remove transparency from elections: They are seeking to remove transparency from the voter. Truth be told, many of my colleagues across the aisle know it, too, which is why this bill has earned bipartisan opposition.

I have spent the better part of 2 years coming to the floor to object to various iterations of this bill, and I will continue to do so until my colleagues abandon this partisan power grab.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I am joining others who have the same problem with what the majority party here in the U.S. Senate is trying to do. It is something that surprises a lot of people, something that would completely revamp, completely change, a system that has been in place since 1787.

I understand that they are soon going to be forcing a vote on a bill they are naming the For the People Act, and it is anything but for the people.

For those unfamiliar, this is a Democrat bill to nationalize our elections and to give Washington unprecedented and unconstitutional power over States and local governments.

Each speaker, including myself, who has spoken so far has been jealously guarding their system because we have put into place a very safe and honest way of handling our elections.

Now, keep in mind, this bill is not new. House Democrats passed this back in 2019, right on party-line votes. In fact, the only bipartisan aspect of the bill is its opposition, as was just stated by another speaker.

Back in March, along with every single House Republican, one brave House Democrat voted against this bill, and the reason is clear—and it has been stated—but let me put all five of these things into one area so that it is a little easier to understand.

The bill is filled with dangerous, anti-democratic provisions—provisions that make it easier to steal votes.

One, legalizing ballot harvesting. Each Member has been talking about ballot harvesting and the threat that is out there.

Banning voter ID. In my State of Oklahoma, we have ID laws to safeguard our votes.

They are attempting to restore felons' right to vote. Why would you want to restore a felon's right to vote? And I have not heard anyone yet give a good argument that is persuasive.

Allowing voters to cast ballots outside of their precincts. That is just one step further and one step easier to falsify ballots.

Subsidize political candidates with Federal funds. We are going to talk about that. It is unbelievable. I mentioned some of the—how it might affect some individuals.

It is more accurately named the "For the Liberal Politicians Act." In their mind, it not only ensures that they can

control elections forever with ballot harvesting and other questionable practices, but they would also give millions in taxpayers' funds to bulk up their campaigns.

I just reminded them, and others have mentioned this, too, it sounds like you might be criticizing TED CRUZ when you say this, but it is not because he knows it is wrong. He observed that—when he was running for office, that if he had been able to harvest the opportunities you have from the Federal Government, he would have raised some \$24 million in Federal funds in the first quarter of this year for his campaign.

The Oklahoma State Election Board Secretary, Paul Ziriox, shared with me his strong concerns about this bill and what it would do to my State of Oklahoma and our election integrity laws. It would impose policies that contradict State law, like legalizing ballot harvesting and preventing voter ID for in-person voting.

As he is responsible for managing the elections in Oklahoma, he knows how bad this would be for Oklahomans.

Today, Oklahoma's elections are safe, secure, and fair. Secretary Ziriox said it best in 2019, when he testified before the House, that Oklahoma's voting system is "one of the most reliable, most accurate, most secure, most efficient, most cost-effective, and speediest voting system in the entire world."

We pride ourselves on that. That is Oklahoma doing it, not the Federal Government—not the Federal Government doing something that might benefit one segment of our society.

It is clear the Democrats are playing politics with S. 1.

Now, following the 2020 Presidential election, Democrats complained about efforts to remove States from running their elections, but now Democrats are seeking sweeping Federal control over elections.

I am going to mention something that no one has mentioned before, and I guess the only reason it comes to my mind is I have been doing this for a long period of time—being concerned in trying to preserve our electoral college.

Back in 1787, we had a problem. They were putting together a Constitution to try to establish a way of voting in the United States of America that would be safe for everyone and be equitable.

And so they came out and—they didn't want to do it just on a one-person vote because if you do that, that is a decided advantage for all of the large States. And so what they did was come up with what they called the electoral college, and that was that they made the effort to correct the problem. We are talking about back in 1787.

In 1787, we had a system where we had four very large States and nine small States. So if you just—the four large States were comprised of more than 50 percent of the electorate so that wouldn't work. That wasn't going

to work. And, of course, the same thing is true today. Today, nine States have a majority of the votes.

And so it was the clear intent not to let the large States have control of our system.

Now, I am sure some of the large States disagree with that. Some Democrats—a lot of Democrats disagree with that because it would be a decided advantage in an interim election.

So what we did, we established the electoral college, and I have committed that is my main cause right now because it is in jeopardy now. The electoral college is being attacked on a regular basis.

In fact, one of the prominent Democrats who is currently in the leadership in the Democratic Party has introduced a resolution to do away with the electoral college. That is something we cannot allow to happen.

And, oddly enough, it has survived for, what, 233 years now—233 years. And yet, it has survived all that time, but there are those attacking it right now.

So that is another one of the major issues that we are concerned with, and that is that we are not only giving up all the creativity and the safeguards that are in a secure system, put together not by the Federal Government but by the States, and trying to take that over for the Federal Government. They have been attempting to do this, now, for 230 years. They haven't been successful, and I am hoping they will not be successful on my watch.

Thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, if H.R. 1, S. 1 were ever passed into law, it would forever be known as the "Nancy Pelosi Power Grab Act."

This legislation lets the Federal Government take over our elections, which is clearly unconstitutional.

Let's talk about ballot harvesting to begin with. Most Americans believe that ballot harvesting is wrought with fraud and wrong. Frankly, it dilutes your vote.

For decades, for centuries, Americans have woken up early in the morning on voting day to get to church, to vote early before they get to work.

Can you just imagine how much seeing so many show up with a bag full of ballots, which can't be vouched for—what it does to devalue your vote.

Let's talk about voter ID for a second. I think most Americans—maybe at least 80 percent of Americans—believe that voter ID brings integrity to the election process.

Certainly voter ID has worked for Kansas for years and brings about integrity to our election process. Just think about all the things that require an ID at this point in time. To rent a car today, if I wanted to check into a hotel, if I wanted to board an airplane tonight, I would need some type of identification.

And I think the value of voting is even more than any of those and thus the need for some type of voter identification. This bill takes integrity out of the election process.

Next, most Americans don't want their tax dollars going to fund any elections, especially elections of the opposite party to which you belong, and I can certainly guarantee that nobody wants to see more political attack ads with their hard-earned tax dollars being spent.

But let me tell you what I am for. I want to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. I want to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat.

Ballot harvesting makes it easier to cheat. Getting rid of voter ID makes it easier to cheat. That destroys the integrity of the election process.

This bill, simply stated, is just another attempt at an unconstitutional power grab.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, today we are discussing S. 1, the so-called For the People Act.

Now, this legislation takes a system that is actually working quite well and applies drastic, draconian, and desperate election reforms meant to keep Democrats in power.

Now, why do I say the current system is working well? Well, let me tell you just how easy it is back home in my home county of Johnson County, IN, to cast one's vote.

You see, beginning 4 weeks before the election, you can vote early in person, with no excuses, Monday through Friday, for at least 8 hours per day. The two Saturdays before the election, early voting was open for 7 hours each day. Monday, the day before the election, early voting was open for 3½ additional hours. And then on election day, polls were open for 12 hours. In total, that is 201½ hours of voting across 23 days, over a period of 4 weeks.

In total, you see, we afford Hoosiers plenty of opportunity to vote.

And lest you think that my suburban county is somehow unique in the State of Indiana, let me disabuse you of that notion. In neighboring Indianapolis, they had 221 hours of early voting over that same period.

Additionally, Hoosiers have the ability to vote absentee. Now, you can vote absentee in the State of Indiana by mail for 11 separate reasons, including being sick or caring for someone who is sick or working on election day.

Now, colleagues, in the history of our country, voting has never been easier than it is right now. That is right. You may not see this in the media, but this is indeed true.

You see, the truth bears it out right in the numbers. Last year, a larger percentage of the population voted than they had in any election since 18-year-olds were given the right to vote 50 years ago. A larger proportion of the population voted than it had since over the last 50 years.

Why aren't we hearing this?

According to the Census Bureau, voter turnout for African Americans and Hispanic Americans were up 3 and 6 percent, respectively, not down. Asian Americans saw a huge 10-percent increase. This is fantastic.

Yet my colleagues on the left would have the American people believe that we are living in an era of extreme suppression or, as President Biden demagogically, dishonestly, and divisively called it, "Jim Crow on steroids."

So what exactly is the national Democratic response to this record turnout?

Well, they would like to strip election powers away from the States, States like Indiana, and give those powers to Democratic overlords here in Washington, DC. That is how we ended up with S. 1, the For the People Act.

So for the folks back home, what is this For the People Act really all about? Why are we having this debate? Why are we going to have this vote? It is really about four things—four things.

One, national Democrats want to fund their campaigns with your taxpayer dollars. That is right. Under the For the People Act, a \$100 campaign donation to NANCY PELOSI could be matched by \$600 from taxpayers.

I don't know about, you know, my colleagues who are listening, but my neighbors work very hard for their wages and salaries, and I expect that is the case for them as well. They don't want \$600 to match \$100 given to NANCY PELOSI.

Two, national Democrats want to gut popular voter ID laws, like those in the State of Indiana. I know what Hoosiers believe. Hoosiers believe you should have to prove who you are in order to vote. Our voter ID law, incidentally, passed in 2005. It was challenged in the courts, and it was upheld in the Supreme Court of the United States by a vote of 6 to 3.

But this bill, this For the People Act, says you don't have to prove who you are. You don't have to prove you are who you say you are in order to cast your vote. We will just take you at your word. That seems to me to be ripe for abuse.

No. 3, the third thing this is all about is that national Democrats want to allow ballot harvesting. It is an awful word, and it is an awful thing—the harvesting of ballots. In Indiana, a member of your household can already turn in your absentee ballot. You can do it. But under this law, anybody can turn in your ballot—or not turn it in—and there is no limit as to how many ballots a single person can turn in—hundreds of ballots, thousands of ballots. It is ripe for abuse.

The final thing this is about is that national Democrats want to take control of the Federal Election Commission. They want to turn it into a partisan committee.

Now, everyone in this body believes that the right to vote is sacred. It is a

sacred right that all of us have, and we ought to be able to exercise it unhindered and with fidelity. We are in this Chamber because each one of our respective constituents exercised their right to vote. That is how we earned our election certificates, and we all agree that our constituents need to be able to trust the systems in place that allowed them to cast their vote.

So we can't take that sacred right and turn it into a partisan exercise, as S. 1 proposes we do. That, my friends, is why this Senator will be voting no on S. 1, the so-called For the People Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, in each new Congress, the bill number S. 1 is a sign of the majority's priority legislation. It says a lot about the new Democrat majority that the bill they chose to design as S. 1 prioritizes themselves.

This bill creates a Federal campaign fund to finance the expenses of candidates for Congress. Instead of addressing the important issues that are on the minds of my fellow Iowans—like the rising cost of gasoline, bread, milk, and all sorts of household goods—this bill literally takes money out of the paychecks of working Americans and puts it into the campaign coffers of Washington politicians.

Rather than helping to get Americans back to work, the Democrats' top priority, again, is S. 1. Their top priority is to create a Federal jobs program for political consultants and pollsters, taxpayer-subsidized robocalls interrupting your family dinner, junk mail cluttering your mailbox, and attack ads blaring—yes—on your TV. And, folks, you cannot—cannot—unsubscribe, either, because there is no opting out.

Think about the politician you dislike the most. Now imagine your tax dollars funding their ads and fliers and campaign parties and rallies. That is what this bill does.

That is right. The bill subsidizes politicians' campaigns—your tax dollars helping to elect politicians who oppose your values.

This idea is so unpopular that a New York poll found that the majority leader's own constituents oppose public funding of campaigns by a 3-to-1 margin.

While the Democrats call the bill the For the People Act, a more apt title would be "Fund the Politicians Act." It is about Washington politicians—the same ones who just brought back earmarks to pay for their pet pork projects with your tax dollars, prioritizing themselves.

The bill not only subsidizes the campaigns of politicians, it nationalizes elections. Washington would tell the rest of the country how you can select your representatives. It does so by creating a Federal workaround of State voter ID laws by effectively eliminating the enforcement of State ID requirements at the polls.

Think about what you are required to show an ID to do: drive a car, board a plane, buy a beer—and the list goes on. But Democrats think it is best if we don't require an ID to vote.

The majority of Americans disagree with Washington Democrats, and 77 percent of voters support voter ID. A little known fact is that this includes support by 63 percent of Democrats and a vast majority of Black and Hispanic voters.

It is all part of the Democrats' larger scheme and total power grab to tilt our political system in their favor. First, eliminate the filibuster. Then, rig elections by eliminating election integrity laws like voter ID verification. Then, add new States, like the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, that will elect Democrat Senators. And don't forget the plan to pack the Court.

There are just 50 Democratic Senators, but 60 votes are required to end debate on legislation in the Senate. Therefore, the Democrats must eliminate the filibuster in order to pass S. 1, their priority legislation. That is right—changing the rules in order to fundamentally change our country.

And I would remind folks that my friends across the aisle are seeking to abolish the very same tool—the filibuster—that they used 327 times last year alone when they were in the minority. If they chose to change the rules, they would destroy this Chamber's long, proud history as being the world's greatest deliberative body.

The Senate's current assistant majority leader made it clear—very clear—in 2018, in no uncertain terms, that ending the filibuster would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding fathers.

Because the takeover of elections is just as radical and largely unconstitutional, the Democrats' Court-packing scheme is another key component of enshrining S. 1.

Folks, we can all see this for what it is—a transparent play for permanent political power. This is not about democracy. It is about changing the rules and tipping the scales to favor Washington Democrats.

As a former local elections commissioner, I believe elections are always best kept at the State and local level, and I will continue to push back on my colleagues' attempts to federalize our elections system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

NOMINATION OF RADHIKA FOX

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I rise today to urge our colleagues to join me in voting to confirm Radhika Fox—Isn't that a great name, Radhika Fox?—to be Assistant Administrator for Water of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Over the past 2 months, as Radhika Fox has gone through the confirmation process, I have had the real pleasure to come to know her and, frankly, to ad-

mire her. I am convinced that she is an excellent choice to lead the EPA's Office of Water at a crucial time in the Agency's history.

Ms. Fox brings with her an impressive, professional record of service and accomplishment spanning over two decades, working on water issues at the local, State, and Federal level.

Most recently, before she was nominated for her position at EPA, Ms. Fox served as the CEO of the U.S. Water Alliance. There she worked hand-in-glove with organizations across this country representing a wide range of water stakeholders, from industries to municipalities, from service organizations to consumer groups, and from agricultural groups to environmental organizations. What those organizations have said again and again about Radhika Fox is that she is an exceptional leader who will work day and night to come up with practical solutions for our country's serious water challenges. Moreover, Ms. Fox will make sure that everyone's point of view is heard and taken into account when EPA acts to protect our country's precious water resources.

And how do we know these groups say all these wonderful things about Radhika Fox? Because they have written to us, urging the Senate to act swiftly to confirm her, again and again and again. In fact, over 80 prominent organizations that are key stakeholders in the nation's water policies have written letters in support of her nomination to this important post.

When I say that over 80 organizations have written, I don't mean that 80-plus organizations have signed on to a common letter—one letter of support. No, no, no. I mean that over 80 organizations have taken the time to write their own unique, thoughtful letters of support.

In fact, the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works, which I am privileged to lead along with SHELLEY CAPITO of West Virginia, has been inundated with letters of support for Radhika Fox. Each letter describes the specific and positive impact that Ms. Fox has already had on issues of importance to those individual organizations and the members of those they represent, and she has done it under previous professional positions consistently.

I will take a few minutes. I don't do this very often, but I just want to take a few minutes here and actually go through some of these letters, these 80 letters of support. They are remarkably consistent letters of great compliment and praise for her and the kind of person she is and the kind of leader that she is. But I want to share the words of some of those who reached out to us.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce writes:

Ms. Fox has worked to ensure that businesses and the groups that represent them are valued stakeholders in water infrastructure conversations. She has created plat-

forms to convene stakeholders from the water sector and industry through her leadership.

The U.S. Water Alliance, what do they say? The U.S. Water Alliance writes:

Radhika Fox developed a consistent record of working cooperatively alongside stakeholders from every corner of the water sector, including drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater utilities of all sizes, environmental groups, labor, frontline communities, and countless others.

How about the Family Farm Alliance. Here is what the Family Farm Alliance writes:

Due to her extensive engagement in policy and public discourse in her previous positions, Ms. Fox understands the implications of guidance and regulation but also the importance of authentic community engagement and the need to achieve quantified results on the ground.

They go on to say:

Radhika Fox is the type of leader to create the conditions to catalyze that work and ultimately see it through.

Again, those are the words we received from the Family Farm Alliance.

How about the Iowa Soybean Association? We raise a lot of soybeans in our State, and I know the Presiding Officer raises a bunch in her State. And for this gentleman sitting over here on my left, they raise a few down in West Virginia. But the Iowa Soybean Association says:

Ms. Fox understands how water management issues are interwoven with the fabric of rural and urban communities and that farmers must be part of the team and beneficiaries of this work. This integration is key for making real and long-lasting progress on protecting and improving water in the 21st century.

And here are some words from one of our neighbors in Delaware, off to the west of us, Maryland. Ben Grumbles, a Republican-appointed secretary of the Maryland's Department of the Environment writes that Ms. Fox has "impressed public and private sector water leaders on her abilities to find common ground and skillfully advocate for integrated 'One Water' policies throughout the country. . . . Radhika is well-qualified to organize, inspire, and lead EPA's national water program and the many diverse constituencies who shape our water future.

