

that everybody will probably, ultimately, if given enough and opportunity, will ultimately come up with a negotiated bipartisan outcome.

I also am not going to vote to proceed to a bill that my constituents, the 29 million people I represent—they don't know what is in the bill either.

Well, all this doesn't sound like a recipe for success. These are the types of things that typically would be ironed out before you bring a bill to the floor. It is obvious this legislation is not ready for prime time, not even close.

As I said, the specifics of the bill are still being negotiated by our colleagues, of course, with the White House. We are days away from having the opportunity to read a bill, let alone provide the Congressional Budget Office the opportunity to calculate the cost.

Republicans and Democrats may disagree on a lot these days, but I hope we could all agree that it is not wise to advance legislation before you know what is in it.

That is why it is so baffling to me that the majority leader, the Senator from New York, is forcing a vote on this bill before it is even ready.

Of course, that raises a very significant question. Why in the world would he do that? Why is he rushing through with the final stage of what has been a productive bipartisan process?

The only logical conclusion I can come up with is he wants this bill and this bipartisan effort to fail.

Why else would he push forward with a vote when he knows it is doomed from the start?

I believe the Senator from New York wants this vote to fail because he really wants to go the partisan route; namely, the big, ugly, multitrillion dollar spending spree that BERNIE SANDERS and others have been advocating.

He doesn't need Republican votes to do that, and he can implement some of the most radical policies on the far left's wish list, things like the Green New Deal, massive tax hikes, crippling new economic regulations.

It is pretty obvious that has been the goal all along. Why else would the President himself say, once he negotiated a bipartisan deal: Well, I am not going to sign this bipartisan deal until we pass our partisan wish list. There is now \$3 trillion proposed. It is for the same reason NANCY PELOSI said she is not going to let the bipartisan bill, even were we to pass it, see the light of day until she knows that the \$3 trillion tax-and-spending spree is successful, which will require all 50 Democratic Senators plus the Vice President.

It is just strange to me to see a designed-to-fail strategy, unless it is for some political purpose.

So, Senator SCHUMER, if you are listening, please don't do it. Call off the vote. Let the bipartisan group finish their work. Don't set up a vote that will fail just because you want to ap-

pease the far left of your party, because if the vote happens and we don't have bill text or a cost estimate by the time it rolls around, it will necessarily fail.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT

Mr. President, on another matter, for more than four decades, the Crime Victims Fund has provided critical funding for survivors, victims, and their families. In Texas and across the country, this funding provides lifesaving support and services for survivors. It supports shelters that provide refuge to victims of domestic violence. It enables critical programming at rape crisis centers and legal services at child advocacy centers. It provides direct compensation for victims and their families in the wake of serious trauma.

I could go on and on naming the countless ways that the Crime Victims Fund supports vital services in our communities, but one of the most remarkable aspects about the Crime Victims Fund is that none of it comes from taxpayers. It is all covered by criminal fines and penalties.

The only downside of this funding stream is that it comes with a fair amount of uncertainty. There is no guaranteed amount that will be deposited into the fund each year, and recent years have brought far less money than is needed by the demand.

In fiscal year 2020, for example, the funding disbursement decreased by 25 percent, and crime victims service organizations have been told to expect even more cuts. We can't let that happen. It is time to address these shortfalls in the Crime Victims Fund and safeguard critical resources for victims and survivors.

I have been proud to work on a bipartisan basis with Senators GRAHAM, DURBIN, and a long list of colleagues to restore this critical funding through the VOCA Fix to Sustain the Crime Victims Fund Act. This legislation brings critical new funding sources to the Crime Victims Fund without asking the American taxpayer to do more.

It makes important changes to the Crime Victims Act which will send more money to the States for crime victim compensation programs and gives States more flexibility to spend the money when and where needed.

As I said, this legislation has broad bipartisan support. More than 60 Senators have cosponsored the bill, and it has been endorsed by 1,700 organizations, including 120 in Texas alone. These absolutely outstanding organizations and law enforcement stand behind the crucial commonsense reforms of the VOCA Fix Act and have called on Congress to pass the bill. So I hope we can deliver soon.

