



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2021

No. 128

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who remains the same when all else fades, thank You for loving and using us for Your glory.

Guide our Senators in the footsteps of those who were willing to risk all for freedom, who carved tunnels of hope through mountains of despair.

Lord, uphold our Nation with Your wisdom and might, enabling it to continue to be a city of refuge for those whose hearts yearn for freedom.

Keep us all from untimely and self-made cares as we continue to fix our eyes on You, the author and finisher of our faith.

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, July 21, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a

Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

DEBT CEILING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, before I get into the substance of my remarks, I just heard Leader MCCONNELL's statements on debt ceiling.

The leader's statements on debt ceiling are shameless, cynical, and totally political. This debt is Trump debt. It is COVID debt. Democrats joined three times during the Trump administration to do the responsible thing. The bottom line is that Leader MCCONNELL should not be playing political games

with the full faith and credit of the United States. Americans pay their debts.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. President, now, let's get into what is happening here in the Senate this afternoon.

The Senate will hold a procedural vote to get the legislative process started on a bipartisan infrastructure bill. I have been very clear about what this vote is. This vote is only the first step in the legislative process on the Senate floor. It is merely a vote about whether the Senate is ready to begin debating a bipartisan infrastructure bill.

I have also been very clear about what this vote is not. This vote is not a deadline to have every final detail worked out. It is not an attempt to jam anyone. If Senators agree to adopt the motion to proceed, the bipartisan group of Senators will have many opportunities to make their agreement the base of the bill, even if they need a few more days to finalize the language.

My colleagues are well aware that we often agree to move forward with debates on issues before we have the final text of the bill in hand. We have done it twice this year already: the anti-Asian hate crimes bill and the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act. Both times, the Senate produced successful bipartisan legislation. There is no reason we can't repeat that process here on infrastructure.

We are now in the fourth week of negotiations since the bipartisan group of Senators reached an agreement with the White House on an infrastructure framework—4 weeks. According to the negotiators, spurred on by this vote this afternoon, they are close to finalizing their product. Even Republicans have agreed that the deadline has moved them far more quickly.

Given the process of the bipartisan negotiations, I believe Senators should feel comfortable voting to move forward today. I know that, since I set a

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4991

date for the vote and announced it, my colleagues on both sides have worked very hard on finishing this legislation. I am grateful for their work. We all want the same thing here: to pass a bipartisan infrastructure bill. But in order to finish the bill, we first need to start.

So I hope my Republican colleagues will join Democrats this afternoon in voting to move forward on an infrastructure package. As majority leader, I have every intention of passing both major infrastructure packages, the bipartisan infrastructure framework and a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions, before we leave for the August recess. That is the schedule I laid out at the end of June, and that is the schedule I intend to stick to.

Now, if Senators had any doubt about the impact of this important work, they should be assured by a new report this morning by the chief economist at Moody's, Mark Zandi. Having analyzed both the bipartisan bill and the agreement by Senate Democrats on the Budget Committee, Mark Zandi concludes that the twin legislative packages will provide a massive boost to the economy and that both—both—are essential.

Specifically, his report says that the two bills are “designed to lift the economy’s longer-term growth potential and ease”—ease—“inflation pressures.” Again, despite the sometimes hysterical warnings about inflation from Republicans, the chief economist at Moody’s concludes that those concerns are “misplaced,” “overdone,” and that our two infrastructure bills are designed to “ease”—his words—“inflation pressures.”

The report goes on to say that our investments in infrastructure and social programs will “lift productivity and labor force growth” and “direct the benefits of the stronger growth to lower-income Americans and address the long-running skewing of the income and wealth distribution.”

In other words, it will help strengthen the middle class and those trying to get there and not have all the income, so much of the income, disproportionately flowing to the top 1 and 10 percents.

I hope my colleagues are listening to those benefits: long-term economic growth, easing inflation pressures, lifting productivity, strengthening the labor force, reducing income inequality. That is what one of the Nation’s leading economists predicts our two infrastructure bills will achieve.

The report by Moody’s should light a fire under all of us. I will be sending the full report to the Senate Democratic conference, and I commend it to my Republican colleagues to read as well.

It has been decades since this Chamber has made significant stand-alone investment in our Nation’s infrastructure. We are the largest economy in the world, but our infrastructure ranks 13th. You would find better infrastruc-

ture in the United Arab Emirates than in the United States. Meanwhile, middle-class and working Americans have watched the American dream fall out of reach as globalization, technology, and vicious inequalities of income have sapped much of America’s fundamental promise of equal economic opportunity.

We must restore that promise, that hope, that American dream. If we want Americans to prosper in the 21st century, if we want to restore that fundamental promise, we need to invest in our infrastructure, create jobs, support families, strengthen the backbone of the middle class, help underserved communities, and rekindle the sunny optimism that has been a hallmark of the American spirit for more than two centuries.

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.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today, the Democratic leader appears to be intent on calling a vote he knows will fail. For several weeks now, Republican and Democratic Senators have been working together, trying to assemble a bipartisan package for our Nation’s infrastructure.

It is an important and a complex subject. They are talking about big projects and big sums of money. They are still talking, still working, still negotiating in good faith across the aisle. But these discussions have yet to conclude. There is no outcome yet, no bipartisan agreement, no text, nothing for the Congressional Budget Office to evaluate, and, certainly, nothing on which to vote, not yet.

So, obviously, if the Democratic leader tries to force a cloture vote on a bill that does not exist, it will fail.

Around here, we typically write the bills before we vote on them. That is the custom. Of course, here in the Senate, a failed cloture vote does not mean no forever.

In the middle of the early COVID crisis, back in March of 2020, with Americans under stay-home orders and financial markets plummeting, Senate Democrats withheld cloture on the CARES Act multiple times so they could continue haggle behind the scenes.

Now, this was during a real emergency. Every day, every hour, was crucial. But Senate Democrats blocked cloture multiple times until various details were fine-tuned to their liking.

Here is what the Democratic leader said while his side tanked those cloture votes last March—March of 2020:

The Majority Leader was well aware of how this vote would go before it happened, but he chose to move forward with it anyway, even though negotiations are continuing. So who is playing games?

That was the Democratic leader in March of 2020, in the middle of a national emergency.

That, of course, was a fast-moving global crisis, with bipartisan text already in hand. There was a bill. Yet Senate Democrats insisted on taking their time in the middle of this national 100-year pandemic. Now, we are talking about long-term infrastructure investments that will play out over many years, but he wants to vote before any agreement even exists.

So this stunt is set to fail. The Democratic leader will be free to change his vote and move to reconsider whenever a bipartisan product actually exists.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, now, on another matter, President Biden campaigned on a pledge not to raise income taxes on the vast majority of Americans. But the latest reckless taxing-and-spending spree that Democrats are cooking up would crush our country with a historic set of sweeping tax hikes.

Here is one of the targets in their crosshairs: Family farms.

It appears our colleagues’ plan will eliminate tax rules that allow family property to be passed down to the next generation without facing a new devastating tax burden.

Without the fix in question—the so-called stepped-up basis for capital gains taxes—scores of family businesses across America will feel a massive squeeze.

In States like mine, family farms drive the rural economy. But as I have heard from many of my State’s family farmers, it is operations like theirs that are especially—especially—at risk.

One Kentucky farmer said his family has worked the same land in Muhlenberg County for 150 years. He had hoped—hoped—to one day pass his property along to his children, just like it was passed along to him. But after generations spent improving and investing in the same farm, he is worried it could all be gone in the blink of an eye.

Another Kentuckian described how her family, like many farmers, is asset rich but cash poor. If the stepped-up basis is eliminated, her family could lose the home, barns, machinery, and fields that have been their life’s work.

The Farm Bureau in my State warned that what Washington Democrats are trying to do would penalize farmers for wanting—for wanting—to continue a tradition, which we all depend upon. If the stepped-up basis is eliminated, generations of accumulated work would be ripped—literally ripped from the hands of America’s farming families.

Family farming in the Commonwealth isn't just a way of life; it is considered a birthright. But if Democrats foist this bill for their reckless taxing-and-spending spree on rural America, a lot of this heritage could be literally ripped out of families' hands and put on the auction block.

And who will gobble it up then? Who will buy this land?

One recent report suggested that one of the biggest bidders for American family farmland these days is actually the Chinese.

Later today, Ranking Member BOOZMAN and some of our colleagues on the Agriculture Committee will be coming to the floor to sound the alarm about the ways that Democrats' reckless tax-and-spend spree could threaten farm families and rural America.

Deaths should not be a taxable event. The family farms that help feed us deserve our support, not sabotage from Washington.

IRAN

Mr. President, on one final matter, earlier this month, the FBI uncovered a plot by Iranian intelligence operatives to kidnap a journalist and vocal critic of the regime from her home in New York.

Let me say that again: Iran tried to abduct a U.S. citizen right here—right here—on American soil.

For years, Masih Alinejad has made a habit of getting under the mullahs' skin. She has called out injustices and organized protests like White Wednesdays, when women across Iran would challenge their nation's strict dress code.

The regime tried to lure Ms. Alinejad out of the U.S. to make her an easier target. That failed. So they decided to try something even more brazen.

Federal prosecutors have charged four Iranians in a plot to kidnap Ms. Alinejad. But with the exception of one accomplice, those responsible for this outrageous planned assault on a U.S. citizen right here on U.S. soil won't see the inside of a courtroom anytime soon. So without nonjudicial steps to impose consequences on the Islamic Republic, there will likely be no justice for Ms. Alinejad and her family.

And why should Tehran think twice about trying again?

Sadly, this has a familiar ring to it. Flagrant disregard for international law is certainly not a new addition to Tehran's playbook. Remember, back in 2011, Iranian intelligence was caught up in a plot to murder the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the United States by blowing up a restaurant right here in Washington. One of the Iranian officials indicted in that case is, actually, still at large.

Of course, extrajudicial activities on American soil aren't the only bits of Iranian behavior that read like old news. Ms. Alinejad has been vocally reminding us that Iran's disgusting disregard for human rights is not unique to American soil. Obviously, it is felt in Iran itself and throughout the Middle East.

This spring, the skies over Israel were filled with reminders of Iran's longstanding support for terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah. Battlefields in Syria and southern Arabian Peninsula testify to the strength of Iran's proxies.

And just this year, on President Biden's watch, we have seen a surge—a surge—in attacks on U.S. interests and facilities in Iraq not seen since the height of our military presence in that country.

So history continues to repeat itself in Tehran. And, unfortunately, the Biden administration appears keen—keen—to follow a familiar playbook of its own. Inexplicably, the White House's response to Iran's latest troublemaking—now listen to this—has been to consider lifting sanctions and offering new concessions to produce a new nuclear deal.

Iran just tried to kidnap an American right here in America. This is not the occasion to desperately reward bad behavior. It is time to work even more closely with our allies and partners in the regions to stare it down.

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

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

NOMINATION OF DAVID H. CHIPMAN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week, I came down to the floor to discuss how the "defund the police" movement has contributed to the surging crime we see around the country. And as I noted, the Democratic Party bears a substantial degree of responsibility to the situation we find ourselves in because this is a party that either actively contributed to defund the police rhetoric or implicitly endorsed it largely by staying silent.

Now, however, Democrats have come to realize that attacking the police and the sharp spike in crime could hurt their electoral chances next year. And so the President and other Democrat leaders have, all of a sudden, announced their concern about rising crime rates.

But as I said last week, they are still trying to have their cake and eat it, too, because missing from their messaging is any real condemnation of defund the police rhetoric and the toll it has taken on our cities and police departments. And their plans for confronting the surge in crime are long on punishing gun dealers and gun manufacturers and short on going after those actually committing crimes.

It is typical of Democrats, for whom fighting crimes seems to involve controlling guns—specifically, guns owned by law-abiding gun owners—more than it involves controlling criminals. What Democrats should be doing is training

their attention on violent offenders, traffickers, and gangs, and illegal straw purchases; not finding ways to saddle law-abiding gun owners with burdensome regulations because it is not law-abiding gun owners who are responsible for most of the gun crimes in this country.

The majority of gun crimes are committed by individuals who have obtained their guns illegally—illegally—which is why fighting these crimes should involve improving enforcement of our laws and increasing prosecution of those who violate them, not creating new laws that will only serve to further burden the constitutionally guaranteed Second Amendment right of law-abiding individuals.

Unfortunately, as I said, Democrats are following their usual playbook during this recent crime surge, which they seem to see as a convenient excuse for pushing some of their gun control priorities.

The President recently delivered remarks on crime, and the first priority he discussed at length was going after federally licensed firearms dealers. That is right, firearm dealers.

While we can all agree that firearms dealers who violate the law should be punished, the rogue gun dealers that the President refers to are only responsible for a tiny fraction of guns being used in crimes.

Going after gun dealers as one of your top law enforcement priorities is not going to do much to stem the illegal flow of weapons or their use in crimes. Enforcement dollars and enforcement personnel are not endless. You can waste a lot of money and a lot of man-hours conducting checks of law-abiding gun dealers while criminals continue to use their illegally obtained weapons unchecked.

Nowhere are President Biden's priorities more clear than in his choice of nominee to lead the ATF, which is the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

David Chipman would come to the ATF directly from an organization where he has spent the past 5 years as a gun control advocate. He is well known for his at times extreme views on gun control and restricting the Second Amendment, including his support for banning probably the most popular rifle in the United States. He supports a so-called assault weapons ban, which usually refers to banning certain guns for their accessories and their appearance of lethality. But, alarmingly, he could not give a clear representation of how he would define such a policy in his confirmation hearing.

Equally as troubling is Mr. Chipman's clear disdain for gun owners. He claimed that most individuals with concealed carry permits are either untrained or irresponsible. During the pandemic, he mocked law-abiding gun owners and condescendingly said that first-time gun owners should put their guns away in their cabinets behind the beef jerky—behind the beef jerky—that

they have presumably been saving for the apocalypse and only take out the weapons if “the zombies start to appear.”

I appreciate Mr. Chipman’s long service as an ATF special agent, but I have serious concerns that, as the head of the ATF, he would spend more time going after law-abiding gun owners than actual criminals.

The fact that he spent years as a gun control advocate gives us a pretty strong indication of what his priorities are likely to be if he ends up heading this Bureau. While Mr. Chipman couldn’t make new gun laws as head of the ATF, he would certainly—I should say he could certainly have a hand in writing a whole lot of new regulations, regulations that could end up substantially burdening Americans’ Second Amendment rights.

ATF has already gotten away with the Biden gun control agenda with proposed rules against firearms parts kits often used by hobbyists and widely used stabilizing braces, often referred to as pistol braces, first designed to help a disabled veteran safely fire a weapon. These regulations would turn millions of legal gun owners into potential criminals, and David Chipman would be in charge of seeing them through.

Moreover, his demeaning attitude toward gun owners should also disqualify him from the ATF position. An individual who regards law-abiding, gun-owning Americans as a bunch of untrained and irresponsible doomsday preppers waiting for the zombie apocalypse has no business—no business—leading a gun enforcement Agency.

The President, the Vice President, and Mr. Chipman may not like it, but the plain language of the Bill of Rights clearly guarantees the right of law-abiding Americans to own firearms. That right, like every other right guaranteed by our Constitution, must be respected and protected, and those who exercise their Second Amendment rights deserve to be respected as well.

I do not believe we can rely on Mr. Chipman to respect our Second Amendment rights or the Americans who exercise them, which is why I cannot vote to confirm him as Director of the ATF. I encourage supporters of the Second Amendment on both sides of the aisle to oppose his nomination. Law-abiding, gun-owning Americans deserve better than Mr. Chipman to handle the ATF.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER ANN ABRUZZO

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, you know, this pandemic has made it clearer than ever that our economy is working great for those at the very top but not for our workers.

Saturday actually marks the 12th anniversary of the last time that we raised our Federal minimum wage. Twelve years. That is unacceptable, and our workers really deserve better.

No one working 40 hours a week should be making wages so low, their family is living in poverty and they can’t even afford to pay for even their most basic needs. It is past time that we finally give workers, who are the backbone of our economy and have kept us going through this pandemic, a hard-earned and much deserved raise.

Another important step the Senate can take to build back an economy that is stronger and fairer and works for everyone is to ensure that Agencies like the National Labor Relations Board work effectively and protect workers’ rights. Jennifer Abruzzo is the type of dedicated public servant who will make sure the NLRB is enforcing the law and protecting the rights of workers.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm her as general counsel of the NLRB. She has dedicated her career to upholding the law and protecting workers from unfair treatment. She has won victories against companies that attempted to undermine workers’ right to organize and call for better wages. She has 23 years of experience at the NLRB, including her time serving as acting general counsel, the role she is now nominated to fill.

It is clear she has the right experience, qualifications, and values for the job, and we need her to be able to get to work right away because we have seen 7 years of—we have seen years of unprecedented Republican obstruction of the NLRB nominees. There has been an empty Democratic seat on the NLRB for nearly 3 years, and there wasn’t a single Democrat on the Board from late 2019 to mid-2020. That obstruction tipped the scales of justice in favor of big corporations, and workers have suffered the consequences.

When workers stand together to form a union, it is the NLRB that makes sure the election is fair. If a worker is fired or unfairly punished because they want to join or form a union, the NLRB is tasked with protecting their rights. If companies refuse to negotiate fairly with unions fighting for higher wages and better benefits or a secure retirement or safer working conditions, it is the NLRB that protects unions and union workers who have helped build our country’s middle class.

Working families simply cannot afford an NLRB that fails to protect workers’ rights when they are threatened. So we have to confirm nominees like Jennifer Abruzzo who will protect workers’ rights and make sure their voices are heard if we are serious about building back a stronger, fairer economy. If we are serious about standing with working families, then we need to confirm Jennifer Abruzzo as general counsel of the NLRB and then get to work increasing our Federal minimum wage.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled to occur at 11:30 a.m. begin immediately.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the Abruzzo nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer Ann Abruzzo, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Abruzzo nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 273 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50. The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative.

The nomination was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the provision of the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will immediately be notified of the Senate’s action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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. 142, Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Lujan, Jeff Merkley, Raphael G. Warnock, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Patrick J. Leahy, Tammy Baldwin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, John W. Hickenlooper, Angus S. King, Jr., Tammy Duckworth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). 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 Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, 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. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 274 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—48

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

The senior Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

JOHN LEWIS VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, there is a reason that the JOHN LEWIS Voting Rights Advancement Act bears his name, and the reason is that John Lewis was truly a civil rights hero, an icon, a trailblazer, a model, and a mentor to so many of us, not because of what he said but because of what he did.

In marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where he was beaten and bloodied in leading those civil rights activists, in fighting for equality and justice here in the Halls of Congress, he set a model of courageous public service that inspires us today.

It has inspired voting rights since 1965, when those acts of courage led the Congress to adopt that Voting Rights Act of 1965. It was bipartisan then; it has been a bipartisan cause since then. In fact, it was most recently reauthorized in 2006 by an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

There should be nothing partisan about voting rights, which go to the core of our democracy. They are the lifeblood of our democracy, as we know better or as well as anyone in this Chamber, because we know that we act here with authority by the consent of the governed, as the Founders said. We govern by the consent of the people who elect us, hopefully fairly. That is the reason we need now the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, because the U.S. Supreme Court, in two decisions, *Shelby County v. Holder* and *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee*, has in effect eviscerated—more bluntly, gutted—two key sections, 5 and 2, of the Voting Rights Act.