Thank you for those words, Ben Grumbles.

Galveston. Galveston, TX, here we go. Galveston Bay Foundation down in Galveston, TX, says this about Radhika:

Radhika is a proven leader who has demonstrated a desire to make sure that all stakeholders and all voices have a place at the table.

And, finally, last but not least, the Community Water Center—that is an outfit in Central California, not too far from where I was stationed when I was in the Navy. They write:

Ms. Fox has the rare ability to bring multiple differing voices into the room (from environmental justice to water agencies to agricultural entities to state government leaders), find the common themes, and then

weave together a shared ground that helps advance the conversation and create real progress. You will be hard-pressed to find a more gifted visionary and leader in the water space than Ms. Fox.

Those are amazing letters. Any one of them by themselves would be, I think, remarkable and compelling, but when you put them all together—from the Chamber of Commerce to environmental organizations and agricultural organizations—we hear this theme repeated again and again. It is pretty amazing, and the reason why is because it turns out that Radhika Fox is an amazing human being and leader.

These excerpts that I just shared with my colleagues today are really a small sample—this is just a small sample—of the expressions of overwhelming support that our committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, has received from organizations and from people around the country who know water issues and who also know Radhika Fox.

Their message is loud. Their message is clear. We have the opportunity today to confirm a truly gifted leader and put her to work serving our country right away from sea to shining sea. I urge my colleagues to join me in doing just that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

NOMINATION OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, today the Senate will be voting to invoke cloture on the nomination of Tommy Beaudreau. And I have to explain the difference between “Bohdroh” and “Beaudreau.” “Bohdroh” is when you are up north in Alaska being raised, and that is how it is said and pronounced. It is spelled B-O-H-D-R-O-H. Now, if you are down in the South, especially in Louisiana, it would be all Beaudreau, which is B-E-A-U-X. So there is a difference here, and Tommy wanted to make sure that I explained that to you.

Mr. Beaudreau has been nominated to serve as the Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I believe that he will be an outstanding Deputy Secretary. He is experienced. He knows the Department of the Interior, and he is familiar with the wide range of issues that come before it.

He has previously served as the first Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, as the Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, and as Chief of Staff of the Department. His performance at his nomination hearing demonstrated that he has both a very firm grasp of the issues and the ability to listen, learn, and work with all sides and to find commonsense solutions to difficult problems.

He has the knowledge, the experience, the temperament, and the skills needed to serve in this important position. Mr. Beaudreau fully understands the role of the Department of the Interior in striking the balance in its dual

mission of preserving and protecting our national parks and public lands and providing a large part of the energy and mineral resources that we need to power the Nation.

And I believe Senators on both sides of the aisle will find that he is someone that they can work with. Mr. Beaudreau is supremely well qualified for the job. He was reported out of the Senate Energy Committee with a very, very strong bipartisan vote. I heartily support his nomination, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today the Senate will take another step toward building a Federal judiciary that reflects the experiences of all Americans by voting on the nomination of Judge Lydia Griggsby to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. Once confirmed, she will be the first Black woman—and first woman of color—to serve in this position.

Since 2014, Judge Griggsby has served as an outstanding and even-handed judge on the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. In fact, many of us in this Chamber are familiar with her intellect and sound judgment. Prior to being nominated to the Court of Federal Claims, Judge Griggsby served as chief counsel for privacy and information policy on the Senate Judiciary Committee under then-Chairman LEAHY. Before that, Judge Griggsby spent 10 years at the Department of Justice as an Assistant U.S. Attorney. Judge Griggsby's long and distinguished career has earned her a unanimous rating of “Well Qualified” from the American Bar Association.

She also received broad, bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee, with five Republicans joining all Democrats to advance her nomination. And she has the strong support of her home State Senators, Senator CARDIN and Senator VAN HOLLEN. In 2014, the Senate confirmed Judge Griggs by voice vote. I hope she will once again receive broad bipartisan support today.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of her nomination.

VOTE ON FOX NOMINATION

Ms. COLLINS. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Fox nomination?

Ms. COLLINS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 236 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—2

Booker	Peters
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON GRIGGSBY NOMINATION

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Baldwin	Feinstein	Merkley
Bennet	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Blumenthal	Graham	Murphy
Brown	Grassley	Murray
Burr	Hassan	Ossoff
Cantwell	Heinrich	Padilla
Capito	Hickenlooper	Reed
Cardin	Hirono	Romney
Carper	Kaine	Rosen
Casey	Kelly	Sanders
Collins	King	Schatz
Coons	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cornyn	Leahy	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Sinema
Duckworth	Manchin	Smith
Durbin	Markey	Stabenow
Ernst	Menendez	Tester

Tillis
Van Hollen
Warner

Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse

Wyden
Young

Feinstein
Fischer
Gillibrand

Lummis
Manchin
Markey

Schatz
Schumer
Scott (FL)

Israeli citizens, I thought about the families impacted by this evil. Think about a 5-year-old you know. They like to play games. They love their brothers and sisters, and they love their mom and dad. Well, a 5-year-old, just like the one you are thinking of, named Ido Avigal was killed as Hamas rockets indiscriminately just pounded Israel. His life was taken by Hamas terrorists. I have a 5-year-old grandson. I can't imagine life without him. I can't imagine what either of those families is going through right now.

Instead of coming together against this violence, we saw the Democrats turn their backs on Israel. I was proud to lead more than 30 of my colleagues in a resolution to support Israel in its right to defend itself against terrorist attacks. Unfortunately, it was blocked by Senate Democrats.

It was not so long ago that the Senate stood with Israel on a bipartisan basis. In 2014, when Israel was again subject to a barrage of rockets targeting innocent Israelis, then-Majority Leader Reid offered a resolution supporting Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas. Every single Senator voted to support Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas—not anymore. It is despicable that something as simple as reaffirming America's support for Israel no longer aligns with the priorities of the Democrat Party.

I have also joined in a resolution with Senator CRUZ to approve the arm sales to Israel and the resolution with Senator HAWLEY to condemn the disturbing wave of anti-Semitic and anti-Israel actions in Congress, in the United States, and around the world. These reprehensible and disturbing acts must be swiftly condemned at every level and those responsible prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

President Biden's State Department recently said:

We're going to be working in partnership with the United Nations and the Palestinian Authority to 'kind of' channel aid there in a manner that does its best to go to the people of Gaza.

The official went on to say:

As we've seen in life, as we all know in life, there are no guarantees, but we're going to do everything that we can to ensure that this assistance reaches the people who need it the most.

So the Biden administration can't guarantee that American taxpayer dollars aren't going to fund terrorists in Hamas? The Biden administration thinks it is OK to fund Hamas terrorists because "in life there are no guarantees"? The Biden administration seems unbothered if some funding goes to the terrorists that killed Ido.

President Biden must do better. His administration must control where this money is going. Yes, we can make sure American tax dollars aren't funding terrorists. What we are hearing from the Biden administration is they simply won't take the time to do what it takes to guarantee that. This lack of accountability or concern is absolutely disgusting, and we should not allow it.

NAYS—39

Barrasso
Blackburn
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Cassidy
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Fischer
Hagerty

Hawley
Hoehn
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
Moran
Paul

Portman
Risch
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Toomey
Tuberville
Wicker

Hickenlooper
Hirono
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnson
Kaine
Kelly
King
Klobuchar
Lankford
Leahy
Lujan

Hassan
Menendez
Merkley
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Portman
Reed
Risch
Romney
Rosen
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse

Shahen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden
Young

NOT VOTING—2

Booker

Peters

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). 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 actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 123, Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher A. Coons, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Baldwin, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Merkley.

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 Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, 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 New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blackburn
Blumenthal
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Brown

Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Collins
Coons

Cornyn
Cortez Masto
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Daines
Duckworth
Durbin
Ernst

Cruz
Hawley
Kennedy

NAYS—9

Lee
Paul
Sanders

Shelby
Sullivan
Tuberville

NOT VOTING—2

Booker

Peters

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). On this vote the yeas are 89, the nays 9.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1899

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I stand again today in support of our great ally Israel. Israel is a vibrant democracy that supports capitalism, champions human rights, and holds free and open elections. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East, and Israel deserves our unwavering support.

Israel is surrounded by nations and terrorist groups that want it wiped off the face of the Earth. I saw this firsthand during my latest visit as Senator, which gave me a clear picture of Israel's proximity to its enemies—Hamas, Hezbollah, ISIS, and Iran.

At my last visit, I was about a half mile from the Gaza Strip and went to a kibbutz. What was shocking to me is that there were little children there instinctively raised that, whenever they would hear the sirens, they instinctively raised their hands because somebody is going to pick them up and get them to a bomb shelter. I think what they were telling me when I was there is they had 15 seconds to get to a bomb shelter when the sirens went off, which said that Hamas was sending rockets. Also, they were told the story that Hamas was sending balloons with candy and explosives. So when the balloon would come down, if the children would touch it, it would explode. It is disgusting.

For 11 days last month, we saw rockets rain down on Israel. As we watched Hamas terrorists target innocent

That is why I, along with Senators JONI ERNST, CINDY HYDE-SMITH, and MIKE BRAUN, introduced the Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act, which says that no funds will be authorized for the territory of Gaza until the President certifies to Congress that these funds can be spent without benefiting terrorist organizations.

The Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act also ensures U.S. funds are not authorized for expenditure in the territory of Gaza to any United Nations entity or office that the President cannot certify is not encouraging or teaching anti-Israel and anti-Semitic ideas and propaganda.

Recently, a European Union report was released showing Palestinian Authority textbooks in U.N.-supported schools encourage violence against Israelis, including anti-Semitic messages. And just last week, a tunnel reportedly dug by Hamas was found underneath a Gaza school run by the U.N. agency for Palestinian refugees.

We can't allow this to continue. I am proud to lead my colleagues in saying the United States will not fund this destruction.

I yield to my colleague from Iowa, Senator JONI ERNST.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I thank Senator SCOTT, and I appreciate the time to speak today on this topic. Certainly, I am rising to also support the Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act.

The United States should no longer provide any recognition or resources to Hamas, a terrorist organization supplied by Iran disguised as a Palestinian political party. Hamas is a long-standing terrorist organization whose attacks and efforts against peace threaten the lives of civilians and innocents.

Using the population of Gaza as a human shield, Hamas fired more than 1,500 rockets into Israeli civilian areas in an unprovoked attack last month. The attack was not the action of a responsible political party but the violent outburst of an Iranian proxy bent on the destruction of Israel and peace.

Hamas's roots and rationale have very little to do with a broader struggle for freedom of worship or narrow land use disagreements. It is far simpler than that. Iran supplies rockets, and Hamas launches rockets on innocent Israelis because they share a common goal: eradication of the Jewish people in Israel. It is that simple.

Hamas couldn't be more clear in their goals. Their charter states:

There is no solution for the Palestinian question except through Jihad. There is no way out except by concentrating all powers and energies to face this Nazi, vicious Tatar invasion.

No mention of peace or advancement for people—Israel's defensive actions against a terror group that compares their people to Nazis and is dedicated to their destruction are to be expected. Self-defense and protection of citizens is a core responsibility of every coun-

try. Hamas attacked innocent civilians, fully expecting them to be attacked in return. Their plan was to purposely create civilian casualties.

We must be unequivocal in support for our ally. The President and Secretary of State must remain strong in American support to Israel and not lose sight of the true threat Hamas's backer, Iran, poses to Israel.

The administration must abandon its attempts to return to the deeply flawed nuclear agreement with Iran. Their attempt to return to the failed nuclear deal only emboldens Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Iran provides Hamas and other genocidal terrorist organizations with rocket systems, rocket parts, assembly training, and cash support every year. And Iran's goal mirrors that of Hamas: to wipe Israel off the map, bottom line.

Just as no country—Israel or otherwise—would tolerate such terrorism and aggression against its citizens, no true ally would turn their backs on a friend in their moment of need. They certainly would not continue funding the organization responsible for the attack. So now, more than ever, the United States must stand with its ally, condemn the attacks against Israel by Hamas, and affirm our commitment to support Israel's peace and security.

The Stop American Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act ensures no funding will be authorized to the territory of Gaza, the site of Hamas's headquarters, until the President certifies to Congress that these funds can be spent without benefiting terrorist organizations.

The United States must be clear in our unwavering commitment to our ally and ensure no American taxpayer dollar goes to Hamas ever again.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Florida for moving on this piece of legislation I am proud to support.

Again, thank you for your leadership on this.

I yield the floor back to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. And I yield to my colleague from Mississippi, Senator HYDE-SMITH.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, I join my colleagues today in defense of our longtime friend and trusted ally, Israel, and to argue that absolutely no American taxpayer dollars should be spent to benefit terrorist organizations.

Israel has no greater friend than the United States, and the Israeli people have long relied on assistance from the American people and other allies. It is an unshakeable bond based on mutual respect, shared democratic values, and common interests that existed long before the modern State of Israel was founded. We must continue to support and foster that relationship with everything we have as Israel faces growing threats from Hamas and other terrorist groups in the region.

As the annual appropriations process moves along, I am concerned, as are

many of my colleagues, that foreign aid—U.S. taxpayer dollars—could end up in the hands of those who have boldly proclaimed that their intent is to do harm to Israel and our interests in the region.

The most recent wave of violence in the Middle East makes it clear that our resources must be responsibly spent and kept out of the coffers of terrorist organizations and bad actors whose violence can be bankrolled by commandeering U.S. foreign aid.

The Biden administration admitted recently “there are no guarantees” our humanitarian assistance will reach the intended recipients. I believe it is our duty to guarantee this. It is imperative that we are certain that not a single cent of taxpayer money is spent to fund Hamas and its military arsenal.

In this effort, my colleagues and I have teamed up to ensure that safeguards are in place to make sure anti-American and anti-Israel groups do not continue down this dangerous path of radicalization and indoctrination at the expense of hard-working Americans.

The Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act, introduced by my friend Senator SCOTT of Florida, is common-sense legislation. It protects American assets and allies, while ensuring that not a penny of foreign aid is spent indoctrinating students abroad and bankrolling terrorist activities.

This is a nonpartisan issue. Americans do not support terrorism, so they certainly should not have to subsidize terrorism. We must take a stand against this barbarism and the harm it poses to most innocent civilians.

I simply cannot imagine why any of my colleagues—Republican, Democrat, or Independent—would oppose legislation that is fiscally responsible, morally sound, and in the best interest of our allies, servicemembers, and our future generations.

Finally, I believe we should recognize that American citizens feel the painful effects from the recent flareup of violence toward Israel. In tandem with the global unrest, we have witnessed the significant rise in anti-Semitic attacks largely fueled by old prejudices and accelerated by harmful political rhetoric. It is my fervent hope that we would dedicate ourselves to stopping anti-Semitic violence, to fortifying our determination to protect the State of Israel, and to promoting peaceful relations in the Middle East.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I want to thank my colleagues from Iowa and Mississippi for supporting me today in our effort to make sure that we do not ever fund Hamas.

I hope every single Member in this body can agree that the United States shouldn't fund terrorists with American taxpayer dollars—funding that could be used to kill Israelis—like I do.

I look forward to my colleagues joining me today to stand with Israel and against terrorism.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1899 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?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have real concerns my colleagues' efforts to subvert the legislative process and push through a bill without due consideration from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I know my distinguished colleague from Florida is very interested in these issues. I hope he would ask his leadership to put him on the committee because he consistently comes to the floor and wants to circumvent the committee. This is not the first time.

Let me be very clear: Hamas is a terrorist organization, and the terrorists who lead Hamas have no regard for human life, whether they be the life of innocent Israelis targeted by their rocket attacks or the Palestinian families they constantly put in harm's way.

Israel has every right and responsibility to defend herself from attacks against their civilians, and the United States does not, and will not, ever provide funding to Hamas. Neither of those statements are up for debate. In fact, I would argue that every single Member of this body agrees with those assertions.

Indeed, the Senate has a long history of carefully crafting foreign aid programs with robust oversight, as well as sanctions that target Hamas and its supporters. With that in mind, there is simply no reason this bill can't go through regular order and sustain a markup in the Foreign Relations Committee. I looked at the dates of introduction and then its subsequent referrals—less than 3 weeks. We have done it before, and we can do it again.

As the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have shown that I prioritize moving serious, bipartisan legislation. This bill in question is not a serious attempt at legislating; it is a partisan talking point.

Had the Senator from Florida, who is the chair of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, or any of the bill's sponsors had a genuine interest in asserting Congress's role in foreign policy and the hard work that goes into legislating, they would have gone through the regular order of the committee process. They did not.

Instead, I imagine they would rather relish in a tweet proclaiming that Democrats support taxpayer funding of

Hamas or oppose defending Israel. And all I can say to this is, enough abusing the United States-Israel relationship for partisan political purposes. It does damage to the United States. It does damage to the State of Israel.

I am proud of my legislative efforts to defend Israel for over three decades, and I would argue that the facts that these efforts have been bipartisan speak to the strength of the United States-Israel relationship. Both Republicans and Democrats share a long track record of working together to defend Israel's right to exist and legislating accountability for U.S. taxpayer dollars spent overseas. But we have to do the work, and I do believe there are Senators who are genuinely interested in working toward that goal.

