

known euphemistically as Medicare for All. He supports destroying union healthcare plans, crushing Medicare Advantage, and ultimately taking away your health insurance on the job, which covers, I would add, 158 million Americans. This disastrous boondoggle would cost \$34 trillion and would inevitably result in the rationing of care, hurting senior citizens most of all. Medicare for All would, in reality, result in Medicare for None.

Last year, President Biden acknowledged that Medicare for All would yield massive tax hikes for middle-class families. Yet Joe Biden selected a supporter of this disastrous Medicare for All plan to be his top Cabinet official on healthcare.

And, of course, Mr. Becerra wouldn't be a Biden administration nominee if he didn't also support open borders. But he has gone further on open borders than even most of the other Biden administration officials, saying out loud what so many Democrats silently believe. He has openly argued for the decriminalization of illegal immigration. He has even stated with a straight face that illegal immigration does absolutely no harm at all, directly or indirectly, to American citizens. If Mr. Becerra really believes that, he is hopelessly naive and needs to get out a little more.

He can start by talking to the millions of Americans who are out of work or whose wages have stagnated thanks to competition from illegal aliens. He could also visit the graves of thousands of Americans killed by Mexican drugs and terrorized by gangs like MS-13. If confirmed, Mr. Becerra would oversee our Nation's response to the drug crisis and the maintenance of many migrant detention facilities. His radical open borders advocacy would make matters worse on both fronts. It would also fuel the ever-growing surge of unvetted, untested, and unvaccinated illegal aliens into our Nation, spreading the coronavirus in our communities just as it looks like we are about to turn the corner on this pandemic.

Finally, Mr. Becerra holds opinions on abortion that are unacceptable, unjust, and far outside the mainstream. As a Member of Congress, he voted in favor of partial-birth abortion—a disturbing and deadly procedure performed in the very last stages of pregnancy. As California's attorney general, he tried to destroy anyone who opposed his extreme position on this issue. He brought 15 felony charges against pro-life, undercover journalists who exposed Planned Parenthood's illegal and disgusting sale of baby body parts—a move that even the liberal Los Angeles Times called “disturbingly aggressive.” He defended an unconstitutional law that would have forced pro-life crisis pregnancy centers to advertise for abortions, the very thing it is their mission to oppose—something that the U.S. Supreme Court called a “serious threat” to freedom of speech.

He even sued to force an order of nuns, the Little Sisters of the Poor, to

purchase healthcare coverage that violated their sincerely held religious beliefs. And when he was asked about all of this in the Senate, like any bully, he tried to cover it up, denying that he sued the Little Sisters at all. If he will sue the Little Sisters, then what will he do to you and your family?

A few of my colleagues have indicated that they will vote for Mr. Becerra, despite disagreeing with these radical views. Perhaps they think those are just his personal beliefs, that he won't practice what he preaches. Perhaps they think he won't undermine pro-life protections like the Hyde Amendment and use his office to persecute Catholic nuns. I would ask those colleagues to look at Mr. Becerra's record, not the words he utters to get their vote, and then to reconsider their support because any honest assessment will show that Xavier Becerra is a partisan cultural warrior who has consistently abused his office to punish his enemies and to enact far-left policies in Congress and in California.

If the Senate confirms his nomination, they will be empowering Mr. Becerra to bring California's lockdowns, lawsuits, and liberal policies to all of our 50 States, and that would be a disaster for our country.

I will close with a simple request for President Biden, who campaigned on unity and ending a terrible pandemic: Merely do what you said you would do. Send us a nominee who will unify the country and bring consensus, not one who will scrape by on the slimmest of majorities. Send us a nominee who is actually a healthcare expert, and the Senate will gladly consider them. Xavier Becerra is not that nominee, and the Senate should reject his nomination resoundingly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, about 1 year ago today, Congress was in the midst of a debate about the most effective way to respond to COVID-19. On a call with his colleagues, the House majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, reportedly laid out his vision about how his caucus in the House should proceed. He said, it is reported: This is a tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit our vision.

For American families, this pandemic has been an unmistakable tragedy, one characterized by lost lives and lost livelihoods, but, apparently, for some, it is viewed as a tremendous opportunity.

