

violation case against a family that is clearly fleeing Russian persecution.

CICIG is supposed to be above reproach. Yet it collaborates with a state-owned Russian bank that, incidentally, is currently under U.S. sanctions. The CICIG is doing the bidding of Putin's henchmen in its acting as the long arm of Russia's dictatorship. The intervention of a Kremlin-controlled bank shows that influencing CICIG is a part of the Kremlin's broader campaign to exert pressure across Latin America, and we ought to be concerned about that.

Earlier this month, in the Wall Street Journal, Ms. O'Grady wrote that the creeping intervention from Moscow is designed to damage U.S. interests by destabilizing liberal democracy.

ADM Craig Faller, the commander of the U.S. Southern Command, told the Senate Armed Services Committee that Russia is flooding Latin America's internet, social media, and television outlets with original and reproduced propaganda to sow doubt about U.S. intentions. Russia has also provided crucial financial support to the infamous Maduro regime in Venezuela, and it competes with the United States to provide military support for regional partners.

Another strategic competitor, China, is also seeking to influence important U.S. partners in Latin America. China has provided more than \$140 billion in Belt and Road Initiative loan commitments. Beijing is now Latin America's second largest trading partner.

Although CICIG once played a significant role in exposing and prosecuting serious corruption, it has now fallen victim to Lord Acton's famous observation—that power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

President Morales has made a decision, as the duly elected head of a sovereign country, that he will no longer tolerate an increasingly neocolonial force. The United States should stand behind this decision. The CICIG was never supposed to stay indefinitely.

This move by the Guatemalan Government does not absolve its own responsibility to fight corruption. Indeed, we should demand a redoubling of these efforts. As a critical country in the Western Hemisphere, a return to pre-CICIG conditions would be unacceptable. This is the chance for Guatemalans to work toward the justice that CICIG abandoned with its complicity in Moscow's vendetta. This should begin with an end to the Bitkov family's long nightmare. Their ordeal has gone way beyond a miscarriage of justice, and with CICIG's being gone, Guatemala must do the right thing without further delay or excuse.

In conclusion, the duly constituted Government of Guatemala has made the right decision and should be congratulated for yesterday's action. The country's leadership took a necessary step in asserting its sovereignty and in ending a dysfunctional relationship

with CICIG, a well-intended agency that has exceeded its mandate and outlived whatever usefulness it may initially have had.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WICKER). The Senator from Colorado.

RECOGNIZING OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to honor our men and women in law enforcement. As Members of Congress and their staffs head home this holiday season, we must remember the sacrifice of those who make our communities safe, those who make our safety possible.

This year, across the United States, 143 law enforcement officers have paid the ultimate price.

In Colorado, we honor three fallen officers. We honor Deputy Sheriff Heath McDonald Gumm, whose final act was to bravely pursue an armed suspect. We will never forget the courage and bravery of his action. We honor Deputy Sheriff Micah Lee Flick, who was killed in the line of duty in February of this year after serving in the El Paso County Sheriff's Office for 11 years. We also honor the memory of Sergeant Matthew Moreno, who was killed in the line of duty in Las Animas County just last week. He was responding to reports of domestic violence when his cruiser and that of another officer's crashed into a civilian's vehicle that was headed in the opposite direction. Unfortunately, the occupants of the other vehicle, including a 1-year-old child, also lost their lives.

The pain of losing loved ones this close to the holidays is unimaginable.

Sergeant Moreno ends his watch after having served honorably for 5 years. He is survived by his loving family, including his three beautiful children, Summer, Morgan, and Jared. He has been described as being a superhero to his kids. It seems very fitting given the bravery that he showed throughout his career. He is also remembered for his sense of humor and his love for hunting and fishing—something all Coloradans can relate to. Our prayers are certainly with Sergeant Moreno's family and with the families of those in the other vehicle. I also offer my sincere condolences to the entire Las Animas County Sheriff's Department. The officers have not just lost a fellow officer but a brother.

All of the officers whom we lost this year were neighbors, beloved family members, and extraordinary Coloradans who gave their lives to protect their communities. Although the need is great, so few of us are blessed with the level of bravery and courage shown each and every day by the men and women in law enforcement.