The truth is, we already have a number of laws and regulations in place regarding the delivery of lifesaving humanitarian relief. As written, this bill, by way of example why we have bills go through the committee so they can be worked on, seems intended to ensure that nobody in Gaza could ever receive any of this support. The language is written so broadly that, for example, before delivering clean water or water infrastructure, the President would effectively have to certify that anyone related to Hamas would never drink that water or drink from a water fountain that carried that water. That is simply absurd.

I would welcome a robust discussion on the ways we can continue to ensure that taxpayer dollars intended for lifesaving humanitarian relief in Gaza and elsewhere can get to those who need it the most and certainly evade and avoid the hands of Hamas.

Let's remember why we invest in foreign aid programs in the first place. We do so in pursuit of our common humanity, of our values, and our own security interests. So let's recognize the political games being played on the floor today for what they are and reject them.

Because of all of those reasons, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I am glad my colleague has acknowledged his interest in helping Israel. Unfortunately, I am surprised that the—if my colleague had an interest, why didn't the Foreign Relations Committee take up the same resolution that the majority leader retook up in support of Israel basically saying that Israel had the right to defend itself and saying that Hamas was a terrorist organization? My colleague didn't.

This is a pretty simple bill. It basically just says, look, any foreign aid we are going to give to the Palestinian Authority, we are going to make sure it doesn't go to Hamas. It is pretty simple.

Let's remember why we are doing this. President Biden's State Department said:

We're going to be working in partnership with the United Nations and the Palestinian Authority to kind of channel aid there in a manner that does its best to go to the people of Gaza.

That should scare us.

It went on to say:

As we have seen in life, as we all know in life, there are no guarantees, but we're going to do everything that we can to ensure that this assistance reaches the people who need it the most.

That is not much of a guarantee. That is a "maybe we will try." We can do better. The Senate should do better. Republicans and Democrats should all say that not a dime will ever go to Hamas, a terrorist organization that kills little boys like Ido. We should all be disgusted with this.

So I am very disappointed that my colleague uses a procedural matter to say he objects, but basically what he is saying is he will not agree that this money will not go to Hamas. This was really simple. You could read this in just 2 minutes.

I am disappointed that my Democratic colleague has made this political. It is not political. It is about, do we support Israel? Are we going to make sure that never a dime goes to Hamas and another little boy like Ido dies?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NOMINATION OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, the Senate will be voting tomorrow on the nomination of Tommy Beaudreau to serve as the Deputy Secretary of the Interior. If confirmed, he will play a critical role in managing our Nation's public lands, our natural resources, our national parks, our wildlife areas, and the Outer Continental Shelf. He will oversee the management of the largest water supply in the West, and he will also oversee our Nation's trust responsibilities to American Indian Tribes and Alaska Natives. He will be responsible for the multiple uses of our public lands.

One of the most important roles that he will fulfill is overseeing the development of traditional and renewable energy supplies on public lands and waters.

Energy production on public lands is the engine of Wyoming's economy. It creates good-paying jobs. It provides tremendous revenue for the State, and we use the essential services of the State funded by this, like public education.

Mr. Beaudreau has extensive experience at the Department of the Interior. He served in a leadership position during the Obama administration. As an attorney in the private sector, he regularly handled matters relating to the Department. He is an expert in his field. His qualifications are clear. It is also clear from his nomination hearing

that he understands America's needs for an "all of the above" energy strategy. That strategy must include coal, oil, natural gas, nuclear power, and renewables.

I appreciated his commitment to working with members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The Department needs to listen and collaborate with the people of Wyoming and the West. These are the States that rely heavily on energy production on our public lands. We are the States that power America. We are the ones that will be hit the hardest by President Biden's punishing Executive orders. This administration has unleashed a barrage of Executive actions that threaten to destroy the livelihoods of oil, natural gas, and coal workers in the West. It is critical that Mr. Beaudreau keep those Americans at the forefront of his mind as he works at the Department. He can serve as a voice of reason in an administration that is waging a war on American energy workers.

My goal is to hold Mr. Beaudreau and the Biden administration accountable to the commitments that Mr. Beaudreau has made to our committee, and I will support his nomination.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Madam President, on another topic, I come to the floor today in support of America's police officers. Every weekend, I go home to Wyoming. Every weekend, people ask me about three issues: the President's attacks on American energy, the crisis at our southern border, and the Democrats' defunding the police.

People see the headlines. They see the images on the news. They have heard about looting and rioting, the violence in Democrat-run cities. They are deeply concerned.

Last year, 63 of America's 66 largest cities saw increases in one or more categories of violent crimes. On average, homicides are up by one-third in just 1 year. Since President Biden took office, these increases have continued in Democrat-run cities. In the first 3 months of this year, homicides went up in Washington, DC; Oakland, CA; Philadelphia; Chicago; and Baltimore, just to name a few. It is no wonder that the American people tell pollsters that they feel less safe today than they did 1 year ago.

The Democratic crime surge is especially shocking because it is a reversal of a long-term trend. For a quarter of a century, crime in America had been going down. The violent crime rate was cut in half. The murder rate was also cut in half. It was a historic, bipartisan accomplishment.

Then, in 2014, Democrats began their war on law enforcement officers. After Michael Brown was killed in Ferguson, MO, Democrats started attacking police. Crime suddenly went up in Democratic cities. In the final 2 years of the Obama-Biden administration, the murder rate went up by one-fifth. Violent crime overall went up by nearly 7 percent.

Then Republicans took back the White House and the Congress. We stopped the war on law enforcement, and crime went down again.

Last year, Democrats began a repeat of 2014. This time, it was on a much larger scale. Democrats began attacking police again. Crime went up again in Democrat-run cities. America's cities saw the largest increase in murder on record.

My Democratic colleagues might say it is a coincidence. Yet there is a very clear chain of events: Democrats attack police. They cut police funding. The number of police officers went down. Crime went up.

We had a chance to fix the problem in law enforcement. Senator TIM SCOTT introduced a police reform bill, which I strongly support. Yet the Democrats blocked it. Time and again, Democrats put criminals ahead of police and law-abiding citizens. Innocent people continue to pay the price.

Democrats spend trillions and trillions of our tax dollars. Yet they cut funding to police, to law enforcement. Last year alone, Democrats cut more than \$1 billion worth of police funding. This includes cutting funding in cities where violent crime went up.

Police have been retiring or quitting in historic numbers. Fewer police officers means more crime, more destruction, and more fear in our cities.

The American people deserve better. The American people deserve safety and peace of mind. It is time for the Democrats to stop attacking the police. It is time for the Democrats to stop wasting taxpayer dollars on liberal spending. It is time for Democrats to start paying attention to public safety.

I say to my Democratic colleagues, the vast majority of police officers in this country are heroes. They put their lives on the line for us every day. It is time to treat them with respect.

When Democrats wage their war on the men and women who dedicate their lives to law enforcement, only criminals win. The rest of our Nation loses. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise to once again call for this entire body to have the opportunity to consider and cast their votes on the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act. This commonsense reform would ensure that people in the military who have been subjected to sexual assault and other serious crimes get the justice they deserve.

I have been calling for a full vote on the floor on this bill since May 24. That was 23 days ago. Since then, an estimated 1,288 servicemembers will have been raped or sexually assaulted. Two in three of the survivors will not even report it because they know they are more likely to face retaliation than to receive justice.

Today I want to share the story of the kind of offender our bill would address.

On March 30 of this year, SSG Randall Hughes pled guilty to a series of rapes dating back to 2006 that he committed while the Army looked the other way. Staff Sergeant Hughes was only brought to justice after his brave daughter decided to come forward. Had the Army prosecuted him the first time one of his victims had come forward, his daughter may have been spared.

At a Super Bowl party in 2017, Staff Sergeant Hughes fed drinks to his host, a soldier under his care, until the host passed out. He then approached his host's wife while she was outside the house. He propositioned her for sex, and when she refused, he forced himself on her against their grill outside their house and then dragged her inside their house, where he raped her—all while the husband was passed out in the next room.

The survivor hid in her bathroom until she could report the ordeal to CID the next day. CID took a year to investigate a relatively straightforward rape allegation. The command did nothing to expedite the investigation or hold CID's feet to the fire.

CID determined that the allegations were credible, but the command did nothing. Instead of prosecuting him, the command put Staff Sergeant Hughes on the sergeant first class promotion list.

Hopeless, the survivor asked that something, anything, be done. The command reacted by putting an administrative remark in his record.

Staff Sergeant Hughes was transferred to a new duty station, Fort Dix. While at Fort Dix, after years of sexual abuse, his daughter bravely came forward to report that abuse. CID at Fort Dix then noticed the administrative remark in his record from the previous rape and began making inquiries. They learned he had raped two other women and physically abused his wife.

The command had every tool available to stop Staff Sergeant Hughes from his serial rapes, including the abuse of his own daughter, but instead they turned a blind eye and did nothing. Even after he admitted to his crime and pled guilty, the Army offered a plea deal of 13 years of confinement—13 years of confinement despite sexually assaulting three women, including a minor. This serial offender avoided justice for 15 years. Even when the command was forced to administer justice, he received a sentence less than we would give a drug offender.

This case is why we need a professional military justice system worthy of the sacrifices the men and women in our military make every day. Having leadership at the top that truly cares and that is truly passionate about prosecuting sexual abuse will have repercussions down the chain. Our bill does exactly this.

We have 66 Senators who have co-sponsored this bill. It deserves a vote on the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, once again, I object to the request from the Senator from New York for the reasons I have previously stated, and I will repeat again what I have said publicly and what I have committed to.

I support removing prosecution of sexual assault, the types of crimes that Senator GILLIBRAND discussed, from the chain of command. But her bill goes further to include crimes not related to sexual assault. The removal of sexual assault crimes from the chain of command will be an historic change in the military justice system and one which Senator GILLIBRAND can claim great responsibility for effecting. We must take care, however, that we do it thoughtfully, in a manner that does not break the military justice system.

The worst thing we can do to victims of sexual assault is to move a bill through that can't be implemented effectively or on time, creates too large a workload for too few qualified military judge advocates, imperils prosecutions, leads to convictions being overturned on appeal, or results in neglected cases because the necessary attention cannot be devoted to them.

According to the Department of Defense, the number of full-time colonels, lawyer disposition authorities required to execute the system as proposed, which would take effect 180 days from enactment, exceeds the number of judge advocates in that senior grade. And this doesn't account for her bill's requirement that these O-6 judge advocates have significant trial and criminal law experience or that they would not then be available for other important assignments reserved for O-6s, such as military judges and division, corps, or combatant command judge advocates.

The heads of the service Judge Advocate General's Corps have previously raised concerns about the implementation timeline, the resources necessary to execute, and a host of other inconsistencies with the current system that would have to be addressed to be sure of successful implementation. These are the very military lawyers that Senator GILLIBRAND's bill would empower to make prosecutorial decisions, which includes an evaluation of a far greater number of cases than simply those that end up in court-martial. These are the

issues that we need discuss in the committee and not dispose of in an amendment on the floor. The committee will do this and do it faithfully. And I am very confident that we will be able to move legislation that does remove any crimes related to sexual misconduct from the current command to a system that Senator GILLIBRAND is proposing.

With that, I would reiterate my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. As you heard from the chairman of the committee, he only intends on taking one crime out of the chain of command, and that is sexual assault. And the reason why that is so problematic is, No. 1, it will continue to undermine women in the military, marginalize them and isolate them, creating a "pink court" that all legal experts have agreed would be highly ineffective and would harm the military justice system.

Second, our allies have already made this move. They have taken all serious crimes out of the chain of command and given it to trained military prosecutors in the UK, Israel, Germany, Netherlands, and Australia. In those instances, they did it specifically for defendants' rights. And we have a similar problem in this country because right now we have a great deal of racial bias in who gets punished.

If you are Black or Brown in the U.S. military today, you are 2.5 times more likely to be punished. And most commanders are White commanders. There is further data that shows most Black and Brown servicemembers have either experienced or witnessed racism within the ranks.

If we want to fix this criminal justice system, you need a bright line, and it should be at all serious crimes. That is how we fix the military justice system. That is how we give justice to sexual assault survivors.

And for the chairman to say today that it would cost too much money or that they don't have sufficient resources or sufficient lawyers, it isn't true. And those are the same arguments that were used over the last 8 years about excluding sexual assault from the chain of command as well.

So I don't think these are legitimate arguments. I think they are brought up year after year as just a way to put an impediment in front of the reform that is needed to fix the system.

I now yield the floor to my colleague Senator GRASSLEY.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Senator GILLIBRAND, as 1 of the 65 other cosponsors of this legislation, I think you are to be commended for every day coming to the floor, to be as consistent in being for this legislation as you have been since 2013. And every one of us thank you for your persistence. You need to be congratulated. And all the people who have been harmed by sexual assaults over the last decades owe you a great deal of gratitude for that.

So I am here to join Senator GILLIBRAND in asking for a vote on this cru-

cial legislation. And, obviously, today we aren't going to get it, but eventually it is going to happen. You can't say no to 66 Senators that want this legislation. The Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act has that many bipartisan cosponsors, and it is past time for this bill to become law.

This legislation was first introduced by Senator GILLIBRAND and me and other Senators 8 years ago and has gained more and more support each year. Senators who previously were skeptical have come around and realized that the Department of Defense can't handle the pervasive problems of sexual assault on their own.

The Armed Services Committee and the Department of Defense have had more than enough time to consider this idea. They have told us that they have it under control and tried other approaches. Those approaches have not worked. Women and men in the military continue to face high rates of sexual assault and retaliation. It is clear this bill is needed.

By moving the decision to prosecute out of the chain of command, perpetrators of sexual assault and other serious crimes will be held accountable. Survivors will have more confidence in the process. Retaliation will be less likely. We have been waiting almost a decade. There is no need any longer to wait. I urge my colleagues to allow this bill to move forward today. And, obviously, it isn't going to move forward today, but Senator GILLIBRAND will be back here tomorrow, asking the same thing. And I applaud you for doing that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UTAH

Mr. LEE. Madam President, 100 years ago, in 1921, a young and newly married couple named Percy and Verabel Knudson saw the need for a gathering place in their community. Knowing they could make money selling ice cream and candy, they started Idle Isle Ice Cream and Candy Store.

A few years later, after raising the necessary funds, Percy and Verabel Knudson—with the help of David H. Call and his wife LaRita—shifted their business from sweets to full-service meals, and Idle Isle Cafe was born.

Over the course of the last century, Idle Isle Cafe has endured remarkable events in history and served important people. It survived the difficulties of the Great Depression and World War II, all while serving locals and national celebrities alike, including Wallace Beery, Charlie Chaplin, Clark Gable, Carole Lombard, and Paulette Goddard.

During the fifties, Idle Isle even served "The Duke" himself, Mr. John Wayne, who stopped in on a number of occasions while visiting Utah on hunting trips and movie shoots.

In those years, the cafe also served as a meeting place for members of the Brigham City unit of the Utah National Guard, who were later called to

serve their country in the Korean war. Idle Isle Cafe has endured both good times and bad over the last century. But whatever the times, it has always been a place where people from every walk of life could share a meal, enjoy friendship, and bear one another's burdens as they endured the ups and downs of life together.

As the cafe celebrates its 100-year anniversary this year, it is worth recognizing all the good that it has done for Utah and for Brigham City. Of course, bearing one another's burdens is one of the things that Utahns do best.

Travis and Jana Porter, the current owners of Idle Isle Cafe, epitomized this spirit. Everyone who befriends or works with the Porters quickly sees their love of community and their dedication to their country. Nearly everything they do, both inside of the restaurant and outside, stems from their passion for helping others and their optimistic outlook on life.

Even with their five kids and the business of running the restaurant, the couple finds intentional time each day to love and serve those who work in the cafe and all who come to visit. As a result of their service, Idle Isle Cafe endures.

We, as Utahns, are engaged in the work of enduring together. In fact, the State's economy is so robust, in large part, because neighbors care for neighbors, friends care for friends, and strangers even look out for strangers. It doesn't matter who you are. In Utah, you belong. Whether in the cafe or the community, there is a place for you at the table. Our doors are open. So, too, are our hearts. You see, Utah is one of these places where it doesn't matter how long your family has been in the State or whether you have been here for 5 minutes; to us, you are a Utahn.

The endearing spirit of Utah is not inspired by government. No, it is inspired by moms and dads, teachers, small business owners, friends, and neighbors.

Earlier this year, when neighbors in West Valley City were overwhelmed at the prospect of revamping and reclaiming their community, an opportunity presented itself. Aging homes, with peeling paint and cracked up driveways, broken fences, and neglected yards, needed to be refinished. So in typical Utah fashion, neighbors came together.

After identifying problems, reviewing resources, and communicating with community leaders, an initiative was born—Operation My Hometown. Operation My Hometown is a neighborhood improvement coalition made up of residents, city workers, and volunteers from various churches and other organizations. It runs entirely on private initiative and volunteerism, two of Utah's hallmark strengths. Their process is simple: see something in need of repair, note it and join the group to help fix it and then, of course, fix it.

Repair requests can be submitted online, and anyone can help. The projects

are significant. And, quite remarkably, they are being completed. To quote one news report:

Six days a week, the church is converting its meetinghouse in the neighborhood into a community center. Corporations are donating cash and goods. A new park is planned. The city is adding street lights. Funds are being raised to finance home ownership. And volunteers are streaming in from all over the Salt Lake Valley to work side by side with residents.

Neighborhood resident, Bonnie Shaw, stated:

I am so encouraged, so hopeful, so blessed. I can't even believe this is happening.

