

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant 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. 172, Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Jacky Rosen, John Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Raphael Warnock, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 128.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant 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. 128, Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Michael F. Bennet, Sheldon Whitehouse.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, June 21, be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

## TALLAPOOSA COUNTY GIRLS RANCH

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, before I begin, I want to first take a moment and remember those that lost their lives in a horrific car accident in Butler County, AL, this past weekend.

Ten people lost their lives. Nine of those were between the ages 9 months and 17 years old. A majority of those killed were in a Tallapoosa County Girls Ranch bus. The girls ranch is an organization that I have been involved with for 20 years. It handles young kids who have been abused, young kids who have no parents. They start at this ranch at most any age, and everything is paid for all the way through graduation of college.

These kids were on a field trip coming from Baldwin County, AL, this past weekend and were involved in this horrific crash. There are no words that can bring comfort to these families or these children, but my family and my staff and the people of Alabama are praying for peace for all those affected during this unimaginable time.

## FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Madam President, as I and others have noted, Democrats call their flagship voting bill For the People Act, but a better and more fitting title is the "Nancy Pelosi Power Grab Act."

My Republican colleagues have done a good job of highlighting the many flaws of this legislation in the last couple of weeks, including doing away with commonsense fraud protection like voter ID, forcing mandatory same-day registration on every State, allowing paid political operatives to harvest voter ballots, and directing taxpayer dollars to the campaigns of progressive politicians. Sadly, there is plenty more.

But let me also note that this recent "compromise" is anything but. A compromise among Democrats should have been their starting offer to Republicans, not their final offer.

The most recent versions still run afoul of the Constitution by trampling

on First Amendment rights of free speech and taking away redistricting from the States. While ID is still required to vote, the bill expands what kind of ID meets that requirement, such as a utility bill. But the last time I looked, there was not a photo on our utility bill. The most secure form of identification is a government-issued photo ID. States shouldn't be forced to water that down.

Americans want faith and trust in the integrity of their election process. This bill does not provide solutions to strengthen these processes, and once Americans learn what is in this bill, they will agree.

The Pelosi power grab yanks power from the States. The Pelosi power grab lets politicians stuff their pockets with taxpayers' dollars. And guess what, folks. A slightly different version of a Federal takeover of elections is still a Federal takeover of elections. That is exactly what this new version of S. 1 is. It is hard to even call this version of S. 1 a compromise when the Democrats only compromise with Members of their own party. This was not a bipartisan negotiation to get an end product that both sides of the aisle could support. The last time I checked, we still have a 50-50 Senate. There has been no negotiation with our side.

But regardless of its form, this bill does not solve the problems currently facing our election system; it makes the problems worse.

You know, in sports, one team changing the rules by themselves is called cheating. It is seen for what it is—a power grab. It is stacking the rules to win the game instead of doing the hard work necessary to get the job done.

Folks may be scratching their heads as to why one political party thinks they can completely change the rules of elections all by themselves, but if you have been paying attention to what the progressives have been up to recently, it won't come as a big surprise. Changing our country as we know it is the end game. That is why they want to pass this Pelosi power grab—so those who disagree with them have a harder time winning at the ballot box.

But it is not just elections. Remember when they tried to hoodwink us with defund the police last year? Remember when they tried to walk that back? But they had made their position very clear. Now we are seeing the same thing with education, as critical race theory is pushed on school districts across the country. Simply put, critical race theory reinforces divisions on strict racial lines. It doesn't teach kids moral values, like treating everyone with respect regardless of race; it is just the opposite. Critical race theory teaches kids to hate one another. That is one thing schools should absolutely—absolutely—not be teaching. But, again, for Democrats, it is about changing the way we view our country.

What we should be focusing on is actually improving education all over this country. The American people need to realize how far we have fallen behind.

As columnist Mark Steyn wrote, “Education is the biggest structural defect in our society. We have an almost entirely corrupt and abusive education establishment.”

Here is where that education establishment has gotten us: We are 37th in the world in math, 13th in reading, and 18th in science. In 2019, only 35 percent of our fourth graders were able to read at the fourth-grade reading level—35 percent. Embarrassing. That was lower than 2 years before, and it was before the teachers unions kept kids out of school all of this past year. You can imagine how it is today. It is unacceptable. It should be unacceptable to every Member of this body.