As we all enjoy the warmth of this holiday season, law enforcement officers around the country will stand guard in cold and uncertain streets. This includes the selfless men and

women who serve right here in the U.S. Capitol, who work through the holidays to ensure that every American who visits the Nation's Capitol can do so safely. It is important that we keep them in our thoughts as we gather with family and friends this holiday season to celebrate.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the families of these brave men and women whose sacrifices must not be forgotten. They endure time apart from their loved ones so that families, like millions across this country, will know peace and security during their holiday celebrations.

When thinking about the brave men and women who defend that thin blue line, I am always reminded of the words of LTC Dave Grossman, who said, "American law enforcement is the loyal and brave sheepdog—always standing watch for the wolf that lurks in the dark." It is my hope that the thoughts and prayers we all offer to those who wear the blue uniform will bring them comfort as they carry out this solemn duty. I am thankful for their service and thankful to their families for their continued sacrifice.

I am also reminded of the words of Joe Rice, a former State legislator in Colorado, with whom I served. He served multiple tours in Iraq and Afghanistan and wrote how he prays for his fellow soldiers and their safety each and every day by saying and praying:

For all of those around the world in harm's way, we pray with you. Please God, just not today.

Each and every day, we echo that same prayer.

Thank you to the men and women in blue.

I also thank my colleague from New Jersey, Senator MENENDEZ, for allowing me to speak out of turn. I greatly appreciate it.

I thank the Presiding Officer for taking the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from New Jersey.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I am going to be shortly joined by my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE, for an exchange we will have, but in order to preserve the time on the floor, I will start.

I come to the floor today to once again join the Senator from Rhode Island in calling attention to the crisis that is climate change. I want to thank my friend Senator WHITEHOUSE for his passion, his persistence, and his refusal to let the Senate be silent in the face of one of the greatest threats to ever confront our Nation and the world.

Some say we can't afford to invest in clean, renewable, American-made energy. I say we cannot afford not to. The fact is, every year that goes by without a comprehensive strategy to reduce the

carbon pollution responsible for warming our planet is another year in which the Federal Government of the United States fails to protect future generations from the immense environmental, economic, and human costs inflicted by climate change.

I yearn for the day that this body summons the courage to stand up to the special interests and boldly confront this challenge, for the longer we wait, the more expensive and the less effective we will be. And if you don't believe me, just look at our National Flood Insurance Program, which is already in dire need of comprehensive, forward-thinking reform.

I have spent the better part of the past 2 years bringing Democrats and Republicans together in support of such a plan. Yet the majority has stubbornly refused to debate our legislation, forcing us to pass short-term reauthorizations that preserve a broken status quo. Like the totality of the climate threat, when it comes to flood insurance, every time we kick the can down the road, the can only gets heavier.

For our coastal and inlet communities, climate change isn't some far-out problem; it is here. We are already feeling the effects and bearing the costs in the form of rising sea levels and increasingly powerful storms. Even if the President of the United States suddenly reversed course and put America on a path to slow our changing climate, we would still need to address how we manage a heightened risk for flooding. From fishing, to tourism, to trade and so much more, the fact is, America's coastal communities are vital to our long-term economic competitiveness, and to give up on them in the face of rising sea levels would be to give up on our country.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, sea level rise will put an estimated 325,000 homes and businesses, worth more than \$135 billion, at risk of chronic flooding in the next 30 years. With increased risks for flooding comes a whole host of challenges. Falling property values will further strain local budgets, leading to downgraded government credit ratings. As communities lose out on approximately \$1.5 billion in property taxes per year, hard-working taxpayers will feel the pain. It will cut away at middle-class families' most valuable asset, the foundation of their financial nest egg, which is their home.

According to a paper published by the University of Pennsylvania Libraries, "As sea level rise manifests along the coasts—reducing property value—impacts on revenue will present new challenges in servicing debt . . . and present a greater probability of default by local government."

We cannot simply keep spending money to preserve the status quo. We need a system for managing flood risk that pushes our country toward resiliency and treats our people and the communities they live in fairly. But,

unfortunately, we have remained at an impasse for over a year now, unable to fix a program that we all know is badly broken.