Another resident, Nickolaus Orwin, shared, as follows:

We live in a strange world these days. We hear this ideology that if you don't look like me, talk like me, act like me and vote like me, then we must be enemies, but throughout all of this social upheaval . . . this community has worked together and served one another in such a brilliant and beautiful way that it just defies the ideology that we're different and we have to segregate ourselves out into groups. Even in the dark days of COVID . . . this community service was such a bright, shiny star. Through all of that hard, we have this, this really beautiful and safe community service that was happening.

It has been said that "the greatness of a community is most accurately measured by the compassionate actions of its members." If that is the case, then Utah is truly a great place.

To honor this tradition of greatness, I myself am grateful to host the annual Flavors of Utah event in partnership with Operation My Hometown in West Valley City later this summer. My office has partnered with this and other great community groups to collect food from local producers and distribute it to those in need. I encourage other Utahns to join me in this effort as we together look for opportunity to thrive.

The spirit of Utah, the enduring spirit of Utah, is borne from a rich history of hard work, industry, innovation, and ingenuity—even against great hardship. Few individuals embody this spirit more than the late Obert Clark Tanner.

Born in Farmington, UT, in 1904, O.C. Tanner was the youngest of 10 children. Despite his position in the family, from a young age, Tanner felt an obligation to provide for his family. He did so by performing odd jobs around the city, including stoking furnaces. One of the people for whom Tanner stoked the furnace was a jeweler. The jeweler became a friend and a mentor to Tanner and, with time, schooled the young Tanner in the jewelry business. Tanner was a quick study. He swiftly implemented the lessons taught to him and began selling graduation pins and class rings from the back of his car.

In 1927, he officially founded the O.C. Tanner Company. Though still an undergraduate student at the University of Utah, he used what little time he had outside of his classwork to make ends meet—and make ends meet, he did. The company quickly grew and en-

dured the difficulties that put others out of business.

Throughout the years, the enduring spirit of O.C. Tanner has been a guiding light and inspiration to many, and the company has achieved truly great heights.

In 2002, the O.C. Tanner Company crafted the medals for the Winter Olympics, which were hosted in Salt Lake City. In 2019, O.C. Tanner designed a copper spike replica of the original golden spike that was ceremonially driven at the joining of the two branches of the first transcontinental railroad.

Today, the O.C. Tanner Company maintains offices in the United States, Canada, England, Singapore, Australia, and India. The company is one of the largest manufacturers of retail and corporate awards in the United States, and it employs over 1,500 people.

Through the dark nights of hardship, O.C. Tanner has endured and even succeeded, thrived. Through the difficulties of community building, the volunteers of Operation MyHometown endure, and they are succeeding.

Through 100 years of historic highs and unforgettable lows, the Idle Isle Cafe endures and, yes, the cafe is succeeding too. As goes the saying, those who endure conquer.

Similar to O.C. Tanner, volunteers of Operation MyHometown, the Idle Isle Cafe, and all Utahns have endured the difficulties of the last year with utmost faith and fortitude, and they are emerging victorious. The enduring spirit of Utah is strong.

The 2020 pandemic, earthquakes, civic discord, confusion, and contention presented daunting challenges in the lives of all, and yet Utahns are breathing a collective sigh of relief as we embrace the shining horizon that lies yet ahead.

Since the onset of the virus over a year ago, Utahns have seen near-continual drop in unemployment. Utah's unemployment rate fell to 2.8 percent in April—less than half the national number.

Though earthquakes shook homes and businesses last year, Utah's economy has still been rated the best in the United States by several nationally recognized outlets. And while the discord, confusion, and contention seem to dominate the airwaves, Utah's citizens have banded together to bridge the partisan divides that can be so difficult to overcome.

Utah and Utahns are remarkable.

If you are seeking a place to start a business, ask those at Idle Isle Cafe. Utah is the place.

If you are seeking a place where community matters, ask those at Operation MyHometown. Utah is the place.

If you are seeking a place where opportunity is abundant, read the story of O.C. Tanner. Utah is the place.

I am very grateful for the privilege of representing the State of Utah here in the U.S. Senate. It is my hope that the successes and the enduring spirit of

Utah will continue to serve as an example for the Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Texas.

JUNETEENTH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate moved a historic bill one step closer to President Biden's desk. The Senate unanimously passed legislation to finally make Juneteenth a Federal holiday and to preserve the legacy of that momentous day for generations to come.

For more than a century, Texans have celebrated Juneteenth and commemorated the anniversary of the day slaves in Texas were first informed of the news that they were, indeed, free. President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, but the news didn't reach Texas for 2½ years, until June 19, 1865.

We were the first State to make Juneteenth a holiday and, of course, it commemorates an event that occurred in Galveston, TX. But over the last four decades, many other States have joined us.

It is finally time to recognize Juneteenth as a national holiday. I reintroduced this bipartisan bill with the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator MARKEY, this year, and I have been proud to work alongside my fellow Texan Congresswoman, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, in the House to get the bill passed and signed into law. The bill now heads to the House and according to Congressman STENY HOYER, the House will actually pass it today.

I will have more to say about the history and significance of Juneteenth tomorrow, but for now, I want to thank the dozens of Senators on both sides of the aisle who have supported this effort. I think, particularly now at this point in our Nation's history, a little reconciliation can go a long way.

It is also an opportunity to learn from our past. America is the greatest Nation in the world, but we are not perfect and, indeed, the original sin of slavery when this country was created has caused this country a lot of angst, death, and injustice over the years. We fought a civil war, and 600,000 Americans died. If you extrapolated that to current population, that would be like 3 million Americans dying.

Of course, we went through the civil rights movement in the sixties, and, of course, the latest manifestation of racial strife is the unfortunate killing of people like George Floyd and the lack of trust that exists between some law enforcement and the communities that they serve.

While America is not perfect, we continue to do the work to strive to be "a more perfect Union," in the words of the Constitution.

IRAN

Mr. President, this Friday, Iran will hold its 13th Presidential election, but unlike Presidential elections in the United States or in any other legitimate democracy, this process in Iran is

more about providing the appearance of a democracy than an actual democratic process.

In America, elections are conduits for change. If the American people don't like their elected officials or the direction of their government, they can change it. In Iran, elections are a sham. The candidates are hand selected, the result predetermined, and the opportunity for change nonexistent.

The process for electing the President of Iran is just a few steps shy of the fabricated elections in places like Iraq under Saddam Hussein. In 2002, Saddam won reelection by 11 million votes—11 million to 0—and there was reported to be 100 percent turnout. In fact, there weren't any other candidates running. In fact, the question on the ballot asked if Saddam should remain in office, check yes or no.

It reminds me of the story I heard about that time of a reporter traveling with a driver whom he had hired to drive him around Iraq to report on conditions there. The reporter asked—when he learned that there was 100-percent turnout and Saddam Hussein won by 100 percent of the votes, he said to this driver: Well, you have been with me; how did you vote? And he said: Saddam must have known what was in my heart.

That, to me, is maybe apocryphal, but a demonstration how even the dictators like Saddam Hussein, even the Ayatollah in Iran, still want to give the appearance of democracy, even though they deny it to their very own people.

In Iran, the situation isn't much different than the election under Saddam Hussein. It is just a larger effort to create the appearance of choices.

While the Iranian people may vote for the eventual winner, there is a highly controlled process that selects the pool of candidates, and the puppeteer behind the curtain is the Supreme Leader, Ali Khamenei.

Unlike a true democracy, the candidates for President of Iran are not selected by the Iranian people. They are selected behind closed doors by a powerful group called the Guardian Council. This group, itself, is comprised of 12 people. Half are selected by the Supreme Leader and the other half are selected by the Parliament.

But Parliament can't select just anyone for this position. These six jurists are chosen from the options presented to the Parliament by the Chief Justice, and the Chief Justice—you might have guessed—is appointed by the Supreme Leader.

This contrived election is not the result of a fair and democratic process. So the candidates hardly represent the will of the Iranian people. Of the 592 registered candidates, only 7 were approved by the Guardian Council—5 conservatives and 2 so-called reformists.

The Guardian Council, in fact, prevented most reformists or moderate candidates from even participating in

the race, and the candidate pool was carefully whittled down to a point that the outcome is virtually a known certainty.

All signs point to the eventual winner being Ebrahim Raisi, the favorite of the Supreme Leader and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. It is easy to see why Mr. Raisi is the chosen front man for the corrupt leaders of a brutal regime, because his resume is nothing less than a long list of atrocities. Mr. Raisi's first step to power came after the 1979 Revolution.

Throughout the 1980s, he gained more power and influence and the trust of the Ayatollah. In 1988, he was chosen to be one of the four members of the so-called "death commission" charged with carrying out executions of Iranians' political prisoners. Mr. Raisi played a central role in these executions, which took place over the course of 5 months.

It is difficult for us to be sure how many political prisoners were killed, but it is widely known to be in the thousands. Some believe the death toll could be as high as 30,000 from these death commissions.

Mr. Raisi's reign of terror did not stop there. He continued to serve in high-ranking positions throughout the government and inflict violence on dissidents. He currently serves as the Judiciary Chief, where he continues to direct the execution of protesters and ethnic minority groups. Once again, this mass murderer is expected to be the next President of Iran.

This election comes at a very precarious time for the regime. Iran has experienced major uprisings since the last election in 2017. Popular slogans included: "Death to the dictator" and "Our enemy is right here; they lie when they say it is America."

Iranian citizens place the responsibility for the economic crisis that the country is currently experiencing on the regime that controls the country. The vast majority of Iranians live below the poverty line, and the government's pathetic mishandling of COVID-19 has made already harsh circumstances even more unbearable.

The Iranian people know this election is a sham. Candidates approved by the Supreme Leader offer no window for the freedoms and change that they desperately want and desperately need.

The Iranian resistance has called for an all-out boycott of the elections, and turnout is expected to be the lowest since the 1979 Islamic Revolution.

For the United States and our allies, this changing of the guard cannot be just a blip on the radar, because Iran continues to commit human rights abuses and back terrorist organizations and authoritarian figures, including dictators around the world.

Currently, two Iranian warships are making their way across the Atlantic, and we have reason to believe that these ships are carrying missile-equipped fast-attack boats and other military equipment to Venezuela.

Whether this is a test or a threat or an effort to seek some kind of leverage remains to be seen, but what is abundantly clear is that Iran has no intention of taking its foot off the gas.

Over the past 2 months, U.S. military assets in Iraq have been attacked by drones laden with explosives, and all signs point to the responsibility being on Iranian-backed militias. Just last month, the world watched in horror as the conflict between Israel and Palestine gave way to more violence and destruction than we have seen in years. This was a proxy war waged by Iran against the Jewish State. Hamas—that proxy—receives significant financial support from Iran, which is the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

Now take these actions over the past few months, and add that to what we have seen over the last several years. Iran has arrested and continues to detain American citizens. It engages in gross human rights abuses. It backs terrorists around the world. We have also watched as Iran has blatantly ignored the restrictions on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the so-called JCPOA, which is designed to prevent Iran from enriching uranium and building a nuclear weapon.

During the time that it violated the terms of the JCPOA, Iran was led by President Hassan Rouhani, broadly considered to be a moderate when compared to his expected successor. Following this election, Iran's already extreme President will be replaced by an even more punishing leader. The United States cannot simply stand by and enable Iran to continue down its current path.

In recent years, Iran has felt significant pressure from the United States and our allies. The Trump administration withdrew from the Iran nuclear deal and placed sanctions on hundreds of businesses and individuals who helped finance Iran's illicit activities, and there is no question that Iran stood the most to lose from the historic Abraham peace accords that were brokered this last year. This took a number of Arab countries that were nominally adversaries, and they joined together to declare their willingness to let Israel live in peace and to recognize it as a legitimate state.

The Biden administration has already loosened the pressure valve on Iran. President Biden has made it clear his intent to revive the Iranian nuclear deal no matter what the cost. At the same time, the administration has rolled back sanctions that would have provided the U.S. maximum leverage to bring Iran to the negotiating table.

By simply signaling his intent, the Biden administration has already emboldened and encouraged Iran's malign activities. Iran did not play by the rules of the JCPOA the first time around, so there is absolutely no reason to believe that this will change when a radical mass murderer assumes the Presidency.

Over the last few days, the leaders of the G7 have reaffirmed the need to stop

Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. I agree that this is one of the most critical responsibilities of our time, but a flawed agreement that relieves pressure on Iran, without concessions, with regard to its nuclear weapon aspiration will only continue to embolden the regime. Iran's belligerence cannot be rewarded with sanctions relief, and the administration should not continue to squander our leverage.

The Biden administration needs to resume the maximum pressure campaign on Iran, and I would encourage the President to work closely with us in Congress to identify an approach that is effective, comprehensive, and built on bipartisan foundations. We have to stop Iran from ever achieving a nuclear weapons capability.

I asked the Director of National Intelligence, Avril Haines, during her confirmation hearing: Should the United States prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon? She said: Yes. She didn't hesitate.

I asked Ambassador Burns, the new CIA Director, the same question: Should we let Iran get a nuclear weapon? He said "no" without hesitation.

I find that encouraging from these two new members of President Biden's Cabinet, but we need to work together, as Republicans and Democrats, as Members of Congress, with the administration to ensure that our efforts to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons can last beyond the term of a single President or Congress.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the escalating crisis on our southern border.

I am the ranking Republican, the senior Republican, on the Homeland Security Committee, which is a committee that has, among other things, oversight over what happens at the Department of Homeland Security and therefore at the border and with the Customs and Border Patrol and has other responsibilities. We have been looking at this issue carefully over the past few months. We have been trying to figure out how we can address this surge at the border that is really overwhelming the Border Patrol.

It is obviously about people, but it is also about drugs. Unfortunately, there are more and more drugs coming over the southern border as well, which, in effect, makes States like mine, Ohio—which is not on the southern border; we are actually on the northern border—part of the border, in effect, because we are affected by what happens down there.

At one time, most of the most deadly drug, fentanyl, which is a synthetic opioid, was coming from China. Frankly, a lot of it was coming from the mail system, from our own Postal Service. We passed legislation here in this body. I have worked with Republicans and Democrats alike on it, and we have largely been able to deal with that issue, but those same drugs have now moved to Mexico, and now they are coming across our southern border. So, if you look at the amount of fentanyl and other synthetic opioids—again, the deadliest of all drugs at a time when more people are dying from overdoses in our country than ever in history—more and more of that is coming across the southern border in addition to the cocaine and crystal meth and other dangerous drugs that were already coming.

This is about the immigration system not working properly and having a huge surge of individuals—family members, unaccompanied kids. It is also about not having control of that border and having this contraband come over—in the case of these dangerous drugs—that is actually resulting in overdoses and deaths all over the United States, including in my State of Ohio.

So how can we tell that it is getting worse? I would just look at these numbers here. This is the latest from the Customs and Border Protection folks of its encounters at the southwest border.

Remember, we had a crisis in May of 2019, which was deemed to be the worst crisis of its kind, and it was pretty bad. We had a lot of unaccompanied kids coming at that time and a lot of family members as well as individuals. The high point was here at 144,000 individuals. We are now, as of May of 2021, which was last month, at 180,000.

Some of my colleagues have said: Well, it is getting better. I don't see that it is getting better, and the numbers don't say it is getting better. It is really at the point now where it is overwhelming those people whose jobs are to try to control the border. They just don't have the resources to be able to handle this.

It is also overwhelming our system all the way through. A lot of this is of families and kids coming in, as an example, and we don't have the facilities to take care of these children.

During this first period of time—here is the Biden inauguration. After the inauguration, this huge increase started to happen, and it was because policies were changed. A new President who is coming in has the right to change policies, but in my view, what a President doesn't have the right to do is to change policies without preparing for it.

It is one thing to say we are not going to have an emergency on the southern border anymore and that we are going to do away with title 42—a provision that says, if you have somebody coming over the border during COVID, he can be turned back—and immediately the President is saying: No,

we are not going to use that anymore for unaccompanied kids. They have also now not used it for most families coming over. So not having title 42 was a shock to the system. You had a situation where people were being turned away because of COVID one day, and the next day, they were not, and you can see the result.

By the way, these are people who come from all over the world, but a lot come from the Northern Triangle countries—the countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras.

Recently, the President of Honduras talked about this, and I know the President of Guatemala has talked about it. What the President of Guatemala has said, in essence, is that the traffickers, the smugglers, heard this. So they came down to our country and said: Let's go to the northern border and make that difficult and arduous journey—it is sometimes a very dangerous journey for these children—because the Biden administration has said that there would no longer be this title 42 in place so that we can turn you away at the border. In fact, he said: We want to reunite families and kids, and that means come to the border, and you can come into the country. That is what has happened.

Look, I believe we ought to have a legal immigration system that is very healthy in this country. I believe in immigration. I think it is a very important part of who we are as Americans. We take more people in legally every year than any other country in the world, and that is over a million people a year. I think that has been good for our country. It is part of the fabric of our society. We should want immigrants to come but to come in a legal and orderly way.

And not only is this surge overwhelming the border, but it is really not fair to all of those people who have been waiting in line for years and years to come to our country from a country like El Salvador or Honduras or Guatemala or Mexico, for that matter, people who want to come legally, people who are reuniting with their families legally here or have skills that we want in this country. We should encourage that. But this is happening in a way that is not orderly, and it is happening because there has been a change in policy.