Now, we have the opportunity—in fact, we have the obligation to make sure that the memory and the cause of John Lewis in advancing voting rights are upheld. We have that obligation not for ourselves but for the country, which is why John Lewis fought so hard and so well.

Today, State legislatures are taking advantage of the gaps and defects opened by those two Supreme Court decisions to attack America's right to vote. What we are seeing is the greatest assault on voting rights in the history of this country, maybe with the exception of Jim Crow.

I know some have called these laws a second Jim Crow. It may be the son of Jim Crow or the nephew or niece of Jim Crow, but the goal is the same: suppression of voting rights, discriminating against individuals who have that right to vote.

Last week, I chaired a hearing in the Constitution Subcommittee on the impact of these two Supreme Court decisions on voting rights. What we heard from the witnesses appearing there was nothing less than a call to action to protect our democracy and live up to America's founding ideals. We heard from men and women who have been litigating—in the trenches, on the frontline of this battle to preserve voting rights—about the impact of these

two Supreme Court decisions and the lower court decisions that have been in their wake.

Since *Shelby County* in 2013, approximately 21,000 polling places nationwide serving the people of the United States on election day have been eliminated. Millions of voters have been purged from the voter rolls. This year alone, 17 States have passed 28 laws to restrict voting rights.

This assault on the right to vote, this effort to suppress men and women who by law should have that right, is purposeful, relentless, unremitting, and it is supported, unfortunately, by elected officials across the country. We have seen it in Arizona, in Florida, Texas, but many more State legislatures are moving in this direction. The voting rights of this Nation are at stake because what we are seeing is a deliberate, systematic attempt to make it harder and more difficult to register to vote and particularly for people of color to have this right. It is an attempt to subvert our democracy and attack the lifeblood of our Nation.

We know in theory that the Founders intended that, in fact, our government “derives [its] just powers from the consent of the governed.” But more than an exercise in theory, this effort is a direct, clear attempt to defend against the tsunami of voter suppression bills now crashing on our Nation. That is why the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act should be bipartisan. I have no illusions about it being so, but one way or the other, we ought to follow the advice of John Lewis, who said:

The right to vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful nonviolent tool or instrument we have in a democratic society.

In memory of what he said but more in tribute to the ideals of democracy that he advanced by his actions, we should stand up to this assault on our democracy and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. There is no time to waste.

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

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN R. STEITZ

Mr. KENNEDY. This is one of those days that we often have, at least for me, that is both happy and sad.

A couple of weeks ago, I was back home in Louisiana. I was sitting at my dining room table, minding my own business, drinking a cup of coffee, petting my two dogs—dogs are the best people—and I got a phone call from one Mr. John R. Steitz, who is my deputy chief of staff for policy and my legislative director. I knew this phone call was coming someday. I knew it. I

didn't know it was coming so soon, but I knew someday I would get this call.

John said: Senator, they made me an offer I can't refuse. I am going to take it.

I have to be honest. I thought to myself: Damn, you know, Steitz is leaving. Another part of me was saying: God, I am so happy for him. I am really pleased with his new position in the private sector.

I wanted to suggest to him that if he needed any help picking out a new Mercedes, I could come help him. If he gets it down to this color or that color, he could just buy two.

I have known some folks in public service. The Presiding Officer has too. I have known some people in business—to each his own—who are often afraid to hire people more capable than them or smarter than them, and that is human nature, you know. I get it. I will have a lot to answer for on judgment day, but doing that is not one of the things. I have always tried to hire people who were smarter than me or more capable than me or had talents that I don't have. But there is a price you pay when you do that. You are going to lose them at some point because you can't keep a good person down. And that is John Steitz. So I knew this day was coming. That is why it really is bittersweet.

John is—most of you know him—John is a graduate of SMU.

When we are joking around, I like to say that the closest John ever got to a 4.0 at SMU was his blood-alcohol level, but that is not accurate. John, as we all know—and we are kidding—is whip-smart. He finished SMU in public policy and business administration. I think he had a minor in cheerleaders, but he never neglected his studies. He is a very smart guy. He is whip-smart. Don't ever let him try to kid you.

Brooks, his better half, who is here with us today, is an accomplished professional in her own right; and they are a team, I can assure you. When you work the hours that John Steitz works, you had better do it as part of a team.

They have two children. Eleanor is their oldest. I am told that Eleanor's very first words were "vote-arama." She said "vote-arama" before she said "Mama" or "Daddy." That is an exaggeration, but probably not by much. They have a young son, John, Jr., whom they call Jack.

If I taught a class or if the Presiding Officer taught a class, and if we told the truth about how a bill becomes a law, I think a lot of Americans would be surprised. This is not "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington." It is hard to pass a bill in the U.S. Senate. It is supposed to be, because that is our job, to not act on the basis of feelings but to act on the basis of logic. It is a lot of work to get a bill passed. I have been able to pass a couple, and I wouldn't have passed one single, solitary one of them without John Steitz.

I made a list here—and I am not going to read all of it—of stuff, like the

National Flood Insurance Program Extension Act, the Justice Against Corruption on K Street Act, the RBIC Advisers Relief Act, the Holding Foreign Companies Accountable Act, and the Rebuilding Small Businesses After Disasters Act.

You know, this isn't all my doing. This has John Steitz's fingerprints all over it—on every one of these bills.

John has a rare combination, and he is going to do really well in the private sector. I mentioned that he is whip-smart, and he is, but it takes more than that to succeed around here. First, you have got to have a work ethic. You have got to be willing to put in the hours. I can't tell you the number of times I looked around when I was working late and I would see Steitz there.

I would say: Steitz, go home for God's sake. Brooks is going to change the locks on you. She may already have.

He was there constantly. I don't know when he found the time to father Eleanor and Jack. I mean, he was always in the office.

So you have got to have a work ethic, but it is more than that. You have got to like people; you have got to understand people; and you have got to respect people. You have got to know which bridge to burn and which bridge to cross. You have got to understand when to go forward and say, "To hell with it. We are going full speed ahead," and when to back off a little bit.

It is a lot more art than science, and everybody in this Chamber knows what I am talking about. That is not something you pick up in a week.

When I asked John to be my legislative director before he became deputy chief of staff, he didn't have all of this. I mean, he was as green as a gourd. I was too. He learned it. He learned it on the job, and, boy, did he do an incredible job.

There is one other quality you have got to have to succeed around this place aside from smarts, work ethic, respect for other people, and integrity, all of which John Steitz has. You have got to care. You have really got to care. You can't fake it, you know. You can't be motivated by moving up another rung on the ladder, though some people are. I get it. We are all human. Sometimes that may be a part of it, but if that is your sole motivation, you are not going to make it. People up here on Capitol Hill are smart. They can smell it. So you can't be guided by ambition. You have got to be guided by knowledge, yes; by wisdom, yes; but also by empathy.

John knows what he believes. He believes what he believes, and he is willing to fight for it. But he is also willing to listen to another point of view. There were many times he would come to my office and say: You know, here is what is going on. Look at it this way, but listen to it from this perspective.

He is also sneaky. Now, I don't mean that in a bad way. By sneaky, I mean

he is a great strategist in terms of he can figure out how to go from point A to point B to point C, do a half gainer, get to point D, and circle back to point A.

There are some times when John has come to my office and said: Here is how we are going to get this amendment done, or here is how we are going to get this passed.

Then he will lay out the plan. I wish I could use examples, but I would tip my hand. He would lay out the plan, and I would say: John, this isn't college. Have you been smoking dope around here? This isn't college. We can't do that. It will never ever work. It won't work.

It usually did. But I always said: Well, heck. Let's try it. If you want to try it, I am willing to try. It is legal; it is honest; but it is just such a long shot.

But it worked, and I was appreciative of that. That didn't just happen. That came from smarts, hard work, and caring.

I guess I will end.

Thank you, Brooks, for sharing your time and for sharing John with us. I know it wasn't easy for you. We are going to—I started to say that we are going to miss you, but we expect you to come back around and bring Eleanor and bring Jack and bring Chili. John has a great dog. Chili became the mascot in the office. Chili is the best beggar you have ever seen. I am going to miss him.

I want to thank John here today for giving so much. He could have made a lot more money in the time he has been here in the private sector because he is that talented, but he is moving to the private sector. It is their gain and our loss. He is welcome back any time.

Thank you, John. Thank you, thank you, thank you not just on my behalf, but on behalf of the people of Louisiana and on behalf of the American people for giving so much to your country.

God bless you. Godspeed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TAX INCREASES

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, America's family farmers and ranchers have faced unprecedented challenges in recent years. They have been caught in the middle of trade wars, repeatedly lost harvests and livestock to one catastrophic natural disaster after another, and faced a whole new set of unparalleled complications when COVID-19 took hold.

Now a new threat to their future looms, the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spend agenda for which family farmers and ranchers are being told to foot the bill.

The Democrats are proposing changes to capital gains tax rates, stepped-up basis, and the use of like-kind exchanges that put the future of our family farms and ranches at risk. The next generation of family farmers will face devastating consequences if the Democrats have their way, as their proposed changes put the future of nearly 2 million family-owned farm operations at risk.

The President and his allies in Congress will tell you that family farms and ranches will not be impacted by their proposed changes. In fact, they make a very specific claim that 98 percent of farms will not be impacted. Yet they have provided no evidence to support that claim, and they have been asked to provide that directly by myself and a majority of the Republican side of the Ag Committee.

We essentially asked USDA to show its math. That request has gone unanswered. It seems unlikely that we will ever get a response, so we took it upon ourselves to find out if there was any legitimacy to their claim.

We asked the highly respected team at the Agricultural and Food Policy Center at Texas A&M University to conduct a study on the legislation that mirrors tax increases President Biden and congressional Democrats have floated to pay for their massive human infrastructure plan.

The results confirm exactly what we expected. These proposed changes are going to crush rural America.

Remember the administration's claim that 98 percent of family farms and ranches will be protected? Well, AFPC's research showed just the opposite when it comes to changes to stepped-up basis, which allows the tax basis of an inherited asset to be stepped up at death to the fair market value as of the date of death.

If these changes were to be implemented, 92 of AFPC's 94 representative farms would be impacted with an average additional tax liability of more than \$720,000 per farm. That means 98 percent of family farms included in AFPC's study are hurt by these tax increases, not protected by them.

And as you can see on this map, this chart, those changes hit rural America very, very hard. We are looking at over half a million dollars in additional tax liabilities per farm in the Southwest and in the Southeast, which includes my home State of Arkansas. In fact, the average tax liability for the five Arkansas farms represented in the study is over \$800,000. In the Northeast and out West, these changes would result in over \$700,000 in additional tax liabilities per farm. And look at the Midwest. It is over \$1 million in additional tax liabilities per farm.

These obligations will take literally years to pay off. And, again, that is just when you take into account changes to stepped-up basis, just that one particular part.

Add in the higher capital gains tax rates Democrats have proposed and

limitations to like-kind exchanges, which allow taxpayers, including family farmers, to exchange property and defer the capital gains tax, and you can see why so many literally fear for their livelihood.

Farmers are land rich and cash poor. Farmland is equivalent to a farmer's 401(k). Instead of traditional retirement accounts, farmers and ranchers invest in cropland and pastureland and tirelessly work that land in an effort to create a more prosperous future for their loved ones.

That lifetime of hard work, planning, and sacrifice will all be for naught if these changes are allowed to be implemented.

On top of that, these Tax Code changes will dry up the farmland market, lead to further consolidation in the agricultural sector, create barriers to entry for new or beginning farmers, and stunt reinvestment in rural communities.

Ultimately, agriculture as a whole and rural America will suffer. That is why my colleagues and I are down here today. If changes of these magnitude are implemented, the economic harm it will cause will have a lasting impact on rural America.

These tax increases, which again are only being proposed because the Democrats are determined to force their reckless spending agenda through Congress, certainly need to be rejected.

With that, I yield to Senator GRASSLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, to finance their big spending agenda, President Biden and Members of his party in Congress have called for over \$3 trillion in new taxes.

This group claims that these tax hikes are targeted solely to the very wealthy. However, deep down, embedded in their tax-hike proposal, is a direct attack on family farms and resulting ruination of rural communities.

If Democrats get their way, family farms would be decimated through the enactment of a second death tax that operates on top of the existing estate tax. This second death tax would subject the paper gains of business and investment assets to tax upon transfer to the next generation. At the same time, the current long-term capital gains rate would be nearly doubled.

Now, as a result, decades of paper gains in farmland and other property could be subject to capital gains taxes at a rate as high as 43.4 percent.

Given inflation as well as the escalating value of farmland over the past several decades, some Iowa farms could easily generate a half-a-million-dollar tax bill or even more based upon land values alone. And those land values have gone up as a result of inflation and nothing else.

Moreover, according to an analysis by KPMG, family farms captured both by this new death tax and the existing estate tax could see tax rates exceeding 66 percent.

Now, it is pretty simple. That is not taxation; that is confiscation.

Proponents claim this new tax—or you might say this new confiscation—is needed to close a loophole that allows the appreciation in value of property over one's lifetime to go untaxed, but death isn't a loophole, and it shouldn't be a taxable event.

In fact, rather than solving a problem, this proposal would resurrect failed policy from a decade past.

As part of the Tax Reform Act of 1976, Congress experimented with a similar attempt to subject paper gains in inherited assets to tax. This change was immediately met with outcries from farmers, ranchers, and small business owners, resulting in its repeal in a few years.

In fact, it is such a complicated process, it is probably impossible to administer such a tax; at least that was the main point made in the late 1970s against that 1976 legislation.

Now, as problematic as this change was for farmers in 1976, what Democrats have in store would actually be far worse. Where in 1976 no tax was due until an asset was eventually sold by an heir, current proposals could result in a tax bill due in the year of that person's death.

As is often said, and with a lot of truth to it, farmers are land rich and cash poor. This means it is unlikely for a decedent's estate to have cash on hand to satisfy a six-figure tax bill. Now, as a result, all or portions of a family farm might have to be sold to satisfy an oversized tax bill.

This would endanger the continuation of family farms from one generation to the next, and it would devastate rural communities along with it because, you see, most people, if you invest in farmland, you don't invest today because you are going to sell it tomorrow; you invest in it to work it and you work it for a generation and you pass it on to the next generation.

Now, we had one recent study that found subjecting paper gains to a tax at death could cost as much as 80,000 jobs each year over the next decade.

So I say to my Democratic colleagues, pursue this policy at your own peril. I assure you, farmers, ranchers, and small business owners are paying close attention. If you aren't, you better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I have the privilege of representing Kansas in the U.S. Senate and Kansas and especially the opportunity, the privilege of representing farmers and ranchers. It is a huge component of our State's economy and a significant way that we live our lives. Agriculture has molded the nature of our State generation to generation.

In agriculture, farming and ranching is one of the few remaining professions where sons and daughters still can work alongside moms and dads. They can work alongside their grandparents.

I still remember a video that a farmer proudly showed me of him and three generations of his family, so four total—him and three other generations—cutting wheat in Kansas one July summer and how proud he was to look out and see that his son was in one combine, he was in another, his father in another, his grandfather in another.

Family farming and ranching is not just important for food production. We are productive in that family farm setting. It is not just important for food production for our country and for the rest of the world, but it also is important for us in preserving our values and principles which are passed down from generation to generation.

The love of life, respect for others, the joy of earning a living, the idea that what you do every day has a consequence in feeding the world—those characteristics of Kansas farmers need to be around for the country not only today but into the future. But unfortunately, the tax-and-spend spree, the Democrats' tax proposal, is a direct assault on multigenerational farms and ranches in Kansas and across the country. These proposals threaten the ability of producers to be able to pass on their operations to that next generation.

I have watched farmers talk to their kids about where the future lies for them, and sometimes it is positive in the sense that there is hope for a bright future, and at other times, in difficult days in agriculture, it is the worry about whether or not the next generation can afford to be on that farm.

For the past century, this thing called stepped-up basis—so that the value of a piece of property for its inheritance tax purposes is valued at the date of the death of the person—the farmer in this case and rancher in this case. For this past century, stepped-up basis has been a cornerstone of our Tax Code, and it has protected family farms and ranches in their plan to transition to the next generation.

Farm- and ranchland have tripled in value since the late nineties, so even a second generation, somebody currently just now coming to the farm because of the death of a parent, could be devastatingly impacted.

For example, a 2,000-acre farm purchased in the midnineties in Kansas by a first-generation producer—kind of a typical-size farm, particularly in western Kansas. Even with a modest capital gains exemption, the inheriting farmer, the son or daughter, could face a tax liability close to a fourth of the present-day value of the land.

To keep the farm in operation to satisfy the tax liability, the son or daughter inheriting the farm would be faced with the difficult decision of either to sell a significant portion of the land that was farmed by their parents or take on even more debt in a business that is faced with increasingly tight margins. The damage would only get

increasingly worse for family farms and ranches passed down through additional generations.

If the proposed changes in stepped-up basis are implemented, the big farms will get bigger by purchasing land from the smaller operations unable to meet that tax liability. The consequences would certainly be felt by the small farmer and his or her family, who are forced to sell the land, but also throughout the entire rural community in which the farms are built around.

We need those family farmers on land in Kansas producing food, fiber, and fuel for the well-being of our country and its economy, but we need them especially for the well-being of the community's future. In the absence of those family farmers and their kids, the family ranchers and their children, the ability to keep a grocery store, to have a farm store, to have an implement dealership, to support the local bank, to pay the taxes for the school—we lose those things when we lose family farmers.

Our farmers and ranchers should not be forced to shoulder the Democratic trillion-dollar spending spree to expand social programs. Our Tax Code should work for American families, not against them, and especially for family farms and ranches that often lack the cash flow to make ends meet.

I urge my colleagues, my Democratic colleagues, to reject imposing taxes, to changing the issue of stepped-up basis that is so valuable and viable for farmers' and ranchers' future, and it would endanger their ability to pass on land to the next generation of producers. It would be a bad thing for the farmers and ranchers and their families, it would be a bad thing for the community in which they live, and it would be a terrible thing for our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, a lot of time when people come to Washington, they come up with ideas for new policies, and they have a theory of how those policies are supposed to work. What they don't always know are the unintended consequences of what that law is going to produce. As a matter of fact, I have said on occasion that the most certain thing that will happen when we pass a law is unintended consequences, and I haven't been proved wrong very many times on that.

The unintended consequences are things that nobody saw coming. They are things you didn't expect to happen the way they did. Smart people writing the laws may do all they can to anticipate everything they can, but there is always something never thought of. So it is helpful to have information that tells us what the consequences are likely to be.

The topic we are talking about here today is filled with intended consequences if you look just beyond the

comment you are making at the impact it is going to have.

In this case, the proposed laws are a couple of ideas my Democratic colleagues have as to how to pay for the spending spree they are on right now. The tax-and-spend plans include a lot of bad ideas, but two of the tax ideas are particularly bad and will have particularly devastating impact.

First is a proposal from Senator SANDERS to raise the death tax on farmers and ranchers, to change the exemption and do things that simply raise that tax. The second would be to impose the double-death tax by eliminating what Senator MORAN was just talking about, the stepped-up basis in calculating how much families have to pay.

