

nominating individuals for key posts who represent a majority of Americans instead of the far-left wing of his party. I think several of the President's nominations have demonstrated his commitment to unity. While perhaps not the people I would have chosen, I believe that a number of his nominees will serve Americans well, and I have voted accordingly, casting votes in favor of President Biden's choice for Director of National Intelligence and Secretary of Defense, among others.

But unfortunately President Biden has also nominated some individuals who represent the extreme left of the Democratic Party rather than mainstream Americans, and nowhere is that more true than with his radically pro-abortion nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, Javier Becerra accumulated an overwhelmingly pro-abortion voting record, even opposing a ban on partial-birth abortion—a procedure so heinous and repulsive, it is difficult even to describe. As attorney general of California, he used his position to advance the pro-abortion cause.

On top of that, he has shown a disturbing tendency to use his position to attack freedom of religion and freedom of conscience. As California attorney general, he sued an order of nuns who care for the elderly poor to try to force them to offer health insurance benefits that violate their faith. That is right—he thought it a good use of his time as attorney general to sue an order of nuns who care for the elderly poor. He also enthusiastically sought to enforce a California law that forced crisis pregnancy centers to advertise abortion services. The case went all the way to the Supreme Court, which overturned the California law because it violated the free speech protection of the First Amendment.

It is bad to support evils like abortion. It is worse to not only support an evil but to attempt to force others to participate in it in violation of their consciences.

I know the President is a man of faith, which makes it particularly perplexing why he would choose to nominate an individual who has used his position to attack freedom of religion and freedom of conscience. As head of the Department of Health and Human Services, Mr. Becerra would have the ability to not only push an extremist abortion agenda but to roll back important progress made to protect individuals' conscience rights. I am disappointed by the President's choice. Javier Becerra's pro-abortion views do not represent the views of the majority of Americans.

I am also very disappointed by the announcement that President Biden will overturn the Mexico City policy, which protects taxpayer dollars from being used to finance abortion in other countries. This is not a unifying action. Americans were not clamoring to have their tax dollars start supporting

abortions abroad. This is only a priority for the pro-abortion lobby.

As I said, I am disappointed in the President's actions, and going forward, I hope he will not let his Presidency be hijacked by abortion extremists. But whatever policies this administration pursues, I and many of my colleagues will continue to work to promote a culture of life in this country. The arc—the arc—of the moral universe is long, but I believe it does bend towards justice. I look forward to the day that we will secure justice for unborn human beings by ensuring that they are protected.

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.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, as we move through what is appearing to be a choppy start to the 117th Congress, I think it is worth reminding ourselves of the standards that guide our work here. The mandate that we have does not come from the 24-hour news cycle or from lobbyists or advocacy groups, but it comes, very simply, from the Constitution. It is the foundation of the rule of law, our Nation's Constitution, and it really serves as a pretty good policymaking guideline.

The American people are looking at what is going on here, and they see the cracks that Washington has made in the foundation of this Constitution. These realizations have eroded their confidence in our ability as a body to perform the basic functions of government without devolving into partisan chaos when faced with disagreements.

Many times I will hear Tennesseans say: What happened to robust political debate? What happened to being able to agreeably disagree and have a discussion? Are those days totally lost, or can we return to them? They are asking themselves how many shortcuts—like Executive orders—Washington is going to take before the shortcut becomes the rule or the norm and how many times can Washington chip away at the standards that govern our country before those standards start to crumble or are not relevant.

Restoring the trust of the American people will not be easy because this fundamental lack of faith in our institutions has caused Americans to question their very safety and security in the physical space and also in the virtual world that they have been forced into by the COVID-19 pandemic.

I like to say we have a lot of security moms who are out there—moms and grandmoms like me—and, quite frankly, they are out in full force, alongside

millions of other Americans who now have cause to wonder if their own government will bother making their security a priority. What about their communities? What about their neighborhoods? What about the universities where their children go to school? What is going to be done about riots? What about the virtual space? As they have seen their children move to online school, more of their daily functional life and their transactional life has moved online. How do they keep their families safe? How do they protect their rights to privacy?

In the physical space, yesterday we got the good news that a Federal judge has granted a temporary restraining order barring the Department of Homeland Security from implementing a nationwide pause on most deportations. That pause was mandated by a DHS memo signed by the Acting Secretary on day one of the Biden administration—not such a great start for the administration's immigration policy team, but the American people will benefit from having the time that has come to them to ask questions about proposed shifts in existing policy. People want to be safe.

I would like to just stipulate for the record that immigration law is very complex. While most Americans aren't experts in the finer points of immigration law, they do have and most of us have a very common touchstone that we relate to; that is, having a secure border.

This should be a basic concept—let's secure the border; let's secure our country—but somehow we have managed to politicize that point that advocates at the highest levels of the Federal Government—for what? A weakened border. Just imagine that. You have individuals at the highest level of the Federal Government who are saying: Let's weaken our border. That is stunning, absolutely stunning to Tennesseans.

Why would you not protect your border? Why would you not want to know who is coming into your country? Why should I be forced to accept a lax border? Why should I be accepting of allowing drug cartels to run those drugs into the country? Why should I be told I should accept human trafficking; I should accept gangs; I should accept sex traffickers coming in across the border?

When we have a weak border, this is what you get. Every town—every town—becomes a border town. Every State becomes a border State because of the impacts—the negative impacts—of drug trafficking, sex trafficking, human trafficking, and the toll that that takes on our communities.

Last week, I introduced two key pieces of legislation that attack specific vulnerabilities in our body of immigration law that thousands of bad actors use to game the system every year.