We have got China outpacing us in every industry and at every level of our economy. But Democrats are too busy painting the United States as the world’s villain. How can we expect our young people to defend the United States abroad if they don’t learn about the things that make America the greatest country in the history of the world?

We, as elected representatives of Americans across the country, should be doing everything—and I mean everything—we can to create opportunity and to protect the freedoms that make this country great. It seems like folks across the aisle aren’t interested in that. They have a completely different vision of and for our country—one that most Americans don’t agree with at all.

I bet if you ask folks back home if they want a bigger government and less State and local power, they would say no way. I bet if you asked them if a Federal power grab sounds like a good idea, they would say no. I bet if you ask them if they want their kids to learn to be more divided by race, they would also say no. They would tell you they want their freedoms protected. They would tell you they want the Federal Government out of the way. They want an education for children that provides opportunity because education is the key to freedom and success. Education can unlock every student’s God-given potential, but critical race theory swallows that key. The Pelosi power grab just fills the lock with cement.

Ladies and gentlemen, this For the People Act is one party’s attempt to rewrite the rules—rewrite the rules of the game in hope that they will get a permanent advantage, plain and simple.

It is really a shame. We are spending so much time on bills that the American people don’t want, bills that don’t have bipartisan support. So I urge my colleagues to come together and find solutions that will unite us as Americans, not divide us further as a country.

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

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

Mr. HAGERTY. Madam President, I am here today to address Democrats’ deceptively labeled “For the People Act,” which should more accurately be labeled the “For the Politicians Act.”

This legislation represents a breathtaking, unprecedented power grab. In a 50–50 Senate, this is a blatant attempt by those who are in power by the slimmest possible margin to take over and rewrite the election and campaign rules for all 50 States in one fell swoop.

This would be done on an entirely partisan basis to ensure candidates from that same party win elections. In fact, while the only supporters of the bill are Democrats, there is bipartisan opposition to this legislation.

This legislation would disenfranchise every American through the Federal seizure of the authority of each State’s representatives to set election rules for their State in accordance with the wishes of their citizens.

This partisan legislation would wash away election integrity measures, making it easier to cheat. Each invalid vote cast dilutes the strength of each valid vote cast.

Our form of government for the people and by the people rests upon voters’ faith in the integrity of our elections. If we allow that faith in our elections to continue to be compromised, we are allowing the very foundation of our American system to be eroded.

Democrats don’t want to talk about the details of this legislation. They don’t want you to peek under the hood. They want to just slap a voting rights bumper sticker on it, jam it through, and then disparage and name-call anyone who opposes it.

So let’s take a look at exactly what is in this legislation.

Under this legislation, a Federal politician running for election can take millions in taxpayer money for his or her own campaign.

The legislation says that States must then allow that politician to pay political operatives to visit nursing homes, dormitories, emergency shelters, and other residences to collect thousands of ballots and, then, choose which ones to be dropped into unmanned drop boxes, maybe in the middle of the night.

This bill would make it illegal for States to verify the identity of voters at the polls. Under this bill, ballots arriving even a week after election day would still be counted.

It would require States to adopt universal mail-in voting practices. States would be forced to allow murderers, rapists, and child molesters to vote, even if a State’s citizens have adopted laws to prevent it.

It would require States to allow unregistered voters to cast ballots by simply showing up on election day and signing a form, without an ID and with no vetting allowed.

The bill would silence political speech by religious and nonprofit organizations while politicians can use taxpayer dollars to air attack ads with which many Americans would find distasteful.

The bill provides that if anyone disputes any of this, that is OK. They can lodge their complaints with the Federal Election Commission, a body that has been bipartisan since its creation. But wait. In addition to changing the rules to benefit one team, the legislation also “buys off the umpire” by transforming the FEC into a partisan, Democrat-controlled body—a body that could hound the opposing party candidates to the ends of the Earth. This bill transforms the judge into the prosecutor.

I wish that was all this legislation did. It also snatches the responsibility for drawing Congressional districts from the elected representatives of all 50 States, who have done that job for the last 230 years, and sets up a Byzantine process that would ultimately hand it over to an academic consultant hired by a liberal judge right here in Washington.

Let me repeat that: A consultant hired by a judge in Washington, DC, will be drawing every congressional district in the country.

Using government power to seize control of elections, to limit speech, to pack tribunals, to ensure the ruling party stays in power—that sounds like a headline you would hear in Venezuela, Russia, Iran, or even China, not in the United States of America.

