



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2021

No. 132

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.

Eternal God, we find rest in the shadow of Your protection. Shield our law-makers in their work with Your love so that they may grow in wisdom.

Lord, show them how to use today's fleeting minutes for Your glory, becoming Your instruments to permit Your Kingdom to thrive on Earth. Sanctify their thoughts as they remember that, because of You, they live and move and have their being.

We praise You this day, O God, for You are the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end.

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 28, 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

CAPITOL SECURITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, our colleagues Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member SHELBY announced a bipartisan agreement on emergency funding for several pressing security matters.

The Appropriations Committee set out to address three key priorities:

First, reimbursing the costs incurred by the Capitol Police, the National Guard, and other law enforcement for their assistance during and after the January 6 attack on the Capitol; and providing for necessary repairs and security updates to the Capitol Complex.

Second, addressing a shortfall from the efforts to keep Congress a safe and functional workplace during the pandemic this past year and a half. This is everything from PPE to overtime pay for staff.

And, third, some urgent support for our Afghan partners who have assisted in the fight against terrorism and now seek to flee the deteriorating situation brought about by the administration's literally disastrous decision to abandon that country.

We owe a real debt to the men and women of the Capitol Police, DC Metro Police, National Guard, and other agencies who helped secure and protect our workplace. We are grateful to support staff, from the Architect of the

Capitol's team to the Attending Physician's office, to the Sergeant at Arms, who have worked day and night keeping us functioning safely throughout the pandemic.

And we intend to keep our Nation's promises to brave Afghans who have taken great risks to help Americans and our partners fight the terrorists.

So I applaud the bipartisan work of our colleagues. I am sure neither side finds the compromise perfect, but I believe that both sides should and will agree it is absolutely necessary.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now on a different matter, the massive, massive taxing-and-spending spree that Democrats want to ram through this summer has problems that go even beyond inflation, rising costs, and massive tax hikes.

The problem is not just Democrats' jaw-dropping \$3.5 trillion pricetag. It is also the long list of bad liberal policies that this reckless taxing-and-spending spree is supposed to purchase.

I spoke yesterday about just a few of those bad ideas. They are talking about amnesty for illegal immigrants, socialist price-fixing that would leave us with fewer new prescription drugs, fewer new treatments, and fewer new cures.

They want to permanently change the child tax credit into welfare with no—no—work requirements; smuggle in big chunks of the Green New Deal.

And in case all of this were not enough, some Senate Democrats want to use this taxing-and-spending spree to grab control over all 50 States' election laws. I thought we just had that debate a couple of weeks ago.

Remember, for several years now, our Democratic friends have claimed that every successive election proved they needed to grab partisan control over our democracy. In 2016, 2018, and 2020, win or lose—win or lose—when foreign

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5115

interference occurred and when it did not occur, every possible result has been claimed as proof that Washington Democrats should rip up our democracy's rule book and write a new one that benefits them.

The latest phony justification has been the false notion that a few States' mainstream voting laws equal some kind of assault on democracy as we know it. Of course, that is absolutely utter nonsense. Americans want it to be easy to vote and hard to cheat. Voter ID protections are hugely popular. Basic voter roll maintenance is common sense.

The new law in Georgia, for example, provides for more flexible early voting and absentee voting than many blue States, including New York. But the facts weren't about to stop the Democrats' big lie. The absurd comparison to Jim Crow segregation and all kinds of other horrors have continued apace.

To provide a little more context about this fake hysteria, we can also look internationally. As one columnist recently observed in the Washington Post, the balance struck by the State of Georgia amounts to "one of the most expansive voting access laws in the world. Most other countries do not allow no-excuse absentee voting, and dropboxes are also virtually unknown elsewhere," other democracies around the world. "If Georgia's elections are undemocratic, then almost all of our democratic allies are also undemocratic."

If liberal activists and woke corporations believed their own rhetoric, they wouldn't stop at boycotting and threatening the State of Georgia. They couldn't possibly. They would be busy trying to divest from most of our NATO allies and essentially the rest of the entire developed world.

Some European countries allow mail-in voting, but most do not. We constantly hear from our socialist friends how we should be emulating Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark. Well, none of them allow in-country postal voting—not a one. Bring on the boycotts, I guess.

And you don't even want to hear about early voting. Goodness gracious. But France, Spain, Germany, Italy, the UK, Ireland—not a day of in-person early voting in any of those countries, none of them. That is according to an international NGO that studies democracy.

So, remember, the Texas and Georgia laws codify a whole lot of early voting, mail-in voting, and lots of election-day voting.

And this is supposed to be the death of democracy? Some outrage on a global and historic scale?

Give me a break. What nonsense.

Even going by Texas's new proposals, there will be voting by mail in Paris, TX, but not in Paris, France. There would be almost 2 weeks of in-person early voting in New Berlin, TX, but zero days in Berlin, Germany. I am sure Democrats will be yelling at the

Fortune 500 to boycott Europe any day now—any day now.

Of course, the reality is that these moving goalposts are absolutely fake. The frantic outrage is phony. It is all meant to justify a political power grab that Democrats have had written and waiting since years before any of these new State laws, which are supposedly prompting it—yet another awful plank that my colleagues across the aisle want to hide in the reckless taxing-and-spending spree they hope to ram through Congress.

TERRORISM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now on one final matter, last week, some of our colleagues expressed disapproval of U.S. strikes against al-Shabaab terrorists in Somalia. I find their views difficult to understand.

Al-Shabaab poses a significant threat to U.S. interests. But you don't have to take my word for it. Late in 2019, the leader of al-Shabaab, an al-Qaida-affiliated terrorist group based in Somalia, said:

Our biggest target today is the Americans . . . The only reason we have exerted all this effort and undertaken all this preparation today is to attack the American troops.

In the assessment of the commander of U.S. Africa Command, U.S. General Stephen Townsend, that is coming from "the largest, wealthiest, and most violent Al Qaeda-associated group in the world" and "the primary African violent extremist organization threat to American interests."

This is not a new threat. Al-Shabaab was designated a foreign terrorist organization back in 2008. Its leaders declared allegiance to al-Qaida in 2012, a year before their attack on the Westgate Mall in Kenya that killed 67 people. The Obama administration designated the group as an al-Qaida-associated force in 2016. That made it subject to the 2001 AUMF.

At the time, it was a difficult but telling acknowledgement that the al-Qaida terrorist threat was growing. The raid that killed Bin Laden had clearly not ended the threat his terrorists posed to our country.

As a result of its declared and demonstrated allegiance to al-Qaida, al-Shabaab is clearly subject to the 2001 authorization for the use of military force, no question. President Obama knew it. General Townsend knows it. Al-Shabaab themselves tell us they want Americans dead. What more, what more do the skeptics need?

If our colleagues do not want the U.S. military to conduct strikes against the al-Qaida terrorists responsible for killing Americans and threatening our interests, I would be interested to hear how they propose we defend against these threats.

So, by the way, with the administration's rushed withdrawal from Afghanistan, there are well-founded concerns that al-Qaida may be roaring back in that country.

So which al-Qaida affiliate should we stop pressuring—al-Shabaab, AQAP, ISIS? Should we stop hunting for al-Zawahiri, the leader of al-Qaida?

Administrations of both parties have identified and supported local partners who share an interest in combating terrorists. By and large, this approach has succeeded in keeping pressure on the terrorists while keeping more Americans out of harm's way.

But despite the best efforts of local partners to keep the terrorists at bay and the best efforts of U.S. diplomats to broker peace, some terrorists do require direct action by the U.S. military to be stopped. These hard-core extremists pose a serious threat to American national security. They seek to attack our interests all around the world, including our homeland, if we let them.

The threat they pose will not recede if we lose focus. In fact, the exact opposite is the case. So I hope the Commander in Chief will exercise the authorities the Congress has provided him and the tools Congress has funded to keep America safe against the terrorists who continue to target our homeland and our interests abroad.

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. SCHUMER. 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 MAJORITY LEADER

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

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, with respect to infrastructure, Senators continue to make good progress on both tracks of legislation. Members should be prepared to vote again on cloture on the motion to proceed to the bipartisan infrastructure bill as early as tonight.

CAPITOL SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on another matter, yesterday, the Senate Appropriations Chairman, Senator LEAHY, announced a bipartisan agreement to provide \$2.1 billion in emergency supplemental funding to support the Capitol Police, reimburse our National Guard, and make sure all the critical functions of the Capitol Complex are properly funded.

The toll of January 6 and the impact of COVID had meant that funding for the Capitol Police, the Capitol Complex, and even for our National Guard was running low.

Capitol Police have been forced to cancel critical training and health services and have had to hold off on buying new, potentially lifesaving gear, like helmets and body armor and respirators.

Thankfully, the bipartisan agreement between the chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee will replenish these critical funds and support the hard-working men and women who keep this building, Senators, staff, media, and Capitol employees safe.

I was pleased to hear the Republican leader support this supplemental appropriations bill this morning, and I look forward to working with our Republican colleagues to swiftly passing this legislation through the Senate.

And I must give accolades to the Rules Committee, led by Senators KLOBUCHAR and BLUNT. Their hearings and focus on this issue—the safety of the Capitol—has helped pave the way for the agreement, and we thank them for their continued diligence.

NOMINATIONS OF GWYNNE A. WILCOX AND DAVID M. PROUTY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, one final matter, by the end of today, the Senate will confirm two nominees on the NLRB, the National Labor Relations Board: Gwynne Wilcox and David Prouty. Both are champions for working Americans.

Ms. Wilcox, who hails from my home State of New York—I am proud to say—has spent her career representing workers and unions seeking to exercise their rights to organize. She is one of the Nation's leading experts on labor law, and if confirmed, she would make history as the first African-American woman to ever serve on the NLRB.

Like Ms. Wilcox, David Prouty has also spent a lifetime defending the rights of organized labor across the country, recently serving as the general counsel of the SEIU, one the Nation's largest unions.

Over the course of American history, the labor movement has been the single most powerful force in lifting Americans out of poverty and into the middle class. It was by coming to this country and joining a union that my grandfather entered the middle class and passed on even more opportunity to his children and then to me and my brother and sister.

So it is no mistake that as labor union participation has declined over the past few decades, wages have stalled as well, and folks are finding it harder and harder to stay in the middle class.

If we are going to strengthen the backbone of the middle class, we need to reinvigorate the labor movement and protect the rights of workers everywhere to organize and bargain collectively for their wages. Appointing these two labor champions to the NLRB is a great way to start.

And, to the American people, the confirmation today of these two NLRB

labor champions is a direct result of having a Democratic majority in the Senate versus having a Republican majority.

Under Leader MCCONNELL and Republicans, the NLRB, which is typically divided between two parties, had only Republican appointees for the first time in its 85-year history. None of them had any experience in labor policy. They are almost atavistically against working people and helped management—the big bosses—to prevent people from organizing and making it harder to stay organized if you were. It was awful, and it is one of the reasons that middle-class incomes have not accelerated in the last 2 decades.

In fact, the Republicans were so intent on not having the NLRB defend the rights of working people that under Leader MCCONNELL a Democratic seat on the NLRB was held vacant for nearly 3 years. If the American people want to know which side each party is on, just look at the NLRB: Democrats appointing pro-labor people who fight for higher salaries, higher pensions, higher health benefits; Republicans making sure the NLRB doesn't function and allowing the big bosses to take a dominant role in negotiations with their workers.

Even during the years when President Trump was in the White House and Republicans had a majority on the NLRB, Leader MCCONNELL blocked Democrats from appointing a minority member to the Board. They didn't want a minority member on the Board even though they would have the majority, the Republicans. It is not a stretch to say if Democrats had not taken the majority in January, these important posts to the NLRB might never have been filled.

So, look, Senate Democrats are working with the Biden Administration to make sure the National Labor Relations Board does what it is intended to do: stand up for working Americans; make sure they have a much better chance of getting better wages, better benefits, better pensions. I look forward to confirming these two outstanding nominees later today.

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.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wanted to just literally pop into the discussion here this morning. There is a great deal going on here in the Capitol.

The discussions on the bipartisan infrastructure bill are continuing in a

good, productive way, and we are hopeful we will be able to move to that great deal of work that has gone on by folks on both sides working in extraordinary good faith.

And to be able to proceed on this matter, I think, will be an important policy initiative but also good for our process in this body.

CONGRATULATING LYDIA JACOBY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I don't come here this morning to speak to that at this moment but to just give a strong Alaska "attagirl" shout-out to Lydia Jacoby.

A few days ago, most people outside of the State of Alaska had probably never heard of Lydia, 17 years old, from Seward, AK. Seward is a pretty small community in the south central part of the State. It is a coastal community. It is a fishing community. It is a hard-working community.

Lydia is a typical high school student at Seward High School, except she is a swimmer, and is she an extraordinary swimmer. To see the news the other night of her gold, of her unexpected and spectacular win, was a moment of pride for all Alaskans, a moment of pride for Americans that just makes your heart swell. So I wanted to come to the floor and share that.

I actually was able to start my morning off early, but in a good way, by being able to call Lydia—she is over in Japan, obviously—and to speak with her directly and offer my congratulations. Mr. President, you can tell when people are grinning ear to ear, even though you are separated by thousands of miles and you are talking over a telephone. This morning, Lydia Jacoby was grinning ear to ear as I was sharing my words of congratulations and she, just her exuberance and delight for being able to represent the United States at these Olympics in this way.

We are extraordinarily proud. Lydia has put Seward and certainly Seward High School on the map. Folks are coming up to me saying: Gosh, I didn't realize you didn't have Olympic-meter swimming pools in most of your communities. Well, that is true. Lydia did some training that I think most would say: It is going to be a long, hard slog to get to any Olympics.

I think the dedication of this young woman has certainly played out. The support that she has received from her parents over the years, the support she has received from her community, is an example of just good, strong Alaska roots: everybody working hard and just doing your best on a daily basis.

Lydia Jacoby has absolutely done her best. She set the gold standard, and we are just extraordinarily proud of this young Alaskan woman.

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 legislative clerk read the nomination of 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, not content with their \$1.9 trillion so-called COVID relief bill—paid for entirely with money borrowed from younger generations of Americans and our children and grandchildren—Democrats are readying another partisan spending spree.

Democrats are preparing to consider a \$3.5 trillion tax-and-spending package, this one at least partially paid for by massive tax hikes—tax hikes on small businesses, tax hikes on large businesses, tax hikes on investment, tax hikes on well-off Americans, and tax hikes on the middle class. That is right, tax hikes on the middle class.

Now, President Biden is fond of repeating that he won't raise taxes on anyone making under \$400,000 a year, but the new death tax he is proposing will definitely hit some middle-class Americans. Let's talk about that new tax.

President Biden and congressional Democrats are proposing to eliminate a part of the Tax Code known as "step-up in basis" or referred to often as "stepped-up basis." Under our current Tax Code, when you inherit something from an estate, whether that is stocks or a house, the value of that item is stepped up from its original value to its current market value when you receive it. This prevents you from having to pay capital gains taxes on the amount that your parents' house increased in value when it was owned by your parents.

Let's say you inherit a house that your parents bought for \$100,000, but it is now worth \$500,000. Under current law, when you inherit that house, you are not liable for taxes on the increase in value from the time your parents bought it. The house is transferred to you at its current market value of \$500,000. So if you sell the house right when you inherit it, you will receive the full value of the house instead of having to pay taxes on the amount that the house increased in value while your parents owned it. If you sell that house 2 years later for \$650,000, you are only required to pay taxes on the \$150,000 in value it gained while it was in your possession.

Under the Democrats' proposal, however, capital gains taxes would automatically be triggered upon death if

the increase in value of an individual's estate has exceeded a certain amount. So, if your parents' house or the family farm or other assets have increased in value more than Democrats deem desirable, you would now owe capital gains taxes on the amount of that increase immediately after your parents' death minus the amount Democrats choose to exempt.

There are plenty of middle-class Americans around this country who would be paying this tax. You wouldn't be protected just because you make under \$400,000 a year.

Now, the President has tried to get around this by arguing that Democrats would be taxing dead individuals, not living ones. So if your parents die and pass on their estate, the argument suggests the tax that you have to send to the Federal Government isn't a tax on you but on your parents. Well, who does he think he is fooling? Who is going to experience the loss of that money—you or your parents? Who is going to be writing the check to the Federal Government? You will.

Let's imagine that a woman's parents die and leave her their estate, and 2 weeks later, a thief comes in and steals part of that inheritance. Who are people going to think was robbed—the daughter or her deceased parents? I think all of us would recognize that it was the daughter who was robbed. The same thing applies to Democrats' proposed new death tax. It is not dead Americans who would be writing checks to the Federal Government. Sure, the tax is owed by the decedent or transferor, but for all practical purposes, the costs would be borne by their descendants.

The truth is, even if we accept the argument that Democrats' new death tax is a tax on deceased Americans and not their descendants, this tax would still hit some middle-class Americans. After all, it is perfectly possible to work hard your whole life and invest wisely and see your estate appreciate in value by more than \$1.25 million—the proposed individual exemption level—over the course of your life without ever exiting the middle class. We are not talking about confining this taxation to individuals with a yearly income of \$1.25 million; we are talking about the increase in value on an estate over a person's lifetime. There is no question that this tax would fall on the estates of some thoroughly middle-class Americans.

The problems with this new death tax aren't limited to the fact that it breaks President Biden's pledge not to raise taxes on individuals making under \$400,000 a year. There are a lot of additional problems, starting with the administration and compliance costs of this tax.

Congress actually passed a similar proposal in the 1970s but repealed it before it went into effect because it was so complicated and unworkable. That is right. Congress repealed the proposal before it was even implemented be-

cause it was clear that collecting this tax was going to be too complicated.

Forty-odd years later, collecting this tax would still be an enormously complicated matter. It would put incredible new recordkeeping requirements on a lot of American families, and it would strain the capabilities of the IRS, although those 87,000 new IRS employees President Biden wants to add to the Agency would certainly increase the available manpower to levy new tax hikes.

Plus, I can only imagine the litigation that would arise over the valuation of assets. What happens if the IRS disagrees with the estimate of the value of your family farm or business? Do you have to take the IRS to court? Will the IRS take you to court?

In addition, there is a very real danger that Americans would be paying taxes on nonexistent gains, in part due to inflation and the natural expansion of the economy. Recent economic reports are raising concerns that, with the administration's robust new entitlement spending, Americans could be shouldering the burdens of significant inflation now and long into the future. But Democrats' new death tax would not account for inflation on an asset, like a family-owned farm or business, which means Americans could be paying a lot of money in taxes on nonexistent gains.

Finally, I want to talk about the threat this tax poses to family farms and businesses.

Now, Democrats claim that they will defer this tax for family farms and businesses as long as a member of the family inherits and then runs the farm or business, but it is completely unclear what this will look like in practice. Will "family members" refer only to sons and daughters? What if a stepson wants to take over the farm, or a niece? Will the inheritors still be subject to the tax then, which could result in their having to sell that farm the niece wants to run? What happens if two or more of the children want to run the farm? There are a lot of unanswered questions.

Of course, it is important to remember that Democrats will only be deferring the tax. So if the time ever comes when the family wants to sell the farm—maybe it is getting hard to run and a neighboring family is willing to buy it—the family would have to pay those taxes that were deferred when their mom or dad died. If that family farm has been handed down through a few generations already, it is completely possible that paying those taxes would consume a big part of that legacy.