The research tells us what we can expect to happen if these two bills pass. Research was done at the Texas A&M University that looked at a representative group of 94 farms in 30 States. You can look at this research. You can verify my facts. With 94 farms, 30 States, they found that under current law, 2 of those 94 farms could expect to be hit by a big death tax when the farm goes from one generation to the next. But if the step-up basis tax hike proposed by President Biden and Democrats in Congress were enacted, the researchers found that 92 of 94 farms would be hit hard. The average additional tax liability would be \$726,000. So 94 farms; 30 States; 92 farms affected; the average tax, \$726,000. That is not the total taxes; that is just the additional taxes if these two bills pass.

If these tax hikes favored by the other side were allowed to pass, we would have 92 farms paying a higher tax bill. That average additional tax would add up to more than \$1.5 million. Many families would be forced to sell all or part of their farm. And these aren't families who are inheriting big stock portfolios or families who are inheriting multimillion-dollar beach houses. They are not families who focus on every way you can think of to cheat the tax law. They are not billionaires looking for every way they can use a loophole. These are farmers and ranchers who have put their lives into the effort to make their farms work.

I will point out also that these same statistics would apply to many small businesses. Give this same speech for small businesses with many of the same considerations.

According to the Missouri Department of Agriculture, our State has 95,000 farms. They cover two-thirds of the State's total land acreage. The average Missouri farm is 291 acres, and almost all of them are owned by families. Between the investment there and the efforts that have been made, those families can be devastated in what they have worked hard to put together.

So for my friends on the other side of the aisle, I point out that unintended consequences are one thing, and unintended consequences often happen, but here we know what the consequences

are. So if these bills pass, this is intended consequences to make a big difference for family farms, for ranches, and, frankly, for small businesses as well.

I hope my colleagues will not go forward with these tax hikes on family farms. We know what damage it will cause. It is easy to verify. Don't make the family sell the farm. Don't make the small business sell the farm to a bigger business. Don't make these mistakes that have clear and intended consequences if this is what the Senate and the Congress will do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my good friend from Arkansas, JOHN BOOZMAN, who is the ranking member on our Ag Committee. He has organized this colloquy that we have to talk about how important it is that we support our farmers and ranchers. I mean, in my home State of North Dakota right now, we have terrible drought, and our farmers and ranchers are up against it. I think the Presiding Officer—I think in your State, you are having real drought as well.

So it is a tough time for our farmers and ranchers, and we need to be out there doing everything we can to help them and support them, but instead, the Biden administration is looking at tax increases. That is going to be a big, big problem for them. So we are here today to talk about that.

Our farmers and ranchers produce the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world, and they continue to navigate bottomed-out commodity prices, complex global trade uncertainties, unpredictable weather, as I said, including drought this year in North Dakota and across much of the West, and also the COVID pandemic. So they have been dealing with all of these things.

Throughout these numerous challenges, our producers have continued to put food on the shelves at supermarkets and on the tables of families around the world, not just in this country but around the world. In this country, every single American benefits every single day from what our farmers and ranchers do, and that is, produce the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world.

Yet, rather than help improve the economic outlook for our producers and strengthen our ag supply chain, the Biden administration has put forth tax-and-spend policy proposals that would further increase the cost of food production, harm family farmers and ranchers, and reduce our economic growth, all as we are working to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic.

The trillions that Democrats in Congress have already spent this year have led to a \$2.2 trillion deficit through the first 9 months of the fiscal year, and we are on track to end the year with a deficit of more than \$3 trillion, the second largest deficit since World War II. With

our national debt already at \$28 trillion, we simply cannot afford to spend more.

The American people are beginning to feel the impact of those spending policies. The prices of consumer goods are increasing at the fastest rate since 2008. Just last week, the Department of Labor released data showing that inflation has increased to 5.4 percent, the largest year-over-year gain since 2008. This includes farm country, where producers are facing increased costs for everything from fertilizer to fencing supplies, to combines and tractors.

As we watch inflation grow faster than American workers' paychecks, wiping out wage gains and leaving American families behind, the Biden administration is planning an even larger, \$3.5 trillion tax-and-spend package that will bring economic harm to American workers, small businesses, and farmers and ranchers.

For example, the Biden administration and Democrats in Congress have proposed to eliminate stepped-up basis, a tax provision that prevents family-owned farms and ranches from being hit with a crippling tax bill when a family member passes away.

Under current law, when passing down a family farm or ranch to the next generation, the tax basis is stepped up to fair market value, preventing a large tax bill on the next generation of farmers.

In addition to increasing the tax bill on multigeneration farmers and ranchers, repealing stepped-up basis would add significant complexity to farmers' and ranchers' tax-filing process. In fact, when a Democratic Congress previously tried to repeal stepped-up basis in the 1976 Tax Reform Act, it was labeled by the New York Times as "impossibly unworkable." Congress at the time must have agreed because the provision was never implemented and was ultimately repealed 4 years later in 1980.

The impacts of a repeal of stepped-up basis would not only be felt by our farmers and ranchers, but it would also impact small businesses and their employees and supplementary services.

A recent report from Ernst & Young estimates the repeal of stepped-up basis would result in the loss of 80,000 jobs in each of the first 10 years after the repeal and the loss of 100,000 jobs in each subsequent year—80,000 jobs to 100,000 jobs.

Similarly, a study by the Texas A&M Agricultural and Food Policy Center determined that more than 97 percent of the representative farms in its 30-State database, including North Dakota, would be impacted by a proposal to eliminate stepped-up basis, with an average additional tax liability totaling nearly \$725,000 per farm.

While the administration claims these changes would impact only 2 percent of farms, they have provided no explanation or data to support those assertions.

With the average age of farmers in our country now nearing 60 years old,

now is not the time to burden the next generation of young farmers and ranchers with massive, complex tax bills.

In addition, the Biden administration has proposed to eliminate the use of 1031 like-kind exchanges, a provision that has been in the Tax Code since 1921, which allows farmers and ranchers to defer taxes on land transfers when they continue their investment in similar land assets.

Farmers and ranchers use the 1031 like-kind exchanges for many reasons. This includes consolidating land parcels to reduce time and money they spend moving equipment, supplies, and commodities from one place to another. Producers also consolidate cropland closer to their livestock barns, crop storage facilities, or even as part of the estate planning process to help young or beginning farmers join their business.

In short, in the middle of the recovery from a global pandemic, President Biden is proposing a massive tax-and-spend bill that will harm our economic recovery, increase the cost of consumer goods, reduce American competitiveness globally, and disproportionately hurt our small businesses, our farmers, and our ranchers.

Instead, we need to get our debt and deficit under control and ensure U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace, while positioning our farmers, ranchers, and ag supply chain to continue to produce the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, in the last few weeks, I have been back home, and many, many people were finishing up wheat harvest. It is absolutely one of the joys of the entire year, when a year's work of hard work comes to fruition. Every corner of the State was speckled with combines, tractors, grain carts, and trucks, all doing their part in the harvest process. Inside those implements were fathers and sons, sisters, mothers, brothers, and my cousins, all working side by side to harvest the crop that will provide the financing for land payments, equipment loans, operating loans, and next year's inputs, like seed and fertilizer.

Now, agriculture is a capital-intensive industry, much more than I could have ever imagined. Harvesting wheat requires at least four different pieces of machinery, many costing \$250,000, \$500,000, or more each. It takes years for a farmer building up equity to purchase a new piece of equipment or land. And for many families, it is only by passing down the land and equipment that a family farm can remain viable. This is the only way a young farmer can truly survive.

Now, the common saying in Kansas is that farmers live poor but die rich. Across this great Nation, contrary to most people's beliefs, 98 percent of farms and ranches are family-owned—

98 percent, family-owned. Those families produce much of the food, fuel, and fiber we consume here in the United States and around the globe. These family farms, many in their fourth, like mine, fifth generation—and even sixth and seventh generation farms and ranches are out there now. They endure turbulent weather, inconsistent market conditions, and tight labor markets. It seemed like, growing up, a week never passed that my dad never looked at me and said: You know, farming has to be the biggest gamble there is in America.

In 2017, Republican-led government passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which provided sweeping tax changes to encourage private entrepreneurship and economic growth. Under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the exemptions for the estate tax—as we call it, the death tax—more than doubled, keeping most family farms safe from redundant government taxation.

But now, the current administration and some of my friends across the aisle want to tax hard-working agricultural producers with the financing of their roughly \$5 trillion reckless tax-and-spending bill. I think President Eisenhower—or Ike, as we call him, a fellow Kansan—hit the nail on the head when he said: “You know, farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil, and you’re a thousand miles from a corn field.”

First, they proposed not only eliminating stepped-up basis on realized property but also on unrealized assets at the time of the owner’s death. Their proposal would tax unrealized capital gains over \$1 million at ordinary income tax rates, which would be levied at the top marginal rate of 39.6 percent. That means the next generation inheriting land and equipment would have to pay taxes on the increase in value, even if the property is never sold.

Secondly, the administration has proposed lowering the exemption to the death tax from \$11.7 million, under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, to \$3.5 million per person and increasing the top tax rate from 40 to 45 percent. Consequently, a family farm commonly would have to sell off a third of their land to keep going from generation to generation. And the buyers, unfortunately, will be large corporations or foreign entities.

According to a report published by Texas A&M’s Agriculture and Food Policy Center, under current law only 2 of their 94 representative farms would be impacted by an event triggering a generational transfer of property—2 out of 94. To contrast this, up to 98 percent of their representative farms would see new higher tax burdens if certain parts of the administration’s plan were enacted.

From 1997 to 2020, in Kansas, crop-land values have risen 220 percent. In some parts of the United States, they have increased over 500 percent. If there was a 20-percent capital gains tax

on those valuation increases, the average Kansas farmer would have a new tax obligation of nearly a quarter of a million dollars. These numbers are simply unbearable.

I stop and pay homage to my grandfather and both of my grandfathers, who have had fourth and fifth generation family farms. These farms were bought in the early 1900s. Both farms have been in the family over 100 years. I would suppose my grandfathers paid less than \$100 per acre. Today, those farms maybe are worth \$1,000 or \$2,000 an acre. But if you can imagine the tax burden of trying to pass down that farm and pay for that stepped-up basis, for the tax on the increase of net property, it simply isn’t going to happen. None of us have brothers and sisters and cousins that have that type of cash available. We want to encourage the next generation to return home to the family farm, not tax them into bankruptcy.

America will see millions of acres of land and billions of dollars of equipment change hands over this next decade. While the current administration contests that only a small percentage of our farm families will be impacted by the proposed changes, all evidence really indicates otherwise.

The administration fails to consider the several realities of multigenerational farms, with some siblings staying on the farm and some selling their interest. Any changes to the estate tax and opportunities to pass assets from one generation to the next will lead to further consolidation in the ag industry, fewer young families returning home to their rural communities, and more rural Main Street businesses closing shop.

We can’t allow this administration to saddle our hard-working farming families with the responsibilities of funding their socialist agenda. Agriculture is still responsible for 40 percent of the Kansas economy. We must all do what we can to ensure our family farms have every opportunity possible to continue their way of life and bring the next generation back to the farm and keep rural America alive and well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to join a number of my colleagues representing farm States to sound the alarm to the millions of rural Americans who will be harmed by proposed tax changes outlined in the American Families Plan. Described as a plan to help American families, it would do the exact opposite for farm families across the United States.

The most concerning changes to the Tax Code include decreasing the estate tax exemption, increasing capital gains tax rates on transfers of property to heirs, and increasing taxes on appreciated assets, such as farmland, which has increased in value very significantly in recent years.

These misguided proposals fail to take into consideration the fact that farmers in general are highly vulnerable to these types of tax changes, as land and equipment comprise most of the farmer’s net worth.

If enacted, these tax provisions would strongly discourage and make it more difficult for our next generation to get into farming. The provisions would create significant hurdles from a financial perspective, to say the least.

With the average age of U.S. farmers being nearly 60 years old, do we really want to force surviving spouses or heirs to sell half of the farm they inherited simply to continue farming the land that has been passed down for generations?

Family farms are the backbone of American agriculture. Roughly 98 percent of all U.S. farms are family owned and operated. Whether you like large family farming operations or not, they account for 44 percent of total U.S. farm production annually. That is a staggering figure, given that American farmers contributed \$136 billion to the U.S. gross domestic product in 2019. These people who put food on our table and clothes on our back do not need to go out of business because they are being taxed at every turn, punished for their achievements and sacrifices.

Initial reports from the Biden administration suggested that the proposed tax changes I am discussing would have very little impact on America’s farmers and ranchers. However, recent research and analysis conducted by Texas A&M University paints a very different picture.

For instance, should the proposed capital gains tax changes and generational transfers become enacted into law, nearly all U.S. family farms would face higher taxes. Nationwide, the average additional tax liability per farm under the capital gains tax change would be \$726,104. Mississippi would be the State most heavily affected, with an average additional tax liability per farm of \$2.1 million. It is totally unbelievable.

Should the estate tax changes become law, recent analysis also determined that nearly half of all U.S. family farms would face higher taxes. The average additional tax liability per farm nationwide would be \$2.2 million, and the fifth most heavily impacted State would again be Mississippi, with an average additional tax liability per farm of \$4.6 million. That is totally incredible. As a former ag commissioner of Mississippi, I personally know these farmers and their families. This is truly unbelievable.

More than 3 years of net cash farm income would be needed to meet these additional tax obligations alone. That is simply unmanageable. I am perplexed as to why Democrats want to place the highest tax burden on one of the most economically challenged and socially disadvantaged States in the Nation, my home State of Mississippi.

Let's not forget that in rural America, the primary source of jobs and income are often associated with agriculture. It is the No. 1 industry in Mississippi, employing more than 17 percent of the State's workforce either directly or indirectly.

If family farms are taxed out of business, far more than the farmers will suffer. Low-income and minority populations across rural America will lose jobs and be forced to rely on government support. I hope this is not the underlying plan of my Democratic colleagues.

Let me be clear. For those who are willing to pay for reckless spending by punishing America's farmers and ranchers and everyone who relies on them, you will be doing far more than just that. You will be running off our next generation of farmers. You will be making it easier for large corporations owned by foreign adversaries, such as China, to buy up available farmland, and you will be ensuring that every American pays more for the food they eat and the clothes they wear. The list goes on.

I know there is a deep desire on the other side of the aisle to enact a reckless tax-and-spending spree that makes Americans more dependent on the Federal Government, but family farms cannot be caught up in the administration's punitive dragnet to find ways to pay for it.

Any changes to the Federal Tax Code should be geared toward supporting economic growth and helping the next generation keep these family-owned operations alive. I hope that we can all come to our senses on this.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF BONNIE D. JENKINS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Bonnie Jenkins to be the next Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security.

The position for which Ambassador Jenkins has been nominated is one of the most vital senior security positions in the Department of State. This individual is responsible for overseeing nuclear policy and nonproliferation efforts, directing U.S. arms sales and security assistance policy, dealing with the legacies of unexploded munitions and landmines, and orchestrating global cooperation among both allies and adversaries on critical national security issues.

As the United States is preparing for its first Strategic Stability Dialogue with Russia, which will occur later this month, it is absolutely critical we have a Senate-confirmed leader in the State Department to effectively compete with and confront Moscow's challenges to our national security. This meeting will set the tone for U.S. diplomatic efforts to limit Russia's nuclear arsenal, which is crucial at a time when we are also witnessing the initial stages of a

major build-up of Chinese nuclear forces.

I am pleased to be supporting Ambassador Jenkins's nomination for this position, and I am confident that her extensive experience in the State Department and her 22 years in the Air Force and Naval Reserves provide her with the type of background and knowledge required to meet the challenges that await her, if confirmed.

During the Obama administration, Ambassador Jenkins' spearheaded efforts to fight nuclear terrorism. She helped coordinate four nuclear security summits which sought to persuade nations around the world to secure vulnerable nuclear material that might fall into the hands of dangerous actors.

For over 20 years, she served as an intelligence officer in the U.S. Naval Reserves, retiring as a lieutenant commander. She also holds multiple degrees, including a Ph.D., a master of laws, a law degree, and a master in public administration.

Outside of government she has consistently empowered voices rarely heard in national security debates, providing a different but important perspective on how the United States should tackle the threats we confront.

The fact that Ambassador Jenkin's nomination, someone whose leadership is so essential to the State Department and to our national security, has languished on the Senate floor for 56 days is a travesty.

I urge my colleagues to support her nomination and make sure that this critical national security position is filled without further delay.

VOTE ON JENKINS NOMINATION

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

(Mr. BENNET assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 275 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

Van Hollen	Warnock	Whitehouse
Warner	Warren	Wyden

NAYS—48

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

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 100, H.R. 3684, a bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Alex Padilla, Jeff Merkley, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jon Tester, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Patrick J. Leahy, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin, John Hickenlooper, Angus S. King, Jr., Tammy Duckworth, Patty Murray, Joe Manchin III, Mark Kelly, Kyrsten Sinema.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3684, a bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Merkley
Bennet	Hassan	Murphy
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Murray
Booker	Hickenlooper	Ossoff
Brown	Hirono	Padilla
Cantwell	Kaine	Peters
Cardin	Kelly	Reed
Carper	King	Rosen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sanders
Coons	Leahy	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Shaheen
Duckworth	Manchin	Sinema
Durbin	Markey	Smith
Feinstein	Menendez	Stabenow

Tester
Van Hollen
Warner

Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse

Wyden

NAYS—51

Barrasso
Blackburn
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst
Fischer

Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeben
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I just want to explain what happened on the floor very briefly.

At the end of the vote, I changed my response to a no so that I may move to reconsider this vote at a future time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Vermont.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I rise on the floor today to honor the legacy of one of the country's most cherished heroes and a very dear and close friend of mine, John Lewis.

This past Saturday marked 1 year since we said goodbye to Congressman Lewis. The pain of his loss is still very fresh for both my wife Marcelle and me, as it is for millions of Americans.

He wasn't just a moral giant and a guiding light for the world, he was, as he always told me, my brother, and I still have such a sense of emotion when I think of the time he introduced me as his brother.

For more than six decades, John Lewis served the United States with an unyielding belief that we could be better; that we have a responsibility to each other and the world to live up to our founding ideals.

John didn't spend his life fighting for Democrats or Republicans; he fought for the rights of all Americans and the dignity of all human beings.

John's principles were so much bigger than party and politics. When he saw suffering, he tried to end it; whenever he saw injustice, he tried to correct it; and wherever good trouble was needed, he delivered it.

I knew John as more than just a generational leader; I knew him as a friend. And I can tell you that his dedication to justice was matched only by his fundamental decency as a person.

John and I served in Congress for more than 30 years. In those years, I

witnessed a tremendous humility and empathy that defined his lifetime of public service.

Every day, John embodied the ideals he fought for through his unfailing generosity and dignity. So I consider John Lewis a brother, and it was an honor of a lifetime to have him consider me one too.

It is—I think when we walked down the street in Vermont, I just felt suddenly so much a person because I was walking beside John Lewis.

But people are seeing where he had walked. Many Americans know the stories of John's bravery in the face of brutality. He was beaten bloody, his bones broken, in the heroic efforts to bolster the ballot box for millions of Americans.