Not too long ago, both parties would have considered this partisan power grab beyond the pale. But far-left operatives want permanent power, and Democrats, eager to keep the power for themselves, are afraid to tell them no.

Democrats are now characterizing this legislation as an emergency response to recent legislation in a few States. This legislation isn’t just a solution in search of a problem; it is a power grab that for years has been in search of a crisis—any crisis, manufactured or otherwise—that can be used to justify it.

Democrat operatives introduced a previous version of this bill on January 24, 2017, 4 days after President Trump took office. The purported crisis then was the American people’s election of Donald Trump, which the Democrats found unacceptable. They continued this effort by introducing yet another version of the “For the Politicians Act” in 2019, which at that time passed the House without a single Republican vote. Like the bill the Senate will consider this week, this bill was a Democrat operative’s electioneering fantasy—federalizing unlimited mail-in voting, prohibiting voter ID requirements, and allowing unregistered voters to show up and vote on election

day. Wisely, the Senate, in 2019, never took it up.

Then, as the pandemic took root in the spring of 2020, Democrats, in search of yet a new crisis to justify this bill, included it in a pandemic relief bill that the House passed—again, without a single Republican vote. Once again, the Senate dismissed it and wisely focused on providing bipartisan pandemic relief, rather than using the pandemic as a justification to federalize elections.

With the pandemic now in the rear-view mirror, this legislation is being pitched as necessary to preserve voting rights, using cartoonish, overheated, and false characterizations of a few sensible, measured voting integrity laws that have recently been enacted by States. Why? Because Democrats have to invent a new crisis every 6 months or so to conceal this quest to install themselves permanently into power.

Don't let them fool you. This isn't about some State election law. The House passed virtually the same bill last year. Most of the components of this bill have been floating in Democrat National Committee back rooms for years.

This isn't about voting rights. This legislation protects voting rights like banning security guards at banks would protect bank depositors.

Now, why are the Democrats so desperate to pass this bill? Well, a recent report from POLITICO explains it. POLITICO says:

What's at stake is . . . potentially the future Democratic majorities. Many in the party privately worry that frontline Democrats could lose their seats if Congress doesn't [pass this bill].

So, to keep power, Democrats have determined that they have to take over State elections. This is about holding on to power and nothing else. There doesn't seem to be a power grab that is too extreme for the modern left, whether it is this bill, legislation to pack the Supreme Court, suddenly changing their position and pushing to scrap fundamental Senate rules in order to obtain short-term political gains or adding Washington, DC, as a State. It is all about one thing—fulfilling a fantasy of permanent Democrat power.

Under this legislation, American elections would no longer be about earning the support of voters by communicating a powerful vision. Rather, American elections would be all about creating the largest machine, identifying favorable voters, and mass-gathering their ballots door-to-door as efficiently as possible.

The winning campaign would be the one with the largest army of ballot harvesters to drive voters—registered or unregistered, with or without ID—to fill out and hand over a ballot that will be “dropped” on their behalf in unmanned ballot boxes.

Americans want commonsense laws that make it easier to vote and harder

to cheat. Such laws currently exist throughout the country. That is why we had recordbreaking voter participation in 2020, including in my State of Tennessee.

This legislation is as unnecessary as it is misguided and dangerous. It is a politician protection measure that would do irreparable damage to the fabric of this country, and it should be soundly rejected by this body.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this Saturday was Juneteenth, the first official Juneteenth recognized by the Federal Government as a national holiday—the official end of slavery in America. I commemorated and celebrated Juneteenth with my colleague Senator VAN HOLLEN at a meeting of the NAACP chapter in Randallstown, MD, and we reflected on the progress that we have made since the end of slavery and the challenges that still remain.

It has been a long path toward justice and equality in this country, and I think we all recognize the wisdom of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., with his famous quote that “the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.”

I think we all believe that, but in recent actions taken by State governments to restrict voting rights, we see some very disturbing trends that would take issue with Dr. King's statement that the moral universe is bending toward justice. It seems like it has taken a detour.

Voting rights is a fundamental issue of importance to a democratic country.

After elections are over and we win, we celebrate. We celebrate the fact that we have gotten the support of the majority of the voters, and that is what democracy is all about. If we don't win—and I think many of us have been involved in campaigns where our candidates have not been successful—we go to work to try to attract more voters in the next election so we can celebrate a victory. That is what participation in a free society is all about. That is what democracies are about.