We in New Jersey witnessed firsthand the pervasive problems plaguing the National Flood Insurance Program—or what we call NFIP—after Superstorm Sandy hit in 2012. It was bad enough that so many New Jerseyans had to grapple with the heartbreaking loss of their homes in the wrath of Sandy, so it made my blood boil to see the suffering compounded by a badly broken flood insurance program. We found ourselves lost in a system that put the policyholder last and that looked for every reason to deny legitimate claims and made up some when they didn't exist. We had homeowners who found the foundations of their homes had washed away into the ocean, only to have their claim denied because their insurance company claimed it wasn't floodwaters but moving soil that caused the damage. The insurance adjuster didn't stop to consider that maybe it was the 5-foot storm surge that moved the soil in the first place.

This is a photograph of Doug Quinn, who served honorably in the U.S. Marines. He is a constituent whom I have gotten to know very well and who got snagged by this very loophole. As you can see from this picture, the storm surge from Sandy inundated his home, and it ripped apart his foundation, leaving a large hole in his living room. But despite paying his flood insurance premiums for years and despite serving our Nation honorably as a U.S. marine, Doug's claim was denied. Supposedly it was Earth movement, but the Earth never moved until the 5-foot storm surge came along.

We saw mitigation programs that were so cumbersome and delayed that many homeowners simply gave up. We had new flood maps come online that were 80 percent inaccurate in some counties. We had FEMA using taxpayer dollars to drag homeowners through expensive litigation until they gave up on their flood claims.

The struggles of everyday New Jerseyans revealed to me the dramatic shortcomings in our Flood Insurance Program and left me determined to fix them, so I began working on flood insurance reform that took the lessons we learned after Sandy and turned them into action.

In the summer of 2017, I introduced the Sustainable, Affordable, Fair, and Efficient—or SAFE—NFIP Act, which is a comprehensive flood insurance reform bill cosponsored by four Democrats and three Republicans here in the Senate. I know this town already has too many acronyms, but this one clearly spells out the first major goals we have in this bill. We want the NFIP—the National Flood Insurance Program—to be sustainable, we want it to be affordable, we want it to be fair, we and want it to be efficient.

Let's start with sustainability. We have to put the NFIP on the path to solvency.

Since Katrina in 2005, the NFIP has been in the red, borrowing from the Treasury Department to pay claims. Some say that we should just jack up the premiums on homeowners and keep charging more to get at this imbalance; that if we ask homeowners to pay more and more and more, eventually the NFIP will have enough money to pay all of the claims without borrowing. But higher premiums alone are not the answer. Of course we want everybody to pay their fair share, but the undeniable reality is that the more we raise the premiums, the more homeowners leave the National Flood Insurance Program altogether, and that guarantees the program's failure.

Instead of looking simply to raise prices, I want to focus on reducing costs. I believe the best way out of this hole is to make proactive investments in resiliency and mitigation to reduce the damage in the first place. In other words, we must build coastal communities that are resilient and strong, so the damage inflicted by the storms of the future is less expensive to recover. That is why the SAFE NFIP Act includes \$1 billion-per-year in mitigation funding and more than triples the maximum increased cost of compliance—or the ICC—grant from \$30,000 to \$100,000.

We also require that this funding be spent more wisely, allowing homeowners to use ICC grants before their house is destroyed. I have never understood why we require homeowners to sit in harm's way and wait for the next storm to come before we help them reduce their flood risk. It makes no sense. Our bill would fix that. By giving Americans the tools to reduce their risks, we can save the NFIP and the taxpayer billions of dollars.

Our legislation also goes after wasteful private insurance company fees, which consume about 30 cents of every premium dollar, despite taking on none of the risk. That is good business if you can get it. Don't get me wrong—that is good business if you can get it, and I have no problem with private companies making a profit, but every dollar they make comes from the pockets of policyholders.

The NFIP also currently pays about \$400 million in interest every year. That is 10 percent of its annual premiums—money that could be going toward flood prevention and mitigation. That is why our bill freezes interest payments on the NFIP debt and redirects that funding toward mitigation. Rather than paying interest to ourselves and forcing the NFIP to borrow even more, let's use that money to reduce future damages, save taxpayer dollars, and build safe communities.

