

focused on aspects of so-called critical race theory and cited such dubious items as the 1619 Project. The notice the Department of Education released last week dropped this discussion and indicated that the Department would not give a competitive advantage to applications that reflect critical race theory.

The bipartisan program in question was established to strengthen American history and civics education, which is in a bad way. Just 15 percent of eighth graders demonstrate proficiency in American history, according to the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress results. A 2019 survey found that just 4 in 10 American adults were capable of passing a U.S. citizenship test. Yet the Biden administration was apparently ready to compound this problem by pushing ideas rooted in critical race theory—a radical, leftist ideology.

As it is currently being pushed, critical race theory advances the idea that America is not merely flawed but inherently and systematically evil and that fixing this problem requires tearing down our institutions.

I don't need to tell anyone that the United States has an imperfect history, and any genuine approach to American history has to examine those times when we failed to live up to our ideals as well as those times when we have succeeded. But while there are sins in our past that we cannot ignore, like the great sins of slavery and segregation, there is also greatness.

Our Founders did something that was pretty much unprecedented in the history of the world. They sat down and built a country based not on who conquered whom but on a set of principles, on a shared belief in liberty and unalienable human rights. While we haven't always lived up to those beliefs, we have never stopped trying, and we continue to hold out the promise of liberty not only to our country but to the whole world. There is a reason individuals around the globe have fled to these shores for the promise of freedom and have found in the United States the refuge they were searching for.

Critical race theory distorts the reality of American history. It sees our failures but none of our successes. More than that, it actively misrepresents our history. The 1619 Project, for example, advances the totally fabricated claim that a primary motivation for the American Revolution was a desire to preserve slavery. That couldn't be further from the truth. It is no surprise that leading historians have criticized the 1619 Project for its historical distortions and factual inaccuracies.

On top of that, by demonizing the United States, critical race theory also invites students to despise our country and ignore the tremendous freedoms and blessings that we enjoy. We are incredibly fortunate to live in the United States of America, and we let our students down when we fail to give them

the perspective to see the blessings our country provides.

By dividing the world into oppressors and oppressed, critical race theory promotes resentment and victimization. It encourages individuals to look at the world through one lens and one lens only and tends to reduce individuals to little more than their racial background.

I am glad that the Department of Education chose not to give preference to applicants with a focus on the radical ideas of critical race theory. This was good news for America's students, who deserve a balanced accounting of our Nation's history, which critical race theory does not provide.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks before the vote starts.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, there is still a lot of reason to be concerned. The Department's reversal was cloaked in bureaucratic language, leaving room for a future flip-flop by the administration. Too many schools around the country are already considering or adopting outlandish proposals informed by critical race theory, from a math course that suggests that focusing on the right answer in math is grounded in racism to materials implying that the nuclear family is somehow inherently racist.

This is a grave disservice to students of all races, and we need to make sure that Federal education dollars are going to genuine history and civics education and not radical propaganda. We owe all American students better than historically inaccurate history lessons.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON KIM NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kim nomination?

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 279 Ex.]

YEAS—58

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-----------|
| Baldwin | Cornyn | Kelly |
| Bennet | Cortez Masto | King |
| Blumenthal | Duckworth | Klobuchar |
| Blunt | Durbin | Leahy |
| Booker | Feinstein | Luján |
| Brown | Gillibrand | Manchin |
| Cantwell | Graham | Markey |
| Capito | Grassley | Menendez |
| Cardin | Hassan | Merkley |
| Carper | Heinrich | Murkowski |
| Casey | Hickenlooper | Murphy |
| Collins | Hirono | Murray |
| Coons | Kaine | Ossoff |

| | | |
|---------|------------|------------|
| Padilla | Shaheen | Warner |
| Peters | Sinema | Warnock |
| Reed | Smith | Warren |
| Rosen | Stabenow | Whitehouse |
| Sanders | Tester | Wyden |
| Schatz | Tillis | |
| Schumer | Van Hollen | |

NAYS—41

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Barrasso | Hawley | Risch |
| Blackburn | Hoeben | Romney |
| Boozman | Hyde-Smith | Rubio |
| Braun | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Burr | Johnson | Scott (FL) |
| Cassidy | Kennedy | Scott (SC) |
| Cotton | Lankford | Shelby |
| Cramer | Lee | Sullivan |
| Crapo | Lummis | Thune |
| Cruz | Marshall | Toomey |
| Daines | McConnell | Tuberville |
| Ernst | Moran | Wicker |
| Fischer | Paul | Young |
| Hagerty | Portman | |

NOT VOTING—1

Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources from further consideration of the nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning, of Montana, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with no motions, points of order, or amendments in order.

Mr. SCHUMER. As a reminder to all Members, the official photograph of the 117th Congress will be at 2:15 p.m. Senators are asked to be on the floor at that time. Following the photograph, the Senate will reconvene and resume consideration of the motion to discharge the Stone-Manning nomination. Senators should expect the vote on the motion to discharge to occur around 5 p.m. today.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:37 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CAPITOL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, it has been more than 200 days since the U.S. Capitol was attacked by mobs of anti-government insurrectionists. It was the darkest day for Congress in more than 200 years, since invading troops set this magnificent building on fire 200 years ago.

Americans in uniform that day stepped up to protect Congress. The officers of the Capitol Police and other law enforcement agencies literally put their lives on the line to protect Senators, Congressmen, and to protect our Constitution.