In repressive autocratic regimes, they will never accept the will of the people. So they look at ways in which they can undermine the voter record—what the voters want to do, the voters' will. In the 2020 election, we should all celebrate the record number of people who cast their ballots. It was a record—the most ever casting their votes for the Presidency of the United States. There were repeated reviews done by both Democrats and Republicans at the national level and at the

State level and at the local level. It verified the simple fact that there was no widespread corruption, that the will of the people prevailed, and Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS were elected President and Vice President of the United States.

But that did not stop former President Trump in promoting the Big Lie. As a result of that, several States have now taken action to make it harder for people to cast their votes. The Brennan Center has pointed out that we have seen the worst assault on voting rights since Jim Crow. Fourteen States have enacted 22 new laws to make it more difficult—more difficult—for people to vote. This is unprecedented in modern times.

So what have those laws done? Made it more difficult for voters to vote by mail, recognizing that for many voters, they prefer to vote by mail. We have States that have 100 percent voting by mail. There has been no indication of fraud in voting by mail.

States have shortened the time for requesting mail-in ballots for voting, making it more difficult for individuals to be able to vote by mail, requiring certain requirements to vote by mail, making it more difficult to deliver their mail-in ballots, limiting the availability of mail ballot drop boxes. All of that had been included. Why? Because it makes it more difficult for people who are likely to vote for my opponent to vote. That is what the State legislatures are doing—stricter signature requirements, making in-person voting more difficult, and purging voter rolls simply because a person did not vote—again, making it more difficult for people to vote. And it goes on and on and on in the type of legislation that has already passed or is currently being considered by many State legislatures around the country, making it more difficult to register to vote, making it more difficult to vote, targeting potential voters more likely to vote for their opponents, targeting minorities, young voters, and older minority voters.

Let me give just one example. Using Georgia as a specific example, their recently enacted changes will disproportionately hurt Black voters. The Georgia State law imposes voter identification requirements on absentee ballots, makes it hard to request an absentee ballot, and makes it a crime for groups to provide food and water to voters waiting in line.

Georgia is basically restricting mail voting in response to a shift in the racial demographics of the voters who use it. On the other hand, Georgia wants to keep mail voting available for older, White mail voters.

Voter suppression is always unacceptable, and the razor-thin political margins in Georgia may mean that suppression efforts like these will change political outcomes. Rather than imposing barriers to casting the sacred right to vote, Georgia should be looking at ways to improve voter access.

As the New York Times pointed out, the Georgia law comes on the heels of a major upset for Republicans in the traditionally red State, after voters picked Joe Biden in the Presidential election and elected Democrats to both of the State's U.S. Senate seats. The paper noted that the new Georgia law "will, in particular, curtail ballot access for voters in booming urban and suburban counties, home to many Democrats." President Biden was right to call this legislation the "Jim Crow in the 21st century."

There are many other examples. Georgia is not unique in the efforts we are seeing to suppress voter participation at elections.

Look, it is fair game to try to persuade voters to vote for your candidate. It is not fair game to suppress their right to vote.

So what is the vote this week all about, the vote we are going to have on bringing forward the opportunity to debate voter suppression legislation to protect the right to vote? It is simply a motion to proceed with a debate on the Senate floor. Let me repeat that. We are not voting on S. 1, the passage of it. We are not voting on any specific proposal. I know my friend from West Virginia has offered a proposal. We are not voting on that. We are voting on the right for the Senate to take up this critically important issue or whether it should be filibustered so we can't bring up a voter issue to protect the integrity of the right to vote.

Now, I support S. 1. I am a cosponsor of S. 1, For the People. I am proud to support the provisions of that bill. To me, it is carefully drafted legislation to deal with the modern threats to voter participation. I am extremely proud that my colleague from Maryland, Congressman JOHN SARBANES, is the principal sponsor of H.R. 1 in the House that already passed the House.

It provides a basic Federal floor on protection of the right to vote—on voter registration, on vote-by-mail, no-excuse balloting, 2 weeks of early voting, including weekends, no notary requirement for absentee ballots, drop-off boxes. That is a simple voter protection against the actions being taken by State legislatures that are aimed at certain demographic groups, a Federal floor.

It ends political gerrymandering. I don't know how any of my colleagues can defend the way legislative and congressional lines are drawn today. I came from the State legislature. I am a former speaker of the house. I was responsible for one of the redistricting plans of Maryland when I was speaker of the house. It is just a horrible, partisan, political process we use today to draw congressional lines.