John wasn't just on the frontlines of our Nation's great civil rights movement; he was the frontline. John was there when the Freedom Riders were dragged off their buses and beaten and arrested; John was there to lead the march from—for freedom from Selma to Montgomery, AL; and John was there when millions of Americans gathered in Washington to proclaim to the country that the time for justice and equality was now. John Lewis put his body and soul on the line for the mighty movement that changed the world.

What fewer Americans may know is that John was beloved and respected by Members of both parties. It is because he believed in his heart that our Nation's greatest challenges must be faced together, regardless of party. When he stood there beside Lyndon Johnson as he signed the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965, he was flanked by Democrats and Republicans. In that moment, he absorbed the lessons that reaching across the aisle wasn't just a political necessity, it is the way to change—everlastingly change society.

And throughout his career in Congress, John embraced bipartisanship. He built friendships with Members of both parties. For years, John led bipartisan groups of Members of Congress, including some of my Republican friends in this body, down to the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL. He wanted to commemorate Bloody Sunday and the American struggle for equal rights.

I will never forget the iconic photo of John. He is flanked on either side by Presidents Obama and George W. Bush; the three of them, heads bowed in silent reflection, arms and hands linked on the Edmund Pettus Bridge for Bloody Sunday's 50th anniversary.

John Lewis didn't just cross bridges; he built bridges. By bringing people together, he helped us forge a more perfect Union.

So it is in John's spirit today that I fervently urge my Republican friends to join me in restoring and reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act. I would remind everyone in this body that reauthorizing the VRA, the Voting

Rights Act, on a bipartisan basis is the way we have always done it. I say always done—the core provisions of the VRA have been reauthorized five times, and every single time it was with overwhelming bipartisan support in Congress.

Look at the Presidents who signed it: President Nixon, President Reagan, George W. Bush. They all signed the Voting Rights Act reauthorizations into law because they spoke of the profound importance of the landmark law for our democracy.

I was here in 2006 for the most recent VRA reauthorization. Do you know what the vote was in this body in 2006? It was 98 to 0 in the Senate. In fact, many of the Republican Senators still serving today voted yes; 98 to 0. You can't do much better than that.

So let's honor John Lewis's legacy the way he would want to be honored, with solid justified action. I am committed to working with my Republican friends to find a bipartisan compromise around my John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, which I proudly renamed in his honor last Congress.

For those who knew John Lewis and for those who did not, I can say John would want us to come together and find a path forward to addressing the many threats facing Americans' foundational right to vote. I will tell you what he wouldn't accept. He wouldn't accept inaction. So let's put in the hard work and let's try to live up to the memory of John Lewis, our hero and our colleague.

Let's remember the person who took me by the arm and walked me on to the floor of the other body one day and said to everybody: I am here with my brother.

Every one of us thought of John as our brother, and we were proud of that. Let us be proud of our brother. Let's be proud of his memory. Let's be proud of America. Let's be proud of our right to vote. Let's pass and reauthorize the John Lewis Voting Rights Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PADILLA. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator LEAHY and a number of our colleagues to remember our friend, John Lewis, and reflect on his legacy.

It was a little over a year ago when John shared his final message to the American people. He wrote, "Democracy is not a state. It is an act, and each generation must do its part to help build what we called the Beloved Community, a nation and world society at peace with itself."

John devoted his entire life to building that "Beloved Community." And in

his final moments, he called on all of us to carry that mission forward. He told us it is now “your turn to let freedom ring.”

We have an obligation to live up to John Lewis’s legacy—and his call to action to protect our most fundamental freedom of all: the right to vote. And we can do that by restoring and revitalizing the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

When President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act into law, it marked the beginning of a new era of American democracy. It ensured that our constitutional rights were not merely sketched onto a piece of paper, but enforced as well. It ensured that poll taxes, literacy tests, and other Jim Crow laws could no longer be used to deny Black, Brown, and indigenous voters access to the ballot box. In the words of John Lewis, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 “helped liberate not just a people but a nation.” It brought America closer to our foundational ideals.

But today, this monument to American freedom is under attack. At this very moment, Republican State officials are working to pass laws that make it harder for people, particularly racial and ethnic minorities, to vote.

Nearly 400 of these bills have been introduced in 48 States. Some of these laws set new limits on voting by mail, others cut hours for polling locations, but the hundreds of restrictive voting provisions we have seen in recent years have achieved the same outcome: erecting new barriers to the ballot box.

The proponents of these laws claim they are designed to help prevent so-called voter fraud. But the truth is, “voter fraud” is nothing more than a fabricated phenomenon. Nearly every investigation into the 2020 election, for instance, has found no meaningful evidence of voter fraud. The Department of Homeland Security called last year’s election “the most secure in American history.” And more than 80 judges, including many conservative judges appointed by President Trump himself, have thrown out baseless challenges brought by the former President’s lawyers.

But even though the “Big Lie” of widespread voter fraud has been debunked, many Republican lawmakers are still standing by it. In fact, they are using the Big Lie to wage an assault on voting rights in America. You see, the laws I mentioned really aren’t about securing our elections; they are about preventing eligible Americans from voting.

Under section 5 of the original Voting Rights Act, many of these efforts to suppress voters would have been prohibited by the Department of Justice or Federal courts. But that authority has been greatly diminished. In 2013, the conservative majority on the Supreme Court essentially nullified section 5 of the Voting Rights Act with its decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*. And just this month, the Supreme Court weakened a remaining key sec-

tion of the Voting Rights Act—section 2—with its decision in *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee*.

This is the trend that has emerged over the past decade: State officials make it harder for Black, Brown, and indigenous Americans to vote, and the conservative majority on the Supreme Court upholds those laws by whittling away at the protections guaranteed under the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In her dissent to the Court’s ruling in *Brnovich*, Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan wrote “in the last decade, this court has treated no statute worse” than the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Those are unequivocal words. The Supreme Court has severely hobbled the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And only Congress has the power—and the constitutional obligation—to restore it to its full potential.

You know, it really wasn’t that long ago that reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act was a unifying cause. Just a few years before the Supreme Court’s *Shelby* decision, the minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, joined his Republican colleagues in supporting its reauthorization. In expressing his support he said, “This is a piece of legislation which has worked.”

To him, and to all of my Republican colleagues, I say: Let’s make sure it can keep working. Let’s honor John Lewis’s legacy by joining together, on a bipartisan basis, to support a piece of legislation that will revitalize and strengthen the original Voting Rights Act: the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

I am proud to be working with Senator LEAHY and our counterparts on the House Judiciary Committee to update and reintroduce this bill soon. Last Congress, it received bipartisan support, and we hope that we will be able to expand that support this year. What remains to be seen is whether the bill will receive the votes necessary to overcome a potential filibuster.

For those of my Republican colleagues who have yet to decide where they stand on the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, let’s show the American people that we can stand together. This Senate has the power—and the responsibility—to protect our most fundamental right as Americans.

Let’s heed John Lewis’s call and defend it together.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, 1 year ago this week, our Nation lost a giant, a man with a righteous purpose and a remarkable legacy, John Robert Lewis, who dedicated his life to the cause of justice.

From Troy, AL, to a bridge in Selma, to the Halls of this very Congress, he put his body on the line for every American’s sacred right to vote.

John Lewis never stopped fighting because he understood that democracy is a commitment we have to make again and again and again. As he wrote in the last days of his life:

The vote is the most powerful nonviolent change agent you have in a democratic soci-

ety. You must use it because it is not guaranteed. You can lose it.

John Lewis understood the power and the fragility of our multiracial democracy, because he did so much to build it in his lifetime. At the age of 25, he led peaceful protesters on a march through Alabama to demand their right to vote. As the world witnessed, they were attacked, gassed, and beaten by police officers.

They were attacked because the right to vote is power, and White supremacists feared the power of people of color exercising that right. But out of the pain and outrage over this Bloody Sunday came one of our country’s greatest monuments to freedom, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

For nearly 50 years, the Voting Rights Act stood as a guardian of our multiracial democracy. It outlawed literacy tests. It prohibited voting procedures that would deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color. It gave the U.S. Department of Justice the power to review any new voting rules in places with a history of voter suppression and to block rules with discriminatory effects.

Critically, the Voting Rights Act recognized the important role of the Federal Government in protecting the right to vote. It helped guarantee communities of color their rightful voice in our democracy.

Over time, the Voting Rights Act was reauthorized four times, including most recently in 2006, when Representative Lewis and a nearly unanimous Congress voted to affirm the continued need for its protections. That’s right. Passage of the Voting Rights Act and every reauthorization of the Act was always on a bipartisan basis.

But in 2013, five conservative Justices of the Supreme Court overrode the bipartisan consensus of Congress. In spite of the voluminous record assembled by the Congress and the reality of the country around them, these five Justices effectively ended preclearance and gutted a key protection of the Voting Rights Act.

As the late Justice Ginsburg wrote in her dissent, it was “like throwing away your umbrella in a rainstorm because you are not getting wet.”

Well, the storm of voter suppression is most certainly pouring over us now.

In 2020, in the midst of an ongoing global health pandemic, our Nation held one of the most successful and secure elections in our history. Voters of color made their voices heard in record numbers and confirmed again that our democracy is strongest when all eligible Americans are able to participate.

But instead of celebrating this remarkable achievement, Republican legislative leaders in statehouses around the country this year have proposed and passed bill after bill after bill restricting the right to vote and restricting access to the ballot. They are doing this on the basis of lies about voter fraud and rooted firmly in the legacy of White supremacy. They continue to do so as we speak.

The Supreme Court's most recent anti-democracy decision in the *Brnovich* case, which eviscerated a key remaining protection of the Voting Rights Act, will only embolden these attacks.

But, so far, in this Senate, our Republican colleagues have turned a blind eye, choosing to be complicit in the outright assault on our democracy. Senate Republicans have refused to even open a debate on voting rights legislation. Instead, they prefer to abuse the filibuster to enable Republican legislative leaders across the country to continue their assault.

Our democracy is on the line. The unfinished work of John Lewis remains. We must summon the courage to act. That is why I am committed to passing the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, which will protect the right to vote for all people. I can think of no more fitting way to honor the memory of a man who chose our democracy as the struggle of his lifetime.

When I was first elected California Secretary of State to serve as the Chief Elections Officer for the State of California, I sought out the counsel of John Lewis. For more than 45 minutes during our first meeting, and time and again after that, John guided me with his wisdom, taught me by his example, and inspired me through his courage. He was always gracious with his time, warm with his spirit, and true in his conviction. And he reminded me, as he reminded so many of us, that our struggle is a struggle of a lifetime.

As he said, we cannot be afraid to make some noise and get into good trouble, necessary trouble, along the way. In fact, given the circumstances, it is exactly what we need to do today. As a bipartisan Senate, if we can, or as the elected Democratic majority, if we must, it is imperative that we pass legislation to preserve our democracy.

We must carry the torch that John Lewis carried for us for so long and build for all Americans a democracy that is as free, as fair, as accessible, and as inclusive as we can possibly make it. And we must remain hopeful in this pursuit.

You see, despite the scars that he bore and the hatred that he faced down, John Lewis was fundamentally a hopeful man, a man who never abandoned the youthful spirit that carried him across that bridge in Selma, and he always looked to the next generation for leadership, for energy, and for inspiration to carry the cause forward.

It is now on us to take up his work. There is no better way for us to honor the legacy of John Lewis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I join in the wonderful words of my colleague from California, a true leader. He is someone who has served as an election official and the secretary of state for the biggest State in our Nation. He knows how important it is to

count the votes and to make sure we allow everyone to vote.

I come to the floor today to join him and to join Senator LEAHY and other of our colleagues to honor the legacy of Congressman John Lewis and to continue his fight to make sure that every American can make their voice heard at the ballot box.

As my colleagues have mentioned, it has been just over a year since John Lewis passed. I have always been in awe of him. This past week, I had the opportunity to reflect on his monumental contributions to our Nation when the Senate Rules Committee held a field hearing on voting rights in his home State of Georgia at the National Center for Civil and Human Rights, a place that commemorates the civil rights movement.

Today, as we celebrate his legacy, I am reminded of his persistence, his resilience, and his faith that this country could be better if only we put in the work. It was his faith in our country that led him to Selma, AL, where he helped lead 600 marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge on that dark day that became known as Bloody Sunday. Several times, several years, including the last year that he came to that bridge before he died, I was able to stand with him on the bridge in awe of everything he had done.

The horrific events of that day shocked the Nation, with marchers attacked with clubs and tear gas. Congressman Lewis's skull was fractured. He bore the scars until the very end of his life.

Soon after, President Lyndon Johnson came to the Capitol, and, as he said, "with the outrage of Selma still fresh," urged Congress to guarantee the freedom to vote. Months later, with the help of former Minnesota Senator and Vice President Hubert Humphrey, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law.

One of the times I visited was, in fact, the 48th year anniversary of that march. That weekend, after 48 years, the police chief of Montgomery handed his badge to Congressman Lewis and apologized for not protecting him and the other freedom marchers. Forty-eight years is a long time, and it only happened because Congressman Lewis never quit fighting for progress, for civil rights, for economic justice, and to defend the voting rights of every American.

But now, more than five decades since that day in Selma and since the Voting Rights Act became the law of the land, so much of the progress that Americans have fought and even died for is at stake. Throughout our country's 245-year history, we have had to course-correct and take action to ensure that our democracy—for the people, by the people—actually lives up to its ideals.

We all had that moment, that night after the insurrection when this Chamber, which we are standing in, was taken over by those who did not be-

lieve in our election processes and in our democracy. And we not only came back to this Chamber that night, but, 2 weeks later, we stood under a beautiful blue sky and declared—Democrats or Republicans or Independents—that we stood with our democracy.

And as I said that day, that was a day where our democracy stood up, brushed itself off, and we went forward as "one nation under God, indivisible, with life and liberty for all."

That is why earlier this week, believing that the job is not done, especially when over 400 bills have been introduced across this country in nearly every State, with 28 of them already signed into law, including an egregious example in Georgia—that is why—for the first time in two decades, we took the Senate Rules Committee on the road and held a field hearing in Atlanta to shine a spotlight on what is happening in Georgia and in States across the country to undermine the freedom to vote.

We heard from State legislators and a former election official who had lost her job after a change in law meant that local election officials were taken away from their posts. And we heard from a voter, a veteran who had stood in line for hours and hours just to cast his vote. And when I asked him, when he signed up for the Air Force, was there a waiting line, he said no.

Well, there shouldn't be a waiting line to vote in the United States of America, and that is why it is so critical that Congress pass basic Federal standards—that is the For the People Act—to ensure that all Americans can cast a ballot in a way that works best for them and that is safe for them, whether it is early voting, whether it is vote by mail, which so many Americans in red States and blue used across the country during the pandemic.

And as we know the history of that, in States like the Presiding Officer's State of Colorado, or States like Utah, known as a red State, or States like Oregon, that has been the way they have been doing business safely for a long time. And many of us, for the first time, voted in that way.

But there are other ways as well, with dropoff ballot boxes. Some people have not registered way early because maybe they moved to a State, as we know happens in the United States, or maybe they are a young person at college, or maybe they forgot to register and they have to catch up and do it. None of those reasons, those simple reasons that could happen to anyone in their everyday life, should be reasons to ban people from voting, and that is why these basic Federal standards are so important.

When we were in Georgia, we heard from Helen Butler, who I mentioned was a former election official from rural Morgan County, who pointed out that it was only after Black voters increased their vote-by-mail numbers in the 2020 election that the Georgia Legislature imposed new restrictions on mail-in ballots, after all those years.

Georgia State Senator Sally Harrell also testified about how the bill was rushed through—this restrictive voting bill—through the Georgia Legislature without meaningful debate.

We heard about the provisions of the bill that basically say that non-partisan—that is already required, and that is correct—nonpartisan volunteers can't even give voters water when they stand in line, despite the fact that there were voters that we heard from the day before, with Senator MERKLEY and Stacy Abrams, and those voters stood in line for 3 hours, for 4 hours, and for 7 hours.

We heard about the runoff changes. The runoff used to be 9 weeks in Georgia. It was reduced to 28 days. And during the runoff period, you can't vote, under the new law, on Saturdays and Sundays. You can vote that way during the general election. All of this—all of this—is done, in the words of one North Carolina judge, many years ago, in a decision, who said: This law discriminates with surgical precision—literally going through ways that people voted, literally noticing that 70,000 new voters registered during the runoff, and then banning that because you have to register now 29 days ahead, when the time for the runoff is 28 days. How obvious can you get?

Where you live and what your ZIP Code is should not dictate whether or not you can vote for President or U.S. Senate or Congress or Governor or any election. We owe it to the people of this country, and to those across the country who stood in line for hours to cast a ballot, to take action and protect the fundamental right to vote.

I know a little bit about that because, in my State of Minnesota, nearly every single election has the highest voter turnout in the country. And guess what. We have elected Republican Governors with those rules that allow for more people to vote and the highest voter turnout. We have elected Democratic Governors, and we have elected Jesse Ventura. What I have noticed is not who wins, given that we are the only State in the country that has one State House that is Republican and one State House that is Democratic, given that our congressional delegation in the House is split evenly and has changed over time. It is not really who wins. It is how people feel about elections. They are part of the franchise we call democracy.

So they will come up to me and say, "You know, I didn't vote for you, but whatever; you are doing OK," or "I have this concern." But they feel like they are part of the action. That is what our goal should be, to have all Americans feel like they are part of the action.

We must meet this moment. As President Biden said in Philadelphia last week, this is the "test of our time." So what do we do? Well, first, we must pass the For the People Act, which Senators SCHUMER and MERKLEY and I introduced, along with many oth-

ers, to ensure that all Americans can cast their ballot.

It is nothing radical. You know why it is not radical? It is firmly based in the Constitution. On the basic voting rights, the Constitution literally says that Congress can make or alter the rules and the manner in which Federal elections occur. That has never been questioned. It has been affirmed time and time again.

The other bill, the bill we are focused on today, Congressman Lewis's bill, that is the Voting Rights Act, and you restore the Voting Rights Act after a Supreme Court decision struck down parts of that bill. I didn't agree with it. I agreed with then-Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's dissent, but you fix it with the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

It is now Congress's responsibility—the Supreme Court decision made that clear—to restore and modernize the Voting Rights Act and provide the Federal Government with the necessary tools to combat the assault on Americans' right to vote. We must recommit to the original goal of the Voting Rights Act to end discrimination in voting in America. We know this is something, historically, until recent years, that brought everyone together. The Senate reauthorized the Voting Rights Act in 1982 by a vote of 85 to 8, including 43 Republicans; in 1992, by a vote of 75 to 20, including 25 Republicans; and in 2006—2006—with a unanimous 98 to 0 vote, including 51 Republicans. And I don't think anyone with a straight face can say: Well, the reason we don't need to do this anymore is that we don't have any discriminatory laws being enacted on the State basis or there aren't any laws being enacted that limit voting.

Truly, maybe you should read some of the court decisions, if you think that.

I would say there is a stronger argument to do this, both sides of the aisle. John Lewis's bill is so important, and it isn't a substitute for passing the For the People bill, but we must do that, as well as include election infrastructure funding in the reconciliation bill, which I believe will be coming our way soon.