We cannot have a solvent and sustainable flood insurance program if it isn't affordable to the people who depend on it. The NFIP's debt and major hurricanes have put upward pressure on premiums, making it more and more expensive to get coverage. So it is no surprise that a lot of people have been forced to drop their flood insurance.

Indeed, in the face of rising premiums, the NFIP has lost more than 650,000 policies—or over 10 percent of its total business—just since 2009. Has the risk of flooding decreased since 2009? Absolutely not. Are there fewer homes in floodplains now? No, of course not. By way of example, when you consider the floods that struck Louisiana and Texas and New Jersey in recent years, the answer is an unequivocal no. What is happening is that the premiums have just gotten too expensive for middle-class families to afford. At the end of the day, this also hurts the solvency of the NFIP because, just like every other insurance model, a small pool means a more risky, more expensive pool.

Our bill creates a first-of-its-kind, means-tested affordability program that helps middle-class and working families afford flood insurance. Pricing families out of coverage and leaving them without a way to protect their homes does nothing to address the underlying risk. On the contrary, it will be taxpayers who ultimately assume the risk when they are asked to fund uninsured disaster assistance.

It is our responsibility to taxpayers to make the NFIP as fair and as efficient as possible. I have no doubt that hundreds, if not thousands, of New Jerseyans dropped their flood insurance after Sandy because of how they were treated. They faithfully paid their premiums for years, often decades, without filing a single claim. Then, when Sandy struck and they tried to collect what they were entitled to, they had to suffer another disaster. This time it was a manmade one—the storm after the storm. After losing everything they had worked for their entire lives, they had to fight against an insurance company and a daunting Federal bureaucracy. Some appealed, some sued, and some just gave up.

I pledged to them I would never let this happen again. Our legislation makes good on that promise by putting the customer—in this case, the policyholder—first.

We close notorious loopholes that allow insurers to deny claims, such as the infamous earth-movement exclusion when we know floodwaters caused the damage.

We fix the appeals process, enforcing FEMA's own deadline to respond to homeowners and giving people who just went through a disaster more time to file their appeal.

We require engineer studies to be conducted by—imagine this—actual, licensed engineers in the State where they are operating.

We require insurance companies to provide policyholders with all of the documents used to process their claims so that homeowners aren't left in the dark.

We end the practice of private insurance companies spending hundreds of millions of policyholder premium dollars on private attorneys whose main goal is to bill as many hours as pos-

sible to ultimately deny the policyholder any resource.

Taken together, these reforms will not only give policyholders a fair shake, they will also save the NFIP resources that can be better directed to mitigation, to mapping, and to other cost-saving investments.

We have to recognize that the NFIP and its 5 million policyholders can't solve all of our Nation's flooding problems on their own. We need to invest tens of billions of dollars elevating and buying out flood-prone properties that get hit year after year, those particularly repetitively lost properties. We need to incentivize homeowners who ultimately will get out of those flood-prone properties so that they are not subject to the consequences of constantly getting flooded and we collectively are not subject to the incredible costs that are a result of that.

There simply aren't enough resources in the NFIP to even put a dent in this problem. So instead of spending hundreds of billions of dollars on disaster grants each time a storm strikes, why not spend a fraction of that on the front end that will yield real dividends in the future? When a disaster strikes, our immediate priority should always be to save lives and get survivors back to a sense of normalcy as quickly as possible.

While recovery funding is absolutely vital, it shouldn't be at the expense of rebuilding stronger, more resilient communities more capable of weathering the next storm.

We have a problem in Congress of short-termism: living in the present and not looking ahead. We are afraid of making tough political decisions in the present, even when the future is on the line. We see it with flood insurance, and we see it with climate change.

The American people desperately need Congress to overcome this short-sighted short-termism. We must start thinking beyond the storm that just hit or even the one that is on the horizon. We must begin thinking about the risk over the next several decades because flood risk is a climate risk we cannot afford to ignore. We must think about what kind of future, what kind of environment, what kind of economy we want to leave to our children and our grandchildren.

It should not matter who controls the House, who controls the Senate, or who sits in the White House. The Americans of tomorrow are depending on us, the leaders of today, to be bold, unafraid, and willing to think big. That is why I hope Republicans and Democrats alike will continue to work with me on the issue of flood insurance and flood prevention when we return in 2019.