I have been accused by my congressional colleagues in the House from Maryland that I ran for the Senate to avoid having to deal with congressional redistricting. There may be some truth to that, but I can tell you this: It is time to end political gerrymandering.

Congressional districts should represent the communities' interests, not an individual Congressman's interest. S. 1 takes a major step forward in ending political congressional redistricting by gerrymandering.

It provides a commitment by Congress to advance a preclearance formula that was in the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that now is not operative because of the Shelby County decision. It puts us on a path to once again have that important tool available in order to deal with the freedom and right to vote.

It promotes voter security, S. 1, by eliminating the paper ballot—by requiring the paper ballot, I should say, not eliminating it, by requiring a paper trail. I think we all agree that we want to be able to verify votes. The only way you can is if there is a paper trail, and it provides for that paper trail.

It puts an end to the dominance of big money in the political system. They do that in a couple of ways: one, disclosure—how can anyone be against the disclosure of who is putting money into our political system?—and secondly, providing a way in which we can get rid of the dependence upon large special interest dollars.

It includes, S. 1, two provisions that I authored. One is a deceptive practices act that deals with false or misleading advertisements which are aimed at targeting minority communities to confuse and mislead their votes.

It includes the Democracy Restoration Act, which I authored, which deals with laws passed after the end of slavery in an effort to prevent African Americans from voting, for, you see, there are States that passed laws back then that are still on the books that disqualify for a lifetime a person convicted of a felony.

The definition of "felony" is pretty general in many States, so we have States where one out of five African Americans has been disqualified from voting because of their conviction of a felony. Even though they are fully part of our society today, they don't have the right to vote. We need to remove that disqualification on voting.

My friend, our former colleague, John Lewis—the two of us were elected to the U.S. House of Representatives on the same day. In an editorial published after his death, our former colleague John Lewis recalled an important lesson taught by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and I quote our former colleague:

He said each of us has a moral obligation to stand up, speak up and speak out. When you see something that is not right, you must say something. You must do something. Democracy is not a state. It is an act, and each generation must do its part.

Well, we cannot take action if we don't start, and we can't start unless my colleagues allow us to proceed to this issue on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

There is a reason why there are so many groups behind us taking action. I

have a Facebook Live that I do every 2 weeks with my constituents. Jana Morgan from the Declaration for American Democracy, which represents over 180 groups, from labor to racial justice groups, faith groups, women's rights groups, environmental and good-governance groups—all telling us that we need to move forward to protect our democracy, that the Senate needs to act on this issue.

One of my guests, Virginia Kase Solomon from the League of Women Voters—now, the League of Women Voters—you can say a lot of things about them, but you can't accuse them of being partisan because they are not. It is one of our premier nonpartisan institutions in America with a proud history. They are telling us to take this bill up and act for the sake of protecting our democracy.

We then have a chance to act, to take up amendments and vote on concerns, whether they are offered by a Republican Senator or a Democratic Senator. That is what the motion to proceed allows us to do, to take up these issues so we can vote on them. But if you vote to filibuster the motion to proceed, we can't even bring the issue up on the Senate floor for action.

I urge my colleagues not to filibuster the right of the U.S. Senate to start the debate on protecting voter integrity, where each Member will have an opportunity to debate the issue, and collectively we can come together, as many of my colleagues have offered suggestions about how we can improve S. 1, how we can make it a broader consensus, but we can't do that unless we have the right to proceed to a debate.

I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion on the motion to proceed so the Senate can take up this most critically important issue to the preservation of our democracy and the integrity of the right to vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks prior to the rollcall vote.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, if the Constitution is the foundation of our Republic, then the concept of "one person, one vote" is the cornerstone. It is also a promise that every single eligible voter in America takes with them into that voting booth on that election day. It gives them confidence that their vote matters. It helps them to keep the faith in our electoral system and in their local government.

We can talk about the vote on a grand scale here in Washington, but this is where it really matters: back home at your local polling place, in your home county, and in the precincts with the people who do the work of

standing up elections, running elections, and certifying their own elections. It is of the people, by the people, for the people that this process is carried out in each and every one of our counties. And you know what, that is how it is supposed to be.

Article I, section 4 of our Constitution clearly states—here it is:

Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof.

Well, how about that? The Constitution delegates that authority to the State legislatures, and that is why our States' secretaries of state work with our counties to make certain the process is put in place.