The other big change in policy is that if you come, people were told—this is after the inauguration—then if you apply for asylum, meaning that you have a credible fear of persecution back home, so you apply for asylum, you will be allowed to come into the country. In other words, there won't be an adjudication of that. There won't be a decision made. Whether you apply properly or not, you will be told you can come into the country.

So I went down to the border a couple months ago and was able to go there with Secretary Mayorkas and my colleague on the committee, Senator PETERS, who is the Democratic chair-

man of the committee, so it was a bipartisan group, and at that point, we were just overwhelmed with these children. At that point, the Border Patrol stations and the border detention facilities, which were primarily built, frankly, for single adults and were never built for long-term detention, were overwhelmed with children. You had children sleeping side by side during COVID—none of them being tested for COVID, by the way—and they didn't have blankets. They had sheets, essentially, that are—you know, no real warmth or padding. They were sleeping on the ground with pads underneath them. The system just couldn't handle it.

Now, at this point, most of those children are out of the Border Patrol system, and they are into the HHS system. HHS is the Agency that is supposed to take care of these kids. They can only be in the Border Patrol custody for a short period of time. That was being violated. They were staying there much longer than they were supposed to under law, but there was no place else for them to go. So now there have been HHS facilities that have been built and opened, and these HHS facilities are taking care of these kids.

I will say that some of my colleagues would say: Well, this is great news. You know, we have fewer children in Border Patrol custody; that is good. But they are still in American Government custody; they just switched from Border Patrol to HHS.

HHS has had a very hard time staffing up, and there have been, as you know, allegations of abuse. Some of these contracts that have been given to the private sector to run these HHS facilities have not been done in a proper way, and it has caused problems.

A lot of the people who were down there on the border helping with these kids do not have the right training. They are not trained to take care of kids—including, by the way, a lot of government employees who have volunteered to go down. God bless them. They are getting paid to go down there rather than do their work here in Washington, as an example, but they don't have the training.

So this creates a lot of issues, as you can imagine, when you have thousands and thousands of these kids showing up in unprecedented numbers. So that is what we are seeing on the border because of changes in policy.

Another change in policy that was made was not only were we no longer going to turn people away because of COVID without putting anything in its place to deal with all these claims, but, instead, there was a policy called the "Remain in Mexico" policy or the Migrant Protocol policy. Under that policy, people who came as families and applied for asylum were told: Fine, but you have to wait in Mexico rather than wait in the United States for your asylum claim to be adjudicated.

Frankly, a lot of those people ended up going back home because they were

not brought into the United States, into the interior, as I said earlier, as the vast majority of people have been. They were instead told: You have got to wait in Mexico. They chose instead to go back to their home, mostly in Central America, rather than wait in Mexico. Those cases, once adjudicated, those people could come back and enter into our country if they were successful in their court case.

But this system is not working. If a trafficker or a smuggler goes to a family in Central America or elsewhere—there are a lot of immigrants now coming from other countries, including all over Latin America, Ecuador, and Nicaragua and other places. They say: Look, if you come with us, give me a lot of money as a trafficker, thousands of dollars, and if these kids come with me or you come with me as a family, we will get you into America, and you will have the opportunity to stay in America.

You know what, I have to say tonight on the floor of the U.S. Senate that those smugglers and traffickers are probably telling the truth, and that is the problem, because when they come to the border and they claim asylum, then instead of having that be adjudicated there at the border and determined—or saying: You need to wait on the other side of the border until we adjudicate this—what I would do on our side of the border, I would do the adjudications right there rapidly. Instead, they are saying: OK. Here is a bus pass or here is a plane ticket. Go to the interior of the United States. Go to your hometown, wherever it is, whoever is listening tonight—my hometown is Cincinnati, OH—go to Washington, DC, wherever, and then wait for your court case. You need to check in periodically.

Those court cases and the adjudications take years—on average, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 years, depending on who you talk to. Because a lot of these cases are appealed, that is maybe where you get to the 7 or 8 years. So that is a long period of time, right, when you are in the United States awaiting your court case. Why? Because there is a backlog—a huge backlog—of over a million cases. I think it is more like 1.3 million now. So that huge backlog and the lack of resources that have been devoted to the system and the fact that just because you apply for asylum, you get to come into the United States gives the trafficker the ability to say that, to say: Just let your kids come with me or come with me as a family member. Pay me a lot of money.

Unfortunately, a lot of these individuals, including kids, women and girls, get abused on the trip north from mostly, again, the Northern Triangle countries—Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras up to Mexico. Obviously there are a lot of issues with crossing the border itself in terms of going across the desert, and there are some terrible stories.

But the point is, they know that when they get to the United States,

they are going to be told not that “You have to turn back,” not that “You have to stay here until we decide whether you actually are, you know, going to get asylum, whether you qualify for it,” but instead “Here is a bus ticket. Here is a plane ticket. Go into the interior and wait.”

Now, let’s say that individual who goes to the interior does not show up for the court case. What happens? Well, in theory, there is a group called ICE, which is part of the immigration system that then, having kept track of that person, deports the person back to their home country. That is not happening, or at least it is not happening in the vast majority of cases.

For a while, it was that the administration—and, frankly, the previous administration had a similar policy for at least some time—that we are going to focus on criminals. So those who are in the United States who are migrants coming up here who have a criminal record, we are going to deport them but not prioritize others who simply come here under an asylum claim and then do not show up at their court case or show up but do not leave the country.

But if you look at the deportation figures over the last several months of the Biden administration, you will see that that is just simply not happening. In fact, there were fewer deportations last month, I am told, than there are ICE agents. So I am not sure what they are doing.

But I do know that on this day, on the inaugural day, President Biden said to the world that we are going to stop deportations for a period of time. So that is added to this narrative that if you are a smuggler or a trafficker and one of these people who are taking advantage and exploiting these families and individuals and kids, you have got a narrative that is pretty strong where you can say: Hey, if you go to the border and you claim asylum, you come into the United States of America, and then we will see what happens. Unfortunately, right now we don’t have a system in place to deal with that.

So that is a long way of saying we have a crisis on the border, and we are not facing up to it.

In a number of the hearings that I have been at on this topic, the administration witnesses go out of their way to say this is the fault of the Trump administration. Their argument is, as I understand it, that the Trump administration should have been prepared for this surge by putting in place during this time period a lot more of this infrastructure.

We talked about the HHS facilities, for instance, that were not ready, and therefore kids got stuck at the Border Patrol detention facilities.

Well, it is an interesting argument. I mean, they didn’t have any issue here. They didn’t have this surge. They did back in 2019, but they put policies in place to deal with it. You can argue whether those policies were right or

not, but you can’t then say: OK. They should have had all this infrastructure in place.

My point is, we need to own up to our own actions, and to blame the Trump administration for what is happening now in terms of the lack of infrastructure when the infrastructure wasn’t needed, frankly, given the policies they had in place, I think is, frankly, just not a very constructive use of time. We should instead be focused on, OK, how do we take this situation and make it better and deal with it?

My own view, for what it is worth, is we start with enforcing the law, particularly along the border, and say to our Border Patrol: We are going to give you the support you need to be able to support keeping these drugs out and dealing with the immigration crisis in an appropriate way. Instead, we have done just the opposite.

So the first thing I would do is to say: Let’s support those who are on the border. Let’s tell them we are going to be there for them and provide them the resources they need to do their job. One of those things, of course, is to complete the fencing that was started during the Trump administration.

There are some in this body on the other side of the aisle and, of course, a lot in the Obama administration who did not support the wall; same with the new Trump administration—or, I am sorry, the new Biden administration. But the Trump administration decided to go ahead with the wall. They got the money for it. He started building it—not across the whole border but over about 20 percent of the border, which has often been misunderstood, but areas where it would make a difference, at least to slow people down.

I have always been of the view that the wall is not in and of itself an answer because if you don’t have technology associated with the wall, people will go under it or over it and around it. You have to have the cameras and the sensors and so on to make the wall effective. That has not been completed.

What has been completed is most of the fencing, but then there are gaps in the fencing. And when I was down there, as everyone can testify who has been down to the border to see this, there are literally holes in the wall where they were going to put a gate in, but they hadn’t completed it yet, and when the Biden administration came in, again, one of the things they did on day one, they said: Stop. Stop the construction—even though the contractors had already been paid to do this work.

So, literally, if you go to the El Paso sector, where I was, you go to an opening in the wall, there will be the construction material there on the ground, and there are no contractors there, and the Border Patrol, you can imagine, is demoralized by this. These people have already been paid to put up the gate, but they leave the gate open. So they have to be 24/7 physically present there to keep people from coming through those openings or just—which is what

they do because they don’t have the people to do it—just assume you are going to have a lot of crossings there when there is not Border Patrol there.

Instead, we should complete those very small sections of the wall that haven’t been completed, and, again, it is mostly openings.

Then we should put the technology in place. We were told when we were down in El Paso in that sector that only 10 percent of the technology had been put in place for, let’s say, you know, dozens of miles of wall—not thousands, not for even the area outside of the suburban and urban areas, but in the areas where it could slow people down to give the Border Patrol a chance to be able to respond. But the technology was stopped, again, on day one because President Biden said we are going to stop construction, stop—even though the contractors had been paid for this work.

So that, to me, is No. 1. Let’s give the Border Patrol what they need in terms of personnel and equipment and specifically the technology. I think the technology is the most important part of this. And you do need the sensors, you do need the cameras, and you do need to know what is going on.

If smugglers are coming through with a bunch of drugs and they can divert the Border Patrol, which they do, with another group—let’s say a group of unaccompanied children or families, where there is a lot of processing time involved—the Border Patrol will go to the one group, spend a lot of time processing, as they have to do, and in the meantime, the group coming with the drugs will sneak across. If you have the technology in place, you can avoid that, but if you don’t, there is no way to deal with that crisis.

So, No. 1, let’s take care of those along the border who are trying their best to do their work and don’t have the support that they need.

No. 2, I think we need to reinstate some asylum policies that were starting to work effectively. Frankly, they hadn’t been implemented fully during the Trump administration, so it is hard to tell. But one is allowing people who want to apply for asylum to apply in their home country or in a safe third country.

So think about this. I talked earlier—people who want to apply for asylum now are just coming to the border, and they are told, under an asylum claim, they can go into the interior of the United States. They are given maybe a notice to appear—actually, a lot of families are not even given a notice to appear anymore because they are just overwhelmed. We saw that, and I saw families who were literally given just a sheet of paper that had the addresses of where the ICE offices are in America, and they were told: We don’t know where you are going in America, but wherever you go, go to this ICE office wherever, in your region, but no notice to appear in court. But whether they are given a notice to appear or not, they are going into the interior.

Instead, what if those people applied—not taking that dangerous journey north through Mexico but instead applied in their home country or applied in a safe third country?

And there were safe third-country agreements with the countries in the region—for instance, Guatemala—which, as you know, those who are in Guatemala are coming from El Salvador or Honduras or farther south. That makes a lot of sense to me. Those are discontinued for some reason. They really hadn't been put in place where they were implemented fully, but that would seem to me to be a very smart thing; that is, to tell people: If you want to apply for asylum, that is fine. Come to our consulate office and apply, or if you don't want to apply in your own country, perhaps because you do fear persecution, go to a third country and stay in a third country and apply. Doesn't that make sense?

Also, I think we should—and again, these should all be bipartisan ideas—give the Border Patrol the resources that they need. On third-country asylum applications, I know for a while there were a number of Democrats who strongly supported applying for asylum in your own home country. President Obama's administration did for some time.

But, third, I would require adjudication at the border. So when you come for asylum—and this is consistent with legislation that is bipartisan that Senator SINEMA and Senator CORNYN introduced and I support—you have regional processing centers on the border. This will take some funds. It will be expensive because we don't have a system in place right now. As I said, there is a 1.2, 1.3 million backlog in asylum claims. That is when people have to wait 4, 5, 6, 7, years. Instead, have these on the border. Have these operations where somebody can come, claim asylum, and go before an immigration official, someone who can judge whether that asylum claim is credible or not.

A little background for this, if you come from these Northern Triangle countries or come from Mexico and claim asylum, only about 15 percent—that is 1–5, 15 percent—of these asylum claims are ultimately successful. Why? Because most people who are coming are coming for economic reasons, which I totally understand. If I were a father in Honduras in a rural area and I had no prospects for a job, I would want to gather up my family and come to the United States, because you can get a lot more financial security here for yourself and your family. That is totally understandable, but that is not the basis for an immigration system because, unfortunately, there are billions of people around the world in that kind of a situation. So it needs to be based on an orderly system where, yes, people can apply, as they do every day from Honduras and come through the legal immigration system, or if they have a credible fear, they can apply for asylum. But why not do it in these safe

third countries or, when you come up to the border, do it at the border?

Again, let's assume 15 percent in the end qualify. Those 15 percent would be able to come in as asylees, much as refugees come into this country. It is basically the same criteria. I am not against the refugee system. I think we should accept refugees in this country, as other countries do, who have a credible fear of persecution in their own country and need a place to land. We have a successful system to do that. We have a system to resettle these people. There are agencies that specialize in that. A lot of them are private sector agencies.

So I think on the border is where we ought to put the funding. These regional processing centers ought to be there to help make the decision quickly—quickly—so that people don't have to wait 4 years, but instead they get an answer, yes or no, to be able to come into this country if they apply for asylum and they qualify for asylum.

Finally, I would say that we need to put a system in place to discourage illegal immigration that goes to the employer. And I know this is somewhat controversial on both sides of the aisle for different reasons, but to me, if an employer can hire someone who is illegal, because that person has documentation—say, a driver's license or Social Security card or something else that is fraudulent—there will be more and more illegal immigration because that is the magnet.

I know some say that people come to this country to take advantage of our social services and not to work. There may be some of that, but I will tell you, if you go to the border and talk to these migrants—which I have done, and I did it again a couple of months ago and did it many times before—and ask them: Why are you coming to America? They are not saying they are coming to America to get on our social welfare system. They say they are coming to work because they know they can make 5 times, 10 times, maybe even from poor areas in Honduras 15 times what they can make in their own country. And they would like to bring their families and would like for them to have a better life and maybe send remittances back to their family. Well, again, that is an issue that we need to address in these third world countries, but in the meantime we need to have an orderly system of immigration, and if you allow employers to hire people without any consequence, then, this will continue to happen.

So what is the answer to that? Well, one is to have an E-Verify system that really works. That means you have to verify electronically whether someone is eligible to work in the United States. And the small business owner should not be the police officer. It should be easy to do. It should be a software system that enables them to find out immediately whether that Social Security card is fraudulent or not. That includes looking at the Social Se-

curity number online and deciding: Is this number connected to this person?

It also, I think, is going to have to require a photograph and looking at the photograph and determining whether the person is who the person says he or she is. But this can be done with the new technologies that we have. Right now we have E-Verify in place, but it is not mandatory. Don't you think it should be mandatory? Because if you dry up the job opportunities for people coming illegally, then you will not have this magnet of pulling people over the border.

Again, legal immigration ought to be encouraged. We ought to bring in refugees. Asylees who qualify ought to be given asylum in this country. That is who we are. We are a country that has always welcomed the stranger. But do it in an orderly and lawful way.

If we don't do that, we will continue to see a border being overwhelmed. We will continue to see this. There is no reason for this to change based upon current policy. These simple steps that I talk about could all be bipartisan. This is not a partisan issue. This is an issue of commonsense approaches that have been taken by Republican and Democrat administrations over the years. We can make a big difference here.

There is a small program called the Central American Minors Program, which was reinstated just this week, and it helps with regard to unaccompanied kids coming from Central America. I support that program. I am glad the Biden administration put it in place, and I have been told by Biden administration officials at the highest level at DHS that this is the answer. Well, we had something like 19,000 kids coming over the border in one month, and thousands a day. In that system in the Obama years, when it was in place, the Central American Minors Program only had 3,000 or 4,000 kids come through it over 10 weeks, or something like that. So we had more children coming over in 2 days than they did in that entire program.

I am not suggesting that the program is a bad idea. Let's do that. But if you don't do these other things, too, you are not going to make a dent in this issue.

And, again, our hearts go out to some of these individuals. They have a tough time in their countries, and we wish their countries were more like ours. We wish that they had more economic opportunities, more freedom, and that they had a democracy and a market system that actually works for the people. That is not the reality now.

I know the administration is focused on saying the answer to this question is dealing with the push-backers, dealing with, as Vice President KAMALA HARRIS said during her trip, the source of the problem, which is the poverty in Central America. Well, I will say, No. 1, there are migrants coming from all over the world, from Central America, of course—and that continues, and that

is a very poor part of our hemisphere—but also from many other countries, including Mexico, including people from Romania, from Yemen. I am just looking here—from Ecuador, from Colombia, from countries all over Latin America. So it is a big problem.

Again, there are billions of people in the world who unfortunately don't have the kind of lifestyle that we have in this country and aspire to it. So you have to have an immigration system of some kind.

Second, I would make the point that the administration is talking about spending \$4 billion in Central America. I suppose that is over the next few years. It should be noted that we just spent \$3.6 billion on economic development in those same countries over the past 5 years.

So I am for that. I think we should be helping these countries develop. I was for a trade agreement with these countries to try to encourage their economic development.

I am for helping to deal with the corruption and dealing with the kind of lack of transparency and lack of opportunity in these countries. That is all good. The judicial system and the rule of law need to be strengthened—no question about it. I am for doing that.

