

falsely calling me a liar on the floor of this Senate and on Twitter. That is unfortunate.

What the Senator said right now is also incorrect. The Senator from Illinois said this amendment would halt the payments that are going out. This amendment doesn't do anything of the sort. This amendment restricts sending payments to people who are here illegally. When the Senator from Illinois said he would love to do that, with all due respect, that doesn't withstand even the slightest bit of scrutiny because if he would love to do that, all he had to do was not object, and the American citizens, the people who are here legally, would all get their \$1,400 checks, would get them on the exact same timeframe, but those here illegally would not.

Today's Democratic Party supports sending checks to millions of illegal immigrants. They have justified it, as the Senator from Illinois did, by falsely claiming none of them are getting checks. Those are not the facts, as the Newsweek fact-check makes clear.

I would note that a bill that Democratic Senators are trying to push, denominated H.R. 1, what many are calling the corrupt politicians act, would compound that by allowing millions of illegal immigrants to be registered to vote and, no doubt, to cast votes.

This is a political decision that is far outside the mainstream. It is unfortunate, but sadly it reflects where today's Democratic Party is.

I yield the floor.

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 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. 17, Martin Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Brian Schatz, Amy Klobuchar, Benjamin L. Cardin, Cory A. Booker, Edward J. Markey, Angus S. King, Jr., Robert P. Casey, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, Sherrod Brown, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the nomination of Martin Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—68

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

NAYS—30

Barrasso	Hawley	Rounds
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Boozman	Inhofe	Sasse
Braun	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lummis	Shelby
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Hagerty	Risch	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Hirono
Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 30.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from West Virginia.

REMEMBERING ROBERT GUTZ THOMPSON

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life of a noble veteran, a beloved husband, father, grandfather, friend, brother, uncle, and someone I had been fortunate enough to call my dear brother-in-law, Robert Gutz Thompson.

What I always admired about Bob was his unparalleled work ethic and determination to learn and serve and to inspire those around him. Bob was a graduate of the University of Wyoming, Class of 1961. He then joined the military and entered flight training in 1963, and he was designated as a naval aviator in 1964. From the day he was motivated to join the military to his military retirement in 1983, he showcased steadfast dedication and a commitment to excellence that can only be matched by his loving devotion as part of our family.

Bob proudly served our Nation for more than 20 years and leaves behind a distinguished legacy of military history, including service aboard the USS *Intrepid*, the USS *Randolph*, the USS *Lexington*, and the USS *Forrestal*. He flew thousands of flight hours throughout his distinguished career. He trained other pilots. He commanded naval units, and he was deployed multiple times, including to the North Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Caribbean, and the Arctic Circle. He earned the Navy Achievement Medal for his perform-

ance as Landing Signal Officer during a winter deployment to the North Atlantic.

In 1967, he joined the VS-30 squadron and reported to Key West, FL, as an instructor pilot. In 1970, he was awarded the Navy Commendation Medal for recovering aircraft within the Arctic Circle. In 1972, Bob was selected for and attended the Naval War College in Rhode Island and then was assigned to the Naval Air Station Cecil Field, in Florida, to lead the squadron's relocation operations.

In 1976, he served aboard the USS *Forrestal* as operations officer. In 1979, Bob assumed command of the VS-30 squadron, where he deployed with his beloved Diamondcutters to the Mediterranean. Later that year, Bob received orders to the Pentagon to work on what is now known as GPS. His assignments were tough—squadron executive officer, squadron commander, instructor pilot, and so many more—but he was always tougher than they were. It is unbelievable the leader he was to all of those who served and served with pride.

Put simply, Bob was one of the most generous, kind, hard-working, and inspirational people I ever knew. My whole family and I adored Bob ever since he joined the family, and Bob's passing has left a deep impact on all of us. This is also an important time to celebrate Bob's life and the profound feelings of joy and pride that he brought to all of us.

While Bob wasn't born in West Virginia, he certainly was a Mountaineer, through and through, in his heart and soul and was a dedicated fan of his beloved WVU sports teams, especially football and basketball.

When visitors come to our little State, I jump at the chance to tell them we are home to the most hard-working and patriotic people in the Nation. We have fought in more wars; we have shed more blood; and lost more lives for the cause of freedom than most any other State. We have always done the heavy lifting, and no one has ever complained.

We have mined the coal, forged the steel that built the guns and ships and factories that have protected and continue to protect our country to this day.

I am so deeply proud of what West Virginians like my brother-in-law Bob Thompson have accomplished and what they will continue to accomplish to protect the freedoms that we all take for granted and hold so dear.

We have every reason to be proud and to stand tall knowing that West Virginia is the reason Americans sleep peacefully at night. It is because of all of our veterans, past and present, that we can proudly proclaim "Mountaineers Are Always Free," and we are all so very, very proud of our Bob for being a vital part of our legacy.

What is most important is that he lived a full life, surrounded by his loved ones. I extend all of our condolences to

my dear sister Janet, Bob's beloved wife of 56 years; his daughter Mary Jo; his son Peter; granddaughter Isabella; his siblings, Mary, Greg, Kathy, and Clark; his 24 Thompson nieces and nephews; his brothers-in-law John and Rock; sister-in-law Paula; and his 45 Manchin nieces and nephews.

Again, we extend our most sincere condolences for our shared loss of this remarkable—absolutely remarkable person. The unwavering love that Bob had for his family, his friends, and our Nation will live on forever in the hearts of all who had the privilege of knowing Robert Gutz Thompson. God rest, Bob.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to join my fellow Senators in remembering Senator MANCHIN's family, his sister, and the rest of his family as they deal with the loss of his brother-in-law.