There is a reason 13 House Democrats sent a letter to House Democratic leaders expressing their concern about the proposed step-up in basis repeal. It is because this tax would pose a real threat to the continued existence of family farms and businesses. It is the same reason that those in agriculture and small business communities oppose this new death tax.

I was proud to lead all 50 Senate Republicans in a letter last week, urging President Biden to drop this misguided proposal, and I will continue to do everything I can to protect family farms and businesses from this new tax.

There should be a limit on how many times the Federal Government can tax you. Americans' bank accounts should not be regarded as a bottomless barrel of money to pay for Democrats' preferred government programs, because that is exactly what is happening here. Democrats want to massively and permanently expand government, and they are looking to Americans and American businesses to pay for their social experiments. They apparently haven't spent much time considering how our economy or American families would suffer as a result of their tax-and-spending spree.

Middle-class Americans should not have to see their inheritances shrink to pay for Democrats' spending, and family farms and businesses that already face challenges from our current death tax should not have to be worrying that a new death tax will spell the end of their hard-earned legacies.

I hope the Democrats will think twice before moving forward with this new tax increase on Americans.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote starts.

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

NOMINATIONS OF GWYNNE A. WILCOX AND DAVID M. PROUTY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, over the past 4 years, the National Labor Relations Board, which was founded to protect workers' rights, has again and again tipped the scales in favor of very large corporations.

While Democratic nominees to the NLRB were blocked and anti-worker nominees were jammed through, we saw decades of worker protections reversed. This has had a devastating impact on workers in our country, who are not only struggling through this pandemic but who have also seen their rights to strike and organize and bargain collectively undermined and constrained in ruling after ruling.

But, today, the Senate has the opportunity to begin healing this damage by confirming two exceptionally qualified individuals. That is why I am urging all of our colleagues to join me in supporting David Prouty and Gwynne Wilcox to serve on the NLRB.

Mr. Prouty's career is defined by his commitment to workers, with a long record representing textile workers, hotel workers, restaurant workers, baseball players, and now as a lawyer for the SEIU Local 32BJ, property service workers.

Ms. Wilcox's experience as a field attorney for the NLRB, as a lawyer representing workers before the Board,

and defending healthcare workers and protecting their rights makes clear that she has the right qualifications and values for this job.

Ms. Wilcox is not only a high-qualified nominee, she will be a historic one. She will be the first Black woman to serve on the Board, and her confirmation will bring us a step closer to ensuring our worker protections Agencies represent the diverse workforce they serve.

It is clear to me we need David Prouty and Gwynne Wilcox on the NLRB to reverse the damage done by years of anti-worker attacks and get us back on the right track of building back an economy that works for everyone, not just huge corporations and those at the top.

Now more than ever, we need to join with workers and defend their rights. Today, that means voting to confirm Gwynne Wilcox and David Prouty.

I yield the floor.

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.

Mrs. MURRAY. 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 257, 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.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Baldwin, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Jacky Rosen, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Mark R. Warner, Brian Schatz, Sherrod Brown, Sheldon Whitehouse, Raphael Warnock, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 281 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 1:10 p.m. until 1:55 p.m. today. I further ask that all postcloture time on the Wilcox nomination expire at 2:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

JANUARY 6 SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday, Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON called to order the first hearing of the special committee that most of our Republican colleagues have tried to block, the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6 Attack on the U.S. Capitol.

It continues to amaze me that an independent, bipartisan committee to investigate the worst assault on our democracy since the War of 1812, an assault that left one police officer dead and more than 140 injured, was filibustered and stopped in its tracks by the Republican leader of the Senate, MITCH MCCONNELL.

That is exactly what he did. He tried to conceal the truth about what happened on January 6. He tried to hide it from the American people and to do this without police officers in this building noticing, many of whom risked their lives on that day. Well, we saw yesterday that he failed. Senator MCCONNELL failed to stop the investigation. We are going to learn what

happened on January 6, despite his effort to stop it.

During the first hearing of the select committee yesterday, we heard testimony from four police officers who battled the mob for hours on January 6. Many of us witnessed it. Two members of the Capitol Police Force and two from the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, DC, testified. These officers were brutalized in hand-to-hand combat. Some thought they were going to die. And they are still grappling with the physical and emotional trauma they suffered.

Officer Harry Dunn recounted yesterday how the mob of the former President's supporters chanted the N-word in his face.

Metropolitan Police Officer Michael Fanone testified that members of the mob attempted to steal his service weapon and kill him with it. He was dragged into the mob, tasered repeatedly, and beaten unconscious. He suffered a heart attack and a traumatic brain injury. This is what Officer Fanone said yesterday: "My fellow citizens, including so many of the people I put my life at risk to defend, are downplaying or outright denying what happened. I feel like I went to hell" he said, "and [came] back to protect them and the people in this room. But too many are now telling me that hell doesn't exist or that hell wasn't exactly that bad."

Is that how we are going to treat police officers in the Capitol? I ask that of the Senators and the House Members.

They risk their lives every day to defend us, to defend this building, to defend what it stands for. Instead of thanking them, are some of my colleagues going to deny the brutality that they faced? That cannot be. These brave officers deserve better. At the very least, they deserve that the truth be told.

One of the most searing images from January 6 was that of a police officer screaming in agony as he was pinned against the metal door and beaten by this insurrectionist mob.

Yesterday, that man, Metropolitan Police Officer Daniel Hodges, told the select committee: "There can be no moving on without accountability. There can be no healing without making sure this will never happen again."

To all of the police officers who held the line on January 6, let me say clearly: You defended the American democracy. You didn't just defend this building and the Members of Congress. And if not for your heroism and sacrifice, the terrible toll of that day would have been far worse. Take solace in the fact that you did your duty.

But there are Members of the Senate and the House who are failing to do theirs. Right now, this Senate has a chance to finally do right by our police officers.

Yesterday, Chairman LEAHY and Vice Chairman SHELBY announced a bipartisan \$2.1 billion security supplemental

funding package that will not only pay the salaries of our Capitol Police officers, it will increase security at the Capitol. It will reimburse the National Guardsmen who were deployed to defend this building after January 6—a great sacrifice.

That package would also provide relief to another group of heroes who risked their lives for America and who did so on foreign soil: our civilian partners in Afghanistan. This package would provide an additional 8,000 special immigrant visas to Afghan interpreters who supported our diplomats and troops on the frontlines of America's longest war.

As we begin to finally bring our troops home from Afghanistan, let's not forget the heroes who supported them and risked their lives to help them. Many of these individuals and their families are no longer safe if the Taliban takes control. We need to give them a new home in America. I am glad this bill provides the means to do so.

I thank Senator LEAHY for leading the negotiations. I hope every Senator will support it.

Yesterday, Officer Harry Dunn told the Select Committee about the anxiety he and other officers felt when the remaining security fence around the Capitol was taken down, but little else has been done to protect this building from another mob insurrection.

Officer Dunn said: "When that fence came down—when we lost that last layer of protection—that was hard. . . . The fence came down and still nothing has changed. Everything is different, but still nothing has changed."

This is the time to show the officers who protected us and the world that when you defend America in our time of need, we will stand by you. I urge all my colleagues to support the security supplemental bill. It is the least that we can do.

Mr. President, there is one other thing I would like to say. It is just too close to call. I thought about it long and hard, and it is just too close to call.

In an effort to plumb the depths of political meanness and irresponsibility, it is just hard to choose between Tucker Carlson and Laura Ingraham. First, they became our Nation's leading anti-vax quacks, making their specious arguments against life-saving COVID-19 vaccines and sowing doubt among their viewers, who were literally putting their lives at risk because of the lies that these two individuals are spouting. And now—and now—they are creating a braying chorus focused on defaming the police who defended this building on January 6.

Their mockery of the bravery of the Capitol and DC police, who risked and some lost their lives on the January 6 attack on the Capitol Building, is cowardly and shameful.

It took courage for the police to face the Trump mob. It takes no courage for these FOX talking-heads to belittle

these officers. It takes no courage to practice their well-worn smirks reacting to the bravery of these policemen.

It is hard to imagine reading a press account of what they said yesterday and last night about the hearing that took place, the things that they did. Ingraham gave the "best performance in an action role" to Washington Metropolitan Police Officer Michael Fanone, who, during the testimony, recalled fearing he would be shot with his own gun.

Ingraham said: "Well, there was certainly a lot of violence that day, but it was not a terrorist attack. It wasn't 9/11. It wasn't the worst thing that ever happened to America. It wasn't an insurrection."

And then Tucker Carlson responded with a smirk to the footage of Fanone telling the hearing he had experienced post-traumatic stress disorder.

Throughout the monologue, Carlson piled onto his previous claims about the violence just being a "political protest that got out of hand."

First the vaccines and now defaming the police—this is irresponsible from start to finish. I would ask those at FOX network, not exactly my friends and allies in politics, to show common decency and common sense—common sense when it comes to these vaccines, which we know if more people were vaccinated we wouldn't be facing this resurgent need for masks and fear of this new variant. And common decency when it comes to the men and women in uniform when it comes to risking their lives for this Capitol, this democracy, and this government. Certainly, there is freedom of speech, but let's hope that good sense will dominate this discussion over at the FOX network as to whether these two ought to be allowed to continue their rant.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that prior to my remarks on the floor, we were going to recognize the Senator from Minnesota for 10 minutes or so. So if that is still desired by the Senator from Minnesota, I would be glad to yield.

And since the Senator from Minnesota is not present, I will go ahead and make my remarks.

I do ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as if in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

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

LIGADO

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, I am here today to share some news about a key subject we have been talking about for quite some time, and that is Ligado. It is a complicated thing. It is something where one company was able to get rushed over a weekend in April of 2020 and get recognized and get an agreement from the FCC to have an operation that deals with the individuals that are wanting to be involved in this group.

The 15 government Departments and Agencies signed a petition for reconsideration of a flawed decision. Keep in mind that this is a decision by the FCC with the NTIA, the National Telecommunications and Infrastructure Administration, because they manage Federal spectrum.

Now, when the new administration was sworn in this January, the petitions were still pending. The NTIA, which I just now used the initials of, is very well-known. This is the one that has the responsibility to take care of the Department of Commerce, some of their instructions, some of their activities. So I spoke with Secretary Gina Raimondo, who is the Secretary of Commerce for the new administration, about the importance of continuing the petition for reconsideration. I also followed up with a letter.

What is a petition of reconsideration? What we are talking about here is that a decision was made by the FCC, and they have been petitioned by almost every bureaucracy and many, many individuals—over 100—to have a reconsideration. And this has not happened yet.

And so we changed administrations, and, of course, the new administration came in and Secretary Gina Raimondo did a great job with the importance of continuing the petition for reconsideration.

I wanted to make sure that even with the change in administration, the government Departments and Agencies still wanted to see the harmful order repealed. And here is the breaking news. I just got a letter from Secretary Raimondo, confirming now that “there has been no change to the Department of Commerce’s or [the] NTIA’s opposition to the FCC’s Ligado Order.”

And that says it all. It says this administration is in full agreement with the previous administration, and they will be acting accordingly.

She also pledges that the NTIA will continue to pursue the petition for reconsideration—the petition that represents the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Interior, Justice, Homeland Security, Energy, Transportation, NASA, FAA, and more—virtually, the entire government.

Now, this is huge. This shows, once again, that there is bipartisan concern about the Ligado order and that it is continuing into the Biden administration.

It is not an exaggeration when I say that the Ligado order would be devastating to public safety, our national defense, and even our way of life. And everybody knows that.

The reliability of GPS and satellite communications is necessary for the safety of life operations, national security, and economic activity.

Here are some of the day-to-day things people might not think of as being a part of the users of GPS and how it affects our daily lives. A big one is using your credit card or debit card when you are making a purchase or anything in terms of making transactions.

Another one is making a phone call—even making a phone call. Cell phone networks rely on GPS to synchronize the cell towers so calls can be passed seamlessly. Otherwise, they could get bogged up, and if they experience interference, your call could be dropped when moving from tower to tower.

Here is one that most people don’t expect, and that is energy. Why would energy be dependent upon an accurate and reliable GPS system? Well, whether that is filling up your tank at the pump or managing electrical grids to light our homes, we rely on GPS timing to safely operate underground pipelines and our electricity grid.

Farmers and ranchers depend on GPS and satellite communications when planting crops, applying fertilizer, and during our harvest operations, to move large critical machinery from place to place.

I was back in my State of Oklahoma last week and met with a bunch of farmers, and I learned myself how farmers are using GPS now. This is a thing that wasn’t true just a few years ago, but it is true now.

Working out. A lot of healthy people are out there doing what they ought to be doing with their bodies, and that is working out. A study last year found that one-fifth—that is 20 percent—of all Americans use a fitness tracker or smart watch, the majority of which use the GPS to count steps and track distances.

Taking a flight. Commercial and civilian aviation relies on GPS navigation and satellite communications to operate safely.

Driving around. Each day, countless Americans rely on Google Maps, Waze, Apple Maps, and other forms of navigation systems to get them from point A to point B. And they rely on GPS to do that.

And while no one hopes that they ever need a firetruck, an ambulance, or other emergency services, 9-1-1 operators and EMS use GPS and satellite communications to locate a caller and navigate as quickly as possible.

We had a hearing just a few weeks ago, and we had the Helicopter Operators Association talk about their emergency runs and what would happen to them if they lost the reliability of GPS.

And there is more: weather forecasting, the movement of goods on our highways, surveying maritime harbors and channels, operation with construction and mining equipment. The list goes on and on.

I had a personal experience about 20 years ago with one of the uses; that is, I had occasion with three individuals and participants to fly an airplane around the world.

I am from Oklahoma. Of course, we are all familiar with Will Rogers. Some people are not quite as familiar with Wiley Post. Wiley Post flew around with Will Rogers. They flew around the world. So what I was doing was replicating that flight in my plane around

the world. I was using a Trimble—that is the manufacturer—a Trimble TNL 2000. That was the first time, I think—I haven’t checked since then—that it has been used for private use for flying around the world. Nonetheless, that is a GPS system.

Because the FCC order allows Ligado to repurpose spectrum to operate a terrestrial-based network, Ligado signals on Earth’s surface will be much more powerful than GPS, causing substantial and harmful interference.

How do we know Ligado will cause interference?

The FCC told us when they approved the Ligado order. They said—you should listen to the FCC statement:

Ligado shall expeditiously repair or replace as needed any U.S. Government GPS devices that experience or are likely to experience harmful interference from Ligado’s operations.

That is a quote. Remember that quote. I will tell you about a bill we will introduce to correct this problem that is serious to so many people.

Last year, we also held a hearing on the Armed Services Committee to hear how the Ligado order would impact the military and warfighter. All of the witnesses—Dana Deasy, Michael Griffin, General Raymond—they are all united.

Dana Deasy, the former Chief Information Officer at the DOD, said it best when asked if he thought the Ligado order would have an impact on DOD or the Federal spectrum. He said:

Yes, the fact that we’re sitting here today, and you have General Raymond here representing our military, would clearly suggest that . . .

We wouldn’t be sitting here today if it didn’t have a heavy impact on our military operations.

There has been multiple testimony about that. The NTIA petition filed in April of 2020—and, again, signed by the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Interior, Justice, Homeland Security, Energy and Transportation, as well as agencies like NASA and the FAA—is also clear and united. There is no division of opinion on this.

That alone should be enough to overturn the order. If not, we need to make sure Federal agencies, State governments, and all others negatively impacted by the actions of Ligado are not left holding the bag when it comes to costs and, worse, aren’t put in the position where they have to push the costs onto the American consumers.

Everyone is on our side with this. The whole of government and over 100 private-sector groups all agree, and they all agree no one else is on the side of Ligado except paid lobbyists.

Ligado said this order is about winning the race to 5G and beating China. Those who claim Ligado’s proposal is necessary to beat China’s 5G push are deliberately mixing up two different and important spectrum issues in order to sell their product: the sharing of mid-band 5G spectrum by DOD with industry and harmful interference of Ligado’s signal with the low-band GPS

signals used in nearly every aspect of daily life.

Ligado's spectrum they are repurposing is not in prime mid-band spectrum being considered for 5G, and Ligado's low-band spectrum was not a part of the FCC's own plan to accelerate 5G development released in September 2018, called the 5G FAST Plan.

Reliable GPS and satellite communications are important to everyone in America and drives much of our Nation's economy. We should not sacrifice GPS reliability. In the event the petitions for reconsideration are not successful—I can't imagine they would not be because almost every bureaucracy in most of the private sector are behind these. This is happening all over the country. But in the event that the petitions for reconsideration are not successful, I have introduced legislation, and I won't give you the name of that because it is one of these things where there are too many words involved. We refer to it as the RETAIN Act to protect the users of GPS when, by approving the Ligado order, the FCC did not.

Just last week, companion legislation was passed by the House of Representatives, by JIM COOPER, MIKE TURNER, FRANK LUCAS, GT Thompson, KEN CALVERT, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, and DON BEYER. They introduced companion legislation to that legislation that we are currently introducing.

As of last week, we had more than 100 organizations who have signed a letter supporting the RETAIN GPS Act to hold Ligado accountable for the interference that they cause.

Clearly, the momentum is with us and the letter from Secretary Raimondo I announced earlier is a great example of that. Clearly, today's announcement is a big step for the good guys.

Let me make sure people understand what we are talking about. We are talking about those who are responsible—that is Ligado—for the use of that spectrum, if and when, as most people are predicting, it does something that damages the GPS system. We are talking about the system that every user in America uses—that if they do that, then they have to pay for it. That is all. They have to pay for it rather than have the public pay for it.

Now, that is really the end of what I am trying to get across to people how serious this is.

I want to put down in the RECORD all the agencies that are strongly supporting this. We have the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, Department of the Air Force, Department of the Navy, Department of Commerce, NASA, Department of Interior, Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Energy, National Science Foundation, Department of Transportation, U.S. Coast Guard, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my re-

marks, these organizations be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I would add to that group the NTIA, which represents a lot of government in addition to what I just read. I would like to add the names—I have a list here of well over 100—talking about Aerospace Association, Agricultural interests, the American Farm Bureau, all of these—virtually every recognizable organization in America is among the 105 organizations that are supporting this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter also be printed in the RECORD.

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

The undersigned IRAC agencies endorse and support the position stated by the Department of the Air Force and the Department of Defense:

Ms. Sarah Bauer, Department of the Army; Mr. Rene (RJ) Balanga, NASA; Mr. John Cornicelli, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. James Arnold, Department of Transportation; Mr. Kenneth Willis, Department of the Navy; Mr. Ramon L. Gladden, Department of the Interior; Mr. George Dudley, Department of Energy; Mr. Jerry Ulcek, U.S. Coast Guard; Mr. Ivan Navarro, Department of Commerce; Mr. Quan Vu, Department of Justice; Mr. Jonathan Williams, National Science Foundation; Mr. Michael Richmond, Federal Aviation Administration; and NTIA.

JUNE 29, 2021.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JACK REED,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. TAMMY DUCKWORTH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE ROUNDS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: The undersigned companies and organizations strongly endorse the Recognizing and Ensuring Taxpayer Access to Infrastructure Necessary for GPS and Satellite Communications Act or the "RETAIN GPS and Satellite Communications Act" introduced today. This legislation would ensure that the costs incurred by the public sector, businesses and consumers as a result of the FCC's decision to permit Ligado Networks LLC to use spectrum in a way that would cause interference to GPS and satellite communications would be covered by Ligado—the licensee benefiting from the decision.