I thank, as I said at the beginning of my comments, my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island who has really been the conscience of the Senate on this issue of climate change that affects not only those of us now here but future generations of Americans. I

have taken one slice of that in talking about the National Flood Insurance Program and how we can mitigate our way and look to a set of circumstances in which we can save enormous consequences for New Jersey families and families across our country and save the taxpayers' money. But the ultimate savings in this is beyond a new flood insurance program. It is making sure that we don't continue to see the climate change that has taken place, which creates the storms that my State endured—Superstorm Sandy—and other major superstorms across the Nation that put us at risk as a people, that put our economies at risk, that really threaten the very essence of our existence as we know it.

I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island leading us in this regard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey for joining me again this week to bring attention to the challenges that climate change and rising seas pose for our coastal communities. Our States—New Jersey and Rhode Island—shared the unforgettable experience of Superstorm Sandy, which roared ashore on higher tides and warmer oceans. We know, in New Jersey and Rhode Island, how vulnerable we are.

As sea levels rise and storms intensify, the National Flood Insurance Program should be one of our government's best tools to educate and prepare our communities for the changes that carbon pollution is driving to our coasts. But the program falls well short of this basic goal. Instead of tackling its shortfalls head-on, ahead of the next big storm, for instance, we are getting set to punt again on the Flood Insurance Program.

My Ocean State, much smaller than New Jersey, has 400 miles of coastline threatened by sea level rise and storm surge flooding, so telling homeowners and coastal businesses that we will get to it eventually is not good enough. Our coastal risk is growing, not shrinking.

A 2017 Zillow chart shows that over 4,800 homes in Rhode Island—4,800 families' homes—valued at nearly \$3 billion would be under water by 2100, using an optimistic assessment of only 6 feet of sea level rise. Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Management Council is now planning for our State to see up to 9 to 12 feet of sea level rise by then. New Jersey, of course, has even more at risk with its bigger shoreline, with over \$93 billion worth of property predicted to fall to rising seas.

This problem does not wait until the year 2100. It hits earlier. It hits as soon as 30-year mortgages and insurance get hard to come by because banks and insurers foresee these risks, and that inhibits buyers, so prices fall—perhaps prices even crash, as Freddie Mac is predicting.

Last year, GAO reported that coastal areas face particularly high financial risks and that annual coastal property losses from sea level rise and increased storms will run into the billions of dollars every year in the short run and over \$50 billion every year by late century. GAO pointed to an EPA estimate of \$5 trillion in economic costs to coastal property from climate change through 2100. Our coastal States can't laugh that off because it makes the oil industry uncomfortable to talk about climate change.

Investors, creditors, appraisers—everybody who works coastal markets—is taking notice. Last December, the credit rating agency, Moody's, adopted indicators "to assess the exposure and overall susceptibility of U.S. states to the physical effects of climate change." This is Moody's. Moody's looks particularly at coasts and at the share of a State's economic activity generated by its coastal communities. It counts the homes built on flood plains, and it counts the risk of extreme weather damage as a share of the local economy.

The managing director at Moody's told the Chicago Tribune that Moody's would be taking these risks into consideration when evaluating the credit ratings of coastal municipalities and States.

Property appraisers are also starting to incorporate these risks into their work. The Appraisal Institute's Valuation magazine quoted Rhode Island appraiser Brad Hevenor's warning that homes that receive a 30-year mortgage today "might be completely different types of property [by the end of their mortgage] than they are today." He points out, as Senator MENENDEZ pointed out, that FEMA flood maps are defective, backward-looking, and often insufficient at accurately predicting risk for communities and homeowners.

My frustrations with FEMA's flood risk maps are no secret. They are notoriously inaccurate, incomplete, and outdated. The Agency's modeling is often based on inaccurate data and on methodology from the 1970s. It has proven particularly incapable of accurately capturing the different wave and dune dynamics that determine real flood risk along coasts during major storms.

The Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, a small State agency, has had to develop its own models to provide better risk information to coastal residents and communities than FEMA provides. The contrast between the State's work and FEMA's maps highlights just how costly and potentially life-threatening reliance on FEMA's maps can be.

This map is FEMA's map relative to mean sea level for a 100-year storm hitting Charlestown, RI. Here is the code as to how much flooding to expect. The worst flooding for the homes that surround Ninigret Pond, along Rhode Island's southern coast, looks to be around 14 feet around this area here.