The partisan \$1.9 trillion bill that was signed into law last week is proof

that, apparently, the Democrats in Congress and in the White House agree. After all, this legislation includes a long list of non-COVID-related priorities, again, completely unrelated to the crisis at hand: blank checks for mismanaged union pension funds, funding for climate justice, backdoor money for Planned Parenthood, an exclusive paid leave program for government bureaucrats, and the list goes on and on.

Before the bill was even signed into law, folks from the other side of the aisle started advocating making many of the provisions permanent. This is an emergency measure, supposedly, but folks advocated making those temporary provisions permanent, further proof that this is more than just a pandemic relief response; this is about, in the words of Mr. CLYBURN, restructuring government as we know it.

But it doesn't stop there. Now our Democratic colleagues in the House and some in the Senate apparently want to hijack the State and Federal election system, starting with making temporary pandemic election responses permanent. Of course, our elections are run at the State and local level. As a matter of fact, I recall, given the efforts of the Russian intelligence services to interfere with our election in 2016, one of the strengths of our system was its dispersed nature, suggesting, in other words, that if it had been a single system, it would have been much easier for our adversaries to interfere—and particularly in the cyber realm.

But we know, as a result of the pandemic, States made provisional changes to their 2020 election processes to make sure that people could safely exercise their right to vote. In my State, we extended early voting. We allowed voters to submit mail-in ballots in designated drop boxes.

Several States, of course, expanded eligibility for mail-in voting. Some, like California, took things even further and sent mail-in ballots to every registered voter. At the time, these changes were billed as temporary, given the unique and extraordinary nature of the challenges presented by the pandemic, but as the House minority whip has said, this pandemic, apparently, is viewed as a tremendous opportunity to restructure the way we run and conduct elections.

House Democrats have passed legislation to make many of the temporary changes in the 2020 elections permanent and add a list of other so-called reforms in order to federalize our State- and local-run elections. This is in the face of article I of the Constitution that explicitly gives the States the power to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

Yet this 791-page document creates a one-size-fits-all mandate for all States. It actually preempts State law, starting with mail-in balloting. Any person in any State could request a mail-in ballot for any reason. There is no need to say why you can't vote in person,

which is the current policy in most States.

Those ballots would not, under this bill, even have to be mailed in by the voter or dropped in a State-sanctioned ballot box because this legislation legalizes ballot harvesting, which means that mail-in ballots could be collected by paid activists or campaign staffers or anyone who has a stake in the outcome of the election.

It goes so far as to specify that States may not put any limit on how many voted and sealed absentee ballots any designated person can return. It really sounds like an invitation to fraud, and you can see how this could go badly pretty quickly. Maybe the ballot gets turned in with thousands of others. Maybe it is altered. Maybe it ends up in the trash. It is hard to say.

That gets to one of the root problems with this legislation is it does create limitless opportunities for fraud. Every single ballot cast illegally or due to fraud undercuts and neutralizes every legally cast ballot.

One way this bill removes some of the most basic requirements of most States' ballot integrity safeguards against election fraud is by removing any requirement of identification. This was, we should recall, one of the main recommendations of the bipartisan 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform, cochaired by former President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State James Baker III. The Commission recommended that voters should be required to present photo ID cards and that States should provide free cards to voters who did not have a driver's license.

In order to vote in person, most States require voters to produce some valid form of identification. I know mine does. In Texas, there are three options—actually, several options: a driver's license, a passport, a military ID, a citizenship certificate, and other forms of government-issued ID. If, for some reason, you can't obtain one of these forms of ID, there is still a process in place to allow a person to vote by presenting other documents, making sure that they identify the person casting the ballot.

Matching the name of an eligible voter with the name on a valid form of ID is a commonsense safeguard against fraud but one which this legislation seeks to eliminate. If you go to a convenience store and want to buy a six-pack of beer or if you want to buy cigarettes or you want to get on an airplane, you have to present an ID card, but this bill eliminates that requirement when it comes to the most sacred duty and privilege that we have as citizens, and that is to vote.