The FCC's Ligado Order already recognizes the potential for interference to GPS receivers and requires that, "Ligado shall expeditiously repair or replace as needed any U.S. Government GPS devices that experience or are likely to experience harmful interference from Ligado's operations." But the Order failed to go far enough in three key ways. First, it did not provide an adequate description of the potential costs to federal agencies and thus the American taxpayer. Federal agencies are responsible for ensuring reliable GPS and satellite communications necessary for all manner of safety of life operations. Second, while recognizing the potential costs associated with interference to Federal agency owned devices, the FCC order inexplicably

fails to require that Ligado also bear the costs of interference to other government and private owners of devices and applications that may be disrupted by Ligado's proposed operations. Third, the Order improperly applies interference limits that are fundamentally insufficient to protect critical satellite communications and navigation signals from unknown millions of Ligado devices operating over wide geographic areas.

Ninety-nine percent of GPS receivers are used in critical applications by non-Federal government users, businesses and consumers. In addition, the Order similarly threatens the satellite communications networks that can enable technologies used to complement and support GPS. The reliability of GPS and satellite communications is necessary for safety of life operations, national security and economic activity; critical communications capabilities; commercial and civil aviation; first responders, 9-1-1 and other public safety operators; military readiness and communications; weather forecasting; the movement of goods on our highways; the marking maritime harbors and channels; farmers planting and harvesting crops; operation of construction and mining equipment—and the list goes on and on.

The Retain GPS and Satellite Communications Act acknowledges the harm to GPS and satellite communications end users caused by the Ligado order and ensures the burden of cost sits squarely where it belongs—on Ligado, rather than our first responders, farmers, pilots, boat owners, surveyors or construction companies. We commend you for recognizing the expense and burden the Ligado order places on federal agencies, American taxpayers, businesses and consumers, and for providing clear and immediate relief to critical stakeholders with this legislation. Thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industries Association (AIA); Agriculture Retailers Association; Air Line Pilots Association, Int'l (ALPA); Airborne Public Safety Association (APSA); Aircraft Electronics Association; Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA); Aireon, LLC; Airlines for America (A4A); Airo Drone, LLC; Alaska Airlines; Allegiant Air; Allied Pilots Association; American Airlines; American Association for Geodetic Surveying (AAGS); American Association of Airport Executives; American Bus Association; American Concrete Pavement Association; American Concrete Pipe Association; American Council of Engineering Companies.

American Farm Bureau Federation; American Rental Association; American Road & Transportation Builders Association (ARTBA); American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS); American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE); American Soybean Association; American Sportsfishing Association; American Trucking Associations; Associated Equipment Distributors; Associated General Contractors of America (AGC); Association of American Geographers (AAG); Association of Equipment Manufacturers (AEM); Association of Marina Industries; Atlas Air Worldwide; Aviation Spectrum Resources Inc. (ASRI); Blue Origin; Boat Owners Association of The United States, BoatU.S.; Cargo Airline Association (CAA); Cartography and Geographic Information Society (CAGIS).

Center for Sportfishing Policy; CNH Industrial; Coalition of Airline Pilots Associations (CAPA); Coalition of Geospatial Organizations (COGO); Coastal Conservation Association; CoBank; CompTIA Space Enterprise Council; Crown Consulting Inc.; Cubic Corporation; Delta Air Lines; Eastern Region Helicopter Council (ERHC); Equipment Dealers Association; Esri; FedEx Corporation;

Frontier Airlines; General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA); GIS Certification Institute (GISCI); Hawaii Helicopter Association; Helicopter Association International (HAI); Hellen Systems.

Intelligent Transportation Society of America; International Air Transport Association (IATA); International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO); Iowa-Nebraska Equipment Dealers Association; Iridium; L3Harris; Lockheed Martin; Management Association for Private Photogrammetric Surveyors (MAPPS); Marine Retailers Association of the Americas; Maxar; MidAmerica GIS Consortium (MAGIC); National Agricultural Aviation Association; National Air Carrier Association; National Air Transportation Association (NATA); National Asphalt Pavement Association; National Business Aviation Association (NBAA); National Cotton Council; National Defense Industrial Association; National Marine Manufacturers Association; National Ready Mixed Concrete Association (NRMCA).

National Society of Professional Surveyors (NSPS); National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC); National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association; National Utility Contractors Association; NetJets Association of Shared Aircraft Pilots (NJASAP); NEXA Capital Partners LLC; Oklahoma Defense Industry Association; Oklahoma Society of Land Surveyors; Polar Cargo; Portland Cement Association; Regional Airline Association (RAA); Resilient Navigation and Timing Foundation (RNTFnd); Skytrac; Southwest Airlines; Southwest Airlines Pilots Association; Spirit Airlines; Subsurface Utility Engineering Association; Sun Country Airlines; The Vertical Flight Society; Trimble; U.S. Contract Tower Association; U.S. Geospatial Executives Organization; United Airlines; United States Geospatial Intelligence Foundation (USGIF); University Consortium for Geographic Information Science (UCGIS); Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA); USA Rice.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

JANUARY 6 SELECT COMMITTEE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about how we must pass emergency security supplemental appropriations legislation to deliver needed funding to the Capitol Police and the National Guard.

Anyone who watched yesterday the moving testimony of the officers who protected this Capitol, I think, understands that we cannot wait.

I appreciate the efforts by my colleagues both over in the House as well as here in the Senate, Appropriations Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member SHELBY, as well as Senator BLUNT who works with me on the Rules Committee, to reach a bipartisan proposal on this critical funding issue, and we should pass this agreement without delay.

But after passing this important legislation, we must also continue to work to ensure that all the funding needs in the aftermath of January 6 are met, including with respect to funding for the Justice Department to bring those who participated in the insurrection to justice and to ensure there is sufficient funding for security improvement for the Capitol.

When an angry, violent mob staged an insurrection on January 6 and desecrated this Chamber, the temple of our

democracy—what they did over in the House, what they did in the hallways, spray-painted on the columns, the Parliamentarian office in shreds—it was an attack on our Republic itself.

As chair of the Rules Committee, I knew that we had to respond immediately in two ways: One was immediately finishing our job that day and getting the ballots counted; and then, 2 weeks later, making sure that inauguration took place on that platform, which they had also desecrated only 2 weeks before.

But the second piece was to get to the bottom of what happened. I am glad that the House, with their bipartisan Select Committee, is continuing this work. Our focus in the Senate was more limited, but Senator BLUNT and Senator PETERS and Senator PORTMAN and I combined our committees to look, to get some immediate answers so we could achieve this funding, as well as do some other things that couldn't wait for a year, that we had to get done right away.

That is why we convened immediate hearings with both officials who are responsible for security at the Capitol, including people who are no longer in their positions and with representatives from key Federal agencies.

We held the first hearing of the event of that horrific day. Our bipartisan report focused on security, planning, and response failures related to the violent and unprecedented insurrection that includes key findings and recommendations that should be put in place without delay.

We learned about one Capitol Police officer who could be heard on the radio that day asking a tragically simple question: Does anyone have a plan?

Sadly, there was no plan.

We found out there was no departmentwide operational plan in place before January 6. We are pleased we have a new police chief who has started this last week, who I know will be committed to getting that plan and working with our Sergeant at Arms, with our new employees here who are committed to work on this, as well as all of those police officers who stood with us that day and protected us from harm.

We found out in that report that, although Capitol Police activated seven Civil Disturbance Unit platoons, only four were trained in advanced civil tactics and had access to full riot gear. Officers in one platoon couldn't access equipment that was locked on a bus. Less than 10 percent of officers—160 of 1,840 sworn officers—were trained in advanced civil disturbance tactics.

With respect to intelligence, neither the FBI nor the Department of Homeland Security issued a threat assessment or intelligence bulletin warning of the potential for violence on the Capitol on January 6. They admitted at the hearing they didn't adequately look at social media or take it seriously.

At the same time, Capitol Police intelligence reports in advance of the at-

tack conflicted with each other. One warned of the Capitol being a target for home violence on January 6, and another rated the likelihood of civil disturbance as "remote" to "improbable." It appeared nothing was actually resolved.

We also found out that, while the National Guard should have been called sooner, they began arriving at the Capitol at 5:20 p.m., more than 4 hours after the barriers were first breached and nearly 3 hours after the Defense Department got a request for support from the Capitol Police.

In light of these findings, our report made many recommendations pertaining to both Capitol Police and Federal agencies. These are measures that could be acted on without delay while important oversight continues.

With respect to security here at the Capitol, progress has already been made, as I mentioned, with the appointment of the new police chief. We said that should be done immediately.

I have also introduced legislation with Senator BLUNT to put in place another one of our recommendations, which is to empower the Capitol Police Chief to directly request assistance from the DC National Guard in emergency situations.

One of the many absurd and tragically sad situations was that day when, of course, there had been mess-ups in not requesting the Guard earlier, which could have changed things dramatically.

But on that day, the Chief had to try to call the Sergeant at Arms of both Chambers, both of whom were leading the fight against the insurrectionists with the police. He had to make those phone calls because he felt that he needed that permission to be able to call in the National Guard.

What our bill simply does is it gives the Capitol Police Chief, in those dire emergency situations, the power to do that.

The agreement announced yesterday would also go a long way toward implementing another of our recommendations, which is one of the most crucial: to ensure that the Capitol Police has sufficient personnel with appropriate training and equipment to fulfill its mission.

Crucially, yesterday's agreement includes essential funding for the Capitol Police and National Guard, including funding for exactly what is called for in our report. This comes at a critical time when the Capitol Police is expected to run out of funding for salaries in August, and the National Guard is considering having to cut upcoming training without having additional support.

The agreement also includes Capitol Police funding for improved equipment and training to ensure officers have the resources they need to fulfill their mission of protecting the Capitol. Importantly, the Capitol Police funding also includes money for mental health support, something I specifically called for.

It also fully reimburses the National Guard for their costs in deploying to the Capitol, which was essential to securing the Capitol following the attack.

By the way, we all know we need to recruit more officers, and I believe the stability of having a police Chief in place, particularly one from this region, and also having the funding and the benefits and the things we need will be helpful in our major effort that must be done to recruit more Capitol Police. People have been working too many shifts; they have been working too late; and they have been away from their families for too long.

While this proposal will deliver needed funding for these urgent priorities, there are other priorities that we must not forget.

First, it remains imperative that the criminal insurrectionists who overtook the Capitol on January 6 are held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. The Justice Department has done incredible work to see that justice is done following the horrific events of that day, with more than 500 people now facing criminal charges. That is, by the way, very important that we fund that. That is something we may have to take up in the future as some of these cases may be very complex.

Secondly, at the same time, the insurrection also made clear—and we all know this—the need to improve the security of the Capitol Complex itself. This includes funds requested to upgrade the windows and doors that were destroyed by the violent mob that day and for new security measures. As we move forward, while I appreciate the funding in this bill, there may be need for additional funding.

We heard again yesterday about the horrific events of January 6 during that hearing. We heard that harrowing testimony, once again, from brave officers who performed heroically under unimaginable circumstances. We all know the stories of staff hiding in closets. We all have seen the videos of how close it was for so many Members. We owe it to those who are with us today, for those we have lost, and for those whom we want to hire in the future to keep us safe. We owe it to them to pass this legislation to fund the Capitol Police and National Guard, but we also will owe it to them in the future to fund these ongoing prosecutions and other security improvements.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to ensure that we pass this bill and also that the critical funding needs are met as we move forward, for nothing is more important to this place than our democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may conclude shortly after 1:10 p.m.

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

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I have good news for the people of Louisiana and good news for the American people: We have an agreement on an infrastructure package.

Now, OK, an “infrastructure package”; what does that mean? Let’s just talk.

There will be \$110 billion for roads and bridges nationwide—\$40 billion for bridges. By the way, Louisiana has the third most bridges in poor condition. So, if you are stuck right now in traffic trying to get over the Sabine River or the Calcasieu River or the Mississippi River or any of our other rivers which have bridges in poor condition, there is relief for you. There is \$47 billion for resiliency.

Now, my State is flooded more than other States, but every State, it seems, has had an issue with flooding. There is \$47 billion; a significant portion of it is for flooding issues, for coastal restoration, and other things regarding resiliency.

There is permitting reform. Right now, we know it can take 6 to 10 years for a bridge project—an Army Corps of Engineers project—to be permitted. Sometimes it takes so long to permit that the facts on the ground have actually changed, and the permit almost is inaccurate. In building upon pilot projects which have shown that permitting can be shortened from 6 years to 2 years, this infrastructure package has that permitting reform. There will be less money for bureaucrats and attorneys, and there will be more money for construction—what a major advance.

By the way, some people have confused this bill with the \$3.5 trillion Democratic tax-and-spend extravaganza. They are two different bills. This bill is for roads and bridges and broadband and resiliency and flood control and coastal restoration. The other is for who knows what.

This bill, the infrastructure bill, has been judged by economists as to not contribute to inflation. The \$3.5 trillion bill, obviously, is going to make the inflation we have now worse. The bill we have does not raise taxes. The \$3.5 trillion bill is estimated to raise hundreds of billions of dollars in taxes.

One bill I love; the other bill I hate. The infrastructure bill that is going to shorten someone’s commute time across a bridge, to make their home less likely to flood, to extend broadband to areas of our country which are not served at all or are poorly served is the bill I love, and I think that it is the bill that the American people desperately need.

Let me conclude by saying, again, if you are stuck in bridge traffic in my State or in any other State right now, wondering why this bridge in poor condition can’t get fixed, help is on its way. If you are in a place in our country, but particularly in my State, which has either flooded or is at risk of flooding or if you live near a coastline,

and that beachfront, which 30 years ago when you bought that home was hundreds of feet out and now waves are lapping up on the road in front of your house and coastal erosion has endangered your property and your life savings, help is on its way. If you have seen an initiative to build a bridge but have been so frustrated that it has taken so long to get the permits, that is about to change. This is legislation—bipartisan, paid for—that will address all of those issues.

I conclude the way I started.

We have good news. There is a bipartisan infrastructure bill that begins to address the needs of the American people—to create jobs, to take away frustrations, and to provide more security—that all Americans should support.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1:55 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:12 p.m., recessed until 1:55 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. ROSEN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

DEBT CEILING

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, we have all experienced a bit of buyer’s remorse this past year. The uncertainty caused by the pandemic had folks stockpiling too much or just doing a little online retail therapy for things they may never use. But when it comes to impulse buying, no one can compete with Democrats in Washington. If running up the taxpayers’ tab was an Olympic sport, Democrats would easily take home the gold.

Over the past 6 months, the Democrats have run up trillions of dollars in new spending. And as we are just days away from hitting the Nation’s debt limit, these same Democrats are preparing to charge trillions more to the Nation’s credit card, paid for by taxpayers, of course, to purchase more of their pricey, partisan pet projects and other items on their progressive wish list.

Their reckless spending spree started in March with their strictly partisan \$2.1 trillion, a so-called COVID bill. The Democrats assured us the \$1,400 stimulus checks and \$300-a-week enhanced unemployment benefits included in the bill would get America back on its feet. Well, folks, this July 28, we have 10 million unfilled jobs. Last week, jobless claims increased. And hard-working Americans are feeling the pinch and paying more for almost everything, from gas to groceries. The Democrats’ poisonous progressive policies are failing us, and Iowans and the rest of Americans know it. Yet

Democrats—they just keep on spending.

Right now, the majority leader is plotting to fast-track an everything-but-the-kitchen-sink tax-and-spending bill that could cost more than \$3½ trillion. So what is in this latest bill? More poisonous progressive policies.

One of the most harmful provisions to families everywhere and especially farm families in Iowa is what I like to call the farm-to-table tax hike. The Democrats want to pay for part of their radical agenda by increasing the tax on family farms being passed from one generation to the next. But that tax won't only hit farmers and ranchers; it will increase the cost of producing and purchasing food for all of our families.

Americans recognize President Biden's budget-busting bills are a key factor in the skyrocketing costs; yet the Democrats keep packing their bills with progressive pet policies and projects they know won't make your life better but that will appease their political base. And their answer when things don't get better is always: Wait, we didn't spend enough.

Folks, it is laughable to argue that Washington hasn't spent enough when our national debt now exceeds \$28 trillion. The shopaholics who control the purse strings in Congress are addicted to spending other people's money on things we don't need or that we can't afford.

Let's review the receipt for Bidenomics: \$2.1 trillion for Biden's so-called American Rescue Plan, which includes \$200 billion for enhanced unemployment payments, \$1.7 billion for Amtrak, \$135 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$50 million for environmental justice grants, plus \$3.5 trillion for the proposed reckless tax-and-spending spree.

We still don't even know what goodies are included in this grab bag, but it is likely to include parts of the socialist Green New Deal and doubling the size of the IRS by hiring an army of new auditors. Add on nearly \$10 billion for swampy earmarks to pay for pork projects.

The list goes on and on and on, like the world's longest CVS receipt; except you don't expect any savings here, folks.

And when you add it all up, the grand total: \$6.8 trillion.

As these bills come due, President Biden's reckless spending spree will leave us with buyer's remorse for years to come. It is time to cut up Washington's credit card and make DC start living within its means, just like every hard-working family across Iowa and America do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, when President Biden was campaigning last year, he made the pledge over and over again that he wouldn't raise taxes on any American making less than \$400,000 a year.

Frankly, I think that is a good pledge, and it is one that he keeps making. But right now, it seems that the facts would prove that he and, frankly, our Democrat colleagues here in the Congress are pushing for this reckless tax spree, this reckless spending spree in a way that makes it impossible for him to keep that pledge.

The Tax Foundation—and people can check this if they want to verify these numbers—looked at President Biden's 10-year plan, the plan he outlined in his 2022 budget. This is not a plan that the Tax Foundation or any other group came up with on their own. They found that his plan would mean a higher average tax burden nationwide, including for middle-class Americans.

In some States, the average taxpayer would see increases immediately; in others, tax hikes would grow over time as the various provisions change in the way that the President's plan says they would change.

You know, no matter what the President says, the tax burden is getting heavier under his plan for middle-class families in every State.

In Missouri, the tax burden on the average filer would be \$618 higher in 2026 than it is today. In New Hampshire, it would be \$1,072 higher than it is today. And maybe most importantly, in Nevada, it would be \$1,293 higher than it is today for the average taxpayer.

And if that doesn't convince you, there was another analysis recently. This one was from the reliably liberal Tax Policy Center. It predicted that three out of every four taxpayers earning \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year would be worse off next year under the Biden plan.

By 2031, that organization estimates that 95 percent of the people making between \$75,000 and \$100,000 would suffer losses on their tax bill.

The tax-and-spending spree envisions monster tax hikes on business, but we all know when you raise taxes on business, they have to get the money from somewhere.

In fact, there are only a couple places to get the money, and one is from workers and one is from customers. And trying to figure out that balance where you don't lose customers and you don't lose workers is pretty hard to figure out. You really can't isolate middle-class workers from these tax impacts. You also can't isolate middle-class customers from these impacts. You can't keep those families from paying higher prices when a chunk of the business tax that the President and Democrats talk about have to get passed on to customers.

So President Biden's tax increases are likely to boost inflation even more than we have seen already, and we have seen a lot of it already. Go to the gas pump, go to the grocery store, go to buy clothes, go to have the basic necessities you have to have, and you are going to see that they are substantially higher than they were a year ago

or 2 years ago before COVID, a year ago during COVID.

