

have online voter registration. Then you have online absentee ballot requests and offers the requirement for no-excuse absentee ballots, which I guess, according to my friend, the election administrator, would be mail ballots. I am going to get better at explaining that phrase. It tells States how and when their ballots must be delivered. It tells them when they have to be counted. It requires States to permit ballot harvesting.

Ballot harvesting is the only thing, I think in a decade, that a candidate elected to the House of Representatives was not seated because the House—this House, the current House of Representatives—decided that ballot harvesting was the reason that person shouldn't be seated; that people went around, collected ballots, apparently decided which ballots they were going to mail in and which ballots they were not going to mail in—if you look at the House determination that this person wasn't lawfully elected. But this bill actually requires States to allow individuals to go and collect ballots and turn them in, in groups rather than some other way.

If States want to do that, they can do that. But apparently, it was not good enough to seat a Member of the House of Representatives from my party. It tells States how they must authenticate their ballots. It prohibits them, however, from using any form of voter identification to authenticate who the person is. It tells States what kind of envelopes they have to use to put their ballots in.

What doesn't it do? It doesn't recognize, again, that for almost 250 years, States have successfully run elections in this country. If the returns were in question, the people who were the local election officials and the State election officials were the people who were questioned. There was no ability to say "Well, that is out of our hands" or "Well, we don't really have anything to say about that. Some person in Washington tells us what we have to do about that."

States have successfully run elections during national disasters. States have successfully run elections during pandemics. States have successfully run elections during wartime.

On March 3, 2020, on Super Tuesday, early that morning, a tornado struck three counties in Tennessee. Election officials were able to use the flexibility they had as State officials to, No. 1, adjust the polling location and, No. 2, move election equipment and carry out the primary election successfully and without challenge. None of that, in my view would have been allowed if this bill had been in effect.

Similarly, in response to the pandemic, many States, as I suggested Missouri has, have changed their law and looked for ways to make this process work. They have had a chance to try—in most cases already in the primary or in some other elections, States have changed their primary dates; they

have expanded absentee balloting; they have expanded early voting; they have altered polling place procedures to ensure cleaning and sanitizing; and they have worked to recruit more workers.

This bill, in my view, doesn't acknowledge the important responsibility and answerability that local and State officials have on election day. That was a job I had for about 20 years, part of that as the chief election official in the State. I will just state that on election day nothing is more important than voters feeling like their vote was cast in the right way and counted in the right way, and there was nobody but me to blame at the county level and then again at the State level if that didn't happen.

So I think my friend Senator KLOBUCHAR's comments are well-intended and well-motivated. I just think we have a fundamental difference on who makes these decisions. I would recommend to all of my colleagues that if we ever make these kinds of changes, we should make them long before 6 months before a Presidential election. If this bill were law, State and local officials would not only lose the flexibility they now have, but they would have a new place to pass the buck.

This is one of the desks that Harry Truman used on the Senate floor, and he didn't have a "pass the buck" symbol yet, but he famously had behind his desk, as President, a sign that said "The buck stops here." On these issues, the buck stops with the person you have chosen locally and statewide to run your elections. I think that continues to be the best course for us to follow.

Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague for his work and his friendship. We obviously don't agree on every aspect of this. I did enjoy hearing his desk story. I didn't know he had Harry Truman's desk. When I got to the Senate, I asked for the desk of Hubert Humphrey, the "happy warrior," and about 8 months later, the desk arrived, and they had accidentally given me the desk of Gordon Humphrey, the former Senator from New Hampshire, and I had it for quite a while. In a new Senate, I one day opened up the desktop and saw that they had replaced it with the desk of Hubert Humphrey. So I would give these comments in the spirit of the "happy warrior"; that is, while you and I disagree on setting these standards, at this moment I think we should; I think if not now, when?

When it comes to things such as not having notaries for getting a ballot and things like that, I am heartened by the fact that, No. 1, we have a hearing, which has been asked for—I think it is really important, and I appreciate that—on this upcoming election.