This afternoon, I expect the Senate to vote on the VOCA Fix Act to protect the solvency of this vital funding. The Crime Victims Fund brings justice to survivors, victims, and families in the wake of serious trauma. This legislation will protect the solvency and longevity of that fund and reverse the dev-

astating funding cuts we have seen in recent years.

I hope we can send this legislation to the President's desk as soon as possible so critical programs across the country can continue to serve our communities.

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

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

The Senator from Iowa.

#### CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I come to the floor to discuss an issue that I have raised during the course of multiple Republican and Democrat administrations. This is a problem that crosses political boundaries, whether you have a Republican or Democrat President. That issue is responding to legitimate and valid congressional oversight requests.

In my time as a public servant, I have seen my fair share of unresponsive government, sometimes downright obstructive government. I have seen it rear its ugly head from decade to decade. There is nothing more eroding to public faith than an unresponsive executive branch that believes that it only answers to the President and not to the U.S. Congress and perhaps, most importantly, we the people.

Based on my interactions with the Biden administration's Justice Department and its component Agencies—specifically, the FBI—the current officials in charge of those Agencies are, at best, unresponsive public servants. That goes all the way to the top, to the President, because the buck stops there.

As I say to many nominees, either you are going to run your Department or the Department runs you. Right now, it looks like the Justice Department is running the Attorney General's office, and that is a great big shame.

I voted to confirm the Attorney General. I had high hopes he would follow through on his public statements of ridding the Department of political infection. Instead, I fear he has taken the Justice Department to new politically charged heights.

To date, I haven't received a full or complete response to a single oversight request from the Justice Department. As one example, on February 3 of this year and March 9 of this year, Senator JOHNSON and I asked the Department about Nicholas McQuaid. Mr. McQuaid is the Acting Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, of which Mr. Polite will be taking his place upon confirmation.

McQuaid was employed by a law firm until January 20 of this year and worked with Christopher Clark, whom Hunter Biden reportedly hired to work on his Federal criminal case.

This arrangement poses a clear potential conflict.

A core function of congressional oversight is to ensure that governmental Departments and Agencies are free of conflicts of interest. That is especially so with the Justice Department and the FBI. If conflict infects them, those investigations and prosecutions, the very purpose of the Department's existence, could be undermined.

So I have requested a recusal memo for McQuaid. I have also requested to know, as a threshold issue, whether one even exists. Attorney General Garland won't answer.

Now, can you believe that? Here we have a Federal criminal case that implicates the President's son, and the Attorney General won't even answer Congress as to whether or not an employee of his Department who has an apparent conflict is recused from that matter?

It certainly looks like the Garland Justice Department is doing all that it can to protect the President's son.

Let me remind the Attorney General that I was the one who led a transcribed interview with President Trump's son. For all of the grief that Trump and his family got from the Democrats, at least that family showed up and answered the questions of legitimate congressional oversight.

Early on in the Attorney General's tenure, I instructed my oversight staff to work diligently and, of course, in good faith with their counterparts at the Justice Department. My staff have done the phone calls. They have had the meetings. They have sent emails, many of which go unanswered. My staff has done this all in good faith.

At my level, I have made every effort to get the Attorney General on the phone to discuss my oversight requests. It took him 2 months to get on the phone with me for a one-on-one call. I found out just the other week that Attorney General Garland's staff never told him of my request to speak with him. This omission is a dereliction of duty by the Department staff, to keep something like that from the Attorney General. Like I said, either you run the Department, or the Department runs you.

This type of unresponsive conduct has consequences. These consequences might not be immediate, but eventually, as I have seen over the years, ultimately the consequences arrive. The more their government tries to hide from them, the more the American people lose faith in government institutions. With such bad government conduct, I don't blame the people for losing faith. The fault is with the government, not the American people. After all, we work for the American people; they don't work for us. It is sad to say, but many in Washington, DC, don't understand that very fundamental precept of our constitutional Republic.