The President's budget effectively repeals the individual tax cuts enacted by Republicans in 2017. The cuts that were enacted in that law for Americans, really, across income levels, have rate reductions that have to be extended in 4 years. The President's plan doesn't call for extending any of those rate reductions.

Under the President's proposal, someone making \$94,000 per year will see her marginal tax rate jump from 24 percent to 28 percent in 2026.

Added to that, you have got higher taxes that Democrats plan to impose on family farmers and ranchers who are hoping to pass along their family business to the next generation.

And, frankly, instead of advocating for these middle-class Americans I have just talked about, our Democratic friends seem to be fixated on restoring the tax break that overwhelmingly benefits wealthy Americans in high-tax States. They are pushing to allow people to deduct more than \$10,000 in State and local taxes on their Federal returns.

That scheme, by the way, would allow the top 1 percent of earners to increase their after-tax income by about 2.5 percent, 2.8 percent, while the bottom 60 percent of all filers—if that law is changed back to what it used to be, the bottom 60 percent of all filers would gain less than one one-hundredth percent on average.

It is clear that President Biden's tax hikes will hit a lot of Americans and a lot of Americans that make less than \$400,000.

The higher tax costs will hurt people who are already struggling with higher prices at the pump and everywhere they shop, and it will hurt our economic recovery.

My friends may not want to admit—and I wouldn't either if I was them—that they are going to raise taxes on middle-class families, but that is exactly what they are doing. And if anybody doesn't know it now, they will know it if Democrats in the Senate and the House get their way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, in less than 72 hours, the suspension on the Federal Government's debt ceiling will expire. That leaves Congress with two options: continue with the reckless, wasteful spending it is accustomed to without any accountability to the American people; or finally face reality, make some tough choices, and chart a path forward that lowers the Federal debt and gets spending under control.

Washington is constantly spending more money and taking on new debt without any plan to ever reduce the debt.

Since 1960, Congress has raised or extended the debt limit more than 70 times. Washington's choice to keep

raising or suspending the debt ceiling is like raising the limit on your credit card month after month with no plan to pay it off.

It is reckless, and it is this kind of fiscal irresponsibility that is hurting American families and causing the rising inflation we are seeing.

As you can see here, 87 percent of Americans are worried about inflation—87 percent. Low- and fixed-income families are having to cut on purchases because of rising costs.

Look at these numbers: Gas up 52 percent in 12 months; milk, 11; bacon, 16 percent; eggs, 6 percent; used cars, 45 percent; utilities, 6 percent.

I am hearing from families all across Florida who are worried. Read you a couple stories.

A father of three in Jacksonville, who is temporarily helping to take care of two other kids because their father is out of work, has started working a second job driving Uber just to pay for groceries that are rapidly increasing in price. Now, his Uber job is becoming less and less profitable because the rising price of gas.

Mother of four in Wauchula said she used to be able to go to the grocery store and spend a certain amount of money for an entire month's groceries; now she can't. Two hundred dollars in meat is not—is no longer enough to feed her family of five. She is being forced to choose between gas to get to work and groceries for her family, and is picking up extra jobs just to get by.

I can relate to all this. I grew up in a family that struggled for money. My mom would take in ironing for extra money. She would send me or my older brother to the grocery store with exact change, but she told us: You have got to check the prices. The prices keep going up. And if it does, you have got to figure out how to get the food we need with less—with the money we have.

I have spoken to the owner of a construction company in West Palm Beach who says materials are going up. Twenty-four dollars for a sheet of plywood is now \$80 a sheet. Drywall is going up a dollar a board. Prices of hardware, like screws, are going up 10 to 15 percent per month. Delivery prices are going up due to gas and the shortage of truck drivers. His employees are complaining about gas and are afraid what it might mean if the price continues to rise.

A restaurant owner in Tampa told me the cost of meat has gone up from \$9 a pound to \$18. Gas prices and food prices, coupled with the struggle to find workers, has been very hard on his business.

Another family in Kissimmee told me how hard it is to keep food on the table because everything is so expensive. They are having trouble keeping the car because of the cost of maintenance and gas, but if he doesn't have a car, he wouldn't have a way to get to work to take care of his family.

The price of gas affects nearly everyone, and right now average gas prices are up nearly \$1 since last year.

For a family that fills up their tank once a week, if you drive a car, that means Joe Biden raised your expenses \$600 a year; if you drive a truck, that means Joe Biden raised your expenses by more than \$1,000 a year.

Biden and the Democrats say they care about people, but they have done absolutely nothing to help families struggling to keep up with inflation. Their plan is to spend more, more, more money, not less.

We have nearly \$30 trillion in debt, and there are no plans to slow down. Now Biden and the Democrats want to spend another \$5.5 trillion on their liberal priorities, with no consideration as to how this might impact families.

Right now, this message that President Biden and the Democrats in Washington are sending to the American people is clear: We don't care about inflation. We don't care about reckless spending that is causing prices to skyrocket.

If they say that is the cost of getting our liberal—their liberal wish list done, so be it.

I think it is a disgusting approach and I am not going to stand for it. I am here to say that enough is enough. It is time to wake up to reality. Eighty-seven percent of Americans are concerned about inflation. We have to take action to get government spending under control, which is why we have introduced the Federal Debt Emergency Control Act.

My bill prevents Washington from mindlessly spending by requiring that two-thirds of the Senate vote to increase the debt before approving any bill with deficit spending.

It would also terminate any unobligated funding from the American Rescue Plan and any previous spending bills—sending it back to the Treasury general fund for deficit reduction.

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

I have also introduced an amendment to the Senate rules to require that all committee reports include inflationary impact statements so Americans can see the true impacts of government spending.

Americans deserve to know how their hard-earned dollars are being spent and how Washington's spending is affecting inflation. This will ensure they do.

I welcome all my fiscally responsible colleagues to join me to say we don't accept status quo. We won't watch in silence as people try to spend us into oblivion. We won't stand by while inflation wreaks havoc on our families and businesses.

We can get spending under control. While I was Governor of Florida, we paid down one-third of our State debt by living within our means, all while cutting taxes and fees about 100 times.

We can do it here, but we have to start acting responsibly today, and the time to do that is now. It is time to stand up for our grandkids, whose fu-

ture is being mortgaged for out-of-control Washington spending. This isn't political. It is good government, and it is commonsense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, America has seen a number of horrendous financial crises before, but none that have so quickly developed as the fiscal crisis this White House created with trillions of dollars' worth of drunken spending and tax proposals in just the first 7 months of control.

The most glaring, almost parody-level, example is the administration's \$3.5 trillion and growing, newly labeled, human infrastructure package, which is nothing more than a rosy-sounding title for socialism.

The results of these radical tax-and-spending policies, what are they? A sluggish economy, inflation, and one of the most dramatic expansions of the welfare state in recent history. Recently, the Department of Labor reported that consumer prices climbed for the third straight month, jumping 5 percent in June, the largest increase in 13 years.

Every day, we see inflation impacting hard-working Americans. In fact, this past weekend, we held five town-hall meetings in Kansas, and thanks to this administration's economic policies, runaway inflation has replaced COVID at the top of the mountain of concerns for people of my home State.

In Kansas, we are paying more than \$1 more per gallon at the gas pump, 40 cents more per gallon of milk, and almost 20 percent more for a home than we were at this time last year. While wages have increased, inflation continues to outpace them by more than two-to-one. I have heard loudly and clearly the concerns from Kansans, and especially from small business owners, the backbone of our economy, about the impact of the Democrats' reckless summer tax-and-spending spree.

One tax proposal, the elimination of stepped-up basis, would be devastating to small businesses and family farms, as that provision allows them to hand down their family business from one generation to the next without paying a costly tax burden.

Under the administration's plan, the average farmer would have a new tax obligation of nearly a quarter of a million dollars, as cropland values in Kansas have risen 220 percent since 1997, not to mention the economy-killing policy of eliminating 1031 exchanges and taxing capital gains at ordinary income levels.

On the spending front, this administration continues to pursue unsustainable and irresponsible spending policies that are actually ruining our economic recovery. Further, they want to increase the debt limit without implementing any spending reforms. This is going to crush our children and grandchildren, leaving their generation to pay for the social sins of this generation.

Instead of getting our fiscal house in order and curbing back on massive government spending, this administration and Democrats in Congress are working to pass trillions more in reckless spending under the guise of infrastructure.

Pre-COVID, we had the greatest economy in my lifetime. That came about because we lowered people's taxes, we lowered regulations, and we lowered energy prices. We need smart, targeted investments, not radical spending that leaves this country at a disadvantage and kills jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, for far too long, the Federal Government has been borrowing and then spending money that it simply doesn't have. This is something we have long understood as a problem for the future, for future generations. But now it is not just a problem for the future any more. We are already feeling the consequences right now. Americans of this generation are paying the price today.

Why is this the case? Well, politicians in Washington vote for enormous, reckless spending packages, and they do so for short-term political gain and praise. Now, we all know that does happen, and we all know that, whether it is a spending bill that is soon to come before this body or another, if it spends a lot of money, it probably will bring people a lot of praise.

But it is the people—the hard-working families in Utah and in every other State across the Nation—who are forced to pay the price, the price for the praise and the political gain of the politician who votes for that sort of thing. They are the ones who bear the brunt of inflation's consequences. It is making day-to-day life more expensive. More than anyone, it is the poor and middle class of America who are hit the hardest.

Every single day, it is getting more expensive to fill cupboards, refrigerators, and bellies. Every day, it is getting more expensive to drive to work or drive to the doctor or drive your kids to the school. Every day, it is getting harder to buy a house or buy a car or pay for the heat and the air conditioning in your home.

To give a few specific examples, gas prices are up over 50 percent from last year. This hurts people not only at the pump but with everything they buy, because everything they buy is more costly to transport and, therefore, more costly to purchase.

Chicken prices are soaring. Boneless, skinless chicken breast is trading at \$2 per pound, compared to the \$1.30 per pound it has averaged over the last two decades. Some diapers that in recent years have cost around \$25 per package now cost around \$40, and there are fewer diapers in each package.

We, in Utah, are certainly feeling the crunch. According to a recent survey, 85 percent of Utahns are worried about inflation, as well they should be.

Now, what does the Democrats' spending package amount to? A multi-trillion-dollar inflation bomb. So far, we haven't seen text, and we haven't seen estimates about how much the bill will cost, exactly. We haven't even seen what Democrats in the White House would like in the bill. But recent estimates suggest that it will spend about \$4 trillion, maybe more. The last thing we need for our already frightening inflation is to spend that amount of money. It is taking an already bad situation and making it far, far worse.

In fact, this is the first time we have seen a spending package of this kind—one that spends the amount that it does. I don't just mean the first time we have seen something like this in the Senate this year. I mean, when we are talking about a spending bill that is likely to cost \$4 trillion, maybe more, that is more money than we in this body have ever spent. In fact, I would dare say it is more money than has ever been spent at any one time for one legislative proposal in the history not just of the United States of America but in the history of the world.

I mean, look at it this way. There is no entity in the history of the planet that has amassed more economic power than the U.S. Government—the U.S. Government, which in recent years has been spending at a rate of about \$4 trillion a year. This bill, in one bill, could well spend that in one single legislative package. This is an astounding amount of money. No one has ever spent money in such a large quantity in the history of the world.

What is more, this type of legislation has great potential—in fact, a darn near certainty—to carry out a reverse Robin Hood mission that is especially perverse, where we essentially rob the poor to give to the rich. Make no mistake. When we pass spending legislation like this, a small handful of well-connected people will get rich. They will get very rich. Why? Well, because they see it coming. They know how to play it. They know how to benefit from it, and they know how to capitalize on it. That is a very small group of people, and that is a small comfort to those who will be hurt by it. We will get to them in a minute. So that is the first category of people.

You have a second category of people who are well-to-do. Maybe they don't capitalize off of it, but they do end up paying a price. They find goods more expensive. But this small category of people, consisting of well-off people, might not actually feel the pinch because, perhaps, they have enough saved up; they have enough assets. It doesn't really, meaningfully impact their standard of living or their quality of life. But even those first two categories—those who will get rich off of a bill like this and those who won't feel much of an impact—make up a really small segment of the U.S. population, quite possibly, percentagewise, in the low single digits. But poor and middle-class Americans, many of whom live

paycheck to paycheck, will be most hurt, as they will be the ones to feel their paychecks—their limited paychecks—stretched thinner and thinner each and every week. You see, the U.S. economy doesn't suddenly make more goods simply because Congress decides to spend more. Quite to the contrary, it can't. We don't have the ability to create wealth. All we have the ability to do is channel existing wealth. So if we just add more dollars to an economy that already has access to a relatively finite group of goods and services in any given year, you are just going to increase the cost. That is what happens, and that is how poor and middle-class Americans get stuck with the bill. That is why poor and middle-class Americans end up being harmed in this bad bargain that is really good for a small handful of wealthy and well connected. It may be good for the moment for a small handful of politicians who will get praise and political gain for voting for it. It is really bad for poor and middle-class people, and that is wrong.

Look, at the end of the day, government is not the one hurt by massive, reckless spending packages like this one. People are. Real, breathing human beings are. The government doesn't go hungry at the end of the month. The government doesn't worry about paying rent when the kids need braces. The government isn't forced to choose between buying groceries and paying medical bills. The government doesn't forgo family reunions when it is time to tighten the belt. Taxpayers do. Families do, especially poor and middle-class families. The reckless spending must stop. This inflation bomb is exploding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, my colleague said it so very well. The inflation bomb is exploding, and people in Tennessee are incredibly concerned about that. I hear about this every single day from Tennesseans.

They are also concerned about the fact that it seems that the Democratic majority has been unable to push forward a budget that would be bipartisan, that would have appropriate spending, and that would prioritize the needs and the concerns of the American people.

Until just a few hours ago, we didn't have any insight into an infrastructure bill that would be bipartisan, and I applaud those who have worked so diligently to reach a bipartisan agreement. But the American people have started to lose a lot of their trust and a lot of their patience with Washington, DC, and I think we can say "rightfully so" because they are watching the cost of government go up. They are watching the hesitancy to move forward on their concerns, and they are speaking out to us. I had a Tennessean this week ask me why Washington was wasting so much time, because time is money, and they want to see things done.

We know we need to see what these bills are going to look like. We are hearing that the majority wants to bring forward this tax-and-spend spree of legislation that would be trillions of dollars, and we know that what would end up happening is this would be something that—I call it lie, cheat, steal. You don't say exactly what you are going to use the money for. You don't say exactly where the money is going to come from within the budget. Eventually, all of it comes out of the taxpayers' pocket. And you are stealing hopes and dreams from future generations who are going to—they are going to have to pay the bill for this. It is our children and our grandchildren and future generations that are going to have to find a way to pay for all of this.

That is why I brought this chart back to the floor. I have used it recently here on this floor to remind us of Ronald Reagan's words:

Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. It has to be fought for and defended by each generation.

Very true words. And what a good reminder to us because as we give government more control over our lives, as we give them more control in the Federal budget, as the government takes more money out of the pocket of hard-working taxpayers, what do we see? We see less freedom.

There is such concern that the Democratic majority has refused to come forward and say how they want to spend these trillions of dollars. I think part of that is because there is not a way to pay for it, and they don't plan to pay for it. Instead, they are going to send that bill to future generations.

This is dangerous. We are upside down on this national debt when you look at how that debt clock is ticking. But we have to choose to spend taxpayer money where it matters, and it still matters. It matters to Tennesseans what their tax dollars are spent for, and it matters how they are spent. Another thing that matters to them is what we are spending it for and the driving of inflation across this country.

If my Democratic colleagues continue to dig this hole, future generations will be in so deep that it will be very difficult for them to compete on the global stage. They will be vulnerable to the deathtraps our adversaries in Beijing set for nations that have made the same mistakes that the Democratic majority wants us to make: spending more money than you have to spend for programs that you cannot afford.

I would argue that existing in a state of dependence and vulnerability created by our own government is the opposite of freedom. It is the opposite of freedom. Is that really what we want for our children and grandchildren, to leave them with so much Federal debt that they are covered in debt; that most of their paycheck is going to go to the Federal Government to pay for

programs that have long outlived their usefulness? I think not.

That is why it is so important that we look at what is happening right now, as there are these conversations about budgets and as there are these conversations about the tax-and-spend spree that my colleagues across the aisle would seek to propose.

I would also offer that that type of spending is not governing. What it is, is a power grab. What it is, is taking care of your friends and not those who elected you to serve. The American people can see what is coming at them from a mile away, and they are expressing their concerns about DC's out-of-control tax-and-spend spree.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON WILCOX NOMINATION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, with the permission of both sides, may I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled to start in 3 minutes start now?

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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.

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

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 282 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	Markley	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Blunt	Braun
Blackburn	Boozman	Burr

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

NOT VOTING—1

Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 258, 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.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Baldwin, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Jacky Rosen, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Mark R. Warner, Brian Schatz, Sherrod Brown, Sheldon Whitehouse, Raphael Warnock, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

Schatz	Stabenow	Warnock
Schumer	Sullivan	Warren
Shaheen	Tester	Whitehouse
Sinema	Van Hollen	Wyden
Smith	Warner	

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

EGYPT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, rightfully, this body is consumed with pending votes on infrastructure, but I want to draw my colleagues' attention to another matter of both importance and urgency.

One of Vladimir Putin's favorite tactics during the Chechen rebellion was to kidnap the innocent relatives of rebel leaders and hold them captive until the leaders surrendered. Sometimes, if the rebel leader never gave himself up, the family members would just disappear forever. Thousands of these cases were documented over the course of the war, all in gross, blatant violation of human rights laws. It is one of the many reasons that Russia is an adversary, not an ally of the United States. We don't do business with nations that prey upon the innocent. We don't align ourselves with nations that use kidnapping or torture as a tool to stay in power.

A few months ago, Moustafa Soltan and Khairi Soltan were startled by a hard knock on their door in the wee hours of a February Sunday morning. It was the Egyptian authorities, there to detain them again simply because their cousin happened to be a man named Mohamed Soltan, an American citizen and vocal Egyptian human rights advocate. Rightly, Moustafa and Khairi were not surprised because for the past year, the Soltan family has been the subject of consistent, coordinated harassment and detention by the agents of Egyptian dictator Abdelfattah Elsis. Now, Sisi would probably argue that he uses the tactic of harassing and detaining family members of his political opponents in a more judicious manner than does Vladimir Putin, but he can't deny that he does it. He further cannot deny the systematic method by which he has used the judicial system in Egypt to eliminate his political opposition.

Now, a reliable estimate is hard to come by because the political arrests have come at a dizzying pace since 2013, but it is believed that there are 60,000 people in jail today in Egypt because they are political opponents of the Sisi government.

Now, Putin jails his political adversaries, too, but his number of around 400 doesn't come close to Sisi's. But that is just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the Egyptian regime's treatment of political opponents. Only China and Iran execute more people every year than Egypt, and many of these executions are for political crimes. Journalists are currently under constant threat in Egypt. The country rates 166 out of 180 by the press freedom group Reporters Without Borders compared against other nations.

In the 2018 Presidential election, Sisi had his main opponent arrested and had his campaign manager beaten up, causing all the other credible candidates to drop out of the race. Shockingly, Sisi won with 97 percent of the vote. That same year, Putin was less greedy. He gave himself only 70 percent in his Presidential election.