These countries are in our hemisphere. They should be treated, in my view, differently than even countries elsewhere in the world because they are close to us. They are our neighbors, essentially. But that is not going to solve the problem—certainly, not during my lifetime. It will take decades, and it doesn't mean we shouldn't do it. And we have been doing it. Some \$3.6 billion of hard-earned taxpayer money has gone toward this in the last 5 years.

But I don't think it is honest to tell the American people: If we just spend a little more money in Central America, this problem will be solved.

Wouldn't that be nice, if we could wave a magic wand and it could be solved and suddenly those countries would be prosperous and free?

It is going to take a long time. It doesn't mean that we shouldn't be doing it, but in the meantime we have to come up with a system that is lawful, that is orderly, that is humane, and that deals with this problem. And by putting our heads in the sand or blaming the previous administration—again, here is their record—that is not going to solve the problem. In fact, it is going to create an impression that the problem is easy to solve, which it is not. It is a difficult problem—no question about it. And broader immigration reform is something that is needed—no question about that.

But, in the meantime, let's focus on the border. Let's do these simple things. Let's support the Border Patrol. Let's be sure that they have what they need in terms of technology. Let's be sure that we are doing all we can to have asylees apply in their country, or, if not, in a third country. If they come

to our border, let's adjudicate those claims at the border, because then the next group will say: Well, I am not going to get to come into the United States and wait for 4 or 5 years and get embedded in the community. I am going to have to have my case decided at the border.

It is much more likely that those traffickers, those smugglers who are exploiting these people are not going to be able to say—again, with some credibility right now: Hey, you come with me. You pay me a lot of money. I will take you not just to the border, but you will get into America, and you will be able to have a life there because you won't be deported.

That is what they can say now. We want them instead to be saying: Well you are going to have to have your case adjudicated at the border, and you may be qualified.

Again, 15 percent have made it through, and those are people who should be taken care of, in my view, as asylees. But for those other individuals, they will know that it is much better to apply legally, to go through the system, and to have the opportunity to go through an orderly, legal process.

So I hope that the administration makes some of these changes quickly because I don't see this situation getting any better. In fact, in May it got worse, despite everyone saying from DHS, with whom I spoke: Don't worry. Things are getting better.

I don't see that. There is a looming date—I think it is the end of July—when title 42 will no longer apply to single individuals. Right now, title 42, which I talked about earlier, which is where, because of COVID, the United States government is turning people away at the border. Right now, this is happening with regard to single individuals. When title 42 ends, which it will at the end of what is the COVID-19 public health emergency, which expires soon, then what is going to happen?

Well, I can tell you, the Border Patrol is very, very nervous about that. That is one question they ask me repeatedly: What are we going to do when we can't use title 42 and when people know that, when they come into this country, they are not likely to get deported?

That is a short-term issue we have to deal with. Congress could extend title 42 for now. We still have a COVID issue, not just in this country. Thank goodness we are getting over it, but it is a much bigger issue, unfortunately, south of the border, in all of these countries we talked about, including some of these countries in South America that are having a serious issue right now with COVID. You could continue with it, in my view, as a public health emergency. But, in any case, let's not do this—get rid of, as an example, title 42 without preparing for it. Let's be sure there is in place something else, something better to be able

to deal with the obvious surge that we have seen.

So I appreciate the fact that this is a tough issue, and I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would probably prefer that we not get into these difficult issues because they are hard.

I do see that the Presiding Officer has now arrived, with whom I have worked quite a bit on this issue, and we have a specific piece of legislation that helps to deal with this issue, that helps to deal with the surge.

That legislation is bipartisan. It creates a strategic plan and a contingency fund for immediate needs at the border when there is a surge to deal with the DHS issue I talked about earlier when the Border Patrol just gets overwhelmed.

That is another part of what we ought to do, is to be honest about the problem and to deal with it. It is called the Border Response Resilience Act, and it enables the Department of Homeland Security to respond to the worst immigration crisis that we have had in at least 20 years. I would hope that—again, that is a bipartisan approach—that we could at least pass that and then take the other four steps that I talked about to ensure that we have an orderly system that actually works and to be sure we can retain the sovereignty of our border, keeping the list of drugs out, like synthetic opioids and like fentanyl, that are killing so many Americans, and that we have an orderly and lawful and humane immigration system.

With that, I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). 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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's votes on motion to invoke cloture and confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 148, Radhika Fox, of California, to be an Assistant

Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted yea on the motion and yea on confirmation.

Mr. President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's votes on motion to invoke cloture and confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 173, Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted yea on cloture and confirmation.

Mr. President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's vote on the motion to invoke cloture of Executive Calendar No. 123, Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted yea on the motion.●

REMEMBERING JIM BUNNING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, 57 years ago on Father's Day, 1964, future U.S. Senator from Kentucky Jim Bunning pitched the perfect game—the seventh in Major League Baseball history—for a 6-0 win by the Philadelphia Phillies over the New York Mets. Jim would have been 90 years old this summer, and in recognition of his legendary career in baseball and politics, the Behringer-Crawford Museum in Covington, Kentucky is celebrating his life with an exhibit running from this Father's Day until August. Today, I recognize Senator Jim Bunning as an outstanding Kentuckian and a lifelong champion on both the pitcher's mound and the Senate floor.

It is fitting that Jim would be honored at the Behringer-Crawford Museum, which has celebrated everything great about northern Kentucky for over 70 years. The exhibit, entitled "From the Mound to the Hill," encapsulates the essence of Jim's life as an all-around Kentucky hero. It is rare that leaders are able to excel in one, let alone two, fields, but Jim earned acclaim with grit, determination, and tenacity.

After his prodigious, 17-year baseball career with the Tigers and the Phillies, which included 224 wins and 2,855 strikeouts, Jim returned home to Campbell County to serve at all levels of local, State, and national government. He dedicated his life to the people of Kentucky, and our gratitude for his public service is apparent in tributes like the one at the Behringer-Crawford Museum.

I served with Jim in the Senate for his entire tenure and was proud to work alongside a man of deep conviction and strongly held principles. As he once said, "I have been booed by 60,000 fans in Yankee Stadium, standing alone on the mound, so I never cared if I stood alone in Congress, as long as I stood by my beliefs and my values." Jim was never afraid to defend his ideals and fight for Kentuckians in the Senate, a trait his constituents whole-

heartedly admired. He truly deserves his place in the Hall of Fame, not just for baseball, but for life.

No commemoration of Jim would be complete without also honoring his wife Mary, a truly remarkable woman who led her own admirable life.

The Northern Kentucky Tribune highlighted the Behringer-Crawford Museum's exhibit in a recent article. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Northern Kentucky Tribune, June 9, 2021]

BEHRINGER-CRAWFORD MUSEUM EXHIBIT
CHRONICLES DUAL CAREER OF BASEBALL
STAR, U.S. SENATOR JIM BUNNING

It will be 57 years to the day. Father's Day, Sunday, June 21, 1964.

That's the day Northern Kentucky's Jim Bunning, a member of the Philadelphia Phillies, pitched the seventh perfect game in major league history—a 6-0 win over the New York Mets at Shea Stadium.

It was the first perfect game in the National League since 1880 and Bunning's second no-hitter. His first came as a member of the Detroit Tigers on July 20, 1958, against the Boston Red Sox.

Behringer-Crawford Museum's From the Mound to the Hill exhibit, a pictorial history of the baseball life of Southgate's Jim Bunning, is on display now through August. Rex Morgan, a life-long friend of Bunning, donated the material to the museum.

"Jim Bunning was truly a local hero," said Jason French, curator of exhibits at Behringer-Crawford Museum. "When we were given the opportunity to display such an extensive collection of Bunning memorabilia, it was less of a question of 'if' than 'when.' We felt that the summer of his 90th year would be a great way to honor his memory." Bunning was born October 23, 1931.

Bunning was the sole major league baseball athlete to be elected to both the United States Senate and the National Baseball Hall of Fame. He pitched from 1955 to 1971 for the Tigers, Phillies, Pittsburgh Pirates and Los Angeles Dodgers. When he retired, he had the second-highest total career strikeouts in major league history. He currently ranks 19th.

A graduate of St. Xavier High School in Cincinnati in 1949, Bunning received a bachelor's degree in economics from Xavier University in 1953. He was elected to the Philadelphia Phillies Baseball Wall of Fame in 1984, and in 1996, to the Baseball Hall of Fame via the Veterans Committee. In 2001, his uniform number, 14, was retired by the Phillies.

After retiring from baseball, Bunning returned to his native Northern Kentucky and was elected to the Fort Thomas city council, then the Kentucky State Senate, in which he served as minority leader. In 1986, Bunning was elected to the United States House of Representatives from Kentucky's 4th congressional district and served in the House from 1987 to 1999. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1998 and served two terms as the Republican junior senator. In July 2009, he announced that he would not run for reelection in 2010. Bunning gave his farewell speech to the Senate on December 9, 2010.

"When we were approached about being a permanent home to a massive Jim Bunning memorabilia collection, there was little chance that we were going to turn it down," French said. "Jim was such an icon and local legend. He did so much for our community

and was always there for Behringer-Crawford Museum, too. Housing his collection is quite natural for us and exemplifies our partnership with the Northern Kentucky Sports Hall of Fame."

Hall of Fame members will be admitted to BCM free on Saturday, June 19 to view the Mound to the Hill Jim Bunning display, as well as adjunct displays featuring the Negro, Cuban and Mexican leagues.

Behringer-Crawford Museum opened to the public in 1950 as a natural history museum based on the collections of William Behringer, an avid collector, traveler, diarist and Covington resident, featuring fossils, minerals, animal specimen and other oddities from his world travels. It is the only museum totally dedicated to the people, history, culture and art of Northern Kentucky.

Admission to the museum: \$9 for adults, \$8 for seniors (over 60), \$5 for children (3-17 years old) and free for children under 3. Hours of operation are Tuesday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. and Sunday, 1 to 3:30 p.m.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING BATTERIES PLUS BULBS

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I will recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize a family-owned small business, Batteries Plus Bulbs of Bowling Green, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Since 2004, David Paschall has owned and operated a Batteries Plus Bulbs franchise in Bowling Green, KY. As a young man, David owned and operated a successful service station in Puryear, TN. After meeting his wife, Dorothy, David relocated to Bowling Green in 1988. Dorothy, who was working in Bowling Green at the time, is a Kentucky native and a graduate of Western Kentucky University. Over the next few years, David started working in the batteries industry. When local entrepreneur Steve Sheldon opened a Batteries Plus Bulbs franchise in 1999, David joined his friend as store manager. In 2004, when Steve moved on from the company, David and Dorothy purchased the store.

Today, Batteries Plus Bulbs Bowling Green continues to thrive under David and Dorothy's leadership. In addition to their original location, they own and operate Batteries Plus Bulbs franchises in Elizabethtown and Somerset, KY, and Clarksville, TN. David and Dorothy's care and attention to detail are evident in every aspect of their business. Their strong sense of family has built a tight-knit and supportive team, with several long-time employees working over a decade at the store. Customers are regularly greeted by name and treated according to the golden rule. Finding a solution to a customer's problem is prioritized over pushing a sale. Notably, Batteries Plus Bulbs Bowling Green is known for its

beloved mascot, Morris. A rescued cat, this 13-year-old orange tabby delights staff and visitors alike. The Bowling Green Area Chamber of Commerce recognized David's outstanding work, naming him the 2016 Small Business Person of the Year.

Together with his wife, Dorothy, David gives back to his community. Locally, Batteries Plus Bulbs has sponsored several sports teams and charitable organizations, including the Bowling Green/Warren County Humane Society. David and Dorothy are active within their local church community as well. Notably, Dorothy also served as executive director of the Barren River Area Development District and was involved with the Hospice of Southern Kentucky.

Like many small businesses, David and his team stepped up to keep their community supplied during the COVID-19 pandemic. As an essential business, they stayed open and adapted to State guidelines, ensuring all of their employees stayed healthy. Despite the challenges, at the end of 2020, Batteries Plus Bulbs Bowling Green was ranked No. 25 out of 740 franchises nationwide by the national corporate office.

Batteries Plus Bulbs is a notable example of the endurance and resilience of family-owned businesses. Small businesses like Batteries Plus Bulbs form the heart of towns and cities across Kentucky, regularly stepping up to support their communities. Congratulations to David, Dorothy, and the entire team at Batteries Plus Bulbs Bowling Green. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky and beyond.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 12:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Barbara Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 1:22 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 290. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to render an individual, who transfers certain educational assistance, to which the individual is entitled because of an agreement by such individual to serve in the Armed Forces, to a dependent of that individual, and who fails to complete such agreement, solely liable for the overpayment of such educational assistance.

H.R. 293. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish qualifications

for the human resources positions within the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 468. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit the use of incentive payments to expedite certain federally financed airport development projects.

H.R. 539. An act to amend the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to waive certain debts owed to the United States related to covered assistance provided to an individual or household, and for other purposes.

H.R. 587. An act to modify permitting requirements with respect to the discharge of any pollutant from the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

H.R. 610. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay.

H.R. 1144. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of the Puget Sound, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1257. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the effect of financial and credit counseling for homeless veterans and veterans experiencing housing instability, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1262. An act to establish a task force on improvements for certain notices to airmen, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1703. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to require the Administrator of General Services to enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Children's Museum to provide the National Children's Museum rental space without charge in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1921. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2008. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to nonpoint source management, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2016. An act to amend the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 to develop a study regarding streamlining and consolidating information collection and preliminary damage assessments, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2093. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog, and other commonly spoken languages, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2332. An act to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from furnishing a consumer report containing any adverse item of information about a consumer if such consumer is a victim of trafficking, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2429. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the staffing, transparency, and accountability of the law enforcement operations of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2545. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the role of doctors of podiatric medicine in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2726. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a plan to reduce the backlog of requests for information made to the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3325. An act to award four congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

H.R. 3642. An act to award a Congressional gold medal to the 369th Infantry Regiment, commonly known as the "Harlem Hellfighters", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service during World War I.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 711) to amend the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 to authorize the use of certain funds received pursuant to leases entered into under such Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:37 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 49. An act to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 290. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to render an individual, who transfers certain educational assistance, to which the individual is entitled because of an agreement by such individual to serve in the Armed Forces, to a dependent of that individual, and who fails to complete such agreement, solely liable for the overpayment of such educational assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 293. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish qualifications for the human resources positions within the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 539. An act to amend the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to waive certain debts owed to the United States related to covered assistance provided to an individual or household, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 587. An act to modify permitting requirements with respect to the discharge of any pollutant from the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 610. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1144. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of Puget Sound, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1257. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the effect of financial and credit counseling for homeless veterans and veterans experiencing housing instability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1262. An act to establish a task force on improvements for certain notices to airmen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1921. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2008. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to nonpoint source management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2016. An act to amend the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 to develop a study regarding streamlining and consolidating information collection and preliminary damage assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2093. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog, and other commonly spoken languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2332. An act to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from furnishing a consumer report containing any adverse item of information about a consumer if such consumer is a victim of trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2429. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the staffing, transparency, and accountability of the law enforcement operations of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2545. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the role of doctors of podiatric medicine in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2726. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a plan to reduce the backlog of requests for information made to the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3325. An act to award four congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3642. An act to award a Congressional gold medal to the 369th Infantry Regiment, commonly known as the "Harlem Hellfighters", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service during World War I; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1190. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1191. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access

Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "June 2021 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1192. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "June 2021 Report to the Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1193. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel of the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligibility To Receive Emergency Financial Aid Grants to Students Under the Higher Education Emergency Relief Programs" (RIN1840-AD62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1194. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates Report for fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1195. A communication from the Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Congressional Budget Justification for fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1196. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Personnel Vetting Core Doctrine" (RIN3206-ZA02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1197. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-93, "Green Food Purchasing Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1198. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-94, "D.C. Central Kitchen, Inc. Tax Rebate Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1199. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-95, "Commercial Insurance Claim Tolling Temporary Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1200. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-97, "Short-term Disability Insurance Benefit Protection Temporary Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1201. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1202. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-84, "Interim Term of the State Superintendent of Education Temporary Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1203. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-85, "Approval of the Transfer of Control of Open Video System Franchisee and Its Open Video System from Radiate Holdings, L.P. to Stonepeak Associates IV, LLC Temporary Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1204. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-86, "Equitable Impact Assistance for Local Businesses Temporary Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1205. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-87, "Closing of Public Streets and Alleys Adjacent to Squares 3039, 3040, and 3043 Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1206. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-88, "Medical Cannabis Temporary Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1207. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-91, "District of Columbia Retirement Board Leadership Temporary Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1208. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-89, "Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1209. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1210. A communication from the Chairman of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1211. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1212. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the six-month period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1213. A communication from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1214. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Governors, United States

Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Postal Services' Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1215. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Reports from the Inspector General and Inspector General for Tax Administration for the period from October 1, 2020, through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1216. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1217. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Designation of Certain Services as Emergency Services Under the Antideficiency Act; Opportunities to Enroll and Change Enrollment in the FEHB Program During a Lapse in Appropriations; Continuation of Certain Insurance Benefits During a Lapse in Appropriations" (RIN3206-AN99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1218. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exercise of Time-Limited Authority to Increase the Fiscal Year 2021 Numerical Limitation for the H-2B Temporary Non-agricultural Worker Program and Portability Flexibility for H-2B Workers Seeking to Change Employers" (RIN1615-AC13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1219. A communication from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inmate Discipline Program: New Prohibited Act Code for Pressuring Inmates for Legal Documents" (RIN1120-AB72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1220. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Office of Aviation Consumer Protection, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tarmac Delay Rule" (RIN2105-AE47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1221. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Office of Economics and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification Adopted for Auction of Flexible-Use Service Licenses in the 3.45-3.55 GHz Band for Next-Generation Wireless Services (Auction 110)" ((AU Docket No. 21-62) (DA 21-567)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1222. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sponsorship Identification Requirements for Foreign Government-Provided Programming" ((MB Docket No. 20-299) (FCC 21-42)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

June 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1223. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Coast Guard nomination of Vice Adm. Michael F. McAllister, to be Vice Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm. Paul F. Thomas, to be Vice Admiral.