I will end with this. Last Sunday, I had the privilege of attending services at the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, where I got to hear Reverend WARNOCK. There was a guest preacher, but for me it was like he was also preaching. And I got to hear him say something I will never forget. He said this:

A vote is a prayer; it's a prayer for a better world, a prayer for your kids' education, a prayer that you're going to finally be able to do something about this world's environment.

So during the last election, we saw an unprecedented number of people go to the polls to do just that. Not every one of their candidates won, but they believed enough in our democracy, in the middle of a public health crisis, that they went and cast their vote.

In Congressman John Lewis's words, "The right to vote is precious and almost sacred, and one of the most important blessings of our democracy." Today, we must be vigilant in protecting that blessing.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise here today to give emphasis to something I think is very important—it has been done basically annually—and that is talking about our Pledge of Allegiance. It is an expression of patriotism and commitment to our great Nation.

The United States is a symbol of freedom around the world. It is a beacon for "the land of opportunity."

Today, let's reaffirm our allegiance to the United States. I urge my colleagues to pass this annual resolution that simply expresses support for our Pledge of Allegiance.

This resolution was first raised by Senator Tom Daschle back in 2002 and passed without objection. Now, nearly 20 years later, this resolution is probably more important than ever.

We have seen countless attacks on our flag and the values it represents. The American flag is a symbol of hope and perseverance across the world. Whether in Cuba, Hong Kong, or Venezuela, those suffering under tyrannical regimes proudly wave the American flag in protest.

The U.S. Senate must stand in support of the Pledge of Allegiance, one of our most powerful expressions of national unity.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 309, submitted earlier today.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 309) expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

Mr. BRAUN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 309) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

Mr. BRAUN. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss facts and fiction. Recently, FOX News reporter Peter Doocy asked White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki about a Biden administration official's claim that Republicans have defunded the police by not voting to pass Biden's wasteful \$1.9 trillion stimulus bill. Ms. Psaki doubled down on the idea that it is Republicans and not Democrats who want to defund the police.

When a White House Press Secretary gives a press briefing, you expect some spin. You expect some verbal bobbing and weaving if the topic is unflattering to the administration. But when Jen Psaki tried to blame Republicans for defunding the police, it wasn't spin. It was horse manure. It was gaslighting.

For over a year, Democrats and left-wing activists have been calling over and over and over again to defund the police. And many Democrat-led city councils and Democrat mayors have done so, cutting and even slashing police budgets. As a result of those reckless policies, we are seeing a deeply concerning wave of violent crime in American cities across the country.

The chief White House spokesperson blaming Republicans for defunding the police is like an arsonist showing up at the fire and blaming the firemen. It is like the Chinese Communist Party blaming America for the Wuhan virus. It is like OJ saying he is going to help find the real killer. It is absurd. It is ridiculous. And Democrats know it.

Let's look at the facts. Democrats have called explicitly to defund the police for over a year and have been successful in doing it. New York Mayor Bill de Blasio, a Democrat, last summer pledged to cut the NYPD budget by \$1 billion, and then he did so. New York City passed a budget that did indeed cut \$1 billion from the police department.

Just a couple of months ago, de Blasio was forced to backtrack. He realized what a terrible decision it had been because now he is working to reverse it.

AOC, the darling of the extreme left-wing, has said: "Defunding [the] police means defunding [the] police" and "The fight to defund [the police] continues." There is not a lot of ambiguity in what AOC is saying.

And she is not alone. How about Representative RASHIDA TLAIB. She has called for "no more policing." Stop and think about that for a minute. This is an elected Democratic Member of Congress whose policy objective is no more policing. Those are her own words.

How about Representative ILHAN OMAR. She has said: "You can't really reform a department that is rotten to the root." An elected Democratic Member of Congress describing police departments as "rotten to the root." Again, those are her words.

And then there is Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY, who has introduced legislation to defund police officers in public schools. And she has said that defunding the police is about "true reparations." Well, maybe this is just a few fringe Democrats in the House of Representatives. Maybe it is not a broader policy of the Democratic Party.

What about Joe Biden? Uncle Joe can't possibly support defunding the police, right? Well, if you thought so, you would be wrong because Joe Biden nominated two of the leading advocates of abolishing the police—Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke—to senior positions at the U.S. Department of Justice. One of them is the No. 3 official at the Department of Justice. The other is the head of civil rights at the Department of Justice. Both had written, as recently as last year, explicit calls for defunding the police, and they got rewarded with helping run the Department of Justice.

But surely, you might say, even if Joe Biden gave in to the activists and nominated these folks, there are Democrats in this Chamber who would say defunding the police is too much; let's not go that far. Well, if you would say that, you would be wrong because both of those nominees, two of the leading advocates for defunding the police, were confirmed when every single Democrat in this Chamber voted to confirm them—100 percent.

The next time you see a Democrat describing themselves as moderate, reasonable, not one of those crazies saying things like "defund the police," maybe you should ask them why they voted to confirm two of the leading advocates for defunding the police to senior positions at the Department of Justice.

Democrat-led city councils all over the country are following the same game plan, and they have voted over and over and over again to defund the police. Last year, the Los Angeles City Council cut the police budget by \$150 million. Portland cut \$15 million from its police budget. Minneapolis cut \$8 million from its police budget. Seattle cut its police budget by 18 percent.

Now, what do these city have in common? They are run by Democrats. It is Democratic politicians who are slashing police budgets. And what have the results been? Well, sadly, these Democratic-led cities are reaping what they sowed. Crime rates are skyrocketing. The New York Times—hardly a right-wing outfit—the New York Times has reported that homicides in Los Angeles increased 36 percent, that homicides have increased in Portland more than 82 percent, and that homicides in Minneapolis increased nearly 72 percent last year. By all appearances, these homicide spikes will continue throughout this year.

Just a few weeks ago, Democrats demonstrated that they couldn't learn from the tragic failure of other cities that had slashed the police and seen

homicides skyrocket. What did they do in Oakland, CA? The city council voted to cut over \$18 million from the police department, and Oakland has already seen a 90-percent increase in homicides over last year.

The New York Times has also reported data showing that in 2020, homicide rates increased more than 30 percent in big cities. So far, they are increasing again this year.

According to the Guardian, some preliminary data showed that there were 4,000 more murders in 2020 than there were in 2019—4,000 men, women, and children who would be living, breathing, living their lives, raising their kids, contributing to the diverse tapestry of our Nation if it were not for the radicals slashing police budgets because of extreme ideological commitments and unleashing these crimewaves.

Now, Democrats know that the politics and the policy of defunding the police aren't working for them, which is why they are desperately trying to backtrack and blame and gaslight Republicans. Yeah, yeah, it is the Republicans who are doing this. Sure, sure, that is the ticket.

Not only did some Democrats blame calls to defund the police for close races that they lost in November and for the razor-thin Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate, they also know it isn't popular with the American people. A recent USA TODAY poll found that only 18 percent of Americans support defunding the police, and a large majority of African Americans don't support defunding the police. The same is true for Democratic voters. A large majority of Democratic voters don't support defunding the police. But in defiance of the interests of their constituents, Democrats continue to go down that road. The facts are that Democrats have repeatedly called to defund the police, and they have done so—this isn't a theory—they have done so in many cities.

Crime is rising, and radical Democratic policies have had deadly consequences. Not only have homicides risen, but there were more law enforcement officer fatalities in 2020 than there had been in 46 years. In 2020, 264 law enforcement officers tragically died in the line of duty, some from COVID-19 as a result of being first responders and others from getting shot while on duty.

After Jen Psaki blamed Republicans for defunding the police, Peter Doocy asked her to name the Republicans who said they were voting against the American Rescue Plan—the massive leftwing spending plan—that had nothing to do with the police. It was shoveling a lot of money to liberal special interests. It was giving money to State and local governments. So the White House argument was, well, some of the money to State and local governments could theoretically have gone to police, so therefore, if you don't vote for the massive trillions of dollars in spending,

you really want to defund the police. Well, unsurprisingly, Psaki couldn't name a single Republican who said they wanted to defund the police or who gave defunding the police as a reason for not voting for Biden's \$1.9 trillion, pork-filled spending bill.

The fact of the matter is, Republicans are proud to support the police, to stand with the men and women of blue, while Democrats are demonizing and vilifying the brave men and women of law enforcement.

I want to say thank you to every law enforcement officer in this country, on the Federal level and on the State and local level. Thank you for answering the call each day, putting on the uniform, wearing the badge, and risking your life to keep us safe.

This morning, all across this country, law enforcement officers woke up, they kissed their husband or wife goodbye, they kissed their kids goodbye, and they went out to defend our communities, and they did so not knowing if they would come home that night. We are proud to stand with the men and women of our police departments.

When it comes to facts and fiction, it is a cynical and calculated lie from the Biden White House that it is anybody other than Democrats who are leading the foolhardy charge to abolish and defund the police. It is dangerous, crime rates are skyrocketing, and it is an exceptionally bad idea.

I yield the floor.

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

HELSINKI COMMISSION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time to talk about the work of the U.S. Helsinki Commission in a recent opportunity we had to participate in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

I am joined on the floor by Senator WICKER, who is the Republican chair of the Helsinki Commission. The two of us have worked together in a non-partisan, bipartisan manner in regards to the work of the Helsinki Commission. I just want to spend a few minutes, and then I am going to yield the floor and allow Senator WICKER to give his comments.

The OSCE, as the chair is fully aware as a member of the Commission, represents the U.S. participation in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe—57 states, which includes all of Europe, all of the former Republics of the Soviet Union, and Canada and the United States.

The Commission works on the principle of three buckets: one for political affairs and security, another for economic and environmental progress, and the third on democracy and human rights. But it recognizes—and I think this has been the hallmark of the Helsinki Commission—that you can't have advancements on political affairs or security or economic or environmental progress unless you make progress on democracy and human rights, that they are interwoven. In the Helsinki

Commission, the OSCE is best known for its advancements for basic human rights.

So I think of the initiatives that we have had in the Helsinki Commission for dealing with trafficking in humans and the legislation that came out of that and how we led the global response to dealing with trafficking. I think about the efforts we made in regards to tolerance, dealing with anti-Semitism, racism, and intolerance and how we have made progress throughout the entire OSCE region. I think about the issues we did in regards to sanctions against human rights violators so they cannot use our banking system or visit our country, the Magnitsky-type sanctions. All of that came out of the work of the Helsinki Commission.

So one of the major arms of our work is the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, which is the group of parliamentarians who meet every year and have meetings throughout the year to exchange views and to carry out the principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

For the last year and a half, we have been compromised because we haven't had an opportunity to meet in person, and it required us to meet by internet, and we have, but we had a unique opportunity during the last recess period to actually travel and meet with the parliamentarians. We had an OSCE Parliamentary Assembly annual meeting in Vienna. And we had a chance to do this in a hybrid manner. So we were able to travel 12-strong from the U.S. Congress to be at that meeting, and we were joined by five others here in the United States, including our Presiding Officer, to participate in the Parliamentary Assembly, and we were able to advance a lot of very important issues.

But I must tell you, we were noticed at this meeting. The U.S. presence was critically important in dealing with some very timely issues. I know that Senator WICKER will talk about this. He is one of the great leaders of the Parliamentary Assembly. He is Vice President of the Parliamentary Assembly. We are very proud of the leadership position that he holds.

By the way, his election was in Vienna to be the Vice President of the Parliamentary Assembly. We had multiple candidates and several elected to Vice Presidents, but Senator WICKER led the ballot with the largest number of votes, which I think speaks to his well-thought-of respect among the OSCE parliamentarians.

We wanted to make sure that this was a substantive meeting. Quite frankly, the leadership of the Parliamentary Assembly said: Let's just get in there and get it over with and not bring up anything controversial. But that is not the way we operate. We have to take up current issues.

So we took up the issue of tolerance. I was happy to sponsor a resolution that ultimately passed by unanimous vote that speaks to anti-Semitism, racism, intolerance, and the growth of

hate in the OSCE region. But we also made sure that we considered the recent elections in Belarus and how unfair those elections were and how Mr. Lukashenko has been acting in a way that is so contrary to the human rights of the people who live there, and the election results there do not reflect the will of the people.

We also had a chance to make sure we took up the issues concerning Ukraine. Once again, there was a lot of controversy on why you should bring that up during this meeting. We did. We supported that to make it clear that Russia's aggression and its occupation of Crimea and its interference in eastern Ukraine will never be recognized as legitimate by the United States or, by that matter, the Parliamentary Assembly, because we responded in all of those areas.

I am pleased to tell you that we supported Margareta Cederfelt, who is going to be the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Sweden, and we look forward to her visit here in the United States.

RICHARD HUDSON, Representative HUDSON, will be the chair of the first committee. So we are going to have active participation in the Parliamentary Assembly.

We had the chance to visit some other countries. But if I might, I think I am going to yield the floor and give my good friend and the leader of our congressional delegation trip an opportunity to expand on some of the things we were able to do in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Maryland, who has been such a leader in the area of human rights and international recognition of the challenges that our world faces today. I do appreciate his leadership and his partnership. We have worked shoulder to shoulder on so many issues.

Yes, I proudly rise with him this afternoon to talk about a very valuable series of meetings that our 12-member delegation had in 4 countries in Europe in recent days. This was Republicans and Democrats from the House and Senate, a truly bipartisan and bicameral delegation—a very large delegation—which I think my colleague will agree made a strong statement on behalf of the United States of America and on behalf of the U.S. House and Senate about the way we view European engagement and our partnership and friendship with the 50-plus member countries of the OSCE and their Parliamentary Assembly.

We visited Vienna, Austria, for the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

As Senator CARDIN mentioned, we met with great success. Yes, I was re-elected to the position of vice president, and I appreciate the support of Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate in helping me get those votes to receive another 3-year term there.

RICHARD HUDSON, our colleague from the House of Representatives, has been very active as chairman of Committee No. 1 in the Parliamentary Assembly. He is highly regarded. He was reelected without opposition. So there are two bits of success there.

And then the great piece of work, actually, was with regard to Senator CARDIN's initiative on the rising hate and intolerance that we are seeing all around the world, particularly among member countries of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Senator CARDIN actually took the lead in challenging the leadership of the Parliamentary Assembly in saying that issues should be discussed.

Even though they weren't in an immediate, like, 3-week crisis mode, they deserved to be brought forward. And Senator CARDIN was able to get his resolution considered and passed overwhelmingly, and we made a strong statement on behalf of countering the rising hate and intolerance and countering the use of these things to buttress authoritarianism and to stoke conflict around the world.

We also passed a very important resolution about the tragedy, the outrage that has gone on in Belarus. I can tell you, the opposition party leader from Belarus was in this Capitol building just yesterday talking about the importance of support from places like the United States Congress.

I can tell you, Madam President, that Senator SHAHEEN and I are about to send a letter to our colleagues asking any and all of us to join a Freedom Caucus for the Belarusian people, the Belarus Freedom Caucus. We asked the opposition leader, Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya, to tell us whether that would be helpful. She said the formation of this caucus to support the freedom movement in Belarus would be a strong signal. It would be well received and effective on behalf of the opposition leadership there in Belarus.

Then, again, we reiterated our opposition to what Russia has done in Ukraine and particularly to the recent Russian military buildup and ongoing aggression in Ukraine. We did a lot there with the Parliamentary Assembly.

We went on to Estonia, met with leadership there—a former President, the current Prime Minister, other leaders. And, also, we had a chance to travel to the very easternmost part of Estonia and actually travel on the Narva River and look right across to Russia and the security guards there, understanding what our Estonian allies are up against with Putin's Russia staring right across the river at their freedom and democracy.

From there, we joined the Three Seas conference in Sofia, Bulgaria. I can tell you, this is a group of Eastern European former Soviet Bloc countries that are striving to be in charge of their own infrastructure and rely less on the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative. I think the fact that 12 Americans

showed up, participated, met with Heads of state at that conference made a very strong statement of American support for freedom and for looking westwardly in trying to get their problems solved and their infrastructure needs met.

We also had a very meaningful visit to Norway, where we saw some American-Norwegian defense initiatives. I am very proud of the partnership that this Helsinki Commission—our organ of the American OSCE PA—and the way that we joined together to express our support for freedom, for democracy, for the rule of law, for opposing corruption, both at the petty local level and also at the larger State-sponsored level.

One other thing before I yield back and let my friend close. Particularly in Bulgaria, but also all during our trip, we were met with hearty thanks for the United States leadership in the global Magnitsky Act. This began as an initiative with Senator CARDIN, Senator Lieberman, Senator McCain, and me several years ago directed—during the Obama administration—directed toward individual Russians who had violated human rights and individual liberty in a very outrageous and gross way, allowing us to sanction individuals rather than causing harm to the people of Russia in that case. That has been expanded now to the global level and other countries are adopting this.

But I can tell you, when we arrived in Bulgaria, we were met with great thanks from people who are trying to combat lawlessness and corruption at the top level of government.

I just have to say, of course, BEN CARDIN has been the premier leader in this worldwide effort. It was gratifying to know and to learn firsthand on the ground there in Sofia, Bulgaria, that an initiative that began right here in this U.S. Senate years ago, and continues to this day, is having a beneficial effect on the people all across Europe and particularly in some of the countries that we visited.

I yield back to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me again thank Senator WICKER. Thank you for your leadership on so many issues.

But on this congressional delegation, for those who are not familiar, it is not easy to put together the type of opportunities to advance American values. And Senator WICKER took the responsibility as the leader of our delegation to make sure that we had the opportunities to advance American values. I thank him for all the effort he put into it. It was certainly extremely successful.

I just want to emphasize a few things before closing.

One, in Vienna, we did have an opportunity to meet with Rafael Grossi, who is the Director General of the IAEA. That is the International Atomic En-

ergy Agency, which has the responsibility of monitoring the nuclear programs throughout the world. Obviously, it has played a bigger role in regard to the program in Iran, and it was monitoring exactly what was happening in Iran under the JCPOA. They now don't have the same access, and we had a chance to talk with the Director General as to the challenges with the Iranian program. And I think it was helpful for all of us to understand exactly the role that the IAEA can play in regard to getting us information about what is happening on the ground in Iran.

Senator WICKER talked about our visit to Estonia, a strong ally partner, NATO partner. We showed our support by going to Narva, which is on the Russian border. It is a town that has a majority of Russian-speaking Estonians. It is an interesting community. But we could see across the river, very clearly, the Russian patrol boats. We know and heard firsthand of the concern of the Estonians. They saw what happened in Ukraine and they worry that same thing could happen in Estonia with Russian aggression.

I must tell you, our presence to reinforce the NATO commitment, I think, was an extremely important message that we gave to the Estonian people.

Mr. WICKER. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CARDIN. I would be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. If I might add, people in Narva, Estonia, and people in the city across the river have access to each other across a bridge there. And it is clear to the people on the Russian side that their cousins and friends in Narva, Estonia, live a better life and have a better standard of living in this free country, this NATO ally called Estonia, than the Russian cousins and friends have on the other side.

I just thought I would add that to the discourse before Senator CARDIN moves on to discussing Norway and Bulgaria.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me move onto Bulgaria very briefly. Senator WICKER did cover Bulgaria.