So why, you might ask, is Egypt our partner and Russia our adversary if their behavior is so malignantly similar? Why does Russia get sanctioned and Egypt get showered with \$1.3 billion in military aid each year? Now, yes, there are important lines of cooperation between Egypt and the United States, and this explains some of that difference. Egypt's 1979 peace treaty with Israel remains one of the most significant diplomatic achievements for the promotion of Arab-Israeli peace. For the last 40 years, Egypt has been a peace broker between the Israelis and the Palestinians. We rely on them historically. Egypt contributed forces to the first gulf war in 1990. The United States and Egypt often cooperate on counterterrorism work. Our ships often get preference in going through the Suez Canal, although we pay for that privilege.

All that is important, but none of it is enough to justify the damage done to U.S. power and prestige when the whole world watches America deliver this giant blank check each year to Egypt while Sisi engages in this repeated, brazen violation of human rights. How do you tell Russia and China to stop their campaigns of political repression when we so openly endorse the grandiose scale of Sisi's?

No, Egypt has come to believe that it can act any way that it wants, that it can carry out a massive campaign of political repression and that the Con-

gress and the American President, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, will just keep the money coming. And it is a stunning amount of money. The \$1.3 billion security assistance package that Egypt gets every year from U.S. taxpayers is bested by only one other country in the world, and that is Israel.

Most outrageous of all in light of this policy, Egypt arrests and imprisons American citizens with near impunity. Mohamed Soltan is not the only Egyptian American to be arrested and tortured as a political prisoner. Mustafa Kassem from Long Island, NY, was arrested in 2013 while visiting family, just visiting family in Cairo. He died in an Egyptian prison in January of last year. There have been dozens of other American citizens.

It is unacceptable that we would be providing over \$1 billion in assistance to Egypt while they are holding a single American in prison for political crimes. When countries accept our money and continue to thumb their noses at our values, it makes America look like a patsy. It makes us weaker as a nation.

So many of us cheered when President Biden took office declaring that there would now be "a foreign policy that unites our democratic values with our diplomatic leadership, and one that is centered on the defense of democracy and the protection of human rights." President Biden's team has been outspoken on human rights in our foreign policy by calling out abusive dictatorships who imprison their critics and muzzle free speech, reuniting our democratic allies in Europe against Russian election interference and Chinese misinformation, and sanctioning corrupt oligarchs all over the world. That is great news.

The Biden administration has chosen to make democracy and human rights a priority because they see this coming fight between Chinese- and Russian-modeled autocracy and American-led democracy. And over the last 4 years, Donald Trump's affection for dictatorship, it gave our adversaries in the autocratic world a headstart. President Biden knows the future of the world depends on our willingness as a nation to take a strong, immediate stand right now for democracy everywhere.

And so let's be clear. An administration that wants to lead on democracy and human rights cannot send another \$1.3 billion to Egypt with no strings attached. To do so would be to endorse Sisi's crackdown and send a bright, blinking message to the world that America talks a big game on democracy but isn't willing to do much about it.

Luckily, Joe Biden doesn't have to take the heat when it comes to a change in Egypt policy. He can simply blame Congress and tell Sisi that he is just upholding the law.

Why?

For more than a decade, Congress has been conditioning some of the aid we

give to Egypt on its human rights record, hoping that if we tied a portion of the \$1.3 billion to things like holding free and fair elections, or releasing political prisoners, allowing the media space to operate, that the Egyptian Government would make progress.

But nearly every single year, the State Department waives those conditions and just gives Egypt the money, even when the conditions aren't close to being met. Only once—and I will give them credit for this—in 2017, Secretary Tillerson cut \$95 million and temporarily held up another \$195 million of Egypt's aid money, but even that \$195 million was released before all the conditions were met.

Never has the State Department just said the obvious: The conditions weren't met. We are not going to waive them. You are not getting the money.

And we are talking about a portion of the money, this year, \$300 million of the \$1.3 billion.

It is painfully clear that the lesson Egypt has learned over the years is a simple one: America is not serious about human rights, and so we don't need to invest in improvements; we are going to get the money anyway.

This year, Congress has said that the Secretary of State should withhold \$300 million of military aid to Egypt if Sisi doesn't substantially reverse his campaign of political repression and intimidation. What we know, unequivocally, is that no meaningful progress has been made. The latest arrests of Mohamed Soltan's family were done in February of this year. That was kind of like a thumb in the eye of the new administration and the new Congress.

Like clockwork every year, right before the annual waiver is given by the State Department, Egypt normally does release a few of the most egregiously detained prisoners or announces some minor change in policy, but it is always window dressing. The trend from year to year is always the same: more human rights violations, more intimidation, less free speech, less democracy.

This year, the United States must withhold the \$300 million, in accordance with the law passed by this Congress. It will send a message to Egypt that we are serious about reform and, maybe more importantly, it will send a message to the world that we are willing to walk the walk, not just talk the talk.

Now, this town freaks out whenever the security assistance gravy train goes off the rails, even for a moment. Keeping the pipeline of American arms flowing to brutal regimes, it makes a lot of people rich in Washington. And those people are whispering in the ears of Congress and the administration right now, making the claim, as they do every single year, that the sky is going to fall if Egypt doesn't get its \$1.3 billion—all of it, all of the \$1.3 billion—as they have every year since 1987. They will say that all the lines of cooperation that I mentioned earlier will disappear.

But in reality, the return on investment for our military aid to Egypt, it has been diminishing for a long time now. And there is no reason that the things that we get from Egypt—Suez access, overflight rights, continued upholding of the peace treaty with Israel—will be overturned should they get only \$1 billion rather than \$1.3 billion this year.

Why is that?

Well, because in 1987, those benefits Egypt provides were arguably concessions to our requests. But, today, Egypt does those things not because we pay them to do it, but because they have their own reasons to do them.

For years, the United States looked the other way while another regional power, Saudi Arabia, carried out its own dizzying campaign of repression against its own people. We did virtually nothing. We said virtually nothing. Instead, we rewarded Saudi Arabia with record amounts of armed sales. And then one day, they kidnapped a U.S. resident and they chopped him to pieces. And America was made a fool in the eyes of the world, and, in some ways, we have had a hard time recovering from that day.

Mohamed Soltan, just like Jamal Khashoggi, believes that there is no other nation in the world that cares more about standing up for democracy and civil rights than America. Egypt doesn't care. They harass and imprison his relatives at will—the relatives of a high-profile American citizen—because they can. Let's not make the same mistake with Egypt that we made with Saudi Arabia.

Egypt notices when we talk tough and do nothing, so does the rest of the world. And so withholding \$300 million of their \$1.3 billion until Egypt makes real concessions on reform, it won't fundamentally harm U.S. interests in the Middle East. It will only make us more safe.

It is the best opportunity for the Biden administration to show that we mean it when we say that the stakes in the fight between autocracy and democracy are sky high and that we are willing to do more than just talk about our values. America has the capacity to live them as well.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it was 1 week ago that the Senate held a procedural vote on a bill that hadn't even been written. And to no one's surprise, it failed.

Republicans, for our part, said it made no sense to advance to a more than \$1 trillion infrastructure plan before knowing what was in the plan and how it would be paid for.

Our Democratic colleagues argued that the big text was imminent, coming any moment, any second, and it was critical to get the process started.

Well, here we are, 1 week later. I guess the bill text wasn't imminent because we still haven't seen it yet.

Earlier today, we heard that there was an agreement, I assume in principle, on the major portions of the proposed plan, which I concede is a major sign of progress. I want to commend all of our colleagues, including Senators PORTMAN, COLLINS, ROMNEY, and CASIDY, who have been working hard on our side of the aisle to achieve consensus, and on the Democratic side, Senators like Senator MANCHIN and SINEMA and others.

But this infrastructure plan that we haven't seen yet is no more ready for action today on the floor than it was last week. We made clear last week that we wanted to see the details before voting on a trillion-dollar bill that will impact every community across this country.

Until this bill is actually written and we have a chance to review it, including all the details, the costs, the pay-fors, and the impact it will have on our States, I will not support it. And I imagine the majority of my Republican colleagues feel the same way.

Now, I say that also believing that it is important for us to get a bipartisan infrastructure bill. I actually want us to. But part of the challenge is these groups of gangs that operate outside of what we would call regular order here; that is, the committees of jurisdiction, where all Senators get to participate in the final product, including on the floor of the Senate, that is really not possible when you have a group—a small group, a subset of the Senate negotiating a deal among themselves, and then they present it to us as a fait accompli and say: You have to accept it.

Well, it doesn't work very well, ordinarily, but I am willing to give them a chance because I know they have committed a lot of time and effort into this. But it is going to depend on a couple of things. My vote, ultimately, is going to depend on a couple of things.

First of all, we fund our highways, our roads, and bridges mainly through the gas tax. That is the amount of money that goes into the gallon of gas that is dedicated for the highway trust fund. Well, because our cars are getting more mileage now and because we are seeing alternatives, like electric vehicles, the highway trust fund is simply inadequate to fund the demand of our infrastructure: roads and bridges and the like.

But that is no excuse for us to get away from what has heretofore been a pay-for model or a user-fee model. In other words, infrastructure should be paid for by the people who use it, not people who don't use it. And that is why the gas tax, at least as originally conceived, made a lot of sense.

But we made a couple of mistakes. One, we didn't index it to inflation. And, secondly, we just couldn't account, back when the gas tax was adopted, for the innovation we have seen in transportation—natural gas-driven vehicles, electric vehicles, and the like—that pay nothing for our roads and infrastructure.

And I think it is a very serious problem for us from a fiscal point of view to get away from the user-fee model. First of all, we know that we have had to spend a lot of money to fight the COVID-19 virus, to deal with the public health and the economic consequences associated with it.

That is why we passed, I believe it was, a total of five bills last year alone on a bipartisan basis to defeat this virus. And you could tell from some of the face masks being worn here in the Chamber right now, we have not yet been able to defeat it finally, notwithstanding the discovery and broad use of vaccines and other treatments.

But an infrastructure bill is different than a pandemic because we actually should be in the position of paying for our spending rather than borrowing from future generations.

I appreciate the good work that has been done by the bipartisan negotiating group to try to come up with some credible pay-fors, but they haven't been able to use the traditional user-fee model because President Biden and his administration took it off the bargaining table, which means you have to use other pay-fors outside of a user-fee model in order to pay for it or else you just merely add to our debt and pass on the responsibility to pay those bills back to future generations.

Well, I don't think any of this is news to the majority leader, who, once again, has scheduled a vote before we have a bill that we can actually read, discuss with our constituents.

I, for example, would like to be able to discuss the contents of the bill with my friends at the Texas Department of Transportation and the Governor and other people who are very much engaged in what the infrastructure in my State looks like, what it should be, and what we need in terms of investments in the future. But I can't do that if the bill text hasn't even been released yet, and the majority leader knows that.

So the question I have is: Why in the world would the majority leader schedule another vote before the bill is even released, before we can read it and consult with our staff and outside experts, like my friends at the Texas Department of Transportation?

We have seen contradictory signs about what our Democratic colleagues really hope to do. When asked about the fate of the bipartisan infrastructure plan, the Democratic majority whip said talks have gone on long enough, and he would support rolling it into the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending bill that NANCY PELOSI said she would not pass in the House a bipartisan infrastructure bill unless, at the same time, she was able to pass what has nominally been called a \$3.5 trillion spending bill, but we know it is actually spending a whole lot more money than that.

President Biden spilled the beans when this bipartisan group was at the White House a few weeks ago, where he said he would not sign the bipartisan

bill into law unless, at the same time, he could sign the partisan, reckless tax-and-spending bill that is passed purely on a partisan basis. In other words, they are linked both by Speaker PELOSI and by President Biden.

Now, President Biden did walk that back, or at least he tried to, but Speaker PELOSI has remained adamant that she will not pass any bipartisan infrastructure bill in the House unless she can get the votes in the House and, presumably, in the Senate in order to put pressure on some of the Democrats who are resistant to seeing us continue to add to our national debt and fuel inflation by more reckless spending, as well as the huge tax increases that would necessarily go along with it.

So I am beginning to wonder if there was actually a sincere desire on the part of our Democratic leaders here in the Senate whether they actually wanted to pass a bipartisan bill or whether their goal was really to pass the reckless tax-and-spending-spree bill that Speaker PELOSI said had to pass if we were going to pass a bipartisan bill.

We also need to know whether Senator SCHUMER will honor requests for people who were not part of the negotiating group, the gang—I guess they call themselves G-10 or G-20 or G-21—whatever they are called. But it is a subset of Senators who have been negotiating the bill. The question is whether the majority will permit other Senators who are not part of that negotiating group to offer amendments to the bill and whether they will permit us to have debate and votes on those amendments because I didn't delegate the responsibilities I have as a Senator, representing 29 million Americans, to them to negotiate a bill for my State. That is my responsibility, and I insist on having a chance to read the bill, to consult with them, and to see what the impact is going to be on my State and to consult with my Governor and the head of the Texas Department of Transportation and others to see whether this is something they believe that earns my support and that Texas should support.

None of this is mysterious. This is the normal way of doing business around here. Moving bills through committee, Democrats and Republicans get a chance to shape those bills in committee, and then the majority leader brings it to the floor, and then everybody else gets to participate in the process.

I hope in his rush to get this bill out the door, that the majority leader will allow a reasonable amendment process. This isn't like the early days of the pandemic, when we were experiencing a global emergency. We need to deal with our infrastructure needs, but this isn't emergency spending. This is part of the daily or annual bread and butter of what the legislative process should be about, and that is another reason why we shouldn't pass a bill without responsible pay-fors.

Well, we have seen this kind of political maneuvering before. In fact, Senator SCHUMER's designed-to-fail agenda practically dominated the work of this Chamber last month. He scheduled votes on some of the most controversial bills out there in order to orchestrate Republican opposition: legislation that exploits the cause of pay fairness to line the pockets of trial lawyers, a bill to seize States' power to regulate their own elections, as provided for in the Constitution, and to cement the Democratic majorities in the Congress for the foreseeable future.

And now the majority leader is threatening to tank an infrastructure bill so he can go on to another partisan tax-and-spending-spree bill, which makes me think that is really what they care the most about. Rather than give the negotiators time to succeed and the rest of us time to understand what is in the bill and to consult appropriately with our constituents, Senator SCHUMER turned what should be a unifying process to build consensus into a divisive one, all in order to tee up his desire to see us pass a multitrillion-dollar tax-and-spending bill. That is on top of all the spending that we have done on a bipartisan basis for COVID-19, at least until the first part of this year, when our Democratic colleagues insisted on pushing through another \$1.9 trillion of unpaid-for spending, all in the name of COVID-19, when we all know that only about 10 percent of it was addressed at the pandemic, which causes all of us to recall Rahm Emanuel's famous statement that "an emergency is a terrible thing to waste." And in the name of COVID-19 relief, another \$1.9 trillion was added to our children and grandchildren's debt burden.

Well, for the reckless tax-and-spending bill that Speaker PELOSI so desperately wants, the pricetag has been put on that legislation at another \$3.5 trillion, and I don't think most of us can really get our head around what a trillion is. It is more than a billion, we know. It is a whole lot more than a million. But this kind of reckless spending is really unprecedented, except in a national emergency, like COVID-19 relief.

Some budget experts have estimated that the reckless tax-and-spending-spree bill that Speaker PELOSI so desperately wants could actually cost \$5.5 trillion, and if our Democratic colleagues insist on rolling the bipartisan infrastructure bill into that plan, it will cost taxpayers even more.

Well, as a reminder, our Democratic colleagues spent more than \$2 trillion earlier this year alone, as I mentioned, and the result of this reckless spending spree speaks for itself.

Democrats have sent big incentives to workers to remain at home, not back at work, through September of this year by enhancing their unemployment benefits with an additional Federal Government bonus, which provided that in my State about 80 percent of

the people collecting unemployment insurance were making more on unemployment insurance than they were going back to work. So it is no wonder that we had trouble getting people back to work, and businesses had to cut back on their open hours. Restaurants had to close down because they simply couldn't find the workers, or the businesses couldn't compete with the Federal Government for these essential workers.

We are a long way from reaching prepandemic unemployment rates. And, surprisingly, job openings are at record highs.

But here is one of the biggest concerns that is borne out by polling that people are beginning to have, and that is inflation. We are seeing inflation at a 13-year high. Consumers are feeling the sting of rising prices for virtually everything they buy. That is what happens when too much money chases too few goods and services. Prices go up. And we are seeing the cause of that inflation, its impact on gasoline, on groceries, and on appliances. Folks are shelling out more money for these products today than they have been as recently as a year ago.

And if you have gone to the used car lot recently, you are bound for some serious sticker shock. And you can't even get a new car because of the semiconductor shortage caused by the pandemic. But over the last year alone, used car prices have gone up an eye-popping 45 percent.

As I said, there is another reason why new cars aren't available, and that is because the semiconductors that make these computers on wheels actually run have not been available because 90 percent of them are made overseas, in Asia.

Now, we have taken an important step to try to deal with this vulnerable supply chain of semiconductors, which affects both our economy and our national security, when we passed the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act last month here in the Senate. So we are capable of doing things on a bipartisan basis if given the opportunity.

The Wall Street Journal recently called this bill, the Innovation and Competition Act, the "third infrastructure initiative" and noted that while smaller, it is "freighted with just as much long-term economic and strategic importance."

So as Congress debates infrastructure investments, we can't let the one that passed the Senate last month slip through the cracks. There is a lot on the line for our economy and national security, and we need the CHIPS program up and running, which is a \$52 billion investment in domestic manufacturing of advanced semiconductors—something that we rely on Asia for, and principally Taiwan, which produces 63 percent of advanced semiconductors. And we can only imagine if that supply chain from Taiwan or Asia was disrupted by another pandemic, a natural disaster, or, Heaven forbid, a military conflict.

I want to make sure that our colleagues know that I appreciate the work they have put into this bill, but I know they also appreciate the individual responsibility that we have as Senators to participate in the process, particularly when it comes to spending \$1 trillion on infrastructure.

We need to have the text of the bill, not just a summary. I appreciate our colleagues giving some of us a notebook. It is a bipartisan infrastructure investment and jobs act summary. That is helpful, but that is not legislative text. And then we need an open amendment process so that those of us who weren't party to the bipartisan negotiations can participate in the process. Hopefully, it will make the bill better. I would like to see us actually substitute some of the spending pay-fors with a user-fee model that has been traditional, using the gas tax. As I said earlier, the gas tax has become a little outmoded and insufficient to pay for the infrastructure that we all want and need.

There is a real need to invest in America's infrastructure, and it has never been more important for us to actually pay for those investments in a responsible way.

As it stands today, our debt-to-GDP ratio—gross domestic product—is at the highest level since World War II. This is not the time to continue spending and spending and spending until our grandkids are left sitting in a pit of debt so deep they will never climb out of it.

I am encouraged that our colleagues have gotten us this far, but the bill is not ready, and we need to see the text and be given adequate time to read it and consult with our constituents about it and to satisfy ourselves that the summaries they provided us and the pay-fors are real.

Senator SCHUMER would be wise to postpone today's vote until Members on both sides have had a chance to evaluate the details of this legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at certain times during my remarks I be allowed to address the Senate in Spanish.

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

CUBA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to urge leaders across the United States and governments around the world to stand in solidarity with the people of Cuba as they cry out for freedom—for "libertad"—and for an end to decades of dictatorship.