The first is the Stop Greenlighting Driver Licenses for Illegal Immigrants

Act. It does exactly what it sounds like. It blocks certain Federal funds from reaching the coffers of sanctuary States. This includes States that defy Federal immigration law or that allow individuals to obtain a driver license without providing proof that they are here legally or without providing proof that they are who they claim to be. This is no small penalty, and here is why.

In 2020, our Nation had 15 States plus the District of Columbia that have decided to give illegal immigrants a valid State-issued ID, a driver license. These 15 States and DC got \$53 million in JAG grants from the Department of Justice. These are funds—these are Justice Assistance Grants that are given to local law enforcement and criminal justice projects to do what? Enforce the law. So if you are not going to enforce the law, why should you get the money? Those funds should go to entities that have said: We will abide by the rule of law. That is where those funds should go.

Now, the second bill is the Ban Birth Tourism Act. This would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit pregnant foreigners from obtaining a temporary visitor visa they could use to enter the United States specifically for the purpose of giving birth here. Yes, you heard me right. There is a loophole in the law, in the Immigration and Nationality Act. Because of this, we have some pregnant foreigners, primarily from Russia and China, who circumvent the law, and they get a temporary visitor visa, and they come here working with some of this multimillion-dollar-a-year birth tourism industry. They get coached. They come here. They go to a facility. They give birth. The child becomes a citizen, and then they return. As I said, primarily these are wealthy Russians and wealthy Chinese.

Our citizenship is not for sale. No, indeed. It is hard-fought. It is hard-won. It is hard-kept. The American people are right to expect better than this. Tennesseans want to see something done about this. That is why I, once again, have filed this legislation.

The American people are not unreasonable. They do not lack compassion. They just don't understand why officials who are charged with upholding the law would act in their official capacity to undermine something as basic as border security, as basic as national security.

We have a lot of security moms out there who understand that it is no small task keeping things secure at home. All of these security moms out there know that there are plenty of threats online—threats that they cannot see, but they know that there are a lot of these threats that come into their homes and onto their computer screens and onto the devices of their children because of a lack of privacy online.

How we curate and protect our virtual use, as I call it, is critically im-

portant because it defines who we are to the people who we do not see in person. And as I mentioned earlier, more of our functional and transactional life is now online. So tomorrow, to mark National Data Privacy Day, I will once again reintroduce the BROWSER Act.

Mr. President, as you and I served in the House together, I know you remember how I would introduce this bill, the BROWSER Act, to secure online privacy for millions of Americans. Now, at its heart, this is an effort to inject awareness, transparency, and accountability into the relationship between technology platforms and their users.

This legislation sets up a very basic Federal compliance framework that tech companies can use as a guide to update their privacy policies online, make it something that is going to give you the ability to say: This is information that I want to share.

It would require companies to secure an opt-in from consumers before collecting their sensitive data. And for less sensitive information, you, the consumer, would have the ability to opt out and not share that browsing history with that company.

Companies would not be able to deny you service if you want to practice your right to privacy. That makes common sense. It happens in the physical space every single day, and it should also be a right reserved to the individual in the virtual space.

This also would put the Federal Trade Commission, our online privacy regulator, in charge of watching what is happening in the virtual space, applying these rules equally across the entire internet ecosystem. A right to privacy, being secure in our communities and our homes, is something that not only Tennesseans but millions of Americans are wanting to see.

TRIBUTE TO HEATH HUCKABAY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, this week Team Blackburn is saying goodbye to Heath Huckabee, who came to us last January as part of a fellowship program between my office and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is located in Oak Ridge, just outside of Knoxville, TN.

It has been an interesting year to say the least, but Heath has risen to the occasion and impressed each and every one of us with his breadth of knowledge and his ability to adapt to the hectic pace of life in the Senate. We did our best to persuade him to stay with us a little longer, but I am confident that his colleagues at Oak Ridge will be happy to see him return, as well as his wife Emily and little Elliot. They are looking forward to having him home.

It was an honor working with him this past year. We will miss him, and we wish him all the best as he heads back to Tennessee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADVICE AND CONSENT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, the Senate is focused on one of its constitutional roles right now, which is meeting with and discussing with the new Biden administration's Cabinet—our advice and consent role. The consent role, obviously, is confirmation votes here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, which we are doing a number of these on the floor and in committee. But there is also the advice role, given to us by the Founding Fathers. On the advice, we are providing whether we vote for some of these nominees or not to the Cabinet. It is a big part of the Senate's role. So I am going to take a minute to provide a little bit of advice to some of the new, incoming Biden team.

Now, look, we are seeing it particularly in the foreign policy realm. A lot of the Biden team has actually come from the Obama-Biden team—maybe too many. You worry about stale thinking, because when they were in power 4 years ago, or a little bit over 4 years ago, there are a lot of things that have changed in the world—particularly on foreign policy, a lot that has happened in the world. So you need fresh views, but we are where we are.

But an example of this kind of stale thinking that I was shocked to see recently at the White House is the use of the term “strategic patience” as a foreign policy concept. Now, this was the phrase the Obama administration used to describe its policy toward North Korea, and I think most people would recognize—Democrats and Republicans—that that was not a very successful policy, a pretty failed policy.

Now, granted, North Korea is difficult. There is no doubt. But the policy that was known as strategic patience was the policy that enabled the North Korea rogue regime to massively build up a nuclear arsenal. So kind of like leading from behind, the Obama administration's term “strategic patience” became synonymous with a passive and even weak foreign policy approach as it related to North Korea, certainly.

So I was very surprised yesterday to hear the White House Press Secretary trot out this term again, “strategic patience,” but this time when talking about the Biden administration's policy with regard to China.

Now, this is almost certainly music to China's ears—the leadership of China—because it is kind of a subtle green light to Xi Jinping and the other authoritarians in China of its failure to uphold promise after promise to the United States—something I refer to as