The Three Seas Initiative, I wasn't that familiar with it before traveling to Bulgaria. It is an initiative by 12 States that are basically part of the Eastern European Coalition, states that are developing democratic institutions and democratic economies after the fall of the Soviet Union. They need to build up their resilience as a collective entity in energy, transportation, and digital infrastructure.

The Three Seas Initiative is to attract investment to connect the 12 countries together on infrastructure needs. It is for many reasons. It is for its own economic strength and growth, but also for resiliency against the efforts of China on its Belt and Road Initiative, which is trying to infiltrate

these countries and convert their way of economy to more of the Chinese system.

The Three Seas Initiative is an effort to have their own independent way of attracting capital. The United States is participating in the Three Seas. We are not a member, but we are participating and providing resources for the fund that is being developed that would be leveraged for these type of investments.

While we were in Bulgaria, we had a chance to have bilateral meetings. There were 12 Heads of state there. We had bilateral meetings with the President of Poland, Bulgaria, Latvia, and Romania. We had very constructive discussions about what is happening in their country.

We raised Helsinki issues with all these countries. Senator WICKER already talked about how we were welcomed by the Bulgarian leadership in regards to the imposition of the Magnitsky sanctions. We are heroes. They feel like they have a second chance to try to develop the type of anti-corruption mechanisms that they desperately need.

Our visit to Varna, which is on the Black Sea, was very educational to see how Russia is trying to dominate the Black Sea area and one of the reasons why they are so aggressive in Ukraine and the Crimea.

I think that was extremely helpful for us to understand the security risks and how we have to work with our NATO partners to protect the Black Sea area, particularly from the potential aggression—not potential—from the aggression of Russia.

Also in Bulgaria, we had a chance to visit a Roma village. It is not my first visit to a Roma village. I have visited over the years. It is a real tragic situation. The Roma population have been in Europe for centuries. They lived in communities for hundreds of years, yet they do not have property rights.

They have lived in their homes, and yet they do not have the opportunity to have their homes registered. And at any time, the government can come in and take away their property without compensation.

They rarely have reliable utilities.

The village we visited did not have water systems, so they had to use outhouses, et cetera. They had limited availability of fresh water. Their utility service is not reliable. And they go to segregated schools. They don't have the same employment opportunities.

So we, once again, will raise the rights of the Roma population as part of our commitment under the Helsinki Commission, and we are following up with the local officials to try to help in that regard.

Then, lastly, on our way back, we visited Norway. I learned a lot because I did not know about the pre-positioning program. I know my friend Senator WICKER already knew about this from his Armed Services service, but it is where we pre-position equip-

ment so that we can respond rapidly to a circumstance anywhere in the world. The Norway pre-positioning is actually used to help us in regard to the Middle East and our needs in the Middle East.

So it was an extremely, extremely, I think, productive visit to these countries. I think we did carry out our commitment under the Helsinki Commission, and we advanced American values. I think we represented our country well, and we were very well noticed.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, one other thing that our colleagues might not understand about the OSCE is their role in election observation.

As we were leaving Sofia on the morning of July 11, we crossed paths with some other representatives from the OSCE from European countries who were there to observe the parliamentary elections being held in Bulgaria that very day. Also, on the same day, Moldova, another member of the OSCE, was having parliamentary elections.

We have every hope that the results of these elections will be a further resolve in those two nation members to counter the corruption at the highest level, and we want to congratulate both of those member states of the OSCE for free and fair elections in Europe.

With that, I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ELECTIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor to talk about the need for integrity in our elections.

On Monday, the Democrats on the Rules Committee took a field trip. The Democrats went to Georgia. They continued their efforts there to start a panic about election laws. Now, I am sure they will take more field trips in the months ahead. Taking over State election laws seems to be the Democrats' No. 1 priority. It was their No. 1 bill in the House, H.R. 1. It was their No. 1 bill in the Senate, S. 1. The Democrats claim that they are only responding to reforms passed in the States, and they say it is just the reforms passed in the States this year. Yet the election takeover bills that the Democrats have introduced were first drafted years ago. It is not in response to anything.

Don't let the Democrats kid you. It is an attack on States' rights and an attempt to stack the deck. After Democrats took over Washington, they rushed this takeover bill right through

the House of Representatives, with NANCY PELOSI at the helm. Then they tried to rush a similar bill through the Senate, and they failed. Senator SCHUMER continues to say the Democrats will try again.

At the State level, most recently in Texas, the Democrats are obstructing the democratic process in order to block election reforms from becoming law. Rather than allow an election reform bill to pass, Texas Democrats fled the State. They took private jets to Washington, DC. They hobnobbed with the Vice President, and they hobnobbed with the Speaker of the House and with many Democratic Senators. They sent out a lot of fundraising emails in the process, and they did a lot of television interviews. They took a lot of pictures of themselves, published them on social media, and told everyone they were making a heroic effort. They said it was a sacrifice.

Well, six of the Democrats became infected with the coronavirus. Then they spread the virus. It wasn't enough they infected each other; they spread the virus to staffers at the White House and here on Capitol Hill. It was a political stunt, and it turned into a coronavirus superspreader event, and I am sure they still consider themselves heroes. The hypocrisy is astonishing.

In the name of the democratic process, they actually blocked the democratic process, disregarded the will of the voters, and shut down the function of State government. They took a joyride on a private jet and endangered the health of many others. They believe in winning at any cost, and they put democracy in second place. This whole stunt is not about voter rights; it is about power. The Democrats are going to keep trying to keep the panic alive.

President Biden went to Philadelphia last week, and he spread even more falsehoods about the law. Now, I can understand why President Biden is doing everything he can to change the subject from the failures of his current administration. We have an open southern border that Americans are very disturbed about; we have surging violence in Democratic cities in the streets; and we have rising inflation that is hitting every family in America. Of course, President Biden doesn't want to talk about his one failure after another after another. So, instead, he throws rhetorical grenades at the Republicans, and he tells stories.

The Democrats' scare tactics on State voting laws are not going to work.

Their claims are false, and they have been repeatedly disproved.

The American people are finding out what is in the Democrats' election bills, and they do not like it. It is not pretty. It is ballot harvesting, which people reject. It is automatic voter registration, which many, many reject. It is taxpayer funding of political activities and campaigns, which Americans reject. It is giving the vote to felons on parole, which Americans reject.

It is 800 pages of mandates, which Americans hate, and it is banning voter ID laws nationwide at a time when voters across the country from both parties, all political persuasions, think voter ID laws are critical to ballot integrity and security. The more the American people find out what is in these bills, the more they oppose them.

You know, it has never been easier to vote in the United States. You take a look at the statistics from this past election year, never been easier. The American people know it.

American people support common-sense laws, which make it easier to vote and harder to cheat, but they do not support the Democrats' radical election takeover.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, we are seeing record numbers of people coming to the U.S. Mexican border. I am told 63 different countries have folks that have arrived at our border.

In the latest numbers released by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, CBP, they encountered almost 190,000 people coming to the United States illegally through the southern border last month. That is the highest monthly number of encounters by CBP in two decades.

This is where we are now. That number is up 471 percent from June 2020. Across the board, every category of CBP encounter at the southwest land border—single adults, unaccompanied children, individuals in a family unit—they are surging in 2021, including in the hot summer months, when it has traditionally been that is when it falls. It is important because these people coming across in the hot summer months are at increased risk for death from dehydration and heat exhaustion.

With June's tally, CBP's migrant encounters surpassed 1 million for the fiscal year.

Now, in context, the last fiscal year had 460,000 encounters; fiscal year 2019, 980,000. That year was labeled a humanitarian catastrophe. That was for the entire year. Now, we are speaking of 1 million, and we have 3 months left to go in this fiscal year.

On Monday, Texas and the national media broadcast videos of migrants trying to force their way past Texas border guards. Eight Federal agents and police officers pushed back on the gate to prevent a rush of about 300 people just breaking through, coming across the border from Mexico.

By any definition, this is a crisis—for the individual, who is at risk of dying of dehydration in the desert; for our country, which cannot control the border crisis; for the infection of the COVID and coronavirus situation in our country, because, obviously, coronavirus could be rampant among these folks.

The Biden-Harris administration could not be doing worse if they inten-

tionally set out to mismanage the situation. This past weekend, it became clear that it is not just a situation on the border, but it is also a situation in Louisiana.

On Friday, KTBS, a Shreveport news outlet, reported that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—ICE—dropped off approximately 80 Haitian immigrants with little or no warning to local government and law enforcement officials.

And, again, this is multiple levels. I presume that these folks are dropped off because we are out of capacity, but let's think about the individual being dropped off. A source told KTBS that the men had money, but some of the women had little or no money—no contacts, no money, they don't speak the language, dropped off in a strange city.

Multiple Louisiana outlets are reporting approximately 400 immigrants from 42 countries have been dropped off by ICE in Shreveport since the end of March, but this is the first we heard. In Baton Rouge, WBRZ, the ABC affiliate, had photos and video of a similar drop-off in Baton Rouge on Friday, July 16. Monroe, LA, had a similar situation; Natchez, MS, similar as well.

We called ICE over the weekend, and yesterday, they—we actually spoke to the acting director. He told me the dropoffs are “not our common practice.” I would argue that releasing migrants without notifying local officials—at least the NGOs that can give them help, particularly when there isn't—when some of them have no money, no contacts, no place to go, is not good. And he acknowledged that. In fairness, he acknowledged that that was a mistake and that the number of 70 was too large a number.

He denied that it was a problem of capacity, but, frankly, when we see what is happening at the southern border and then we see a whole group of 70 being dropped off without the organization required to make sure there is seamless entry into our society, that tells me that there probably is a capacity problem.

Again, you cannot imagine a worse immigration policy and execution of what we have seen in the first 6 months of this administration. It is incoherence; it is dysfunction. It appears that Washington told ICE: Just send them someplace with, again, little or no notice to State and local officials.

We have to ask: Does the President, does the Vice President care about controlling the border? Do they care about communities? Do they care about these immigrants? It is almost as if they are wishing that the issue be swept under the rug.

Unfortunately, the crisis continues to worsen. I don't know if there is a plan. I say that because if there is a plan, we have not yet seen it executed. What we have seen is that record numbers of people are now coming into our country. It is more as if hands are being thrown up in the air.

I will also say there was a lot of criticism of what President Trump did, but

it is my observation, whatever the last thing the last President did was the first thing that worked because it is not as if they tried the immediate solution first off. It is like they worked through some things that didn't work and they finally got to where they were able to stem the tide.

So if it is the era of “let's do the opposite of what President Trump did, even if it is the only thing that has ever worked,” we are in trouble.

I do think it is time for the Biden administration to admit they were wrong and to begin going back to that which appeared to work.

I want to thank the people of Shreveport. They have been kinder than the Federal Government in terms of helping people out—the churches, the NGOs that came out to help folks. As one of them said, the Scripture teaches us to help those who are aliens in our land.

They have been willing to handle the situation when the administration failed. But the charity of the American people is not a substitute for a coherent policy, and this is an issue for the executive branch, specifically President Biden and Vice President Harris, who was personally put in charge.

We need to get it right. We need answers. We need accountability. We need sound immigration and border policies, and it starts with securing our southern border and enforcing our laws.

Again, the current situation is unfair to everyone—the migrants, the community, our country. The situation in Shreveport, Monroe, and Baton Rouge shows the failure of the policies. I don't think they are the only communities dealing with this, and we will continue to deal with it even more so until we have a controlled border.

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.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. SMITH. 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.

NSCAI REPORT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may place into the RECORD a portion of the final report by the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence,

NSCAI. This landmark report and its important recommendations are the result of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, which established the NSCAI as an independent commission “to consider the methods and means necessary to advance the development of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and associated technologies to comprehensively address the national security and defense needs of the United States.”

In March 2021, the Commission submitted its final report to Congress and the President, in part, warning of the dangers of the Chinese Government obtaining the personal genetic information of U.S. citizens and the importance of ensuring U.S. leadership in biotechnology. As we complete our work on the United States Innovation and Competition Act that will enable us to maintain our technological edge over China, it is imperative that we acknowledge the findings of this Commission regarding the critical importance of securing our biodata from China and its agents. To that end, allow me to cite warnings and recommendations directly from this Commission. I hope our State Department leadership, including Secretary Blinken, take these into serious consideration and put them into action.

On Page 53, the report finds: “[China understands the tremendous upside associated with leading the bio revolution. Massive genomic data sets at places like BGI Group (formerly known as the Beijing Genomics Institute), coupled with China’s now-global genetic data collection platform and “all-of-nation” approach to AI, will make them a formidable competitor in the bio realm. BGI may be serving, wittingly or unwittingly, as a global collection mechanism for Chinese government genetic databases, providing China with greater raw numbers and diversity of human genome samples, as well as access to sensitive personal information about key individuals around the world. The United States cannot afford to look back in 10 years and be “surprised” by the biotechnology equivalent of Huawei.]”

Later, on Page 586, the report finds: “[BGI has also benefited from substantial support from the Chinese government, as well as its 2013 acquisition of a competing U.S. firm, Complete Genomics. There are indications that BGI’s links with the Chinese government may run deeper than it publicly claims, as it built and operates China National GeneBank, the Chinese government’s national genetic database, and has used PLA-owned supercomputers to process genetic information. Chinese diplomats have pushed BGI-built COVID-19 testing kits, including in the United States, and by August 2020 BGI had “sold 35 million rapid COVID-19 testing kits to 180 countries, and built 58 labs in 18 countries.” The highest levels of the United States government should publicly state these

concerns so as to raise awareness among the U.S. commercial and academic biotechnology communities, as well as U.S. allies, many of which currently have partnerships or business dealings with BGI.]”

The Commission then recommends on Page 587 that the State Department design a specific initiative to warn America and its allies about BGI. “[Launch a strategic communications campaign to publicly highlight the links between the Chinese government and BGI. The Secretary of State should personally voice concern about BGI’s ties to the Chinese government and instruct the Department to conduct a strategic communications campaign to highlight those links and warn of the dangers of the Chinese government obtaining personal genetic information via BGI. The Department should also warn BGI and the Chinese government that it will closely monitor BGI’s activities, and that should BGI be utilized as a mass DNA-collection apparatus for the Chinese government, it could face additional U.S. regulatory action.]”

It is important to note that two subsidiaries of BGI were placed on the entity list by the Commerce Department last year for their role in aiding the genocide being perpetrated by the Chinese Government against the Uyghur minority in Xinjiang, an issue that I and many of my Senate colleagues have been vocal on.

In closing, I think it is important that this report be part of our RECORD today.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE FREDERICK DOUGLASS PARK

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and celebrate the centennial of Indianapolis’ Frederick Douglass Park.

In the early 20th century, recreational opportunities for Black Americans in Indianapolis were separate and unequal. There were no public swings or slides for children to play on, no designated green spaces for communities to gather in. When the city’s government took notice of the polluted and dangerous swimming holes and streams in which citizens cooled off, it constructed sanitary swimming pools, in White neighborhoods only.

There were, thankfully, Hoosiers who recognized these injustices and resolved to right them: the physician and city council member Sumner Furniss and journalist Marcus Stewart, who both lobbied for the creation of a park to accommodate the city’s growing Black population. And the family of local entrepreneur Edward Claypool, who donated the land on which to build it.

Because of their efforts, in the summer of 1921, a new park opened on the northeast side of Indianapolis where African Americans were welcome. It was fittingly named for the great

champion of freedom, Frederick Douglass.

A year later, a large swimming pool filled with clean water opened. There were slides, swings, and merry-go-rounds too. Next came the adjoining Douglass Park Golf Course. Originally six tomato cans in a cow pasture, it later grew to nine holes and par 34 and is one of the only golf courses in the Nation named after an African American. Tennis courts, basketball hoops, and baseball diamonds were added as well.

When the doors to other communal gathering places across Indianapolis were closed and locked, Frederick Douglass Park didn’t just provide an alternative, it created a beloved institution that brought people together.

Thousands of Hoosiers spent their weekends and holidays here. It was the site of civic gatherings, political rallies, family reunions, basketball tournaments, little league championships, and jazz concerts. Across the park on a typical summer night the thump of basketballs on pavement competed with the echoes of brass instruments. It was not uncommon to see the likes of champion boxer Joe Louis playing a round of golf or future basketball legends Mel Daniels or George McGinnis working on their game.

One hundred years later, Frederick Douglass Park continues to play an important role in the civic life of our capital city and bring joy to those who call it home. It is exactly the type of public place where Americans have always engaged, interacted, and found common ground.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this milestone.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BRIDGER BOGUS

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Bridger for his hard work as an intern in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Bridger is a native of Cheyenne. He is a student at the University of Wyoming, where he is studying economics and political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Bridger for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey. •

TRIBUTE TO REBECCA BRENNER

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to

express my appreciation to Reba for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Reba is a native of Nebraska. She is a graduate of the University of Wyoming, where she studied physiology and molecular biology. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Reba for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO SABRINA CONSIDINE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Sabrina for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Sabrina is a native of Laramie. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she studies economics, math, and honors political science. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Sabrina for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO GABRIEL DeGRAEVE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Gabe for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Gabe is a native of Casper. He is a student at Belmont University, where he is studying politics and public law, and music business. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Gabe for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO CASSIE HAUPT

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to

express my appreciation to Cassie for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Cassie is a native of Casper. She is a student at the University of Utah, where she studies business management and international relations. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Cassie for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN HENRY

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Brian for his hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican conference. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Brian is a native of New York. He is a student at Providence College, where he is studying history and political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Brian for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO KAYLA JONES

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kayla for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kayla is a native of Casper. She is a student at Casper College, where she is studying general studies and political science. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kayla for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO RUDY NESVIK

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to

express my appreciation to Rudy for his hard work as an intern in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Rudy is a native of Cheyenne. He is a student at the University of Wyoming, where he is studying mechanical engineering. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Rudy for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO JULIA TWIFORD

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Julia for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, D.C. office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Julia is a native of Story. She is a student at Loyola Marymount University, where she studies political science and Irish studies. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Julia for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO CAROLANNE WALLS

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Carolanne for her hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican conference. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Carolanne is a native of Colorado Springs. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she studies communications and public relations. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Carolanne for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE ROGER BURDICK

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the retirement of Idaho

Supreme Court Justice Roger S. Burdick. Roger has served Idaho's judicial system with distinction and integrity for over 47 years.

Roger graduated from Boise High School in 1965 and received his bachelor of science in finance from the University of Colorado in 1970. He graduated from the University of Idaho School of Law with a juris doctor degree in 1974. After graduation, he worked at the law firm of Webb, Pike, Burton & Carlson in Twin Falls, served as a deputy prosecutor in Ada County, and as a partner for the law firm of Hart, Burdick & Healzer in Jerome. In 1980, Justice Burdick was elected prosecutor for Jerome County.

In 1981, Roger began his career as a judge, being appointed to magistrate judge for Jerome County. During that time, he became the first magistrate judge member of the Idaho Judicial Council. In 1993, he was appointed as a district judge in Twin Falls County.

In Idaho, the saying, "Whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting" fits all too well. Given his extensive legal and judicial experience, Judge Burdick was assigned one of the most difficult and challenging processes in Idaho in 2001, presiding over water rights determinations through the Snake River Basin Adjudication. During this time, he also became the administrative district judge for the Fifth Judicial District.