No. 2, you continue to be open to discussing with me and with the Appro-

priations Committee the funding as we go into November. I think that is really going to be important for all voters, whether in red, blue, or purple States. We know that so many people vote by mail, including the President of the United States with a ballot from Palm Beach, FL. We all want to have that ability and make sure people in our States have an ability to either vote by mail or vote safely at the polling places this fall.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

THE JUSTICE ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today on the eve of what should be a routine vote in the U.S. Senate. Tomorrow the Senate is scheduled to vote on a motion to proceed to the justice reform legislation that we ought to be considering in the U.S. Senate.

It is important to point out to the American people what that means. This isn't a vote yet on passage of the bill. It is not a vote to end debate. It is not a vote to amend the debate. Any Senator can amend, vote no, or offer different substitutes for the bill. This isn't any of those things. The motion to proceed is a simple and rather routine agreement to begin debate on a bill. Yet, here we are. It has turned out to be anything but routine.

Senators on the other side of the aisle in this very Chamber are threatening to filibuster the motion to proceed—filibuster even allowing us to debate a bill of great importance to the Nation.

In terms the American public might better recognize, the Democrats are threatening to filibuster the very issue—the very issue—that they claim to care about. If you listen to them on television, if you see them in the streets, talking to groups, they claim to care about it. Welcome to the bizarre world of partisan politics and bankrupt leadership on that side of the aisle.

On the same day that the minority leader will come to the floor to urge the Senate to pass justice reform legislation, he will also attempt to rally his Democratic caucus to block even starting a debate, and they seem to be following him, refusing to even debate an issue which is so key in the minds of the American people. He is telling his Members to filibuster the bill.

Madam President, the JUSTICE Act deserves a debate. It deserves a debate for the American people to see and to hear and to watch on television. The American people deserve that. What they don't deserve is partisan obstruction. What they don't deserve is a filibuster. They need a debate. Amend the bill if necessary and then pass it. We want to try to stop what happened to George Floyd—a murder that we all witnessed—from ever happening again in America.

The American people know that. They took to the streets, and now they

are turning their heads to Washington, to the Capitol, and saying: What can you do to make sure that something like this never happens again?

We have a bill that addresses all of these issues, a bill that is ready to come for a debate. Yet, again, the Democrats are threatening and are likely tomorrow to vote one after another after another to go up and vote no to even beginning debate on the bill.

Incredibly, they began knocking this bill authored by Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina with many of us as original cosponsors—they began knocking this bill before they ever read it, before they knew what was in it. They attacked it before it was released. While the bill was still in the process of being written, they were attacking it. Then Senator TIM SCOTT unveiled the legislation, and almost immediately the Democrats decided to agonize over whether to block it. They were agonizing over allowing a debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate—agonizing over a debate. I mean, you could hear them in the halls: I don't know. Should we get on it? Shouldn't we get on it?

What was the issue? Racial justice. We need to be focusing on that and discussing it and passing meaningful legislation that will make measurable progress. It shouldn't be a tough call.

Senator SCHUMER came and said: We should have a bill on the floor by July 4. Here we are; it is before July 4. We brought the bill. It has a 70-percent overlap and agreement with what the House has to offer.

Here we are, yet Senator SCHUMER is telling his Democrats to line up, one by one by one, and say: No, we don't want to debate or even discuss your bill even though it has a 70-percent overlap in agreement with what the House of Representatives is offering as a meaningful solution to a concern that all of us have.

I don't say this often, but Senator SCHUMER ought to listen to NANCY PELOSI because the Speaker knows we are not that far apart. The Pelosi and the Scott bills share many of the same goals—much of the same underlying legislation. Senator SCOTT says that they agree 70 percent of the time on the issues. At one point, Speaker PELOSI said that she would love to go to conference with what we have going on in the Senate. The Wall Street Journal, last Wednesday, published a chart, and it showed just how similar the two bills are—the JUSTICE Act in the Senate and the bill that the House is working on as well.