This legislation stops States from requiring voters to provide proof of identification. Just sign a piece of paper saying you are who you are, and no one can ask any questions. On top of that, this bill would require the States to automatically register anyone in their databases, for everything from DMV to

public assistance programs. Well, we know these databases are not limited to registered voters or even eligible voters. That could include people illegally present in the country because some States allow a driver's license to be issued to noncitizens who are not legally present in the country. These databases include other noncitizens and others not eligible to vote, not to mention the fact that those who are already registered to vote could be registered again and again.

And even if there are duplicate registrations or if someone passes away or moves, States would not be allowed to clean up the voter rolls within 6 months of an election. Just when you think things can't get any crazier, they do.

Our Democratic colleagues are proposing that the taxpayers fund their elections. A lot of companies have a match program for charitable giving. If an employee donates to a charity of their choice, then the company will match that donation dollar for dollar. The same principle applies except, instead of a charity getting the money, under this proposed legislation, it is now a political candidate. Instead of a company footing the bill, it is the taxpayers, and instead of an exact match, it is up to \$6 for every \$1 donated. That means if someone donates 200 bucks to their preferred candidate, Federal taxpayers will wind up coughing up \$1,200.

Well, I think there are a lot of better uses for government tax dollars. They can go to support crime victims or support the response to the humanitarian crisis at the border, which we are experiencing right now. But, no, the proposal in this legislation is, let's use it to elect them.

Then there are the campaign vouchers. This bill creates a new program that provides eligible voters with a \$25 voucher to donate to the campaign of their choosing—again, more government, taxpayer-funded election activities.

I could go on and on.

This legislation also alters the fundamental structure of the Federal Election Commission to remove any need for bipartisanship or consensus building. It undermines trust and accountability in elections. It implements a new financial disclosure policy that even the American Civil Liberties Union says "could directly interfere with the ability of many to engage in political speech about causes that they care about." That is the ACLU.

Above all, this bill amounts to nothing more than a Federal hijacking of State elections. I can promise you, folks in my State don't want Speaker PELOSI or Majority Leader SCHUMER to determine how elections are run in our State. They want accountable leaders in our State, elected by and accountable to them, to determine the best way to conduct free and fair elections.

Following the last two Presidential campaigns, the side that lost had expressed concerns about election secu-

rity. A partisan attempt to overhaul our entire election system is hardly a confidence-building exercise. This bill is not a serious attempt to improve security and accountability in our elections; rather, it is a partisan power grab that will do serious damage to our Republic.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

RACISM

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I take no pleasure in coming to the floor today. We in the Senate take pride in our decorum and our sense of comity with each other, so much so that we often twist ourselves into pretzels to avoid saying anything that might be interpreted as a criticism of another Senator. Yet there comes a time when these verbal gymnastics simply won't do. You are either going to speak the truth or fail to do justice to the values you hold dear.

What one of our colleagues said last week about the events of January 6 was felt by many to be racist and hurtful—a stain on the office he is so fortunate to hold.

Look, I get that no one likes to be called racist, but sometimes there is just no other way to describe the use of bigoted tropes that for generations have threatened Black lives by stoking White fear of African Americans and Black men in particular.

On a radio show, our colleague explained that he never feared for his safety during the January 6 insurrection of the U.S. Capitol. But make no mistake, under different circumstances, he would have been afraid. He said:

Now, had the tables been turned—now, Joe, this will get me in trouble—had the tables been turned and President Trump won the election and those were tens of thousands of Black Lives Matter and antifa protesters, I might have been a little concerned.

Is that not racism?

I don't think the Senator is ignorant of the fact that for centuries in this country, White supremacy has thrived on using fear to justify oppression, discrimination, and violence against people of color. I do, however, think my colleague may be ignorant of the pain caused by his comments and unaware of how they compound the trauma that so many still feel in the wake of the events of January 6.

Because I do not think I can do justice to that pain, I want to share with you an email I received this weekend. It is from one of the most devoted public servants I have ever had the pleasure of working with, an African-American member of my staff. His name is Keith Roachford. He has devoted nearly three and one-half decades to serving the people of New Jersey in Congress and his community as a faithful churchgoer and Boy Scout leader. It reads:

Senator,

I would not normally send you an email like this but I am at a loss of how to express