Roger was appointed to the Idaho Supreme Court in 2003 by Governor Kempthorne. He won reelection three times, serving as vice chief justice of the court and two terms as chief justice. Before his retirement, he was again serving as vice chief justice. In retirement, he will apply to serve as a senior judge, taking on periodic cases to help ease the workload across the judiciary.

In addition to being a judge and attorney, Justice Burdick has contributed to the Idaho judicial system by serving on various Idaho Supreme Court advisory committees, as the district judge member on the Idaho Judicial Council, and as president of the Idaho District Judges Association. Nationally, he served on the board of directors for the Conference of Chief Justices.

As an avid waterfowl hunter, Roger makes time to enjoy this sport with family and friends. He also likes to spend time with his wife Rachel and his two grown sons, Phillip and Benjamin.

Vicki and I wish you all the best in your retirement. Thank you for your outstanding service to Idaho and the Nation's judicial and legal system. You make Idaho proud. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

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. 678. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a moratorium

on number reassignment after a disaster declaration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1036. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in activities in contravention of United States or United Nations sanctions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1079. An act to establish an inter-agency working group to develop a comprehensive, strategic plan to control locust outbreaks in the East Africa region and address future outbreaks in order to avert mass scale food insecurity and potential political destabilization, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1158. An act to provide women and girls safe access to sanitation facilities in refugee camps.

H.R. 1250. An act to direct the Federal Communications Commission to issue reports after activation of the Disaster Information Reporting System and to make improvements to network outage reporting.

H.R. 1754. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to consider market entry barriers for socially disadvantaged individuals in the communications marketplace report under section 13 of such Act.

H.R. 1833. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the responsibility of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to maintain capabilities to identify threats to industrial control systems, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1850. An act to amend Homeland Security Act of 2002 relating to the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1870. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize strengthening of local transportation security capabilities by assigning certain officers and intelligence analysts to State, local, and regional fusion centers in jurisdictions with a high-risk surface transportation asset and improving the timely sharing of information regarding threats of terrorism and other threats, including targeted violence, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1871. An act to improve the understanding and clarity of Transportation Security Administration policies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1877. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to issue a plan to improve security screening procedures at airports during the COVID-19 national emergency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1893. An act to direct the Transportation Security Administration to develop a transportation security preparedness plan in the event of a communicable disease outbreak, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1895. An act to enhance the preparedness of the Transportation Security Administration for public health threats to the transportation security system of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2118. An act to authorize United States participation in the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2668. An act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to affirmatively confirm the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to seek permanent injunctions and other equitable relief for violations of any provision of law enforced by the Commission.

H.R. 2795. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the Blue Campaign of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2928. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a voluntary Cyber

Sense program to test the cybersecurity of products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2980. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the remediation of cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3003. An act to direct the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information to take certain actions to enhance the representation of the United States and promote United States leadership in communications standards-setting bodies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3138. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize a grant program relating to the cybersecurity of State and local governments, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3223. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency the National Cyber Exercise Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3263. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a medical countermeasures program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3264. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require research and development to identify and evaluate the extent to which critical domain risks within the United States supply chain pose a substantial threat to homeland security, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:27 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 bill:

H.R. 1652. An act to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund to waive matching requirements, 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. 678. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a moratorium on number reassignment after a disaster declaration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1036. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in activities in contravention of United States or United Nations sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1079. An act to establish an inter-agency working group to develop a comprehensive, strategic plan to control locust outbreaks in the East Africa region and address future outbreaks in order to avert mass scale food insecurity and potential political destabilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1158. An act to provide women and girls safe access to sanitation facilities in refugee camps; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1250. An act to direct the Federal Communications Commission to issue reports after activation of the Disaster Information Reporting System and to make improvements to network outage reporting; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1754. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to consider market entry barriers for socially disadvantaged individuals in the communications marketplace report under section 13 of such Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1833. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the responsibility of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to maintain capabilities to identify threats to industrial control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1850. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 relating to the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1870. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize strengthening of local transportation security capabilities by assigning certain officers and intelligence analysts to State, local, and regional fusion centers in jurisdictions with a high-risk surface transportation asset and improving the timely sharing of information regarding threats of terrorism and other threats, including targeted violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1871. An act to improve the understanding and clarity of Transportation Security Administration policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1877. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to issue a plan to improve security screening procedures at airports during the COVID-19 national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1893. An act to direct the Transportation Security Administration to develop a transportation security preparedness plan in the event of a communicable disease outbreak, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1895. An act to enhance the preparedness of the Transportation Security Administration for public health threats to the transportation security system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2118. An act to authorize United States participation in the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2795. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the Blue Campaign of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2928. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a voluntary Cyber Sense program to test the cybersecurity of products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2980. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the remediation of cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3003. An act to direct the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information to take certain actions to enhance the representation of the United States and promote United States leadership in communications standards-setting bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3138. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize a grant program relating to the cybersecurity of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3223. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency the National Cyber Exercise Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3263. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a medical countermeasures program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3264. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require research and development to identify and evaluate the extent to which critical domain risks within the United States supply chain pose a substantial threat to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental 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-1451. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1452. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1453. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines" (RIN2120-AA64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1454. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by

Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited) Helicopters" (RIN2120-AA64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1455. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1456. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1457. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Durant, OK" (RIN2120-AA66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1458. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1459. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31370)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1460. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31371)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1461. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; Missoula, MT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0208)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1462. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-207; in the Vicinity of Cecil, FL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0062)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1463. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-487; Eastern New York and Northern Vermont" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0042)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1464. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Area R-6413; Green River, UT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0483)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1465. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Clear Lake, Clear Creek, TX" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0420)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1466. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Savannah River, Savannah, GA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0012)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1467. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Sector Ohio Valley Annual and Recurring Special Local Regulations, Update" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0013)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1468. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Coast Guard Sector Ohio Valley Annual and Recurring Safety Zones Update" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0014)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1469. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0033)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1470. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; East Passage, Narragansett Bay, RI" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0035)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1471. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fincantieri Blasting Project; Menominee River, Menominee, MI and Marinette, WI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0083)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1472. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Choptank River, Between Trappe and Cambridge, MD" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0103)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1473. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Cape May, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0132)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1474. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0170)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1475. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Chesapeake City Anchorage Basin, Chesapeake City, MD" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0202)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1476. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Clinch River, Oak Ridge, TN" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0215)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1477. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lake of the Ozarks, Mile Marker 1 approximately 500 feet of the Bagnell Dam, Lake of the Ozarks, MO" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0260)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1478. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Potomac River, Between Jones Point, VA, and National Harbor, MD" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0262)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1479. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River, Lawrenceburg, IN" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0286)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1480. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 770, Randolph Bluff, TN" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0287)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1481. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Pierce County Ferry Steilacoom II, Puget Sound, WA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0313)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1482. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Toledo Country Club Fireworks, Maumee River, Toledo, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0316)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1483. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Gulf of Mexico; Sarasota, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0339)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1484. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; North Channel Fireworks, Lake St. Clair, New Baltimore, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0341)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1485. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Explosive Arc at Military Ocean Terminal Concord, Suisun Bay, Concord, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0349)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1486. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; M/V ZHEN HUA 26 Transit; Everport Container Terminal, San Pedro, California" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0383)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1487. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Potomac River, Between Charles County, MD and King George County, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2021-0399)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1488. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hackensack River, Jersey City, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0603)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1489. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Areas; Harbor Entrances along the Coast of Northern California" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0785)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1490. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 559" ((RIN2120-AA63) (Docket No. 31372)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1491. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Baker City, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0041)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1492. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Alaskan VOR Federal Airway V-319, United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes, T-219 and T-269, and Revocation of Federal Colored Airway" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2020-0868)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1493. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of VOR Federal Airway V-242 Due to the Planned Decommissioning of the Atikokan, Ontario, Canada, Nondirectional Radio Beacon (NDB) Navigation Aid" ((RIN2120-AA66)

(Docket No. FAA-2020-1191)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1494. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of V-72, V-132, V-190, and V-289, and Revocation of V-238 in the Vicinity of Maples, MO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1103)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1495. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hebronville, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0055)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1496. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wellsville, NY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0033)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1497. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3955" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31368)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1498. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 3956" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31369)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1499. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0862)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1500. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Gila Bend, AZ" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0008)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1501. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0018)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1502. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Carson Helicopters, Inc.; Croman Corporation; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation; and Siller Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2006-26107)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1503. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1184)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1504. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1171)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1505. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0568)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1506. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0370)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1507. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0143)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1508. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0105)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1509. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0101)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1510. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-0973)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1511. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0270)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1512. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0344)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1513. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France) Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0092)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1514. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0020)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1515. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Turbomeca, S.A.) Turboshaft Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1038)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1516. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0341)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1517. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0342)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. MURRAY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Roberto Josue Rodriguez, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education.

*Elizabeth Merrill Brown, of Maryland, to be General Counsel, Department of Education.

*Gwynne A. Wilcox, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2023.

*David M. Prouty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2026.

*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 Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2405. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to States to improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2406. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to set maximum contaminant levels for certain chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 2407. A bill to ensure timely Federal Government awareness of cyber intrusions that pose a threat to national security, enable the development of a common operating picture of national-level cyber threats, and to make appropriate, actionable cyber threat information available to the relevant government and private sector entities, as well as the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2408. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal funds to an institution of higher education that hosts or is affiliated with a student-based service site that provides abortion drugs or abortions to students of the institution or to employees of the institution or site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2409. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2410. A bill to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2411. A bill to prevent surprise medical bills with respect to COVID-19 testing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2412. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2413. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to expand the requirement for States to suspend, rather than terminate, an individual's eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan while the individual is an inmate of a public institution, to apply to inmates of any age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2414. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a national service program that provides conservation opportunities on public and private lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the use of retirement plan funds to obtain long-term care insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2416. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for expedited coding and coverage of novel medical products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KING, Mr. COTTON, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 2417. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2418. A bill to amend the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 to improve mapping under the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2419. A bill to authorize the President to declare a smoke emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2420. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for the purchase of certain new electric bicycles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2421. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct research on wildfire smoke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 2422. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program supporting trauma center violence intervention and violence prevention programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2423. A bill to authorize transitional sheltering assistance for individuals who live in areas with unhealthy air quality caused by wildfires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 2424. A bill to make available \$250,000,000 from the Travel Promotion Fund for the Corporation for Travel Promotion; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2425. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure the provision of high-quality service through the Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2426. A bill to transfer unobligated COVID relief funds to the Department of Justice for the COPS Hiring Program, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2427. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report examining the feasibility of funding the Universal Service Fund through contributions supplied by edge providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. HYDESMITH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. Res. 309. A resolution expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. Res. 310. A resolution expressing solidarity with Cuban citizens demonstrating peacefully for fundamental freedoms, condemning the Cuban regime's acts of repression, and calling for the immediate release of arbitrarily detained Cuban citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 311. A resolution congratulating the 2021 Scripps National Spelling Bee champion Zaila Avant-garde; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 312. A resolution congratulating the Tampa Bay Lightning on winning the 2021 Stanley Cup Final; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. Res. 313. A resolution commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Souris River flood in Minot, North Dakota; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to support library infrastructure.

S. 377

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 452

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) 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. 464

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 464, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 904

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 904, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to digitize and make publicly available geographic information system mapping data relating to public access to Federal land and waters for outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to prohibit the United States Armed Forces from promoting anti-American and racist theories.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1079, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the troops from the United States and the Philippines who defended Bataan and Corregidor, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service during World War II.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to establish a national commission on fiscal responsibility and reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1186

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1186, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1248

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1248, a bill to establish an Outdoor Restoration Fund for restoration and resilience projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1270

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1270, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1298

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1298, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to promote international press freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 1550

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1550, a bill to support Foreign Service families, and for other purposes.

S. 1660

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1660, a bill to expand access to health care services for immigrants by removing legal and policy barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1664

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1664, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take certain actions to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for disability compensation for post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1787

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1787, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to prevent the transfer of actions arising under the antitrust laws in which a State is a complainant.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Montana

(Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1872, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1909, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform requirements with respect to direct and indirect remuneration under Medicare part D, and for other purposes.

S. 1958

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1958, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to teaching health centers that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 2005

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

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food and vitamins and individual amino acids for digestive and inherited metabolic disorder under Federal health programs and private health insurance, to ensure State and Federal protection for existing coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 2032

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2032, a bill to extend and modify the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, to postpone the medical exam for aliens who are otherwise eligible for such program, to provide special immigrant status for certain surviving spouses and children, and for other purposes.

S. 2094

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2094, a bill to provide for a new building period with respect to the cap on full-time equivalent residents for purposes of payment for graduate medical education costs under the Medicare program for certain hospitals that have established a shortage specialty program.

S. 2123

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2123, a bill to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship, and for other purposes.

S. 2136

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2136, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, parents, and school and youth development personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes.

S. 2202

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2202, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property.

S. 2229

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2229, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway formula modernization study, and for other purposes.

S. 2263

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2263, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for sustainable aviation fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 2346

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2346, a bill to codify Executive Order 13950 (relating to combating race and sex stereotyping), and for other purposes.

S. 2370

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2370, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide rebates for the installation of zero-emission technologies in single-family homes and multifamily buildings, and for other purposes.

S. 2395

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2395, a bill to require an annual feasibility report on cooperation between the National Guard and Taiwan, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 139

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 139, a resolution recognizing the importance of the blueberry industry to the United States and designating July 2021 as "National Blueberry Month".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2412. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the bipartisan "Protecting Access to Lifesaving Screenings Act," which would protect access to annual mammograms by ensuring breast cancer screenings are covered through insurance for women starting at age 40.

With the exception of skin cancers, breast cancer continues to be the most common cancer in American women and second leading cause of cancer death in women behind lung cancer. According to the American Cancer Society, in 2021, about 281,550 new cases of invasive breast cancer will be diagnosed in women and about 43,600 women will die from breast cancer.

Fortunately, we're seeing the death rate for breast cancer go down with a decrease of 1 percent per year from 2013 to 2018. According to the American Cancer Society, this has been largely credited to earlier diagnosis of breast cancer through screening and patient awareness, in addition to improvements that have been achieved in breast cancer treatments.

Mammography has been the best test we have at finding breast cancer early, providing a better chance of survival after diagnosis. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, women with insurance coverage are more likely to report having had a mammogram in the past two years compared to uninsured women. But while regular breast cancer screenings have helped tremendously in the early detection of breast cancer, health insurance coverage of these screenings for women in their forties is at risk.

While leading medical groups, including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Cancer Society, and the American College of Radiology support women having no-cost access to breast cancer screenings starting at age 40, the ac-

tual decision of coverage is typically determined using recommendations by an independent volunteer panel known as the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF).

Unfortunately, when USPSTF updated its breast screening guidelines in 2015 to recommend that women should start mammography screenings at age 50, health coverage without cost sharing was put in jeopardy for women in their 40s.

The "Protecting Access to Lifesaving Screenings Act" was first introduced shortly thereafter to postpone these recommendations that would have limited coverage for breast cancer screening. Congress has subsequently acted to extend this moratorium several times since then, most recently passing an extension in December 2020 that is set to expire January 1, 2023.

The benefits of screenings are clear, and we need to ensure that women in their forties continue to have coverage for, and access to, these screenings. To that end, we are reintroducing the "Protecting Access to Lifesaving Screening Act" to further protect access to mammography screenings that are covered at no cost to patients ages 40-49. If passed, the current moratorium on USPSTF breast cancer screening guidelines would be extended through 2028.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the total number of breast cancer screening tests received by women through CDC's National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program declined by 87% during April 2020 as compared with the previous 5-year averages for that month. This decline is attributed to reduced routine medical visits due to COVID-19. Consequences of these prolonged delays in screening include delayed diagnoses, poor health consequences, and an increase in cancer disparities among women already experiencing health inequities. Further removing barriers to screening by ensuring patients are covered at no cost will be crucial as the public begins to resume routine preventive health services.

I am honored to be joined by Senators BLACKBURN and SHAHEEN in introducing this legislation. I am also very grateful for supporters of this bill, including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Radiology, American Women Unite for Breast Cancer Screening, Black Women's Health Imperative, Breast Care of Washington, Check for a Lump, DenseBreast-Info, FORCE: Facing Our Risk of Cancer Empowered, Living Beyond Breast Cancer, Men Supporting Women With Cancer, National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, National Black Nurses Association, National Consortium of Breast Centers, National Hispanic Medical Association, National Medical Association, Prevent Cancer Foundation, Servicewomen's Action Network, Sharsheret, Society of Breast

Imaging, Society of Breast Imaging, Susan G. Komen and the Tigerlily Foundation.

I urge my colleagues to join us in protecting access to lifesaving screenings by supporting the passage of this bill.

Thank you Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2425. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure the provision of high-quality service through the Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, unfortunately, rates of suicide have risen to epidemic levels in the United States, with suicide now the tenth leading cause of death in the country. On average, there are 129 suicides every day, roughly one every eleven minutes, a staggering statistic. That is why I am pleased to be introducing the Suicide Prevention Lifeline Improvement Act with Senator MORAN to help turn the tide on this increasingly dire situation.

This legislation would provide \$568 million in new funding over five years for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, delivering an infusion of new funds to help improve call capacity, make improvements to the Lifeline, and make the switch to a new, easy-to-remember, three-digit number, 9-8-8. The Lifeline has long been underfunded, but we have worked on a bipartisan basis to more than double the funding over the last three years. However, much more is needed, and this new legislation will help build on these efforts to ensure that the Lifeline is able to answer the calls of those seeking help.

In 2019, 47,500 Americans lost their lives to suicide. That same year, there were 1.4 million suicide attempts. We must renew our efforts on suicide prevention. In 2004, working with my colleague, former Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon, we authored the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act. This law authorized new youth suicide prevention programs in honor of Senator's Smith son, who tragically died by suicide just a couple of weeks short of his 22nd birthday. For over a decade, these programs have funded college campus, state, and tribal efforts to prevent suicide among our youth and young adult populations, who are particularly at risk of suicide. During this time, youth suicide rates have decreased significantly in my home state of Rhode Island. However, nationwide, suicide rates have skyrocketed.

That is why we must renew our attention and focus on suicide prevention, including by increasing funding for, and improving access to, the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. This effort is critical to ensuring that when people in crisis call looking for help, someone will be there on the

other end of the line to offer hope and counseling. Last Congress, I was able to work with my former colleague Senator Gardner, and Senators BALDWIN and MORAN on legislation to designate the Lifeline as an easy to remember, three-digit number, 988. This common-sense law will make it easier for people across the country to access the Lifeline when they really need it. I am glad that the bill was signed into law last year, paving the way for every state to implement the switch to 9-8-8 by July 2022. This upcoming deadline, however, makes it all the more important that we provide more funding for the Lifeline.