What is happening in Cuba today is nothing short of historic. Yes, we have seen protests take place in years past, but the demonstrations that began on July 11 stand apart.

What began as one small pro-democracy protest in San Antonio de los Baños spread across the island in a matter of hours. Cubans from all walks of life

took to the streets in a courageous call for democratic change. Among those clamoring for freedom were Afro-Cubans demanding an end to discrimination and injustice, young people dreaming of a brighter future in their country, artists and activists from the San Isidro Movement singing "Patria y Vida" and ordinary citizens facing widespread food shortages, poor access to healthcare, and little to no protection from the ravages of COVID-19.

The people of Cuba are crying out for freedom, and we must hear them.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The Cuban people are asking for what is fair, which is freedom, and we must listen to their cry.

This is not about politics or ideology. The free world has a responsibility to stand with those who are not yet free, and the people of Cuba are anything but free.

Let's dispel the myths about what life is under the Cuban regime. For decades, the regime's ruthless and repressive tactics have systemically silenced the Cuban people while party insiders and cronies enrich themselves at their expense.

Today, Cuba remains a one-party communist state, where the basic principles of political pluralism and representative democracy are outlawed—outlawed. There are no free and fair elections in Cuba. Miguel Diaz-Canel may have appeared on a ballot, but there were no other candidates. He was not chosen by the people but hand-picked by the Castros as their successor. He has the same ideology. He says the same things. He talks about "la continuation," the continuation—continuation of oppression.

There is no freedom of the press in Cuba. Independent journalists are routinely targeted with violence, harassment, imprisonment, and raids on their homes and offices.

There is no internet freedom in Cuba. The regime monitors online traffic, blocks sites, and charges so much money for data that most Cubans cannot afford access. And when the regime gets scared about what the Cuban people are saying and doing, they shut down the whole internet. Yes, they shut down the whole internet. The only reason a government shuts down the internet is because they fear their own people.

But this has consequences. I recently had a Catholic priest visiting here in Washington from Cuba. He told me an incredibly powerful story. He said this young man came to see him in church and said: I would fight. I would give my life for the cause of freedom if only someone would know that I died.

If only someone would know that I died.

There is no freedom of expression in Cuba. Hundreds of activists, artists, and political dissidents are taken prisoner every year without due process. Others are beaten in the streets or terminated from their jobs for daring to

express a contrary opinion. Cubans can even be imprisoned for the Orwellian offense of “precriminal dangerousness.” You heard me right, precriminal dangerousness. Let that sink in. The political police can arrest you if they decide you might commit a political crime in the future.

Fortunately, the regime’s brutality has failed to extinguish the flame of liberty alive in the hearts of the Cuban people. Their courageous call for freedom is truly awe-inspiring. Yet the regime responded to these protests—as all authoritarian governments do—with repression, with censorship, with violence. The regime’s internet outages tried to stop the Cuban people from using social media to open the eyes of the world to the repression and injustice they live with each and every day.

Yet it was too late. The truth went viral. Images of everyday Cubans chanting “abajo la dictadura” or “down with the dictatorship” and singing “Patria y Vida” or “Homeland and Life” spread around the world.

And so did countless videos of the regime’s violent crackdown. Make no mistake, the incitement of violence came from the very top itself. It was Miguel Diaz-Canel, ostensibly the President of Cuba, who encouraged supporters to attack peaceful protesters, declaring in a televised address: “The order to fight has been given—into the streets,” and he pledged his supporters’ lives: “Over our dead bodies. We are prepared to do anything.”

What leader of a country invokes the people of the country to turn against their brothers and sisters in the country in violence? Who does that? Diaz-Canel did that.

The regime has confirmed just one death. Yet independent reports suggest additional lives were lost as well as numerous cases of violence and even torture. I have seen many of the videos. We can’t show videos here on the Senate floor, but I tell you, if we could, it would be incredibly compelling and incredibly graphic and incredibly violent.

International human rights groups believe that more than 500 people have likely been detained, most facing arbitrary charges. Likewise—don’t take my word for it—the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Michelle Bachelet, expressed her concern about “the excessive force against demonstrators in Cuba and the arrest of a large number of people, including journalists. It is particularly worrying,” she said, “that these include individuals allegedly held incommunicado and people whose whereabouts are unknown.”

And, in fact, we have seen many videos and many stories of families trying to find out, Where are their loved ones? Where are their loved ones?

Already the regime is preparing summary trials for protesters that deny them access to legal representation, subject them to sham sentences, and make a mockery of due process.

Luis Manuel Otero Alcantara, a leader of the San Isidro Movement of art-

ists, known globally for their efforts to promote freedom of expression, has been jailed and charged with “resistance” and “public disorder.” For what? For merely announcing on social media that he intended to join the peaceful protests—for merely announcing that he intended to join the peaceful protests. This artistic leader, this individual, as one of the leaders of the San Isidro Movement, jailed. For what? For nothing.

Jose Daniel Ferrer, head of the Patriotic Unit of Cuba, or UNPACU, is already behind bars. He is a renowned civil society leader who spent 8 years in prison for organizing an entirely legal electoral referendum under the existing Cuban constitution and was declared a “prisoner of conscience” by Amnesty International.

The regime has also unjustly detained multiple journalists for courageously reporting on the events of July 11, including Camilla Acosta, Luz Escobar, and Henry Constantin. Regime security forces also violently assaulted Ramon Espinosa, a photographer for the Associated Press.

Arrests have surged in recent days, but the politically motivated arrests have taken place throughout 2021. Rap- per and Afro-Cuban artist Maykel Osorbo has been in prison since May. He is one of the artists featured in the protest’s anthem “Patria y Vida. Patria y Vida.” Yes, in Cuba, you can be arrested for singing.

Today’s protest movement builds on decades of efforts by Cuban patriots to advance the cause of freedom.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

In the decades of the Castro oppression, the Cuban people have never stopped looking for their freedom. Despite the little attention some heroes have received, they have made possible this moment in Cuban’s history.

From the Patriotic Union of Cuba’s efforts to unite activists in support of democracy to Berta Soler and the intrepid leaders of the Ladies in White—these are the spouses, daughters, mothers of political prisoners who repeatedly faced violence for attending church services and walking peacefully in white to Havana’s streets with a gladiola in their hands, beaten, beaten, for walking peacefully along the streets of Havana dressed in white with a gladiola in her hands; I was privileged to have Berta here at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—to the Christian Liberation Movement’s work exploiting tools afforded by the regime’s own constitution to advance democratic change.

This month marks 9 years since the movement’s leader, Oswaldo Paya, died in a suspicious car crash that has never been fully investigated due to the regime’s obstruction. I believe he was assassinated.

Decade after decade, Cuban patriots have dedicated their lives and given their lives to the cause of democracy and freedom. They have struggled to

rebuild communities and preserve values relentlessly attacked by Cuba’s Communist leaders. They have worked tirelessly to alleviate the hardships that forced hundreds of thousands of Cuban families to abandon their homeland in search of opportunities abroad.

The suffering that the Cuban regime inflicts on its own people extends beyond its borders. For over two decades, Cuba has provided military and intelligence assistance to Venezuela’s dictatorship. It has exploited its repressive tactics from Havana to Caracas. It has shared its failed economic model with Venezuela’s kleptocrats. And it should be no surprise that Venezuela is now a failed state with a devastating humanitarian crisis.

Cuba also provides safe haven to members of Colombia’s ELN guerrilla group, designated by the United States as a “foreign terrorist organization.” The regime continues to deny extradition requests from the Colombian Government.

In addition, Cuba has also harbored and still harbors American fugitives evading the U.S. justice system. They include Joanne Chesimard, who remains on the FBI’s Most Wanted List for her role in the murder of New Jersey State Trooper Werner Foerster; and William “Guillermo” Morales, a terrorist who took part in several bombings in the United States, including Fraunces Tavern in Manhattan in 1975.

As it exports criminality and repression across the Americas, the Cuban regime is a cancer that spreads instability across our hemisphere.

Against this backdrop, the people of Cuba cry out for freedom, and I urge our partners in the international community to listen to their voices, hear their cries of desperation.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

It is time the international community listens to the Cuban people and act. Not only to say they’re sympathetic to their cause, but to take action.

They want freedom from a system that denies them basic human rights and control over their own destiny. They want freedom from an economic model that places the interests of corrupt party and military oligarchs above those of the people.

But there is no freedom today in Cuba. There is no economic opportunity. There is no justice. The regime has turned a blind eye to reports documenting a disturbing rise in femicide and violence against women. It continues to treat Afro-Cubans as second-class citizens unworthy of political representation and opportunity, even while they are the leaders of the freedom movement inside of Cuba.

And it continues to deploy Cuban doctors to foreign countries against their will and under conditions that meet the definition of human trafficking. The regime sends Cuban doctors abroad, takes away their passports, monitors their activities, threatens retribution against their families,

all the while garnishing 75 percent of the wages that that country is paying for that doctor. These medical missions aren't humanitarian aid; they are forced labor.

The regime continues to engage in gross economic mismanagement. Money that could be spent caring for the sick or vaccinating people against COVID-19 instead goes to new hotels and tourist destinations.

Despite the growing number of international companies there, Cuban workers cannot be hired directly by those companies. So you own a hotel, like the Spaniards do, in Cuba. You don't hire the worker directly; you go to the state employment agency, and they send you the worker. You pay the state employment agency, which means the regime, in dollars, and they pay the worker a fraction of what the regime is getting paid. They have no rights. If you have a problem with that employee, send him back to us, and we will send you someone else. Fire them at will. They have no rights. Cuban workers cannot be directly hired by them. Instead, they are contracted by state-owned employment agencies that garnish their wages and, ironically, deny them the right to organize outside of the Communist Party-controlled union.

As the Cuban people push for a new dawn in their country, a vibrant Cuban-American community here has never wavered in their support for their brothers and sisters on the island. They have worked tirelessly to support family members in Cuba to ensure their cries for help are heard around the world. In rallies and demonstrations in my home State of New Jersey, in Florida, and, yes, here in Washington, Cuban Americans are standing with loved ones on the island and diaspora living around the world and calling for an end to a system that has robbed generations of Cuban families of their dignity.

For me, in my 30 years in Congress, this has been a constant struggle, from my days in the House of Representatives, helping pass the Cuban Democracy Act; to the tragic downing of the Brothers to the Rescue, civilians who were just flying over the Straits of Florida between Cuba and the United States, looking for those people who had taken to the to try to seek freedom and were shot down, which led to the LIBERTAD Act, otherwise known as Helms-Burton, which I helped write; from my visit to Guantanamo, our base, with former Congresspeople Lincoln Diaz-Balart and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, where thousands of Cubans were being held at one time when the boatlifts were making their way to the United States and where we eventually brought them back to the United States; from presentations in Geneva, at the U.N. Human Rights Council, leading to a resolution there condemning the regime and here, as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, leading to a resolu-

tion, a bipartisan resolution—a bipartisan resolution—that unanimously passed out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today; and so much more. So I marvel at some of my Cuban brothers and sisters with their insulting remarks toward me.

Since July 11, President Biden and Secretary Blinken have repeatedly spoken in support of the Cuban people and made clear the United States stands with them in their call for freedom.

More importantly, the administration is backing up its words with action. Last week, President Biden invoked the Global Magnitsky Act, which is a law that we use, passed by the Congress of the United States, to sanction human rights violators across the globe. The President invoked the Global Magnitsky Act to sanction Cuban Defense Minister General Lopez Miera and the Black Berets SWAT unit for their violent and repressive actions against peaceful protesters. Secretary Blinken, the Secretary of State, has made clear the administration will continue to hold human rights abusers accountable.

I urge the administration to consider additional Global Magnitsky designations and also to revoke the existing visas of senior Cuban officials. Such steps are greatly needed.

With the Diaz-Canel regime wielding internet connectivity as a political weapon against its citizens, the administration is also pursuing ways to help Cubans gain unrestricted access to the internet. They need unfettered access to information. They need to be able to communicate with each other. They need to be able to tell each other what is happening in their country. They need to be able to organize peacefully to create change in their country, and we must accelerate our efforts to provide them with the tools they need to do so, whether that is satellite feeds, whether that is tethered global balloons, whether that is a multiplicity of options. Because a beam can be jammed, we need to find a way to get the people of Cuba internet connection.

The United States also must continue working with international partners in support of democracy and human rights in Cuba.

Last week, I was proud to lead a joint statement for the first time ever in support of the Cuban people with my counterparts who chair the Foreign Affairs Committees of the United Kingdom, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. This week, the Foreign Ministers of 20 nations joined Secretary Blinken to “condemn the mass arrests and detentions of protestors in Cuba and call on the government to respect the universal rights and freedoms of the Cuban people.” Many of these countries have never ever expressed themselves in solidarity with the Cuban people.

I am proud to see Secretary Blinken and the administration make that happen. I applaud those governments that joined Secretary Blinken, but I also

note the absence of those, including Canada and Spain and the European Union. Does Spain care more about Spanish hotel investments than it does about the human rights of the Cuban people?

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Is it more important the business you conduct on the island than the freedom and democracy of the oppressed people? Do you care more about those investments?

Does Canada place more priority on mining investments than it does on fundamental freedoms? I would hope not.

These universal principles should unite all of us.

The administration is also convening a working group to study options for the restoration of some remittances. For too long, the Cuban military's economic conglomerate has managed the remittances that Cuban Americans send their families on the island, using fees and currency conversion to enrich itself. The United States would never allow the Spanish, the Mexican, or the Argentine military to control the flow of remittances to their countries. It is time that we insist that Cuban Americans be able to freely and directly support their loved ones.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

It's only fair that the hard working Cuban American families can send money to their families instead of that money being used to enrich the elite of the Cuban Communist Party.

The steps taken thus far by the Biden administration are important, but we must do more.

Today, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved my resolution, along with colleagues on both the Republican and Democratic sides, expressing our solidarity with the Cuban people and condemning the regime's abuses. This bipartisan, bicameral initiative deserves the support of the full Senate, and I hope we will pass it on the floor this week.

It is also time for the Biden administration to issue a new Executive order to provide direction for U.S. policy toward Cuba. The order should hone our accountability measures for persons involved in human rights abuses and those who materially support them. It should solidify our strategies on internet access and support for the Cuban people. Congress should review options to increase funding for U.S. democracy programs as well as internet freedom initiatives.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

We must continue putting pressure on who violate human rights and elevate our support to the Cuban people.

The United States must also find new ways to work with trusted, impartial international partners, including international organizations, to provide vaccines and other aid directly to the Cuban people. The Cuban regime has grossly mismanaged its pandemic response. It has refused to participate in

COVAX and continues to promote its own vaccine, which is either ineffective or unavailable because people in Cuba are dying. As a result, everyday Cubans continue to suffer.

The United States must lead a serious effort to push for the demilitarization of the Cuban economy. The military-owned umbrella company GAESA reigns supreme over the Cuban economy. It is run by whom? By Raul Castro's son-in-law, Luis Alberto Lopez-Callejas, fueling the rise of a new generation of regime oligarchs. The Cuban people will never achieve economic prosperity while regime military companies control the economy.

After years of efforts by the Trump administration to slash funding for programs that we continuously had to fight to bring back that provide lifelines to Cuban activists and civil society, I am very pleased to see that the Biden administration has requested \$20 million for these programs and made clear that America will continue standing with those on the frontlines of Cuba's pro-democracy movement.

It is time also for the United States to launch a campaign in support of labor rights inside of Cuba. There is no acceptable explanation for why Cuban men and women are unable to be directly hired and directly paid by international companies and organizations that are present in Cuba. If we are serious about empowering the Cuban people, they must have a direct say in their livelihoods.

The Biden administration should pursue the success of past campaigns, such as the Sullivan Principles in South Africa, to lead efforts that require businesses to engage directly with the Cuban people and their employment.

The Biden administration should also maintain the State Department's Cuba Restricted List, which can help businesses and organizations directly engage with the Cuban people instead of regime conglomerates.

Additionally, the United States and our allies must send a message to members of the Cuban military. The Cuban military's slogan is that it draws its power from the people. Well, the people are protesting. In reality, you should not use your power against the people.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The Cuban Army has to understand that if their mandate comes from the people, the people is protesting; the people wants freedom. Don't use your arms against your brothers and sisters if you want to have a future in Cuba.

Additionally, let's be clear. When we send that message to the Cuban military not to turn its arms against its brothers and sisters, the world is watching what is happening in Cuba. There is a future in a democratic Cuba under civilian control for members of the military who refuse to repress their fellow citizens, but if you are involved in human rights abuses and have blood on your hands, you will be held accountable.

It is also worth noting to Cuba's military leaders that their future with this regime is anything but certain. In the last 10 days—in the last 10 days—five Cuban generals have died under highly suspicious conditions that the regime seems intent on covering up. All of a sudden, five Cuban generals, in 10 days, have died. I don't know at this time that I would want to be a general in Cuba.

To those who want to blame Cuba's misery on the U.S. embargo, I would say that it is the Cuban regime that needs to lift its embargo on its own population. It is the regime's own restrictive policies that have left the average Cuban destitute while oligarchs enjoy state-run stores that are brimming with dollar-denominated goods out of reach to the general population.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The real embargo is the one the communist regime has imposed against its own people who are not able to access food, medicine or basic needs without its consent.

The steps to end the embargo are laid out clearly in title II of the LIBERTAD Act, which is the law of the United States, which I wrote. Those steps include releasing political prisoners, legalizing political activity, and holding democratic elections.

If the regime ends its iron-fisted rule over the Cuban people, title II of the LIBERTAD Act lays out what the United States stands ready to do to pursue a different relationship with the people of Cuba. The United States would work directly with a democratic government to take steps to remove the embargo, to engage in direct trade with Cuba, to support its return and membership to international financial organizations, and so much more. It is all there in U.S. law. This is not a promise of something that could happen; it is a promise of what would happen if there is a change in Cuba.

It is time for the Cuban regime to take the steps and accept the demands of the Cuban people.

Let me close on a personal note.

I stand here on the floor of the U.S. Senate as the son of Cuban refugees who came to this country in search of freedom and opportunity.

Today, we are bearing witness to something in Cuba that my parents never got to see.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The day they dreamt about is the day millions of Cubans around the world dream today, the day Cuba is set free.

We are bearing witness to a historic moment in which Cubans from all walks of life are coming together to demand that same freedom. We are bearing witness to a deep discontent within the Cuban people with the status quo and life under one of the most repressive regimes ever known.

For more than 60 years, they have lived without liberty and justice, without freedom of expression, without human rights and the ability to determine their own future.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Don't be fooled. When the people went out to protest, they are not asking for food, vaccines, or work. No.

One word, and only one. Freedom, freedom, freedom.

Freedom, because with freedom, everything else comes.

Let us not repeat the mistakes of the past. Let us not fall victim to tired myths. Let us embrace the facts over the fiction. Most importantly, let us hear the Cuban people's cries for freedom.

It is our job to stand with them, to empower them, to ensure that the international community helps them achieve their dreams and aspirations.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Because without freedom and democracy, there is no "Patria y Vida." But with freedom and democracy, there is a homeland of life and many opportunities.

I yield the floor.

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

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to oppose Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending spree.

If Democrats pass the bill, every American will end up paying more, and clearly pay more in taxes, also pay more for the costs that people are seeing today at home—goods, gas, groceries. These prices all continue to go up.

First, let's talk about taxes. This bill would be the largest tax increase in the history of the United States—actually, in the last half century.

