

COVID-19, this bill hijacks the constitutional authority of the States in the purported name of increasing voting access. But this bill, too, is chock full of unnecessary, unpopular, and unconstitutional election proposals.

It makes it much easier for partisans to affect our elections through fraud, in part, by removing requirements for the most basic safeguard, which is voter identification.

That was one of the main recommendations in 2005 of the Commission on Federal Election Reform, a bipartisan commission cochaired by former President Jimmy Carter, a Democrat, and former Secretary of State, James Baker, a Republican. That Commission, back in 2005, recommended that voters be required to present a photo ID card and the State should provide free cards to voters who, for some reason, didn't have a driver's license or other identification.

In order to vote in person, most States require voters to present some valid form of identification. Matching the name of an eligible voter with the name on a valid form of ID is a commonsense safeguard against fraud, but one our Democratic colleagues apparently want to eliminate.

In fact, their legislation would stop the States—actually it would prohibit the States—from requiring proof of identification in order to vote. Just sign a piece of paper saying you are who you say you are and no further questions can be asked.

On top of that, this bill would require the States to automatically register anyone in their databases for everything from the department of motor vehicles to public assistance. We know these programs aren't limited to eligible voters and could include noncitizens and others who aren't eligible to cast a ballot, not to mention the fact that those who are already registered to vote would be registered again, potentially.

And even if there are duplicate registrations or if someone passes away or moves, States would not be allowed, by this law, to clean up their voter rolls within 6 months of an election.

But just when you think things can't get any crazier, they do. Our Democratic colleagues want to provide taxpayer funding for political campaigns and elections. That is right. They want you to pay for a political candidate's campaign, whether you want to or not, whether you support the policies of that candidate or not.

A lot of companies have matching programs for charitable giving. If an employee donates to the charity of their choice, the company often will match the donation dollar for dollar. Well, that same principle applies here, in part, except instead of the charity getting money, it is now a political candidate. Instead of the company footing the bill, it is—you got it—it is you, the taxpayer.

I could go on and on. This proposal, S. 1, which we will be voting on in the

near future, changes the basic structure of the Federal Election Commission, which is currently a bipartisan Commission, which is forced to obtain a bipartisan majority before they can act. It split 3 to 3. But this bill would eliminate that bipartisan requirement and simply allow a partisan Federal election committee to work its will.

This bill also legalizes something called ballot harvesting, which is susceptible to widespread fraud. In other words, it lets a campaign worker go around to nursing homes, neighborhoods, union halls, wherever, and collect your ballot and then to take them down to the clerk's office and cast that ballot. Well, the opportunities for fraud are pretty obvious.

This bill would also implement a new financial disclosure policy that even the American Civil Liberties Union says "could interfere directly with the ability of many to engage in political speech about causes that they care about."

But above all this, this bill undermines the trust and accountability that is so important to elections. The Judiciary Committee recently had a hearing where the secretary of state, who happens to be a Democrat, from New Hampshire said the single most important thing in providing a big turnout for elections is public confidence that their ballot will be counted. It is not how many days before election day you can vote, who can vote by mail; it is the public's confidence that their ballot will be counted, no matter how and when cast.

So S. 1 is not a serious attempt at bipartisanship. It is the opposite. It is not an honest effort to pass legislation. Right now, we know that Democrats don't even have 50 votes on their side of the aisle. But the majority leader is trying to prove that partisanship apparently has a death grip on the Senate, but, unfortunately for him, it is not the party he thinks.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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 majority whip.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INVESTIGATION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, last Friday, the New York Times reported that during the Trump administration, the Justice Department issued subpoenas involving Members of Congress, their staff, and family members, even a minor family member. It is highly unusual for the Justice Department to investigate Members of Congress. The reason it is unusual is clear: Our Founders created three separate

branches of the Federal Government with a separation of powers so that each branch could serve as a check and balance on the other and no branch would have too much power.

When the Justice Department investigates a Member of Congress, typically, it is for corruption charges. That is understandable, but that is not what happened here. This was an investigation into a leak of information. And the use of subpoenas to investigate Members of Congress is extremely strange territory.

These concerns are heightened when the President has publicly attacked those same Members of Congress. That is what former President Trump did when he repeatedly and without any evidence accused Representative ADAM SCHIFF about leaking information about Russian election interference.

These reports and the reports that journalists and even Trump's own White House Counsel were included in the Justice Department's so-called leak investigation raise serious questions about the Justice Department and its former leaders.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has a constitutional responsibility to oversee the Department of Justice on behalf of the American people, so yesterday our committee sent a letter to Attorney General Merrick Garland asking for more information. But yesterday Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican minority leader in the Senate, came to the floor and warned us off. He warned the Judiciary Committee against exercising our statutory oversight responsibility because it could become "a partisan circus." This came on the heels of Senator MCCONNELL's personal veto of a bipartisan Commission to investigate the deadly January 6 mob attack on the U.S. Capitol. But now the minority leader is warning us against even looking into the targeting of Trump's perceived political enemies by the Justice Department. The minority leader claimed that the Senate does not need to look into this matter because—get this—the Department of Justice inspector general has already announced he would investigate. That is a pretty decent argument if you have no memory whatsoever.

For over 13 months during the last Congress, under a Republican majority, the Senate Judiciary Committee conducted an extensive oversight investigation into the FBI's opening of the Crossfire Hurricane investigation even though the Department of Justice inspector general had already investigated it. The Department of Justice inspector general had already completed a 19-month investigation of so-called Crossfire Hurricane involving over 100 witnesses and reviewing over a million documents.