More than 25,000 members of the National Guard also came from across the country to secure Capitol Hill, including from my home State of Montana.

Words cannot express my thanks for what these men and women did on behalf of our Nation, and their service was not without sacrifice.

Police officers were assaulted by an angry mob, and we know that post-traumatic stress is a real problem for many who had been to hell and back. The citizen soldiers of the National Guard stood watch day and night.

Now, today, we find out that pay is running short for both Capitol Police and the members of the National Guard. The good news is that after weeks of Senate negotiations, we are on the verge of a bipartisan deal that ensures that the Capitol Police will have the money to pay its officers for the rest of the year.

And as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I have worked with Vice Chairman SHELBY on two critical funding items to be included in this bill.

First, we have agreed that the National Guard urgently needs \$521 million to pay them for securing this Capitol. This funding will allow the summer drill season to proceed without interruption. We need a prepared Guard.

Second, we have learned of the substantial costs of moving Afghans who helped our military get out of that country safely. We owe a debt to those brave Afghans, who risked their lives to support our American troops. That debt can never be fully repaid.

I would like to thank Chairman LEAHY and Vice Chairman SHELBY for working with me on this important bill. I hope we can seal the deal very soon and have this measure approved by the Senate today because it is our job to defend the brave officers who defended us on January 6 and who continue their tireless work to keep us safe today.

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. BARRASSO. 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. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to be able to use a prop during my remarks.

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

NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to strongly oppose the nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning.

I want to focus my remarks now on the misleading and false statements that Tracy Stone-Manning has made to the Senate and how they just don't align with the facts.

On her committee questionnaire, which is a sworn affidavit that every nominee fills out, the committee clearly asks: Have you ever been investigated?

Tracy Stone-Manning said she had not.

On the same document, she also stated that she testified for a grand jury about an alleged tree spiking. Well, these statements are not true, and Ms. Stone-Manning knows it.

Tree spiking involves hammering a metal spike, like this one, into the trunk of a tree. Ecoterrorists use spikes like this. This is something they do to prevent loggers from harvesting trees. If a saw blade hits that spike, it destroys the saw, and metal shrapnel flies in every direction. The results can be catastrophic.

The trees in the Clearwater National Forest were spiked in 1989. Individuals were found guilty of this crime, and a local sawmill was damaged as a result of the spikes. Some of the trees standing today are still spiked and can still do damage to loggers and firefighters. These are serious dangers and damages that can occur to people still today.

If there is a forest fire in the Clearwater National Forest, a smoke jumper may need to cut down trees to slow the spread of the fire. If that person hits a spike with a chain saw, it could kill or maim the firefighter. Worse still, Tracy Stone-Manning knew who the ecoterrorists were, and she could have turned them in at the start.

In 1989, she edited, typed, and sent this vile, threatening letter to the men and women of the U.S. Forest Service. She did it on behalf of the tree spikers. The letter included lines like:

You bastards go in there anyway and a lot of people could get hurt.

She went on:

I would be more than willing to pay you a dollar for the sale, but you would have to find me first, and that could be your WORST nightmare.

Tracy Stone-Manning has said since the incident that she mailed this disturbing, threatening letter to warn people of the danger of the spiked trees. But she didn't go to the authorities. No, she did not. She did not go to the police. No, not at all. She took ex-

traordinary steps to ensure that she and the tree spikers would never get caught.

If she had gone to the police, the Forest Service would have been much better able to identify the spiked trees. Instead, she covered up for the criminals for years. All the while, these trees remain spiked and remain incredibly dangerous.

Ms. Stone-Manning told our committee that she was never investigated. Well, that was a lie. Following the tree spiking in 1989, she was subpoenaed by investigators to provide hair samples, fingerprints, writing samples, and other physical evidence.

These are criminal investigators. Press articles at the time confirm this fact, as do the court documents obtained by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. This is further verified by the letter that our committee received by the lead criminal investigator for the U.S. Forest Service, Mr. Michael Merkley. We received this letter after she had testified in front of the Senate committee a few months ago.

He wrote:

... the grand jury issued subpoenas for hair samples, handwriting exemplars, and fingerprints. These subpoenas were served on persons suspected of having knowledge of the incident, including Ms. Tracy Stone-Manning.

But don't take his word for it. Let's listen to the words of Tracy Stone-Manning herself. In a 1990 article about law enforcement's investigation at the University of Montana, she complained about how the investigation made her feel.

She said:

It was degrading. It changed my awareness of the power of the government.

Through this entire period, she did not tell the truth to the investigators. Remember, she knew who spiked the trees. She sent a threatening letter to them. She never went to the police, and she never identified the ecoterrorists. She also didn't cooperate.

The lead investigator says in his letter that the committee has received since the time she testified to the committee a few months ago—he said:

Through this initial investigation in 1989, Ms. Stone-Manning was extremely difficult to work with; in fact she was the nastiest of suspects. . . . she was vulgar, antagonistic, and extremely anti-government.

He goes on to say she refused to comply with the investigation until she learned she would be arrested if she did not.

But the investigation of Tracy Stone-Manning did not end in 1989 with the subpoenas. In December of 1992, after years of her covering up for the ecoterrorists, she was identified as the one who sent the threatening letter. A woman connected with the group came forward and gave her name to investigators.

Mr. MERKLEY writes, again, in this letter we received since Stone-Manning