The bill raises taxes on small businesses, and that means higher prices on everyone and also fewer jobs.

The bill raises taxes on farmers and ranchers, who will have a harder time in terms of passing down the family farm or ranch to their kids or grandkids.

The bill raises taxes on savings and investments. So seniors will either have to work longer or retire with less.

It includes trillions of dollars in tax increases, yet Democrats seem to be pandering to their elite donors. They made sure to include special exemptions for rich people in blue States and for the owners of electric vehicles.

Now a study from the University of California Berkeley—clearly not a conservative university—they say that 9 out of 10 electric vehicle subsidies go to the rich—go to the rich. Nine out of ten, according to Berkeley, go to the rich.

Democrats also would give tax breaks for people making up to \$400,000 a year for all sorts of things, including sending their kids to summer camp.

Is that what the Democrats want to vote for: Tax breaks for people making up to \$400,000 a year to send their kids to summer camp?

Well, the contrast with Republicans could not be clearer. Where Democrats

are making more handouts for their friends, Republicans actually simplified the Tax Code. Where Democrats' increases are going to eliminate jobs, our tax cuts increased job growth, increased employment, lowered unemployment, raised wages.

The 2017 tax cut was an across-the-board tax cut. It helped businesses and working families, and the result was the best economy in my lifetime.

In the months after the tax cuts, nearly 200 companies—200 companies—announced raises for their employees.

Six million American workers received either a bonus or a raise or an increased retirement contribution—6 million Americans after we passed that law.

Now, before the pandemic, unemployment was at a 50-year low. Wages were growing at the fastest pace in a decade, and the biggest wage gains were for people at the bottom of the economic ladder.

On average, American household income rose by more than \$4,000 a year. Well, this is more than the increase over the entire 8 years of the Obama-Biden administration.

We had the lowest poverty rate in a half a century. Child poverty was down; income inequality went down. The top 1 percent's share of taxes went up, so the richer folks were actually paying more in taxes.

After Republicans cut taxes, we saw the lowest unemployment rates ever recorded for African Americans, for Hispanic Americans, and for Asian Americans.

When we began to reopen the economy last year, it was the fastest recovery in American history. That was because we had such a strong economy before the pandemic.

What a contrast to what we have with the Democrats over the last 6 months. Since Democrats took control of Washington, we have seen the fastest rise in core inflation in 40 years—the fastest rise in core inflation in 40 years.

And we have also seen the most unfilled jobs in Americans history. The American people are already paying more at the grocery store, paying more at the gas station; now the American people are bracing for the fact that they are going to pay a lot more on tax day as well.

Yet just as bad as the Democrats' tax increases, on top of that, we see reckless spending. Democrats tell us the bill costs \$3.5 trillion. This is nearly the cost of what America spent in World War II. Yet the bill is actually much more expensive than \$3.5 trillion, because Democrats continue to use accounting gimmicks to hide the real cost of the legislation.

Last week, a nonpartisan group released a study showing the real cost is likely \$5.5 trillion. This is on top of the \$6 trillion we have already spent on coronavirus relief. Five and a half trillion dollars is larger than the entire economy of Japan, which is the third largest economy in the world.

This is clearly a recipe for inflation. So now Democrats are waving around a report from a single discredited economist who says: Oh, don't worry about inflation.

Well, the people in my home State of Wyoming are worried about inflation because they are living it.

Now, this same economist has been wrong over and over and over again in his career. He predicted a recession under President Trump. Instead, we saw the best economy of our lifetime. He wasn't even close. His work was an influence on President Obama's stimulus plan, which gave us the slowest recovery in 70 years.

So hard to know why the Democrats would want to even turn to this person other than he is saying what they want him to say.

Who are you going to believe? Him or your own two eyes?

And the people of Wyoming believe their own two eyes when they go and fill up with gas or they go to the grocery store or other stores and see their paycheck being eaten away.

Now, Democrats now tell us they can spend their way out of inflation. Spend their way out of inflation?

This isn't just wishful thinking. This is radical. It is extreme. It is dangerous. It is scary. Our economy doesn't need a dime of stimulus. We don't even need stimulus. We didn't need it 4 months ago, when Democrats borrowed and spent an additional \$2 trillion.

Prices are going up because Democrats spent too much already. The money supply hasn't gone up this fast since World War II.

One Democrat Senator, this weekend, said inflation is happening because of money we have already spent.

Well, if this is true, then why would we want to add fuel to the fire and spend more? Why would we want to do that?

Democrats are printing more money without creating more goods and services. So if you print more money without creating more goods and services, this is almost a textbook definition of inflation.

The two bills coming to the floor now would bring Democrats' total for the year to \$8 trillion in additional government spending.

According to an estimate from the Manhattan Institute, this is enough to give every American household \$60,000; or it is enough to cut income taxes by one-third.

Instead, Democrats are preparing more payoffs for their friends and donors. This bill is a full giveaway to union bosses, trial lawyers, leftwing professors. It includes taxpayer funding for full-time professional climate activists. It includes corporate welfare for connected companies.

This tax-and-spending spree is utterly reckless. Not one Republican will vote for this bill. This means all it takes is one Democrat in the Senate or a handful in the House to stop this

freight train to socialism. All it takes is one Democrat concerned about our future, willing to say: We shouldn't weigh down our children with debt or our economy with massive tax increases.

President Biden and the Democrat party are in charge of this runaway train. Each and every Democrat is going to be held responsible for the consequences. This includes more inflation, more worker shortages, more debt, and more dependency.

Look, Democrats did enough damage with their last spending spree. This new spending spree is much worse.

Unlike their last spending spree, this bill includes massive tax increases. It is one more reason why the American people are already speaking out against this reckless tax-and-spending spree.

People across the country and certainly home in Wyoming are fed up, and the poll numbers are showing it. Seventy-four percent of Americans—we are talking Republicans, Democrats, Independents—74 percent of Americans are concerned this spending spree will accelerate inflation; 78 percent are rightly concerned about their own wages going up at a time when—with their own taxes going up at a time when their wages have been getting eaten into by inflation.

The people are going to remember how you vote on this bill. They are going to remember it. They remember it every time they go to the gas station, every time they go to the grocery store, and they are clearly going to remember it when they go to vote.

So election day will come, people will make their votes as citizens, and they will realize what the Democrats have done with this reckless tax-and-spending spree and how it has impacted them as they are paying more in taxes, having a greater national debt, and inflation eating away at their paycheck.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

(The remarks of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO pertaining to the introduction of S. 2513 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I yield the floor.

VOTE ON PROUTY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time be yielded back on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. PETERS. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 284 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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	Sullivan
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the cloture vote failed on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3684.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the cloture failed on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3684.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant 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, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 285 Leg.]

YEAS—67

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

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Hawley	Rubio
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Boozman	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Braun	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Toomey
Ernst	Marshall	Tuberville
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Hagerty	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 32.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is agreed to.

MOTION TO PROCEED

The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to commend the group of Senators who worked with President Biden to reach an agreement on a bipartisan infrastructure bill. The Senate has just come together and, in a strong bipartisan fashion, voted to begin the legislative process here on the Senate floor.

For the past few months, I have laid out a two-track strategy on infrastructure: a bipartisan bill, focused on traditional, brick-and-mortar infrastructure projects, and a budget reconciliation bill, where Democrats plan to make historic investments in American jobs, American families, and efforts to fight climate change.

In order to start work on a reconciliation bill, the Senate must pass a budget resolution first. As I have said repeatedly, our goal was to pass both bills in this session—hopefully, in July.

My goal remains to pass both the bipartisan infrastructure bill and a budget resolution during this work period—both.

It might take some long nights. It might eat into our weekends. But we are going to get the job done, and we are on track.

Again, the vote tonight means we are on track to reach our two-track goal before the Senate adjourns for the August recess.

TRIBUTE TO ROCKY AND LISA EADES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of Rocky and Lisa Eades, the 2021 honorees of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming.

Since 1978, the Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming has made a positive difference in the lives of children. Their mission is to inspire all youth, especially those who need them the most. They strive to help young people reach their full potential as productive, responsible, and caring citizens. The programs, leagues, and activities serve the children in our community by cultivating academic success, healthy lifestyles, and good character and citizenship.

On September 8, 2021, the Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming will host their 23rd annual awards and recognition breakfast. At this breakfast,

the organization honors members of the community who have made a significant difference in the lives of others. It is an inspiring celebration.

This year's honorees are Rocky and Lisa Eades. They are an ideal choice because of their tremendous role in helping families. Their story of generosity and compassion is inspiring.

Rocky and Lisa cofounded the Jason's Friends Foundation, a nonprofit organization based in Casper, WY. Jason's Friends provides financial and moral support to families with children fighting cancer. The couple took on this charge after experiencing firsthand the hardships associated with childhood cancer. Their 8-year-old son Jason was diagnosed with a brain stem tumor in January 1995.

Rocky and Lisa dedicated their all to Jason's recovery. They upended their lives, traveling to Denver and New York for care and treatment. Jason's brave fight ended in November 1995. To honor Jason's life and help Wyoming families in similar situations, they founded Jason's Friends Foundation in 1996.

Jason's Friends has crafted an inspiring legacy, providing over \$5.8 million in financial assistance to families dealing with the added stress and financial burden of a child with cancer. Currently, 145 families are enrolled in the program. The foundation helps cover nonmedical expenses such as travel and household bills. Their work allows families to fully commit to their fight against cancer.

The Bowl for Jason's Friends fundraiser, in its 23rd year, is a highly anticipated event, drawing in the entire community. The foundation also hosts Camp Courage, a no-cost summer camp for childhood cancer patients and their families.

Family is the highest priority for the Eades. In addition to Jason and the countless families they have helped throughout Wyoming, they have two grown daughters, Brooke and Skylar. Lisa serves as the volunteer president/CEO of Jason's Friends, cochairs the Wyoming Cancer Coalition, serves on the Wyoming Department of Health's Institutional Review Board, and was appointed by then Governor Mead to the Wyoming Palliative Care Advisory Council. Rocky is the president of Eades Construction in Casper and has built hundreds of custom homes in Natrona County.

Rocky and Lisa live a life of heart and perseverance. They are the first to offer a helping hand to those experiencing tremendous challenges. The Code of the West charges us to live each day with courage. Not only do Rocky and Lisa embody this principle, they give everyone around them the courage needed to do the same. Casper and Wyoming are fortunate to have them.

It is with great honor that I recognize these outstanding members of our Wyoming community. My wife Bobbi joins me in extending our congratula-

tions to Rocky and Lisa Eades upon their selection for this special award.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL SPRAYBERRY

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the distinguished service of Michael "Mike" Sprayberry who will be retiring as director of North Carolina Emergency Management on August 1, 2021. Every citizen of North Carolina is indebted to Mike for his tireless efforts over the last 16 years to respond and rebuild following the countless disasters big and small that the State has faced.

Since his appointment as deputy director for North Carolina Emergency Management in 2005 and subsequent elevation to director in 2013, his department has been called upon to respond to 32 Federal emergency and disaster declarations, ranging from hurricanes and tornadoes to fuel shortages and a global pandemic. Throughout his time, he has served under four Governors and provided steady leadership to ensure that the State of North Carolina is prepared to respond to any crisis at all times.

While being charged with running emergency management operations for a large State is never easy, the last 5 years would have been an insurmountable challenge to almost anyone except to Mike Sprayberry. In 2016, Hurricane Matthew slowly crawled up the southeastern coast bringing record setting rain across nearly half of the State. While many had termed Hurricane Matthew a once in a generation event, less than 2 years later Hurricane Florence stalled along the coast once again bringing historical rains. In some areas of southeastern North Carolina over 30 inches of rain fell, cutting off Wilmington, NC, and other communities from the outside world for days. Through it all, Mike oversaw the rescue and sheltering of thousands of displaced North Carolinians while also ensuring that information continued to flow to Senator TILLIS, myself, and other Federal agencies to allow for better federal coordination.

While communities across the State are thankful for North Carolina Emergency Management's quick response at the height of the storms to rescue hundreds trapped in their homes due to flood waters, Mike Sprayberry's lasting legacy will be his dogged effort to rebuild North Carolina better and more resilient than before. Understanding that billions of Federal aid would be coming to support recovery, Mike advocated for the creation of the North Carolina Office of Recovery and Resiliency, including the establishment of the State's chief resilience officer, one of the first such positions in the country. He is a fierce proponent of the development of affordable housing and challenges his team daily to think about the long-term impacts they can make in storm preparation, storm recovery, and everything in between.

Mike Sprayberry has lived a life of service first as a U.S. marine, then 25 years in the North Carolina National Guard as a field artillery and infantry officer, and finally serving as director of North Carolina Emergency Management. While he will be missed, his reputation and the culture of preparedness he has built in the organization and across the State will live on.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DARRELL HUETH

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing Darrell Hueth of Valley County as Montanan of the Month for his devotion to the Glasgow community and passion for Montana agriculture and education.

Darrell has been a staple in Glasgow since his high school football and basketball days. He went on to become a star athlete for the Montana State University Bobcats from 1956-1959—"Go Cats!" During his time at MSU, Darrell studied agriculture economics.

Darrell brought his athletic experience and agriculture knowledge back to Glasgow a teacher and coach. Under his leadership, the Scotties' football team went undefeated for 2 years and won three State championships. Darrell also led the Scotties' wrestling team to three state championships. When he wasn't on the field or in the gym, Darrell taught consumer economic accounting and bookkeeping, a course that is crucial for the next generation of Montana ag leaders.

Teachers serve an important role as they shape the minds of young Montanans and have the opportunity to influence the next generation and help prepare them for future careers. Montana has a rich legacy of agriculture, and it is our No. 1 economic driver. There is no doubt that Darrell's passion for teaching about agriculture helped encourage young Montanans to pursue careers in this important field.

His educational impact extends beyond the great State of Montana. As professor emeritus at the University of Maryland's Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Darrell has had many academic articles, working papers and books published throughout his professional career.

It is my honor to recognize Darrell for dedicating his life to education and making a positive impact on young Montanans through athletics and agricultural studies. Keep up the great work, Darrell.●

TRIBUTE TO NOELLE LAMBERT

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Noelle Lambert of Manchester as July's Granite Stater of the Month. Noelle is a Paralympic athlete who founded the Born to Run Foundation, which helps young people who have lost a limb achieve their

dreams by providing them with specialized prosthetics.

A lifelong athlete, Noelle was recruited to play Division 1 lacrosse at UMass Lowell. In her freshman year, Noelle was in a moped accident that severed her left leg.

Noelle did not let this devastating accident stop her from finishing out her college lacrosse career. With the help of nonprofit organizations, Noelle received a specialized prosthetic for running that allowed her to continue competing. A specialized prosthetic like the one Noelle needs can cost up to \$50,000 and is rarely covered by insurance, so the help Noelle received from these charities was essential in her return to competition.

Inspired by the nonprofits who helped her compete at an elite collegiate level and determined that others in need of prosthetics receive the help that they need, Noelle started her own nonprofit to help other children and young adult amputees.

Already, the Born to Run Foundation has donated specialized prosthetics to 14 individuals, including one as young as 4 years old. With the assistance of prosthetics provided by Born to Run, individuals have been able to run, weightlift, or simply take a walk on the beach again.

If her work leading Born to Run wasn't enough, Noelle is also a world-class athlete and national record holder who qualified for the U.S. Paralympic Team and is competing at the Tokyo Paralympics in the 100-meter dash in the T63 division.

Noelle's grit, perseverance, and compassion for others represent the best of the Granite State. Her ability to turn a traumatic experience into an opportunity to help others is an inspiration to us all, and I am honored to recognize her.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 957. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that certain med-

ical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs have physical locations for the disposal of controlled substances medications.

S. 1910. An act to authorize major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2021.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 11:58 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 3(b) of the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 15202), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Minority Leader appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Medal of Valor Review Board: Mr. Anthony Galagaza of Bakersfield, California.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 3(b) of the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 15202), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Medal of Valor Review Board for a term of 4 years: Mr. Shon Buford of San Francisco, California and Mr. Brandon Clabes of Chocataw, Oklahoma.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today July 28, 2021, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 957. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs have physical locations for the disposal of controlled substances medications.

S. 1910. An act to authorize major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2021.

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-1518. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining Electric Program Procedures" (RIN0572-AC53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1519. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "1-Aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic Acid (1-ACC); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10021-90-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1520. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Fluxapyroxad; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. -8663-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1521. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alkoxylated C8-C18 Saturated and Unsaturated Alcohol and Adipic Acid (AASUAA); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. -8581-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1522. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Implementing Interagency Working Group (IWG) Recommendations on Improving the Consultation Process Required Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for Pesticide Registration and Registration Review"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1523. A communication from the Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1524. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Screening the Ready Reserve" (RIN0790-AL00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1525. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "TRICARE: Referring of Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy by Doctors of Podiatric Medicine Acting Within the Scope of their License" (RIN0720-AB71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1526. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "TRICARE Coverage of National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease Coronavirus Disease 2019 Clinical Trials" (RIN0720-AB83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1527. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administration and Support of Basic Research by the Department of Defense" (RIN0790-AK51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1528. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Covered Defense Telecommunications Equipment or Services (DFARS Case 2018-D022)" (RIN0750-AJ84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1529. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Property Loss Reporting in the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (DFARS Case 2020-D005)" (RIN0750-

AK92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1530. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause 'Tariff Information' (DFARS Case 2018-D044)" (RIN0750-AK07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1531. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act of 1974: Implementation" (RIN0790-AL16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1532. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "TRICARE: Extended Care Health Option (ECHO) Respite Care" (RIN0720-AB69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1533. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Malpractice Claims by Members of the Uniformed Services" (RIN0790-AL22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1534. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Malpractice by Members of the Uniformed Services; Correction" (RIN0790-AL22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1535. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Data Collection and Inventory for Services Contracts (DFARS Case 2018-D063)" (RIN0750-AK30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2021; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1536. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Eleven-Year Update, Longitudinal Study on Traumatic Brain Injury Incurred by Members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1537. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022"; to the Committee on Armed Services

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHATZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1471. A bill to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-33).

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with a preamble:

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.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 812. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jeanne Frances Bailey and ending with Bruce J. Zanin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2021.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Russell Anthony Duncan and ending with Mark Clayton Prescott, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

Foreign Service nomination of Marc Clayton Gilkey.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Gabriel J. Allison and ending with Amanda M. Zeidan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 22, 2021.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Wade C. Martin and ending with Fernando Ospina, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 22, 2021.