That wasn't good enough for the Republican majority. They persisted in conducting a committee investigation nevertheless even though the inspector general's investigation concluded that Crossfire Hurricane had a proper basis

and that anti-Trump bias did not affect the FBI's work on Crossfire Hurricane. Those are the very issues the Republican majority reexamined in their own investigation. In that instance, the Department of Justice inspector general satisfied all the criteria of an inspection, an investigation, and yet the Republicans rejected it and proceeded forward.

In this case, the Republican leader in the Senate is arguing that the work of the inspector general should be enough—quite a difference.

Throughout the course of that investigation, the Senate Judiciary Committee held extensive hearings, but it wasn't enough.

The Republican-led Senate Judiciary Committee was so focused on investigating a conspiracy theory about Obama that they didn't hold a single hearing on the Trump administration's Department of Justice in 4 years. If they had, maybe they would have discovered this latest revelation rather than the New York Times.

Senator MCCONNELL did not warn the Judiciary Committee that the DOJ inspector general's investigation was sufficient or that its investigation into Crossfire Hurricane would become a partisan circus. He saw it completely differently in those days.

Importantly, it seems the minority leader does not speak for his entire caucus. Yesterday the minority whip said: "Obviously this warrants further review and investigation," and he "assume[s] the committee will work through that." I hope that other Republican Members of the Chamber join the minority whip to call for further investigation. Congress's place in our constitutional order is too important to simply look the other way.

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it was 9 years ago today, after a year or more of writing letters to my friend and colleague President Obama, that he finally agreed to an Executive order known as DACA. DACA took the heart of the DREAM Act, which I introduced 20 years ago, and made an Executive order. He said to those who were brought to this country as children, infants, who really had nothing to do with the family decision on coming to America: We are going to give you a chance, since you grew up undocumented, to be a part of this Nation. So every 2 years, you can apply for renewable status, be protected from deportation, and be allowed to legally work. We will do a criminal investigation, national security investigation, and if we believe that you are no threat to this country, we will give you 2 years to prove yourself.

More than 800,000 young people stepped forward and made a life in America and did extraordinary things for this country. They proved that, given a chance to be part of America's future, they would make it a better na-

tion. Two of them testified today. One of them is a doctor from the city of Chicago. I am so proud of him, Dr. Bernal Mejia. He was born in Mexico and grew up in Memphis, TN. He struggled, scrapped, clawed his way into an amazing undergraduate institution, graduated summa cum laude, and hoped that one day he would have a chance to go to medical school.

Before DACA, that was a dream that was way too distant. Then came DACA. He looked around to see if any medical schools in the United States would let someone who was protected by DACA apply for medical school. It turned out there was one. I am proud to say it was Loyola University in Chicago, the Stritch School of Medicine. They didn't create a new category of students; they just said: We will let you compete. If you are good enough, we will admit you as a student.

Over 30 DACA students became medical students at Loyola. Dr. Mejia was one. He is now about to finish, in a few weeks, the third year of his residency in emergency medicine. He has spent the last year and a half, as you can imagine, in emergency rooms saving the lives of so many people, particularly victims of COVID-19.

How many times has each of us thanked the healthcare heroes, and how many times have we thought that one of them might have been an undocumented doctor whose future and fate are still so uncertain in America? That is the case today because the DREAM Act has not become the law of the land.

So we had a hearing and discussed his situation and the bill that was sent to us by the House. I believe there is some bipartisan sentiment in favor of that, and I am trying to work to develop that into legislation that will finally give to Dr. Mejia and so many others across this country the future in America which they have all prayed for. They have worked hard to earn it. They deserve it.

I am glad, at this hearing today, the doctor came and told this story. It is an inspiration to me and all who believe in this country that we should have justice when it comes to immigration.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise for the ninth time to once again call for this entire body to have the opportunity to consider and to cast their votes for the Military Justice Im-

provement and Increasing Prevention Act.

This commonsense reform would ensure that people in the military who have been subjected to sexual assault and other serious crimes get the justice they deserve.

I have been calling for a full floor vote on this bill since May 24. That was 22 days ago. Since then, an estimated 1,232 servicemembers will have been raped or sexually assaulted.

Two in three of those survivors will not even report it because they know they are more likely to face retaliation than to receive justice.

Tonight, I want to share the story of just one of these countless survivors of sexual assault in our military who bravely shared her story with me.

A husband and a wife both served in the Marine Corps when the wife was assaulted by another marine. Her commander concluded that she deserved ill treatment for wearing running shorts and makeup. Her husband said that when he read the opinions of the command-appointed investigator, he found that he compared rape to prostitution or marrying a rich man. The wife said of the retaliation after she reported the assault that "[t]he humiliation of the retaliation was worse than the assault because it was sanctioned from those same leaders I once would have risked my life for."

I ask my colleagues—I ask my colleagues to imagine living through the worst day of your life and knowing that nothing would happen to your assailant. Imagine knowing that there was a bill that could change this system that failed you, knowing that Senators from both sides of the aisle have come together to advocate for it, knowing that if it were allowed to be voted on, it would pass.

Now imagine the vote getting denied night after night after night, watching the government that you volunteered to serve and defend continue to fail you.

We have to do better. We can start by bringing this legislation to the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Madam President, reserving my right to object, the legislation that the Senator from New York proposes, particularly with respect to the issue of crimes involving sexual misconduct, is something that I support. But without a thorough, careful review in the Armed Services Committee, which is the traditional means of making these decisions, particularly when