My fellow Senators, this type of conduct from the Biden administration

and the Justice Department is unacceptable. But it isn't just this administration or this Justice Department; it is something I have seen too long under both Republican and Democratic Presidents, and it will have long-term consequences for the integrity of our governmental institutions.

In light of the Department's consistent failure to respond to my oversight requests, I will object to any unanimous consent request that Kenneth Polite be confirmed as Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division. I do not do so on the basis of his credentials, which I don't question; I do it as a message to the Attorney General that he needs to improve DOJ's interaction with the Congress.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT

Mr. President, on another matter, we will soon be voting on the Victims of Crime Act. I was an original cosponsor of that act when the Senate Judiciary Committee developed the legislation years ago. I appreciate the opportunity to work with Senators DURBIN, GRAHAM, and other Judiciary Committee colleagues this year on amendments to this landmark law.

The principle behind this statute is very simple. It is that fines and penalties collected by the Department of Justice from those who are convicted of committing Federal crimes should be used to help those who are victims of the crimes.

Because the fund relies solely upon fines and other assessments paid by Federal criminals, not from the taxpayers, it does not add to the deficit. So any of these expenditures are very fiscally responsible.

The money in this fund helps at least 6,800 local organizations, examples like rape crisis centers and child advocacy centers. So this money provides needed services to millions of crime victims across the country each year. The fund supports crisis hotline counseling or medical care or other services to these crime survivors, but it also does things like providing lost wages, courtroom advocacy, temporary housing, and there are a lot of other services that come from this money.

Since its enactment, billions of dollars have flowed through the Crime Victims Fund to our States and our communities to help support victim assistance programs. More than three decades after its inception, the fund is still working, but deposits into the fund have declined significantly in recent years. So obviously the continuation of some of these programs is less effective or even in doubt when the money available for them is not certain to be there. This is an issue of why this bill is before us, the VOCA Fix Act. This bill would resolve this problem of not enough money going into the fund.

Why is the money not going into the fund? The issue stems from Federal prosecutors' increasing reliance upon no- or deferred-prosecution agreements rather than upon conviction. The

money collected by the Department of Justice in these settlement agreements, then, is not attributed to the Crime Victims Fund the same way as if it had gone through the court process and people had been convicted.

Among other provisions, the bill makes a deposits fix to preserve the Crime Victims Fund; in other words, to overcome the fact that these no- or deferred-prosecution agreements—that money doesn't now go into those funds. It requires that the money from the no- or deferred-prosecution agreements must go into the fund rather than the General Fund. The bill also changes the match requirements for State and local grant programs that rely on this statute.

Providing this fix will enable crime survivors in my State of Iowa and across the Nation to continue to have these services available in their communities. I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

#### FILIBUSTER

Mr. President, the last point I want to make is a very short one.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the definition of "filibustering" is this: "Filibustering includes any use of dilatory or obstructive tactics to block a measure by preventing it from coming to a vote."

Now, this is exactly what Texas Democrats are doing by fleeing their State to avoid a majority vote on an election reform bill. This group of Texas legislators flew to Washington, DC, where they are hypocritically demanding that the Senate abolish its tradition of extended debate so national legislation can be passed on the slimmest of majorities. And you can't get any slimmer than a 50-50 Senate.

The Senate majority leader called these legislators brave and courageous for their dishonest filibuster in the Texas Legislature, while they denounce the filibuster at the national level.

Texas is a very large and diverse State, but the United States is made up of 50 different States, plus territories, spread over a great distance. If the majority ought to not be allowed to rule in Texas, then how can they justify breaking the rules and traditions of the Senate to impose the will of 50 percent of the country on the other 50 percent?

So let's be very clear. As I have said before, the false, evidence-free claims of widespread voter suppression are as damaging as false claims of widespread voter fraud and thus need to stop. The reality is that each State is different, so it makes sense that States will have different voting processes.

Discrimination in voting is illegal. It is a Federal crime, and thank God it is a Federal crime. Beyond that, diversity in our Nation is a strength, not a weakness.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the