*Pamela A. Melroy, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

*Coast Guard nomination of Vice Adm. Linda L. Fagan, to be Admiral.

*Carlos Alberto Monje, Jr., of Louisiana, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

*Richard W. Spinrad, of Oregon, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Charles J. Clark and ending with Luke P. Strittmatter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Lisa M. Thompson and ending with Tara E. Larkin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

By Mrs. MURRAY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Dawn Myers O'Connell, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, Department of Health and Human Services.

*Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*Gwen Graham, of Florida, to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education.

*Taryn Mackenzie Williams, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*Miriam E. Delphin-Rittmon, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, Department of Health and Human Services.

*Rajesh D. Nayak, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

By Ms. HASSAN for Mr. PETERS for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Robin Carnahan, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

*Jen Easterly, of New York, to be Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

*Chris Inglis, of Maryland, to be National Cyber Director.

By Mr. WARNER for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*Robin C. Ashton, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2072. A bill to increase consumer protection with respect to negative option offers in all media, including on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2073. A bill to maintain the ability of the United States Armed Forces to deny a fait accompli by the People's Republic of China against Taiwan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 2074. A bill to require greater transparency for Federal regulatory decisions that impact small businesses; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2076. A bill to establish a program to develop antimicrobial innovations targeting the most challenging pathogens and most threatening infections; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 2077. A bill to establish a bipartisan Presidential Commission to study the establishment of a National Museum of the American People to tell the story about the making of the American People, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2078. A bill to prohibit the issuance of F or J visas to researchers affiliated with the Chinese People's Liberation Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE:

S. 2079. A bill to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2080. A bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the treatment of core seasonal industries affected by antidumping or countervailing duty investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2081. A bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 2082. A bill to mitigate drug shortages and provide incentives for maintaining, expanding, and relocating the manufacturing of active pharmaceutical ingredients, excipients, medical diagnostic devices, pharmaceuticals, and personal protective equipment in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 2083. A bill to waive the requirement to undergo a medical exam for aliens who are otherwise eligible for special immigrant status under the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2084. A bill to terminate the order requiring persons to wear masks while on conveyances and at transportation hubs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. REED):

S. 2085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas and criteria air pollutant emission fees, provide rebates to low and middle income Americans, invest in fossil fuel communities and workers, invest in environmental justice communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2086. A bill to improve the identification and support of children and families who experience trauma; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2087. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the membership of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans to include veterans who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, gender diverse, gender non-conforming, intersex, or queer; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2088. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the process by which a member of the Armed Forces may be referred for a mental health evaluation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2089. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 2090. A bill to prevent a person who has been convicted of a misdemeanor hate crime, or received an enhanced sentence for a misdemeanor because of hate or bias in its commission, from obtaining a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MUR-

KOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. ERNST, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2091. A bill to amend the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to increase appropriations to Restaurant Revitalization Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2092. A bill to permanently authorize the Native Community Development Financial Institutions lending program of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2093. A bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. Res. 272. A resolution expressing support for health and wellness coaches; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 273. A resolution designating June 2021 as "Great Outdoors Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 189

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 189, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustments to be made automatically by law each year in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 194

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide treatment for eating disorders for dependents of members of the uniformed services.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to establish a National Climate Bank.

S. 306

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont

(Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 306, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 311

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include certain employment as a health care practitioner as eligible for public service loan forgiveness, and for other purposes.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol.

S. 377

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 435

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 435, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 452

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

S. 454

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 454, a bill to provide health care and benefits to veterans who were exposed to toxic substances while serving as members of the Armed Forces at Karshi Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, and for other purposes.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for the research and development, production, or deployment of the nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missile and its associated nuclear warhead.

S. 773

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 773, a bill to enable certain hospitals that were participating in or applied for the drug discount program under section 340B of

the Public Health Service Act prior to the COVID-19 public health emergency to temporarily maintain eligibility for such program, and for other purposes.

S. 775

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

S. 834

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 868

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 868, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title and waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals with Huntington's disease.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 976, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and to expand eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation paid to certain survivors of certain veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1061

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1061, a bill to encourage the normalization of relations with Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1084, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the portability of professional licenses of members of the uniformed services and their spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 1151

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connected disability for certain veterans who served in Palomares, Spain, and for other purposes.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer and for other purposes.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop best practices for the establishment and use of behavioral intervention teams at schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to establish additional requirements for dealers, and for other purposes.

S. 1393

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1393, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out training for employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to exposure of veterans to toxic substances.

S. 1404

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1404, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1450

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1450, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for expanded coverage of services furnished by genetic counselors under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1613

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1613, a bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a grant program for certain fitness facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1848

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New

Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1848, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1873, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 1899

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1899, a bill to prohibit any direct or indirect United States funding for the territory of Gaza unless certain conditions are met.

S. 2005

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors 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. 2030

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2030, a bill to declare that any agreement reached by the President relating to the nuclear program of Iran is deemed a treaty that is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, and for other purposes.

S. 2060

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2060, a bill to amend disclosure requirements of foreign gifts and contracts under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 105

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 105, a resolution condemning the coup in Burma and calling for measures to ensure the safety of the Burmese people, including Rohingya,

who have been threatened and displaced by a campaign of genocide conducted by the Burmese military.

S. RES. 269

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 269, a resolution designating June 19, 2021, as “Juneteenth Independence Day” in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which news of the end of slavery reached the slaves in the Southwestern States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. TUBERVILLE:

S. 2079. A bill to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, today, I want to discuss an issue that many folks may not be familiar with, but they should be. After today, they will be. When I first heard about this, I couldn't believe it was true, but I have learned up here that just when you think you have seen or heard the worst, the swamp will always surprise you.

One of the many important roles of the Department of Justice is to represent the United States in civil and criminal trials. Sometimes the DOJ decides that a pretrial monetary settlement for a lawsuit is the best route to take. The DOJ directs the money from the settlement to the victims or to the Treasury. That is the way our system is supposed to work.

But during the Obama administration, the DOJ took a different course. Rather than direct settlement money to victims, the DOJ pushed the defendants to give money instead to third-party organizations favored by the Department. This was a slush fund for groups chosen by the DOJ. What is more, the DOJ would count the dollar amount of any donation as double toward the settlement. Money paid to the victims or the Treasury would only count dollar for dollar. So it was a huge incentive for these defendants to pay a third party, and these third parties often had nothing to do with the lawsuit.

When companies like JPMorgan, Bank of America, or Citigroup had to pay settlements based on mortgage lending practices, the DOJ intentionally directed millions of dollars to liberal activist groups. You don't have to take my word for it; here is an email from the Office of the Associate Attorney General in 2013 talking about the DOJ settlement with JPMorgan:

Can you explain to Tony the best way to allocate some money toward an organization of our choosing?

Those are the key words there: “of our choosing.”

Let me continue to quote: We have been discussing having the agreement provide that JPM agreed to pay \$9 bil-

lion but that, if, by the time we sign the settlement agreement, JPM has given \$60 million to X, they will have to pay only 8 billion.

I think that is OK. We understand that we would not have control over what X organization does with the money.

The “Tony” referred to there is Tony West, an Associate Attorney General, who was at that time No. 3 in the Department of Justice.

Two days later, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights wrote to the Office of the Associate Attorney General to lobby on behalf of a group called VOICE. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights includes the biggest activist arms of the political left, including the ACLU, Planned Parenthood, Big Labor's AFL-CIO, and the teachers unions.

On No. 3 here, but when the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights contacted the DOJ, it was because VOICE wanted funds from the JPMorgan settlement. Not surprisingly, VOICE ended up receiving \$1 million from JPMorgan.

They had a listening ear in the Obama administration. This is what he wrote to Tony about the settlement with Citigroup. Chart 4.

They were concerned with the possibility of Citi picking a group like, “The Pacific Legal Foundation does conservative property rights free legal services.” The DOJ was clear: Conservative groups couldn't have the access to the same funds that liberal groups could. It was obvious.

Here was the result, chart No. 5.

From Bank of America alone, the National Council of La Raza, now known as UnidosUS, received \$1.5 million. The National Urban League received \$1.2 million. VOICE got another million dollars, on top of the first million.

This won't shock you, but both La Raza and the Urban League were big supporters of President Obama's agenda. They are also both members of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights today. La Raza consistently lobbied Congress to pass President Obama's misguided immigration reform bill. Urban League was a routine cheerleader of the Obama administration's Big Government approach to public housing. They were rewarded for their advocacy with millions of dollars from the DOJ.

In total across the Federal Government, the money directed to third parties added up to a total of \$668 million, according to the nonpartisan Regulatory Transparency Project.

On chart No. 6, out of the \$668 million, at the end of the day, they could only locate \$9.5 million, which is 1.4 percent of the total money given. We don't even know exactly where or how the rest of the money was spent.

Folks, I have one word for you on this. This is called corruption. This is the swamp. The fact that this practice ever existed should make Americans' blood boil. Political appointees at one

of the most powerful Departments in the country used their position of power to extract money from companies, and then they gave that money to their like-minded friends. That is what is wrong with Washington, DC.

We have grown used to hearing about this type of behavior from dictatorships around the world, like Russia or Venezuela. We should not, we cannot accept this type of behavior here in the United States of America.

Well, President Trump didn't. His administration, very early in his tenure, put a stop to this practice. They were right to do so. It should never have happened in the first place. But now, with a new President in office and with so many high-profile Obama administration retreads throughout the administration and in the White House, this corrupt practice could and probably will return. Congress cannot allow this to happen. I don't care if it is a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent in the White House; the power of the purse lies with us, the folks in this building. It is called the 117th U.S. Congress—elected officials, not bureaucrats.

We need a permanent fix. If the Federal Government is diverting settlement funds away from victims into politically connected groups, they are undermining Congress's role. There is a way to stop this. Earlier today, I introduced the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act. This bill would ensure that all settlement funds would go first to the victims and then to the Treasury—no third party. No administration should be allowed to force donations to politically connected groups at the direct expense of victims.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense solution. Let's ensure our Federal Government works on behalf of all of its citizens, not just the ones with connections to people in power.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2086. A bill to improve the identification and support of children and families who experience trauma; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2086

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Resilience Investment, Support, and Expansion from Trauma Act” or the “RISE from Trauma Act”.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING SEC. 101. TRAUMA AND RESILIENCE-RELATED COORDINATING BODIES.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 520A (42 U.S.C. 290bb-32) the following:

“SEC. 520B. LOCAL COORDINATING BODIES TO ADDRESS COMMUNITY TRAUMA, PREVENTION, AND RESILIENCE.

“(a) GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Assistant Secretary, shall award grants to State, county, local, or Indian tribe or tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act) or non-profit private entities for demonstration projects to enable such entities to act as coordinating bodies to prevent or mitigate the impact of trauma and toxic stress in a community, or promote resilience by fostering protective factors.

“(2) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall award such grants in amounts of not more than \$6,000,000.

“(3) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award such grants for periods of 4 years.

“(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall include 1 or more representatives from at least 5 of the categories described in paragraph (2).

“(2) COMPOSITION.—The categories referred to in paragraph (1) are—

“(A) governmental agencies, such as public health, mental health, human services, or child welfare agencies, that provide training related to covered services or conduct activities to screen, assess, provide services or referrals, prevent, or provide treatment to support infants, children, youth, and their families as appropriate, that have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma;

“(B) faculty or qualified staff at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) or representatives of a local member of the National Child Traumatic Stress Network, in an area related to screening, assessment, service provision or referral, prevention, or treatment to support infants, children, youth, and their families, as appropriate, that have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma;

“(C) hospitals, health care clinics, or other health care institutions, such as mental health and substance use disorder treatment facilities;

“(D) criminal justice representatives related to adults and juveniles, which may include law enforcement or judicial or court employees;

“(E) local educational agencies (as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)) or agencies responsible for early childhood education programs, which may include Head Start and Early Head Start agencies;

“(F) workforce development, job training, or business associations;

“(G) nonprofit, community-based faith, human services, civic, or social services organizations, including participants in a national or community service program (as described in section 122 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12572)), providers of after-school programs, home visiting programs, family resource centers, agencies that serve victims of domestic and family violence or child abuse, or programs to prevent or address the impact of violence and addiction; and

“(H) the general public, including individuals who have experienced trauma who can appropriately represent populations and activities relevant to the community that will be served by the entity.

“(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—In order for an entity to be eligible to receive the grant under this section, the representatives included in the entity shall, collectively, have training

and expertise concerning childhood trauma, resilience, and covered services.

“(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(d) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to entities proposing to serve communities or populations that have faced or currently face high rates of community trauma, including from intergenerational poverty, civil unrest, discrimination, or oppression, which may include an evaluation of—

“(1) an age-adjusted rate of drug overdose deaths that is above the national overdose mortality rate, as determined by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and

“(2) an age-adjusted rate of violence-related (or intentional) injury deaths that is above the national average, as determined by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and

“(3) a rate of involvement in the child welfare or juvenile justice systems that is above the national average, as determined by the Secretary.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity that receives a grant under this section to act as a coordinating body may use the grant funds to—

“(1) bring together stakeholders who provide or use services in, or have expertise concerning, covered settings to identify community needs and resources related to covered services, and to build on any needs assessments conducted by organizations or groups represented on the coordinating body;

“(2)(A) collect data, on indicators to reflect local priority issues, including across multiple covered settings and disaggregated by age, race, and any other appropriate metrics; and

“(B) use the data to identify unique community challenges and barriers, community strengths and assets, gaps in services, and high-need areas, related to covered services;

“(3) build awareness, skills, and leadership (including through trauma-informed and resilience-focused training and public outreach campaigns) on covered services in covered settings;

“(4) develop a strategic plan, in partnership with members of the served community or population, that identifies—

“(A) policy goals and coordination opportunities to address community needs and local priority issues (including coordination in applying for or utilizing existing grants, insurance coverage, or other government programs), including for communities of color and relating to delivering and implementing covered services; and

“(B) a comprehensive, integrated approach for the entity and its members to prevent and mitigate the impact of exposure to trauma or toxic stress in the community, and to assist the community in healing from existing and prior exposure to trauma through promotion of resilience and fostering protective factors;

“(5) implement such strategic plans in the local community, including through the delivery of covered services in covered settings; and

“(6) identify funding sources and partner with community stakeholders to sustainably continue activities after the end of the grant period.

“(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds and private funds expended to provide trauma-related coordination activities.

“(g) EVALUATION.—At the end of the period for which grants are awarded under this section, the Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the activities carried out under each grant under this section. In conducting the evaluation, the Secretary shall assess the outcomes of the grant activities carried out by each grant recipient, including outcomes related to health, education, child welfare, criminal justice involvement, or other measurable outcomes pertaining to wellbeing and societal impact.

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$600,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2029.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED SERVICES.—The term ‘covered services’ means culturally responsive services, programs, models, or interventions that are evidence-based, evidence-informed, or promising best practices to support infants, children, youth, and their families as appropriate by preventing or mitigating the impact of trauma and toxic stress or promoting resilience by fostering protective factors, which may include the best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115-271).

“(2) COVERED SETTING.—The term ‘covered setting’ means the settings in which individuals may come into contact with infants, children, youth, and their families, as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, including schools, hospitals, settings where health care providers, including primary care and pediatric providers, provide services, early childhood education and care settings, home visiting settings, after-school program facilities, child welfare agency facilities, public health agency facilities, mental health treatment facilities, substance use disorder treatment facilities, faith-based institutions, domestic violence agencies, violence intervention organizations, child advocacy centers, homeless services system facilities, refugee services system facilities, juvenile justice system facilities, law enforcement agency facilities, Healthy Marriage Promotion or Responsible Fatherhood service settings, child support service settings, and service settings focused on individuals eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; and”.

SEC. 102. EXPANSION OF PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP PILOT FOR CHILDREN WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED OR ARE AT RISK OF EXPERIENCING TRAUMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 526 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (42 U.S.C. 12301 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ‘To improve outcomes for infants, children, and youth, and their families as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma’ means to increase the rate at which individuals who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, including those who are low-income, homeless, involved with the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system, have been victims of violence (including community, family, or sexual violence), unemployed, or not enrolled in or at risk of dropping out of an educational institution and live in a community that has faced acute or long-term exposure to substantial discrimination, historical oppression, intergenerational poverty, civil unrest, a high rate of violence or drug overdose deaths, achieve success in meeting educational, employment, health, developmental, community reentry, permanency from foster care, or other key goals.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “FISCAL YEAR 2014” and inserting “FISCAL YEARS 2022 THROUGH 2026”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(C) by striking “Federal agencies” and inserting the following:

“(1) DISCONNECTED YOUTH PILOTS.—Federal agencies”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) TRAUMA-INFORMED CARE PILOTS.—Federal agencies may use Federal discretionary funds that are made available in this Act or any appropriations Act, including across different or multiple years, for any of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out up to 10 Performance Partnership Pilots. Such Pilots shall—

“(A) be designed to improve outcomes for infants, children, and youth, and their families as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma; and

“(B) involve Federal programs targeted on infants, children, and youth, and their families as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2018” and inserting “2025”; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by inserting before the semicolon “, including the age range for such population”; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “2018” and inserting “2025”.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, working with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary of Education, and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and any other appropriate agency representative, shall, with respect to carrying out this section—

(1) explore authorities to enable the issuance of appropriate start-up funding;

(2) issue guidance documents, template waivers and performance measurements, best practices and lessons learned from prior pilot programs, recommendations for how to sustain projects after award periods, and other technical assistance documents as needed; and

(3) align application timing periods to provide maximum flexibility, which may include the availability of initial planning periods for awardees.