The Scott bill ensures that both African-American communities and law enforcement communities are protected. This is precisely why the JUSTICE Act can and should become law. Without a doubt, this is our Nation's best chance for change—best chance in 25 years. It is the best chance to put the 1994 Biden crime bill in the rearview mirror. It is a chance to pass meaningful reforms and a chance to make a law that actu-

ally makes a difference—a difference in communities all across the country and in the lives of people all around America.

So Democrats will be asked to vote tomorrow, and they have a choice to make. They can continue to filibuster, to say "No, no, no, we don't even want to get on the bill to debate it" or to offer amendments to improve upon it, to look for common ground. Or they can do what apparently they want to do, which is to continue the status quo, which is not what we need in America today. They ought to be embracing bipartisan reform.

The JUSTICE Act is not—as one Democrat on this very Senate floor sadly described—a token. That is what he said on this Senate floor. This reform bill is serious. This reform bill is significant. This reform bill is substantial, and we should pass it. At a minimum, we should at least debate it on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Democrats plan to filibuster simply debating the bill. They should be held accountable by the very American people that they claim they are looking to help—claim they are looking to help. Well, they have an opportunity to help all American people when we vote tomorrow.

So I urge my Senate Democratic colleagues: Do not filibuster this historic bill. This is a wonderful opportunity to move our country ahead. We can build on the progress of the last 4 years—opportunity zones, permanent funding for historically Black colleges and universities, the FIRST STEP Act. Let's build on this record. Let's debate it. Let's amend it as we see fit, and then let us pass the JUSTICE Act and send it to the conference committee that Speaker PELOSI talks about, and then send a bill to the President of the United States and have it signed into law and help our country move ahead.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I may require.

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

#### PROTESTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, the late historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., said this: "Self-righteousness in retrospect is easy—also cheap." The late Samuel Huntington, who was a Harvard professor of U.S. history and politics, wrote, in effect, that most of our politics is about setting great goals for ourselves—we, the American people—and then the struggle we have

with the disappointment we feel when we don't reach those high goals, like "all men are created equal."

Ben Hooks, who was from Memphis and a well-known citizen of our State and a good friend and once president of the NAACP, used to tell his students at the University of Memphis:

Remember that our country, America, is a work in progress. We've come a long way, but we have a long way to go.

It is in light of those three comments that I would like to discuss the effort that some people made last night to tear down President Andrew Jackson's statue in Lafayette Square across from the White House.

I believe it is always appropriate to review the monuments and the places that we name to see if there is a more appropriate name in the context of today's times. For example, in this Capitol, every State has two statues. From Tennessee, it is Andrew Jackson and John Sevier.

Senator BLUNT, who is the chairman of our Rules Committee, tells us that, at any given time, some of those statues are in rotation because the State of Mississippi or Tennessee or Oregon or some other State may have decided, instead of those two individuals, we would like to send up another statue. We would like, in the context of today's times, to name somebody else.

As we think about statues that are already named for generals in the Confederacy or the Union—a war that was fought a long time ago—it is appropriate, I think, to keep in mind that we have had a lot of wars since then: two World Wars, Korea, Vietnam. We have had a lot of very distinguished generals. We have had courageous Congressional Medal of Honor winners. Maybe in the context of today's times, there is a place for Camp MacArthur or Camp Eisenhower or Alvin C. York, who is a Congressional Medal of Honor winner and hero from Tennessee. It is always appropriate to review the places that are named and the monuments we put up to see if there should be a better name or a better place for a monument in the context of today's times.

But what about Andrew Jackson, whose statue is one that the State of Tennessee has sent here, whose statue is of him on a horse outside the White House at Lafayette Square? The similar statue is in Jackson Square in New Orleans. What about Andrew Jackson? Let's make the case for Andrew Jackson.

Presidential historians, almost without exception, put him in the top 10 of America's Presidents. They see him as the sophisticated, often subtle political actor that he really was. What they realize—and, unfortunately, what only dedicated students of the American Presidency often realize—is that Jackson was arguably the most important American President between Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln because, much like Lincoln, he preserved the Union. If not for Jackson's devotion to the Union against his own local