By Mr. WARNER for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*Thomas Andrew Monheim, of Virginia, to be Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

*Stacey A. Dixon, of the District of Columbia, to be Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2493. A bill to extend the deadline for eligible health care providers to use certain funds received from the COVID-19 Provider Relief Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. 2494. A bill to counter malign influence, require transparency, and promote accountability within the United Nations system,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2495. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to maintain a list of the country of origin of all drugs marketed in the United States, to ban the use of Federal funds for the purchase of drugs manufactured in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2496. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration to implement certain recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board relating to pedestrian safety, bicyclist safety, and speeding-related crashes involving passenger vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2497. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to prohibit nonconsensual release of a nondebtor entity's liability to an entity other than the debtor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2498. A bill to protect minors from premature waiver of their constitutional rights during a custodial interrogation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2499. A bill to establish data privacy and data security protections for consumers in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 2500. A bill to require providers of interactive computer services to publicly disclose information relating to requests or recommendations made by government entities to moderate content, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2501. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an offshore wind career training grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2502. A bill to provide first-time, low-level, nonviolent simple possession offenders an opportunity to expunge that conviction after successful completion of court-imposed probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2503. A bill to provide definitions of terms and services related to community-based gang intervention to ensure that funding for such intervention is utilized in a cost-effective manner and that community-based agencies are held accountable for providing holistic, integrated intervention services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2504. A bill to promote the provision of exercise or fitness equipment, and exercise or fitness classes and instruction, that are accessible to individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2505. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6223 Maple Street in Omaha, Nebraska, as the "Petty Officer 1st Class Charles Jackson French Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2506. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, and the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to take actions to mitigate tree spiking devices on certain Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2507. A bill to establish a grant to provide mental health services and behavioral health services to at-risk youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2508. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to extend the consumer credit protections provided to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents under title 10, United States Code, to all consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2509. A bill to authorize the New Partnerships Initiative to expand and diversify the partner base of the United States Agency for International Development and to provide more entry points for organizations to work with USAID; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 2510. A bill to reduce the health risks of heat by establishing the National Integrated Heat Health Information System Program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Integrated Heat Health Information System Interagency Committee to improve extreme heat preparedness, planning, and response, requiring a study, and establishing financial assistance programs to address heat effects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an investment credit for the conversion of office buildings into other uses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2512. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices and judges of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2513. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the application and review process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for clothing allowance claims submitted by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 2514. A bill to rename the Provo Veterans Center in Orem, Utah, as the "Col. Gail S. Halvorsen 'Candy Bomber' Veterans Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2515. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to treat attendance at an institution of higher education the same as work for the purpose of determining eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. LANKFORD, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 2516. A bill to prohibit the United States International Development Finance Corporation from imposing restrictions on the source of energy used by power-generation projects intended to provide affordable electricity in IDA-eligible countries or IDA-blend countries and to require the Corporation to promote a technology- and fuel-neutral, all-of-the-above energy development strategy for such countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2517. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2518. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to disclose testing and results of testing for perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances and to provide additional requirements for testing for such substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 2519. A bill to repeal the multi-State plan program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 2520. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for engagements with State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 2521. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an SBIC Working Group, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain tribal benefits and Alaska Permanent Fund dividends as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules for tribal economic development bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2524. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to exclude certain payments to aged, blind, or disabled Alaska Natives or descendants of Alaska Natives from being used to determine eligibility for certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2525. A bill 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.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 2526. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements for the planning, design, and construction of facilities to be operated as shared medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2527. A bill to require officers and employees of the legislative and executive branches to make certain disclosures related to communications with information content providers and interactive computer services regarding restricting speech; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 325. A resolution recognizing the seriousness of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) and expressing support for the designation of September 2021 as "PCOS Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 326. A resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Peru; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. Res. 327. A resolution amending the Standing Rules of the Senate to require inflationary impact statements in committee reports; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 97

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 97, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of dental services under the Medicare program.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 377

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to suspend certain United States assistance for the Government of Honduras until corruption, impunity, and human rights violations are no longer systemic, and the perpetrators of these crimes are being brought to justice.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a bill to amend section 303(g) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)) to eliminate the separate registration requirement for dispensing narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V, such as buprenorphine, for maintenance or detoxification treatment, and for other purposes.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 924

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 924, a bill to establish a demonstration program to provide payments on eligible loans for individuals who are eligible for the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program.

S. 1031

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1031, a bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on disparities associated with race and ethnicity with re-

spect to certain benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to direct the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue an occupational safety and health standard to protect workers from heat-related injuries and illnesses.

S. 1089

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to direct the Government Accountability Office to evaluate appropriate coverage of assistive technologies provided to patients who experience amputation or live with limb difference.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, a bill to categorize public safety telecommunications as a protective service occupation under the Standard Occupational Classification System.

S. 1198

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1198, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and expand the Solid Start program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1404

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1404, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1428

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products.

S. 1435

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1435, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit product hopping, and for other purposes.

S. 1574

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1574, a bill to codify a statutory definition for long-term care pharmacies.

S. 1813

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1813, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to support research on, and expanded access to, investigational drugs for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) 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. 1912

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1912, a bill to clarify the rights of certain persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

S. 1976

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1976, a bill to establish a program to oversee the global COVID-19 response and prepare for future pandemics, and for other purposes.

S. 2048

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2048, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 2081

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 2081, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas and criteria air pollutant emission fees, provide rebates to low- and middle-income Americans, invest in fossil fuel communities and workers, invest in environmental justice communities, and for other purposes.

S. 2229

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) 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. 2315

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2315, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a program to provide health care coverage to low-income adults in States that have not expanded Medicaid.

S. 2405

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 2447

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2447, a bill to amend the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to provide additional funding for E-rate support for emergency educational connections and devices, and for other purposes.

S. 2449

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2449, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to enhance penalties for theft of a firearm from a Federal firearms licensee.

S. 2467

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2467, a bill to provide for a Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2489

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from North

Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2489, a bill to require the maintenance of the country of origin markings for imported goods produced in the West Bank or Gaza, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 310

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of 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.

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 310, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2508. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to extend the consumer credit protections provided to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents under title 10, United States Code, to all consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Veterans and Consumers Fair Credit Act (VCFCA) along with Senator MERKLEY, Senate Banking Committee Chairman BROWN, and many of my colleagues. This important legislation would extend the bipartisan Military Lending Act's (MLA) protections for active-duty servicemembers and their families to all Americans by imposing a nationwide 36 percent cap on the annual percentage rate (APR) for most extensions of consumer credit.

The MLA was enacted on a bipartisan basis in 2006 to rein in payday and other unscrupulous lenders that targeted American troops with abusive and predatory loans. Unfortunately, the MLA does not protect veterans or Gold Star families from these exploitative practices. Our servicemembers and their families should not lose important consumer protections simply because they retire, separate from honorable service, or lose their loved ones. As such, our legislation would extend the MLA's protections to veterans and Gold Star families as well as ensure that all Americans are shielded from predatory loans.

Hundreds of millions of American consumers could benefit from a 36 percent APR cap. In states that do not have such a cap, predatory lenders are permitted to offer loans with triple-digit APRs that trap individuals in cycles of debt. For instance, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found that 80 percent of payday loans are rolled over or renewed within two weeks. This practice can cause bor-

rowers to pay more in fees than the amount of money they originally borrowed, which is a sign of predatory lending and poor underwriting.

According to a coalition of community organizations, payday lenders are known to target the most vulnerable, including seniors, veterans, and low-income borrowers. Many in these communities were already struggling to make ends meet before the pandemic, and continuing to pay exorbitant APRs may cause them to fall deeper into economic insecurity. This is why it's important to extend strong protections against unscrupulous lenders to all Americans.

The MLA's successful track record demonstrates that providing for reasonable, responsible limits on interest rates does not cut off consumers' access to credit. According to a May 2021 report from the Department of Defense, "credit cards, auto loans, and personal loans are widely available at risk-based rates under the 36 percent [military] APR" and "[s]ervice members continue to have ample access to necessary credit."

Moreover, this legislation would follow the trend in many states towards greater protections against predatory loans. Eighteen states and the District of Columbia have enacted APR caps of 36% or lower for payday loans or banned them altogether. Lenders in these states have incentives to offer more affordable loans that borrowers have an ability to repay. The same incentives should apply across the nation.

I thank the bill's supporters, including the Consumer Federation of America, the National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low income clients), the Center for Responsible Lending, Americans for Financial Reform, Veterans Education Success, the Military Officers Association of America, and the National Military Family Association.

I urge our colleagues to join us in supporting this important legislation.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2509. A bill to authorize the New Partnerships Initiative to expand and diversify the partner base of the United States Agency for International Development and to provide more entry points for organizations to work with USAID; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President. The United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) New Partnerships Initiative (NPI) was formed to help small and local nonprofit organizations partner with the agency on humanitarian work, and was inspired in part by requests from Congress for USAID to cooperate more closely with these organizations. The program was founded on the principle that greater diversity and competition among the USAID partner base would lead to better and more effective development

work. Since its creation, NPI has helped USAID expand its collaboration with local nonprofits to undertake critical work overseas, but this vital program needs a clearly defined foundation in statute and long-term authorization of funding to sustain its progress well beyond 2021.

Today, I am pleased to introduce the New Partnerships Initiative Authorization Act with Senator RUBIO. This legislation would cement USAID's commitment to diversifying its nonprofit partner base by authorizing the program and necessary funding through Fiscal Year 2026. Additionally, the New Partnerships Initiative Authorization Act would improve outcomes at the NPI program by outlining in statute core elements of the program, and requiring the USAID Administrator to adhere to certain criteria regarding program management and nonprofit recruitment.

This bipartisan legislation is an opportunity to ensure that the New Partnerships Initiative continues to be an effective tool for diversifying USAID's partner base through the inclusion of locally based and underutilized partners. I look forward to working with USAID leadership and my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee to swiftly consider and implement the New Partnerships Initiative Authorization Act.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2513. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the application and review process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for clothing allowance claims submitted by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise today to tell you about Brian Neuman, an Iraq combat veteran who was wounded while serving our Nation overseas in 2004.

Brian has spent years working with the Wounded Warrior Project to help other veterans get the benefits that they need.

Years after returning home, Brian applied for an annual clothing allowance of \$841. This allowance should be available to veterans like Brian when a medication or a medical device causes irregular wear or damage to their clothing.

As many vets with service injuries will tell you, their clothes wear down much faster than other people's, and the prosthetics can rip or tear clothes as well. Some veterans need tailoring to make clothing fit more comfortably around their injuries. Others have to treat skin conditions with creams that damage their clothes.

These veterans get compensation for the expenses associated with their injuries—and rightly so. Our veterans have given this country so much, and Congress has a responsibility to hold up its end of the bargain, to care for them

when they are injured during their service to our Nation.

But right now, this benefit isn't accessible for many veterans, and that is wrong, and we need to change it.

In the case of the clothing allowance benefits, as Brian discovered, the VA currently requires veterans to be evaluated for this benefit in person, every year. One year, Brian physically went to a VA clinic to submit the clothing allowance application, and his request was denied because the VA had no record that he received a prosthetic at that specific clinic. At that point, like many vets, Brian gave up on the process in frustration.

That is just unacceptable. These are brave men and women who are living with severe burns or who wear prosthetic devices as a result of their service. In many cases, the VA already knows these veterans have a medical condition that isn't going to change year from year.

And that didn't make any sense to Brian, so he did something about it. He reached out to see if Congress could solve the problem. He did. He did it, he says, less for himself, but more for the many veterans in rural States, like mine in Nevada, who live hours away from the nearest VA. Brian knows that many of them are so worn out by the process of applying for what is owed them that they just give up.

These men and women are tired of jumping through hoops to access their earned benefits. So why are we forcing them to navigate this complicated bureaucracy? There are certainly places to cut costs, but this isn't one of them.

The Senate can fix this problem easily, and I have introduced a bipartisan bill to do just that. I am glad to be working across the aisle with my colleague Senator BOOZMAN to support injured and disabled veterans. Our bill makes it easier for them to get clothing that works for their specific needs. My legislation requires the VA to automatically renew this clothing allowance. Veterans can get it until they say they don't need it anymore or until the VA's records indicate that they don't require it. This will make sure they aren't forced to drive long distances to access a VA benefit they are owed.

I am looking forward to moving this legislation through Congress so we can make life a little easier for the 40,000 wounded warriors who currently receive this benefit and for the thousands more who qualify. There shouldn't be any redtape stopping veterans from getting their benefits, so let's pass this bill and fix this problem.

I am going to continue to work in every way I can to make sure that veterans in Nevada and across the country get the Federal resources they need.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 325—RECOGNIZING THE SERIOUSNESS OF POLYCYSTIC OVARY SYNDROME (PCOS) AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2021 AS "PCOS AWARENESS MONTH"

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. BALDWIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 325

Whereas polycystic ovary syndrome (referred to in this preamble as "PCOS") is a common health problem among women and girls involving a hormonal imbalance;

Whereas there is no universal definition of PCOS, but researchers estimate that between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000 women in the United States are affected by the condition;

Whereas, according to a 2004 study, the annual burden of PCOS in the United States is an estimated \$4,360,000,000, and this figure pertains to only the reproductive years of women and does not consider the cost of other comorbidities, including obstetrical complications, or the cost of metabolic morbidities in post-menopause or adolescence;

Whereas PCOS can affect girls at the onset of puberty and throughout the remainder of their lives;

Whereas the symptoms of PCOS include infertility, irregular or absent menstrual periods, acne, weight gain, thinning of scalp hair, excessive facial and body hair growth, numerous small ovarian cysts, pelvic pain, and mental health problems;

Whereas women with PCOS have higher rates of mental health disorders, including depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, and eating disorders, and are at greater risk for suicide;

Whereas adolescents with PCOS often are not diagnosed, and many have metabolic dysfunction and insulin resistance, which can lead to type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, obstructive sleep apnea, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, and endometrial cancer at a young adult age;

Whereas PCOS is the most common cause of female infertility;

Whereas PCOS in pregnancy is associated with increased risk of gestational diabetes, preeclampsia, pregnancy-induced hypertension, preterm delivery, cesarean delivery, miscarriage, and fetal and infant death;

Whereas women with PCOS are at increased risk of developing high blood pressure, high cholesterol, stroke, and heart disease (the leading cause of death among women);

Whereas women with PCOS have a more than 50 percent chance of developing type 2 diabetes or prediabetes before the age of 40;

Whereas women with PCOS may be at a higher risk for breast cancer and ovarian cancer, and their risk for developing endometrial cancer is 3 times higher than women who do not have PCOS;

Whereas research has found genetic evidence of a link between depression and PCOS;

Whereas research has indicated PCOS shares a genetic architecture with metabolic

traits, as evidenced by genetic correlations between PCOS and obesity, fasting insulin, type 2 diabetes, lipid levels, and coronary artery disease;

Whereas adolescents with PCOS are at markedly increased risk for type 2 diabetes, fatty liver disease, and heart disease;

Whereas PCOS negatively alters metabolic function independent of, but exacerbated by, an increased body mass index (BMI);

Whereas an estimated 50 percent of women with PCOS are undiagnosed, and many remain undiagnosed until they experience fertility difficulties or develop type 2 diabetes or other cardiometabolic disorders;

Whereas the cause of PCOS is unknown, but researchers have found strong links to a genetic predisposition and significant insulin resistance, which affects up to 70 percent of women with PCOS; and

Whereas there is no known cure for PCOS: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes polycystic ovary syndrome (referred to in this resolution as “PCOS”) as a serious disorder that impacts many aspects of health, including cardiometabolic, reproductive, and mental health, and quality of life;

(2) expresses support for the designation of September 2021 as “PCOS Awareness Month”;

(3) supports the goals and ideals of PCOS Awareness Month, which are—

(A) to increase awareness of, and education about, PCOS and its connection to comorbidities, such as type 2 diabetes, endometrial cancer, cardiovascular disease, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, and mental health disorders, among the general public, women, girls, and health care professionals;

(B) to improve diagnosis and treatment of PCOS;

(C) to disseminate information on diagnosis, treatment, and management of PCOS, including prevention of comorbidities such as type 2 diabetes, endometrial cancer, cardiovascular disease, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, and eating disorders; and

(D) to improve quality of life and outcomes for women and girls with PCOS;

(4) recognizes the need for further research, improved treatment and care options, and a cure for PCOS;

(5) acknowledges the struggles affecting all women and girls afflicted with PCOS in the United States;

(6) urges medical researchers and health care professionals to advance their understanding of PCOS to improve research, diagnosis, and treatment of PCOS for women and girls; and

(7) encourages States, territories, and localities to support the goals and ideals of PCOS Awareness Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 326—COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF PERU

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 326

Whereas July 2021 marks two centuries of Peru's independence from Spain, an occasion also referred to as “Las Fiestas Patrias”;

Whereas Peru's proclamation of independence in July 1821 marked a historical turning point at a time when countries in the hemisphere were collectively on a quest for independence and freedom;

Whereas Peru's Act of Independence was written by Manuel Pérez de Tudela—a prominent Peruvian attorney and patriot—and took place in Lima on July 15, 1821;

Whereas, on July 28, 1821, José Francisco de San Martín—an Argentine General who helped propel independence movements in the region and who played a pivotal role in Peru's independence—proclaimed at the Plaza de Armas, “Since this moment, Peru is free and independent by the general will of the people and by justice of their cause that God defends. Long live the Homeland! Long live freedom! Long live independence!”;

Whereas the road to Peru's independence consisted of a long and arduous process, initiated decades prior through the various uprisings of mestizo and indigenous populations who protested their oppression and sought to improve their rights and livelihoods;

Whereas Peru's proclamation of independence marked the beginning of the people of Peru's quest to establish a government committed to advancing the democratic rights and prosperity of its citizens;

Whereas the United States established diplomatic relations with Peru in 1827 and today both countries enjoy a strategic partnership based on shared democratic values and interests of democratic governance, the rule of law, security, economic prosperity, and human rights;

Whereas the bonds of association and friendship between the peoples of the two countries have been strengthened by the large number of Peruvians who have migrated to the United States where they make significant contributions to both the United States and Peru; and

Whereas Peruvians and Peruvian-Americans residing in the United States have enriched and added to the United States way of life in the social, economic, and political arenas, and Peru's rich identity and heritage have become an integral part of the cultural tapestry of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 200th anniversary of the independence of Peru;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of Peru's independence in the Western Hemisphere and reaffirms its commitment to supporting the people of Peru in their quest for further development, stability, and prosperity;

(3) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Peru are committed; and

(4) celebrates the contributions that Peruvians and Peruvian Americans have made in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 327—AMENDING THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE TO REQUIRE INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENTS IN COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 327

Resolved, That paragraph 11 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (c) as subparagraph (d);

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (b) the following:

“(c) Each committee report shall also contain a detailed analytical statement as to

whether, and the extent to which, the increased budget authority, outlays, or revenue produced by the enactment of the bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy. The statement shall also include whether, and the extent to which, the inflationary impact would affect the purchasing power of low and middle income families.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (d), as so redesignated, by striking “subparagraphs (a) and (b)” and inserting “subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c)”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have 12 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 10 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 28, 2021, at 9 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 28, 2021 at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 11:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 4, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kimi Chernoby and Daniel Elchert, fellows who are assigned to my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this year.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Andrew Zacher and Hannah Oakley, fellows who are assigned to my office, be granted floor privileges through September 1, 2022.

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges today, July 28, 2021: Bryce Billiot and Will Sirmon.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 29, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Thursday, July 29; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 3684, with all time during adjournment of the Senate counting postcloture on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:16 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 29, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ADRIENNE WOJCIECHOWSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE KENNETH STEVEN BARBIC.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARK GITENSTEIN, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE EUROPEAN UNION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY. LAURA S. H. HOLGATE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE VIENNA OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

LAURA S. H. HOLGATE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PATRICIA MAHONEY, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC.

JULISSA REYNOSO PANTALEON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SPAIN, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PRINCIPALITY OF ANDORRA.

PETER HENDRICK VROOMAN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

LISA M. GOMEZ, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE PRESTON RUTLEDGE.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

ERIK ADRIAN HOOKS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE PETER GAYNOR, RESIGNED.

WILLIAM J. VALDEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE CLAIRE M. GRADY.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28, 2021:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

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.