SEC. 103. HOSPITAL-BASED INTERVENTIONS TO REDUCE READMISSIONS.

Section 393 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) HOSPITAL-BASED INTERVENTIONS TO REDUCE READMISSIONS.—

“(1) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities to deliver and evaluate hospital-based interventions to improve outcomes and reduce subsequent reinjury or readmissions of patients that present at a hospital after overdosing, attempting suicide, or suffering violent injury or abuse.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection and entity shall—

“(A) be a hospital or health system (including health systems operated by Indian tribes or tribal organizations as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act); and

“(B) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, which shall include dem-

onstrated experience furnishing successful hospital-based trauma interventions to improve outcomes and prevent reinjury or readmission for patients presenting after overdosing, attempting suicide, or suffering violent injury or abuse.

“(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity shall use amounts received under a grant under this subsection to deliver, test, and evaluate hospital-based trauma-informed interventions for patients who present at hospitals with drug overdoses, suicide attempts, or violent injuries (such as domestic violence or intentional penetrating wounds, including gunshots and stabbings), or other presenting symptoms associated with exposure to trauma, violence, substance misuse, or suicidal ideation, to provide comprehensive education, screening, counseling, discharge planning, skills building, and long-term case management services to such individuals, and their guardians or caregivers as appropriate, to prevent hospital readmission, injury, and improve health, wellness, and safety outcomes. Such interventions may be furnished in coordination or partnership with qualified community-based organizations and may include or incorporate the best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115-271).

“(4) QUALITY MEASURES.—An entity that receive a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report on the data and outcomes developed under the grant, including any quality measures developed, evaluated, and validated to prevent hospital readmissions for the patients served under the program involved.

“(5) SUSTAINABLE COVERAGE.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, shall evaluate existing authorities, flexibilities, and policies and disseminate appropriate and relevant information to eligible entities on the opportunities for health insurance coverage and reimbursement for the activities described in paragraph (3).”.

SEC. 104. TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY FIGURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall study and establish guidelines for use by States with respect to standards for training, certification, and partnership or supervision from licensed clinical professionals as appropriate, of community figures, including community mentors and trusted leaders, peers (including young adults and youth) with lived experiences, faith-based leaders, coaches and arts program leaders, and community paraprofessional providers such as out-of-school providers, to—

(1) educate and promote an understanding of trauma, toxic stress, and resilience;

(2) promote resilience by fostering protective factors and providing peer support services;

(3) provide case management services and promote linkages to community services; and

(4) deliver appropriate, culturally responsive, and trauma-informed practices.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Training and certification guidelines under subsection (a) shall include recommendations for experience, education, and supervision requirements for, and partnerships between, such trained and certified community figures and other health care providers such that the trained and certified community figures may be reimbursed through the State Medicaid plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) for furnishing services to individuals enrolled in such plan.

TITLE II—WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT OF INDIVIDUALS FROM COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE EXPERIENCED HIGH LEVELS OF TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, OR ADDICTION.

Part B of title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 742. INDIVIDUALS FROM COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE EXPERIENCED HIGH LEVELS OF TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, OR ADDICTION.

“In carrying out activities under this part, the Secretary shall ensure that emphasis is provided on the recruitment of individuals from communities that have experienced high levels of trauma, violence, or addiction and that appropriate activities under this part are carried out in partnership with community-based organizations that have expertise in addressing such challenges to enhance service delivery.”.

SEC. 202. FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.

Section 10503(b)(2) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) \$360,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, of which \$50,000,000 shall be allocated in each such fiscal year for awards to eligible individuals whose obligated service locations are in schools or community-based settings as described in section 338N of the Public Health Service Act.”.

SEC. 203. INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD CLINICAL WORKFORCE.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 399V-7. INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD CLINICAL WORKFORCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Associate Administrator of the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, shall establish an Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health Clinical Leadership Program to award grants to eligible entities to establish a national network of training institutes for infant and early childhood clinical mental health.

“(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall—

“(1) be—

“(A) an institution of higher education as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including historically Black colleges and universities (as defined for purposes of section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061)), and Tribal colleges (as defined for purposes of section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c)); or

“(B) be a hospital with affiliation with such an institution of higher education, or a State professional medical society or association of infant mental health demonstrating an affiliation or partnership with such an institution of higher education; and

“(2) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) USE OF GRANT.—An entity shall use amounts received under a grant under this section to establish training institutes to—

“(1) equip aspiring and current mental health professionals, including clinical social workers, professional counselors, marriage and family therapists, clinical psychologists, child psychiatrists, school psychologists, school counselors, school social workers,

nurses, home visitors, community health workers, and developmental and behavioral pediatricians with specialization in infant and early childhood clinical mental health, and those pursuing certification or licensure in such professions; and

“(2) emphasize equipping trainees with culturally responsive skills in prevention, mental health consultation, screening, assessment, diagnosis, and treatment for infants and children, and their parents as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, including from intergenerational poverty, civil unrest, discrimination, or oppression, exposure to violence or overdose, as well as prevention of secondary trauma, through—

“(A) the provision of community-based training and supervision in evidence-based assessment, diagnosis, and treatment, which may be conducted through partnership with qualified community-based organizations;

“(B) the development of graduate education training tracks;

“(C) the provision of scholarships, stipends, and trainee supports, including to enhance recruitment, retention, and career placement of students from populations under-represented populations in the mental health workforce; and

“(D) the provision of mid-career training to develop the capacity of existing health practitioners.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 204. TRAUMA-INFORMED TEACHING AND SCHOOL LEADERSHIP.

(a) PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1022a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (H) through (K) as subparagraphs (I) through (L), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

“(H) how the partnership will prepare general education and special education teachers, including early childhood educators, to support positive learning outcomes and social and emotional development for students who have experienced trauma (including students who are involved in the foster care or juvenile justice systems or runaway or homeless youth) and in alternative education settings in which high populations of youth with trauma exposure may learn (including settings for correctional education, juvenile justice, pregnant, expecting and parenting students, or youth who have re-entered school after a period of absence due to dropping out);”;

(2) in subsection (d)(1)(A)(i)—

(A) in subclause (II), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subclause (III) as subclause (IV); and

(C) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“(III) such teachers, including early childhood educators, to adopt evidence-based approaches for improving behavior (such as positive behavior interventions and supports and restorative justice practices), supporting social and emotional learning, mitigating the effects of trauma, improving the learning environment in the school, preventing secondary trauma, compassion fatigue, and burnout, and for alternatives to punitive discipline practices, including suspensions, expulsions, corporal punishment, referrals to law enforcement, and other actions that remove students from the learning environment; and”;

(3) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(7) TRAUMA-INFORMED AND RESILIENCE-FOCUSED PRACTICE AND WORK IN ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION SETTINGS.—Developing the teaching skills of prospective and, as applicable, new, early childhood, elementary school, and secondary school teachers to adopt evidence-based trauma-informed and resilience-focused teaching strategies—

“(A) to—

“(i) recognize the signs of trauma and its impact on learning;

“(ii) maximize student engagement and promote the social and emotional development of students;

“(iii) implement alternative practices to suspension and expulsion that do not remove students from the learning environment; and

“(iv) engage with other school personnel, including administrators and nonteaching staff, to foster a shared understanding of the items described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii); and

“(B) including programs training teachers, including early childhood educators, to work with students with exposure to traumatic events (including students involved in the foster care or juvenile justice systems or runaway and homeless youth) and in alternative academic settings for youth unable to participate in a traditional public school program in which high populations of students with trauma exposure may learn (such as students involved in the foster care or juvenile justice systems, pregnant and parenting students, runaway and homeless students, students exposed to family violence or trafficking, and other youth who have re-entered school after a period of absence due to dropping out).”.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—Section 203(b)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1022b(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) to eligible partnerships that have a high-quality proposal for trauma-informed and resilience-focused training programs for general education and special education teachers, including early childhood educators.”.

(c) GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS.—Section 202(f)(1)(B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1022a(f)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (vi), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) identify students who have experienced trauma and connect those students with appropriate school-based or community-based interventions and services.”.

SEC. 205. TOOLS FOR FRONT-LINE PROVIDERS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with appropriate stakeholders with subject matter expertise which may include the National Child Traumatic Stress Network or other resource centers funded by the Department of Health and Human Services, shall carry out activities to develop accessible and easily understandable toolkits for use by front-line service providers (including teachers, early childhood educators, school and out-of-school program leaders, paraeducators and school support staff, home visitors, mentors, social workers, counselors, health care providers, child welfare agency staff, individuals in juvenile justice settings, faith leaders, first responders, kinship caregivers, domestic violence agencies, child advocacy centers, homeless services personnel, and

youth development and community-based organization personnel) for appropriately identifying, responding to, and supporting infants, children, and youth, and their families, as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma or toxic stress. Such toolkits shall incorporate best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115-271), and include actions to build a safe, stable, and nurturing environment for the infants, children, and youth served in those settings, capacity building, and strategies for addressing the impact of secondary trauma, compassion fatigue, and burnout among such front-line service providers and other caregivers.

SEC. 206. CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE INITIATIVE.

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART OO—CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE AND ADDICTION INITIATIVE

“SEC. 3051. GRANTS TO SUPPORT CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE AND SUBSTANCE USE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, Indian tribes and tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act), and nonprofit organizations to reduce violence and substance use by preventing children’s trauma from exposure to violence or substance use and supporting infants, children, and youth, and their families, who have been harmed by violence, trauma, or substance use to heal.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under subsection (a) may be used to implement trauma-informed policies and practices that support infants, children, youth, and their families, as appropriate, by—

“(A) building public awareness and education about the importance of addressing childhood trauma as a means to reduce violence and substance use and improve educational, economic, developmental, and societal outcomes for infants, children, and youth;

“(B) providing training, tools, and resources to develop the skills and capacity of parents (including foster parents), adult guardians, and professionals who interact directly with infants, children, and youth, in an organized or professional setting, to reduce the impact of trauma, grief, and exposure to violence on children, including through the best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115-271); and

“(C) supporting community collaborations and providing technical assistance to communities, organizations, and public agencies on how they can coordinate to prevent and mitigate the impact of trauma from exposure to violence and substance use on children in their homes, schools, and communities.

“(2) PRIORITY.—Priority in awarding grants under this section shall be given to communities that seek to address multiple types of violence and serve children who have experienced poly-victimization.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$11,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 207. ESTABLISHMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT CHILD AND YOUTH TRAUMA COORDINATING CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in coordination with the Civil Rights Division,

shall establish a National Law Enforcement Child and Youth Trauma Coordinating Center (referred to in this section as the "Center") to provide assistance to adult- and juvenile-serving State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies (including those operated by Indian tribes and tribal organizations as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act) in interacting with infants, children, and youth who have been exposed to violence or other trauma, and their families as appropriate.

(2) **AGE RANGE.**—The Center shall determine the age range of infants, children, and youth to be covered by the activities of the Center.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Center shall provide assistance to adult- and juvenile-serving State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies by—

(1) disseminating information on the best practices for law enforcement officers, which may include best practices based on evidence-based and evidence-informed models from programs of the Department of Justice and the Office of Justice Services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115-271), such as—

(A) models developed in partnership with national law enforcement organizations, Indian tribes, or clinical researchers; and

(B) models that include—

(i) trauma-informed approaches to conflict resolution, information gathering, forensic interviewing, de-escalation, and crisis intervention training;

(ii) early interventions that link child and youth witnesses and victims, and their families as appropriate, to age-appropriate trauma-informed services; and

(iii) preventing and supporting officers who experience secondary trauma;

(2) providing professional training and technical assistance; and

(3) awarding grants under subsection (c).

(c) **GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General, acting through the Center, may award grants to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies or to multi-disciplinary consortia to—

(A) enhance the awareness of best practices for trauma-informed responses to infants, children, and youth who have been exposed to violence or other trauma, and their families as appropriate; and

(B) provide professional training and technical assistance in implementing the best practices described in subparagraph (A).

(2) **APPLICATION.**—Any State, local, or tribal law enforcement agency seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require.

(3) **USE OF FUNDS.**—A grant awarded under this subsection may be used to—

(A) provide training to law enforcement officers on best practices, including how to identify and appropriately respond to early signs of trauma and violence exposure when interacting with infants, children, and youth, and their families, as appropriate; and

(B) establish, operate, and evaluate a referral and partnership program with trauma-informed clinical mental health, substance use, health care, or social service professionals in the community in which the law enforcement agency serves.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General—

(1) \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to award grants under subsection (c); and

(2) \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 for other activities of the Center.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 272—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR HEALTH AND WELLNESS COACHES

Mr. HEINRICH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 272

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention considers chronic diseases to be "the public health challenge of the 21st century";

Whereas decades of research have linked lifestyle factors, such as inactivity, poor diet, tobacco smoking, and sustained stress, with increased risk for major illnesses and death;

Whereas the costs associated with the treatment of many chronic diseases are high and often preventable;

Whereas a health and wellness coach is a new type of healthcare worker who serves as a supportive mentor to motivate individuals to make positive health choices and move toward specific wellness goals;

Whereas health and wellness coaches support clients in achieving good health—

(1) based on the goals of each client; and

(2) in a manner consistent with the treatment plan recommended by a healthcare provider for the client;

Whereas health and wellness coaches assist clients in making healthy lifestyle changes by encouraging them—

(1) to use insight;

(2) to use personal strengths and resources;

(3) to set goals;

(4) to create action steps; and

(5) to hold themselves accountable;

Whereas health and wellness coaches play a vital role in improving individual wellness that complements, and does not replace, the work of healthcare professionals; and

Whereas an increasing number of studies demonstrate how health and wellness coaches help—

(1) to improve individual health and wellness; and

(2) to reduce healthcare costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the efforts of the health and wellness coaches of the United States in their important work to improve the health and wellness of the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 273—DESIGNATING JUNE 2021 AS "GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH"

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 273

Whereas hundreds of millions of individuals in the United States participate in outdoor recreation annually;

Whereas Congress enacted the Outdoor Recreation Jobs and Economic Impact Act of

2016 (Public Law 114-249; 130 Stat. 999) to assess and analyze the outdoor recreation economy of the United States and the effects attributable to the outdoor recreation economy on the overall economy of the United States;

Whereas the Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account, updated in September 2020 by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce, shows that outdoor recreation generated more than \$788,000,000,000 in economic output in 2019, comprising approximately 2.1 percent of the current-dollar gross domestic product;

Whereas the Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account shows that, in 2019, the outdoor recreation sector experienced faster growth in real gross output, compensation, and employment than the overall economy of the United States, while also providing 5,200,000 jobs across the United States;

Whereas the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6; 133 Stat. 13) encouraged the Department of Commerce to continue its work with the Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account;

Whereas the Great American Outdoors Act provides billions of dollars over the next 5 years to help improve infrastructure on public lands and waters and expand access to outdoor recreation for all people of the United States;

Whereas regular outdoor recreation is associated with economic growth, positive health outcomes, and better quality of life;

Whereas many outdoor recreation businesses are small businesses, which have been heavily impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas outdoor recreation businesses are cornerstones of rural communities and outdoor recreation is part of the national heritage of the United States; and

Whereas June 2021 is an appropriate month to designate as "Great Outdoors Month" to provide an opportunity to celebrate the importance of the great outdoors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2021 as "Great Outdoors Month"; and

(2) encourages all individuals in the United States to responsibly participate in recreation activities in the great outdoors during June 2021 and year-round.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have 14 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 15, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing nominations.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing nomination.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 12 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 4:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

The Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND BORDER MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Government Operations and Border Management of the Committee on Homeland Security

and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is one of my colleagues, Mr. Elad Vaida, and I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. Boatner Calhoun, who is an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Will Taylor, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of Congress.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2093

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2093) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The Presiding Officer. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 117th Congress: The Honorable John BOOZMAN of Arkansas.

RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENTRY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE INTO THE UNITED STATES AS THE 16TH STATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 248.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 248) recognizing and celebrating the 225th anniversary of the entry of the State of Tennessee into the United States as the 16th State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 248) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 27, 2021, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 273, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 273) designating June 2021 as "Great Outdoors Month".

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 273) was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that 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 preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be

reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Beaudreau nomination, postcloture; further, that the cloture time on the Beaudreau nomination expire at 11:30 a.m.; that the Senate recess following the cloture vote on the Tien nomination until 1:45 p.m.; that if cloture is invoked on the Tien nomination, all postcloture debate time be expired at 1:45 p.m.; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the

motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:25 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 16, 2021:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

RADHIKA FOX, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

THE JUDICIARY

LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.