I want to talk today about a draft I just received—a bill we are actually going to have a hearing on next week—S. 1, the so-called For the People Act.

This bill is the companion act to the House version of H.R. 1. I actually think it is even longer than H.R. 1, which I would have thought impossible. It is over 800 pages. I think they will be introducing the final version in the next day or so, and that is a good thing, since we are supposed to have a hearing on it in the middle of next week.

It packs a lot of what I consider bad changes relating to election administration, campaign finance, redistricting, and so much more into those 800 pages, but there is a lot of space there to pack things in.

I would have to take a lot more time than I have got today to talk about all the things in the bill that I have had concerns about, but I would say, to start with, this idea that one size fits all, this Federal takeover of elections, can't be in the interest of voters in our country.

It would force a single and, I believe, a partisan view of elections and how they should be run in 10,000 different jurisdictions in the country. I don't know how you do that. I don't know how you take 10,000 jurisdictions and try, at the Washington, DC, level in legislation, to determine changes like how they would register voters. Every State, under this bill, would do it exactly the same way—which voting systems they would use; how they would handle early voting and absentee ballots, no matter how long they had been doing it one way that worked for voters in their State; and how they maintain their voter list, whether you can go in and verify whether people on the voter list were still there.

We used to think that was a critically important protection in the election system; that you knew that the voters that had registered to vote in a jurisdiction actually were still in that

jurisdiction. It was actually, in every State, a bragging point of responsible election administration. That would largely go away in this bill.

This bill would require States to make ballot drop boxes available for 45 days prior to the Federal election. Those are boxes that—it even designates the locations and tells the local jurisdiction how they need to handle those ballots as they come out of the boxes and would be processed.

Remember, these are not mailboxes. They would be the ballot drop boxes all over the jurisdiction, if you could find one.

It would mandate unlimited ballot harvesting. That is a process where one person could collect and submit as many ballots as they could collect and submit. You know, in recent elections, we have seen ballot harvesting as a real problem in these elections. Not only does one person have your ballot and get that ballot to where it should be, frankly, one of the problems always with ballot harvesting is maybe a person who knows voters pretty well would collect 20 and put 18 in the mailbox or take 18 to the vote counting area and the other two just somehow don't get there.

Unlimited ballot harvesting, prohibited in many States—and, in fact, in recent years the Democratic House of Representatives failed to seat an elected Representative in North Carolina because that person had used ballot harvesting.

The bill would require States to allow felons to vote in Federal elections. If you didn't like that, in this case, you could have two sets of voter registrations, one for Federal elections and one for all other elections.

And, by the way, if you did that, you would also have to have two different sets of ballots for an election day that had both local and State and Federal issues on the ballot.

And this bill would require that all of these changes be made quickly. Even jurisdictions that recently have changed their processes and spent a lot of time talking to people about those changes over maybe 2 years or 4 years would suddenly be told, no, you have to change them one more time. And maybe it is a day here or a day there, but that makes a big difference if you have already got in your mind how far before an election you have to register to vote or transfer your address or things that election administrators work on all the time.

You know, my first elected job was as the county clerk in Greene County, Springfield, MO, where I was the chief election authority. We had a county of about 180,000 people in it, lots of registered voters, but you had to take that very seriously.

And later I was the chief election authority in our State for 8 years as the secretary of state, and I know how much planning goes into the elections. I know how seriously local officials take it.

I also know how difficult it could be if every change you made had to be cleared some way with somebody in Washington, DC.

You know, States can often take years to transition to a new ballot system or transition to a new way they do things. They also can do it very quickly if they need to, and we saw that happen in a number of States last year.

I think this bill, if it did pass, really doesn't allow the time you need for planning.

The diversity of our election system is one of the great strengths of our system. There is bipartisan agreement on that. I have quoted President Obama on this before, but he said in 2016: "There is no serious person out there who would suggest somehow that you can even rig America's elections, in part, because they are so decentralized and the numbers of votes involved."

This bill would undo that decentralized strength. It would undo that local and State responsibility for having laws that voters who vote for you understand you need to apply in the fairest and best way you can. The bill would make our system less diverse, less secure.

Unfortunately, this bill doesn't just stop at election administration. It takes the campaign finance system and changes it dramatically.

You know, when the Federal Elections Commission was created in the early 1970s, it was a six-member Commission. It was to be bipartisan. This turns it into a five-member Commission, with whoever is the President being able to appoint the third member on one side to always outvote, if they need to, the two members on the other side.

There have been many times, obviously, in the history of the Federal Election Commission when the vote has been 3 to 3 or 2 to 2, whatever the makeup was at the time. This would do away with that and basically turn the Commission from a bipartisan Commission into a prosecutorial body, where one side always has the majority if they want it. I think voters should and would be very concerned about that.

It would allow the Chair of the FEC to make key staffing changes. It would allow judges to review cases, even when the Commission found no violation of the law.

In addition, the bill would create a system of public financing for political campaigns by matching certain contributions with Federal dollars. The match would be 6 to 1. So in the matchable, low-dollar—whatever you define that to be—contributions, if you raise \$100,000 of those contributions, you would have \$700,000. Six hundred thousand of those dollars could have been used by the Federal Government for other things rather than to finance politicians in a campaign.

Now, I understand why politicians would like that. I have raised as much money as most people in this body have raised, and, you know, the idea