You know, I had the opportunity to serve on my county's local election commission prior to my being in elective office. One person, one vote—that is the No. 1 rule that guided the decisions they made. When we recruit poll workers, it is the No. 1 concern that drives people to go sign up. When we train the volunteers who are staffing polling places, it is the No. 1 rule to teach. Every person gets one vote. All legally cast votes are counted. That is the way it is supposed to work—one person, one vote.

Here in the Senate, I am concerned that my Democratic colleagues have forgotten about this rule. Why else would they once again pledge to move a piece of legislation that would throw "one person, one vote" out the window? Many of my Republican colleagues have taken to calling H.R. 1 or S. 1 the Politician Protection Act or the For the Politician Act, and I will have to agree that is a fairly apt description.

There are a lot of problems with this bill, but I want to focus on a few key provisions that will gut "one person, one vote" and destroy confidence in our elections.

If this bill passes, say goodbye to meaningful voter ID laws. My Democratic colleagues kept the idea of these requirements intact, but to please their radical base, they added a loophole that would force every single jurisdiction to accept affidavits in lieu of identification—that is right, an affidavit. They may as well have banned voter IDs because that loophole makes requirements that voters prove they are who they say they are absolutely meaningless. They can just sign a statement saying "I am who I say I am" without having to show proof.

The bill also requires States to allow paid campaign operatives to engage in ballot harvesting schemes. That is right. This allows your paid campaign operatives to engage in ballot harvesting schemes. Now, these ballot harvesting schemes have been proven time and again to increase the risk of fraud, so much so that many States on their own moved forward and banned ballot harvesting schemes. Why did they ban this? Because it leads to fraud in elections.

Inexplicably, my colleagues also want to throw ballot drop boxes into the mix. They pitched them as a convenience, but that convenience will be nearly impossible to monitor and to protect 24 hours a day, which means that it will be nearly impossible to monitor and protect the ballots that are inside those boxes, and these boxes then become a fairly convenient way to stuff the ballot box.

But perhaps the most dangerous, counterproductive, and outright infuriating provision my Democratic colleagues have included in this mess of a bill is a restriction against voter roll maintenance. Anyone with a bit of common sense knows how inaccurate or duplicate entries in a dataset can add up. That leaves these datasets in a state of disrepair, and that is how fraud and mistakes occur.

It is just one more provision in a bill raising red flags for local officials in every single State in this country. And this red flag, in particular, is prompting people to ask me if my Democratic colleagues involved in drafting this bill have ever actually volunteered at a local polling place, which really tells you a lot about how shortsighted this legislation is.

This bill really doesn't have anything to do with voting rights. This is a politically motivated Federal takeover of elections that would give us the exact opposite of what is laid out in the Constitution.

The Founders—the Founders—granted the States power over their own elections for a reason. The Federal Government is beyond incompetent to get this job done. If you like the service you get from the IRS or the EPA or OSHA, that is what you could expect the next time your community has an election.

If we allow this bill to pass, the promise of one person, one vote will crumble. The promise of counting eligible ballots and not counting ineligible ballots would go by the wayside. And what do you get in exchange? The promise of chaos, confusion, and a lack of confidence in the integrity of the vote.

#### TRIBUTE TO CHUCK FLINT

Madam President, the time has come for Team Blackburn to say goodbye to our fearless leader and current chief of staff, Chuck Flint.

Chuck first joined my team in the House as a member of our legislative staff. He was eager to prove himself capable and well versed on our legislative issues, and I will tell you, he succeeded. In the 7 years since he first walked through my office door, he has grown into one of the finest office chiefs of staff I have seen on the Hill and one of the finest political strategists here on Capitol Hill, one of my most trusted advisers, and, I will add, the most enthusiastic softball player on Team Whiskey Business—the most enthusiastic I think we have ever fielded.

I wish Chuck, Jessica, and little Everett all the hope and happiness in

the world as they embark on their next beautiful adventure together.

We will miss him tremendously, but no matter how far they travel, they will always have a home with Team Blackburn and in service to the Volunteer State.

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. 149, Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Jacky Rosen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Sherrod Brown, Edward J. Markey, Brian Schatz, Ron Wyden, Elizabeth Warren, Mark R. Warner, Raphael Warnock, Benjamin L. Cardin.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 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 New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "nay", and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cornyn
Bennet	Cardin	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Carper	Duckworth
Blunt	Collins	Durbin
Burr	Coons	Feinstein