This map shows the CRMC's prediction for the same area for the same storm. It projects that homes in this same area may see closer to 20 feet of floodwaters, which means FEMA's map is underestimating flood risk by 6 feet.

It is not just errors in Rhode Island. Rice University and Texas A&M found that FEMA flood risk maps captured only about 25 percent of the actual damage from storms that hit Houston between 1999 and 2009—25 percent. According to the Houston Chronicle, more than half of homes damaged by Hurricane Harvey were not listed in any flood risk areas, meaning they were not required to have flood insurance or meet any flood risk mitigation building codes.

Congress continues to fund these maps on the cheap, leaving Americans to bear the risk of antiquated models that don't reflect the changes that climate change is bringing to our coasts. Families are forced to endure the repeated damage and destruction of their homes, and taxpayers are made to pay the cost of over and over and over rebuilding the same building in the same place that is already washed away.

After Hurricane Harvey in 2017, the Flood Insurance Program hit its \$30 billion borrowing limit. We maxed out. So in October of 2017, Congress had to forgive \$16 billion worth of debt to free up money to pay off claims for Harvey, Irma, and Maria. The program is currently at least \$20 billion in debt, and claims from the 2018 hurricane season are still being processed. The Congressional Research Service, as of September 2018, found that the program had only \$9.9 billion of remaining borrowing authority.

It is time to get serious about reforming this broken system and reform it for a changing climate and for changing coasts—the things we know are coming at us. The current system often leaves homeowners no option but to rebuild the same building in the same place on the flooded property. CRS estimates that only about 2 percent of current NFIP-related properties are considered repetitive loss or severe repetitive loss properties—only 2 percent, but that 2 percent accounts for 16 percent of claims, \$9 billion. Over the life of the NFIP, those repetitive loss or severe repetitive loss properties have totaled around 30 percent of all claims, about \$17 billion.

Insurance should allow homeowners to walk away from flood-torn structures and go find new, safer homes. Currently, only States or municipalities can use FEMA to arrange buyouts of flood-prone properties. FEMA then provides up to 75 percent of funding for the local government to buy the property at fair market value, and then it becomes open space. But the buyout process is cumbersome, it is bureaucratic, it is not in the hands of the homeowners, and it doesn't get much use. How many mayors and city councils want to buy out and turn to public use valuable property that is a part of

their tax base and encourage folks, potentially, to leave?

The flood program should work with communities to plan for cost-effective resiliency to flooding, whether it is elevating properties, moving homes, or retreating from rising seas. Homeowners should have these options. It is willful blindness to ignore this problem as seas continue to rise and storms become more unpredictable and ferocious, and it is even worse when you compound it with false and erroneous mapping so that the warnings to these families are wrong.

Property owners and communities deserve proper warning about the flood risks they face, and they deserve alternatives to simply rebuilding the same building in the same place so that it can be flooded again and again and again, which the program now forces them to do.

With so much at risk for American families, it is time to wake up and put in place a smart and reliable system once and for all.

I yield the floor, with my gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey in joining me here today.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF CHAI FELDBLUM

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to raise concerns about the unprecedented and partisan obstruction of a highly qualified nominee to a critical agency.

In this country, it is illegal to discriminate against someone in the workplace because of the traits that make them who they are—their race, religion, sex, disability, and more—and it is the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's responsibility to enforce those laws and give every person the opportunity to make a living for themselves without fear of discrimination or harassment.

Right now, a single Republican Senator is threatening to derail the confirmation of Ms. Feldblum for another term on the EEOC. Ms. Feldblum has served two terms on the EEOC, where she has earned the respect of her professional colleagues on both sides of the aisle. She has strong support from Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, and she has been confirmed by this Senate twice.

When it comes to independent boards and commissions, including the EEOC, the Senate has a longstanding practice of pairing nominees—one from the majority party and one from the minority party. This is so important because it allows the minority party the opportunity to have a voice. In this case, it allows my Democratic colleagues and me to ensure that employers are held accountable for workers' rights and safety on the job. This practice is also important to bipartisanship in the Senate. Part of that longstanding practice is that the majority cannot railroad