I am pleased to once again have the opportunity to partner with Senator MORAN on suicide prevention efforts. I look forward to working together with our colleagues, as well as stakeholders supporting these efforts, to pass this critical legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 309—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 309

Whereas the United States was founded on principles of religious freedom by the Founders, many of whom were deeply religious;

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States embodies principles intended to guarantee freedom of religion through the free exercise thereof and by prohibiting the Government from establishing a religion;

Whereas the Pledge of Allegiance was written by Francis Bellamy, a Baptist minister, and first published in the September 8, 1892, issue of *The Youth's Companion*;

Whereas, in 1954, Congress added the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas, for more than 60 years, the Pledge of Allegiance has included references to the United States flag, to the United States having been established as a union "under God", and to the United States being dedicated to securing "liberty and justice for all";

Whereas, in 1954, Congress believed it was acting constitutionally when it revised the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas the Senate of the 117th Congress believes that the Pledge of Allegiance is a constitutional expression of patriotism;

Whereas patriotic songs, engravings on United States legal tender, and engravings on Federal buildings also contain general references to "God";

Whereas, in *Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow*, 542 U.S. 1 (2004), the Supreme Court of the United States overturned the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Newdow v. U.S. Congress*, 328 F.3d 466 (9th Cir. 2003), a case in which the Ninth Circuit concluded that recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance

by a public school teacher violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit subsequently concluded that—

(1) the previous opinion of that court in *Newdow v. U.S. Congress*, 328 F.3d 466 (9th Cir. 2003) was no longer binding precedent;

(2) case law from the Supreme Court of the United States concerning the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States had subsequently changed after the decision in *Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow*, 542 U.S. 1 (2004); and

(3) Congress, in passing the new version of the Pledge of Allegiance, had established a secular purpose for the use of the term "under God"; and

Whereas, in light of those conclusions, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit upheld the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance by public school teachers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Pledge of Allegiance has been a valuable part of life for the people of the United States for generations; and

(2) the Senate strongly defends the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance.

SENATE RESOLUTION 310—EX-PRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH CUBAN CITIZENS DEMONSTRATING PEACEFULLY FOR FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, CONDEMNING THE CUBAN REGIME'S ACTS OF REPRESSION, AND CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF ARBITRARILY DETAINED CUBAN CITIZENS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 310

Whereas on July 11, 2021, thousands of Cuban citizens took to the streets to peacefully protest and to call for respect for basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the end of the dictatorship in Cuba;

Whereas the demonstrations were the largest protests witnessed on the island in 25 years, with courageous Cuban men, women, and youth taking to the streets in at least 50 different cities and towns across every province to affirm a deep aspiration for democratic change and to denounce the regime's corruption;

Whereas the nationwide protests represent the full diversity of Cuban society, with demonstrators proudly proclaiming "*Patria y Vida!*" (Homeland and Life!) and calling for "*libertad!*" (liberty);

Whereas the demonstrations in Cuba follow months of severe shortages of food and basic medicine, frequent power outages, record high rates of transmission of COVID-19, and the Cuban regime's ineffective response, in addition to the Cuban regime's continued repression and arbitrary imprisonment of citizens, peaceful activists, and artists;

Whereas despite the authoritarian regime's blocking of internet service to prevent the spread of information about the demonstrations, Cubans witnessed examples of their

compatriots demanding change in their country and courageously joined the growing protests;

Whereas despite the peaceful nature of the demonstrations, Miguel Diaz-Canel incited violence among Cubans and encouraged his supporters to attack peaceful protesters, declaring in a televised address, "the order to fight has been given – into the streets" and pledged his supporters' lives: "Over our dead bodies. We are prepared to do anything";

Whereas Diaz-Canel has sought to delegitimize peaceful protesters, crudely stating they constitute a small group of "vulgar criminals" that are "paid" to be disruptive;

Whereas Diaz-Canel sought to blame the endemic problems causing so much human suffering by the Cuban people on outside forces instead of on the Cuban regime's longstanding corruption, mismanagement, and theft of public resources;

Whereas the Cuban regime's domestic security apparatus, including military and police, were recorded on video violently repressing peaceful Cuban citizens, including by using live ammunition and attacking journalists;

Whereas numerous reports indicate deaths of and injuries to Cuban protesters at the hands of the regime's security forces, including instances of police firing live ammunition into crowds and at least one documented police beating that led to a civilian death;

Whereas independent Cuban civil society groups have reported that hundreds of individuals have been arrested, detained, or are missing;

Whereas defying regime repression, continued internet shutdowns, and illegal searches of the homes of activists and protesters, Cuban men, women, and youth continued to peacefully protest throughout the island on Monday, July 12, using social media to organize themselves and document acts of regime repression;

Whereas international human rights groups, including Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, have long condemned the Cuban regime for violating human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Whereas for years the Cuban regime has exported its authoritarian methods to Venezuela, sending intelligence personnel to assist Venezuelan security forces as they repressed similar peaceful protests calling for democratic change;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its strong solidarity with the people of Cuba in their desire to live in a free and democratic country with uncensored access to information, justice, and economic prosperity;

(2) condemns the violence ordered by Miguel Diaz-Canel against peaceful protesters as violations of internationally recognized human rights that does nothing to address Cuba's challenges;

(3) calls on Cuban forces—

(A) to respect the Cuban people's exercise of freedom of assembly, freedom of expression, and other universal human rights;

(B) to refrain from restricting internet access and connectivity in the country; and

(C) to permit Cuban citizens to freely communicate on digital platforms, as is their fundamental right;

(4) calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all arbitrarily detained Cuban citizens and all Cuban political prisoners;

(5) calls on members of the Cuban Revolutionary Armed Forces, the Cuban Ministry of

the Interior, and Cuba's National Revolutionary Police Force to refrain from violently repressing peaceful protesters and committing other human rights violations; and

(6) urges democratic governments and legislatures in Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean—

(A) to pledge their support for freedom and democracy in Cuba; and

(B) to speak out against the repression of demonstrators in Cuba.

SENATE RESOLUTION 311—CONGRATULATING THE 2021 SCRIPPS NATIONAL SPELLING BEE CHAMPION ZAILA AVANT-GARDE

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 311

Whereas Miss Zaila Avant-garde is a 14-year-old from Harvey, Louisiana;

Whereas Miss Avant-garde is the first winner of the Scripps National Spelling Bee from the State of Louisiana;

Whereas the Scripps National Spelling Bee is the largest and longest-running educational promotion in the United States and is administered by the E.W. Scripps Company and local sponsors, most of whom publish daily and weekly newspapers;

Whereas the 2021 Scripps National Spelling Bee began with competitors from across the United States, American Samoa, the Bahamas, Canada, Europe, Guam, Jamaica, New Zealand, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and each competitor had qualified for the contest by winning locally sponsored spelling bees;

Whereas Miss Avant-garde is the first African American to win the Scripps National Spelling Bee;

Whereas Miss Avant-garde has spent most of her days spelling around 13,000 words per day, yet has still found time to become an accomplished basketball player and holds 3 Guinness World Records;

Whereas Miss Avant-garde survived several rounds of fierce competition this year and won the 2021 Scripps National Spelling Bee by correctly spelling "murraya"; and

Whereas the achievement of Miss Avant-garde brings an immense sense of pride to her hometown of Harvey and the entire State of Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates the 2021 Scripps National Spelling Bee champion Zaila Avant-garde.

SENATE RESOLUTION 312—CONGRATULATING THE TAMPA BAY LIGHTNING ON WINNING THE 2021 STANLEY CUP FINAL

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 312

Whereas, on July 7, 2021, the Tampa Bay Lightning (referred to in this preamble as the "Lightning") won the 2021 National Hockey League Stanley Cup Final;

Whereas the 2021 Stanley Cup Final is the third Stanley Cup Final won by the Lightning in the 30 years that the franchise has competed in the National Hockey League;

Whereas the 2021 Stanley Cup Final directly follows the victory of the Lightning in the 2020 Stanley Cup Final;

Whereas, en route to the 2021 Stanley Cup Final, the Lightning won the Prince of Wales

Trophy for the fourth time in franchise history by defeating the Florida Panthers, the Carolina Hurricanes, and the New York Islanders;

Whereas the Lightning defeated the 2021 Clarence S. Campbell Bowl champions, the Montreal Canadiens, in the Stanley Cup Final, clinching the series with 4 wins and only 1 loss;

Whereas millions of fans watched the Lightning during the 2021 Stanley Cup playoffs as the franchise won the Stanley Cup Final for the third time;

Whereas Lightning goaltender Andrei Vasilevskiy—

(1) led all goaltenders in the 2021 Stanley Cup playoffs with 5 shutouts; and

(2) won the Conn Smythe Trophy, awarded to the most valuable player in the Stanley Cup playoffs;

Whereas Lightning right winger Nikita Kucherov was the leader in points and assists in the 2021 Stanley Cup playoffs; and

Whereas the following entire Lightning roster contributed to the Stanley Cup victory: Alex Barre-Boulet, Erik Cernak, Anthony Cirelli, Fredrik Claesson, Blake Coleman, Ross Colton, Callan Foote, Christopher Gibson, Barclay Goodrow, Yanni Gourde, Victor Hedman, Tyler Johnson, Mathieu Joseph, Boris Katchouk, Alex Killorn, Nikita Kucherov, Patrick Maroon, Ryan McDonagh, Curtis McElhinney, Ondrej Palat, Brayden Point, Jan Rutta, David Savard, Luke Schenn, Mikhail Sergachev, Gemel Smith, Steven Stamkos, Mitchell Stephens, Ben Thomas, Andrei Vasilevskiy, and Daniel Walcott: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Tampa Bay Lightning (referred to in this resolution as the "Lightning"), and the loyal fans of the Lightning, on becoming the 2021 National Hockey League Stanley Cup champions; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Chairman and Governor of the Lightning, Jeff Vinik;

(B) the Vice President and General Manager of the Lightning, Julien BriseBois; and

(C) the head coach of the Lightning, Jon Cooper.

SENATE RESOLUTION 313—COMMEMORATING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOURIS RIVER FLOOD IN MINOT, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 313

Whereas, in late June 2011, the city of Minot, North Dakota, and surrounding communities were inundated by widespread flooding;

Whereas high soil moisture content, above-average snow pack, and persistent spring and summer precipitation produced record-level flooding throughout the Souris River Basin;

Whereas, in June 2011, the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority informed communities downstream that "reservoirs [had] no capacity to store further inflows";

Whereas, on June 22, 2011, following continued releases from upstream reservoirs, water began to overtop levees in the city of Minot, resulting in a mandatory evacuation and the displacement of 11,000 Minot residents;

Whereas nearly 11,500 acres in Ward County were covered in 2 to 15 feet of water, impacting nearly 4,800 structures;

Whereas the river's flow peaked at 27,000 cubic feet per second, resulting in almost as

much water moving through Minot in June 2011 as in the entire year of 1976, which was the previous all-time annual flow record;

Whereas, on June 26, 2011, the river crested at 1,561.72 feet above sea level, a Minot record;

Whereas the floodwater destroyed 4,100 homes, 250 businesses, and numerous schools, parks, churches, and other public infrastructure at a cost of as much as \$1,000,000,000;

Whereas floodwater created national security concerns by temporarily blocking access to some intercontinental ballistic missile facilities operated by personnel at Minot Air Force Base;

Whereas the Federal Emergency Management Agency provided more than 1,500 temporary housing units to address the agency's third largest housing mission in its history to date;

Whereas the people of Minot and surrounding communities demonstrated resilience and worked together to help their fellow neighbors in a time of need;

Whereas Federal, State, and local officials and agencies coordinated to provide immediate recovery assistance;

Whereas Congress provided hundreds of millions of dollars in disaster relief and recovery funding to assist the city of Minot and the surrounding region;

Whereas the people of Minot and surrounding communities continue to deal with the effects of the flood, including efforts to construct permanent flood protection in the Minot area; and

Whereas 2021 marks the tenth anniversary of the Souris River flood in Minot, North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the tenth anniversary of the Souris River flood in Minot, North Dakota;

(2) expresses sympathy to people in the Souris River Basin and condolences to the families who lost their homes or businesses;

(3) commends the resilience of the people in the Souris River Basin and their commitment to recovery and rebuilding; and

(4) expresses gratitude and appreciation to State and local leaders, first responders, and the North Dakota National Guard for protecting the people of the Souris River Basin.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have 9 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 S(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 Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July

21, 2021, at 11:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

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, July 21, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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, July 21, 2021, at 12 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 2:30 p.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, July 21, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ashley Roberts, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

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

ENSURING SURVIVOR BENEFITS
DURING COVID-19 ACT OF 2021

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 83, S. 89.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 89) to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to secure medical opinions for veterans with service-connected disabilities who die from COVID-19 to determine whether their service-connected disabilities were the principal or contributory causes of death, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 89

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 "Ensuring Survivor Benefits during COVID-19 Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. MEDICAL OPINIONS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES WHO DIE OF COVID-19.

(a) *IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall secure a medical opinion to determine if a service-connected disability was the principal or contributory cause of death before notifying the survivor of the final decision in any case in which all of the following factors are met:*

(1) *A claim for compensation is filed under chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to a veteran with one or more service-connected disabilities who dies.*

(2) *The death certificate for the veteran identifies Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) as the principal or contributory cause of death.*

(3) *The death certificate does not clearly identify any of the service-connected disabilities of the veteran as the principal or contributory cause of death.*

(4) *A service-connected disability of the veteran includes a condition more likely to cause severe illness from COVID-19 as determined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.*

(5) *The claimant is not entitled to benefits under section 1318 of such title.*

(6) *The evidence to support the claim does not result in a preliminary finding in favor of the claimant.*

(b) *OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall provide information to veterans, dependents, and veterans service organizations about applying to dependency and indemnity compensation when a veteran dies from COVID-19. The Secretary shall provide such information through the website of the Department of Veterans Affairs and via other outreach mechanisms.*

Ms. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 89), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2021

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 84, S. 189.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 189) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting

clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) *RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2021, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2021, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).*

(b) *AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:*

(1) *WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.*

(2) *ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.*

(3) *CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.*

(4) *DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.*

(5) *DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.*

(c) *DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2021, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).*

(d) *SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.*

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased under that section, not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2022.

Ms. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; that the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 189), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The committee-reported amendment to the title was agreed to as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2021, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for

the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.”.

HIRE VETERAN HEALTH HEROES ACT OF 2021

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 85, S. 894.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 894) to identify and refer members of the Armed Forces with a health care occupation who are separating from the Armed Forces for potential employment with the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.

S. 894

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 “Hire Veteran Health Heroes Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH A HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DURING SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

[(a) IDENTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall identify members of the Armed Forces in a health care occupation during the separation of such members from the Armed Forces.

[(b) REFERRAL OF INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS.—

[(1) IN GENERAL.—If a member of the Armed Forces identified under subsection (a) expresses an interest in working in a health care occupation within the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall refer the member to a recruiter of the Department for consideration of open positions in the specialty and geography of interest of the member.

[(2) TIMING.—Any referral of a member of the Armed Forces conducted under paragraph (1) shall be made not earlier than one year before the separation of the member from the Armed Forces.

[(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Any identification of a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a) or referral of such member under subsection (b) shall not be construed as a guarantee of employment of such member with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

[(d) REPORTS.—Not later than each of one year and two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the efficacy of the identification and referral of separating members of the Armed Forces under this section.

[(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

[(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

[(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

[(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

[(2) HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION.—The term “health care occupation” means an occupation for which an individual may be appointed for employment with the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 7401 of title 38, United States Code.]

SEC. 2. IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH A HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DURING SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 207 of the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-46; 38 U.S.C. 7401 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 207. IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH A HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DURING SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a program to identify and refer members of the Armed Forces with a health care occupation for employment with the Department of Veterans Affairs during the separation of such members from the Armed Forces.

“(b) REFERRAL OF INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a member of the Armed Forces identified under subsection (a) expresses an interest in working in a health care occupation within the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall refer the member to a recruiter of the Department for consideration of open positions in the specialty and geography of interest to the member.

“(2) TIMING.—Any referral of a member of the Armed Forces conducted under paragraph (1) shall be made not earlier than one year before the separation of the member from the Armed Forces.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Any identification of a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a) or referral of such member under subsection (b) shall not be construed as a guarantee of employment of such member with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(d) REPORTS.—Not later than each of one year and two years after the date of the enactment of the Hire Veteran Health Heroes Act of 2021, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the program established under subsection (a).

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(2) HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION.—The term ‘health care occupation’ means an occupation for which an individual may be appointed for employment with the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 7401 of title 38, United States Code.”.

Ms. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 894), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 894

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 “Hire Veteran Health Heroes Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH A HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DURING SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 207 of the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-46; 38 U.S.C. 7401 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 207. IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH A HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DURING SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a program to identify and refer members of the Armed Forces with a health care occupation for employment with the Department of Veterans Affairs during the separation of such members from the Armed Forces.

“(b) REFERRAL OF INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a member of the Armed Forces identified under subsection (a) expresses an interest in working in a health care occupation within the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall refer the member to a recruiter of the Department for consideration of open positions in the specialty and geography of interest to the member.

“(2) TIMING.—Any referral of a member of the Armed Forces conducted under paragraph (1) shall be made not earlier than one year before the separation of the member from the Armed Forces.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Any identification of a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a) or referral of such member under subsection (b) shall not be construed as a guarantee of employment of such member with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(d) REPORTS.—Not later than each of one year and two years after the date of the enactment of the Hire Veteran Health Heroes Act of 2021, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the program established under subsection (a).

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(2) HEALTH CARE OCCUPATION.—The term ‘health care occupation’ means an occupation for which an individual may be appointed for employment with the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 7401 of title 38, United States Code.”.

MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY
AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1910.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1910) to authorize major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2021.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

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

The bill (S. 1910) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1910

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 "Major Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects in fiscal year 2021 at the locations specified and in an amount for each project not to exceed the amount specified for such location:

(1) Construction of an outpatient clinic and national cemetery in Alameda, California, in an amount not to exceed \$266,200,000.

(2) Construction of a new specialty care building 201 in American Lake, Washington, in an amount not to exceed \$110,600,000.

(3) Construction of a community living center and renovation of domiciliary and outpatient facilities in Canandaigua, New York, in an amount not to exceed \$383,741,000.

(4) Construction of a spinal cord injury center in Dallas, Texas, in an amount not to exceed \$249,000,000.

(5) Realignment and closure of the Livermore Campus in Livermore, California, in an amount not to exceed \$455,000,000.

(6) Seismic corrections to the mental health and community living center in Long Beach, California, in an amount not to exceed \$367,300,000.

(7) Construction of a spinal cord injury building with a community living center, including a parking garage, in San Diego, California, in an amount not to exceed \$252,100,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2021 or the year in which funds are appropriated for the Construction, Major Projects account, \$2,083,941,000 for the projects authorized in subsection (a).

NATIONAL BLUEBERRY MONTH

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 139.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 139) recognizing the importance of the blueberry industry to the United States and designating July 2021 as "National Blueberry Month".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 139) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 25, 2021, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN
COWBOY

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 274.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 274) designating July 24, 2021, as "National Day of the American Cowboy".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 274) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 17, 2021, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 311, S. Res. 312, and S. Res. 313.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Ms. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 22,
2021

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Thursday, July 22; 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 the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that at 1:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 162, Jill Hruby, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security at the Department of Energy, and the Senate immediately vote on confirmation of the nomination; that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Ms. SMITH. 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 6:05 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BONNIE D. JENKINS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

JENNIFER ANN ABRUZZO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.