

The clerk will call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 288 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Bennet, Blumenthal, Blunt, Booker, Brown, Burr, Cantwell, Capito, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Cassidy, Collins, Coons, Cortez Masto, Cramer, Crapo, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Gillibrand, Graham, Grassley, Hassan, Heinrich, Hickenlooper, Hirono, Hoeven, Kaine, Kelly, King, Klobuchar, Leahy, Lujan, Manchin, Markey, McConnell, Menendez, Merkley, Murkowski, Murphy, Murray, Ossoff, Padilla, Peters, Portman, Reed, Romney, Rosen, Sanders, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Sinema, Smith, Stabenow, Tester, Tillis, Van Hollen, Warner, Warnock, Warren, Whitehouse, Wyden, Young.

NAYS—28

Table with 3 columns of names: Barrasso, Blackburn, Boozman, Braun, Cornyn, Cotton, Cruz, Daines, Ernst, Fischer, Hagerty, Hawley, Hyde-Smith, Johnson, Kennedy, Lankford, Lee, Lummis, Moran, Sasse, Scott (FL), Scott (SC), Shelby, Sullivan, Thune, Toomey, Tuberville, Wicker.

NOT VOTING—6

Table with 3 columns of names: Inhofe, Marshall, Paul, Risch, Rounds, Rubio.

The motion was agreed to.

INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3684) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety pro-

grams, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

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 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. 232, Ur Mendoza Jaddou, of California, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jacky Rosen, Debbie Stabenow, Edward J. Markey, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tina Smith, Amy Klobuchar, Michael F. Bennet, Christopher Murphy, Elizabeth Warren, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal, Ron Wyden, Catherine Cortez Masto, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters.

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 Ur Mendoza Jaddou, of California, to be Director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 289 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Bennet, Blumenthal, Booker, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Coons, Cortez Masto, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Gillibrand, Hassan, Heinrich, Hickenlooper, Hirono, Kaine, Kelly, King, Klobuchar, Leahy, Lujan, Manchin, Markey, Menendez, Merkley, Murphy, Murray, Ossoff, Padilla, Peters, Reed, Rosen, Sanders, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Sinema, Smith, Stabenow, Tester, Van Hollen, Warner, Warnock, Warren, Whitehouse, Wyden.

NAYS—41

Table with 3 columns of names: Barrasso, Blackburn, Blunt, Boozman, Braun, Capito, Cassidy, Collins, Cornyn, Cotton, Cramer, Crapo, Cruz, Daines, Ernst, Fischer, Graham, Grassley, Hagerty, Hawley, Hoeven, Hyde-Smith, Kennedy, Lankford, Lee, Lummis, McConnell, Moran, Murkowski, Portman, Romney, Scott (FL), Scott (SC), Shelby, Sullivan, Thune, Tillis, Toomey, Tuberville, Wicker, Young.

NOT VOTING—9

Table with 3 columns of names: Burr, Inhofe, Johnson, Marshall, Paul, Risch, Rounds, Rubio, Sasse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 50, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ur Mendoza Jaddou, of California, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, each year on July 30, we take time to celebrate whistleblowers and the very hard role that whistleblowers play in keeping our government transparent and accountable.

But the task of supporting whistleblowers doesn't start and stop on July 30; it is a year-round job. And here in this Congress, it is something that we have been working on for decades.

When I first came to Washington in the 1970s, most of the whistleblower laws we take for granted today didn't even exist then.

I like to tell people, anyone who dared to blow the whistle back at that time was about as welcome as a skunk at a picnic.

People in government would often retaliate by trying to run the whistleblower off and make them out to be the problem instead of the problem the whistleblower was trying to present.

I still hear about that kind of retaliation going on this very day in far too many cases. But, today, we have better whistleblower protections in place than we did years ago, and whistleblowers have important advocates in their corner to support them.

The Nation owes a special thanks for many of the key whistleblower protections that we have in place this very day to my former colleague and good friend, Senator Carl Levin, who died yesterday at the age of 87.

Carl was the original sponsor of the Whistleblower Protection Act back in 1989, and a cosponsor of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012.

I was proud to have worked with Carl on those foundational pieces of whistleblower legislation. I know that if Carl

were still here in the Senate this very day, he would be continuing to lead on whistleblower issues.

Carl understood that whistleblower protections are not just important to Members of Congress and a small network of interest groups in Washington, DC; they are important for the entire Nation because whistleblowers play a critical role in our government. They call attention to the problems of waste, fraud, abuse, and inefficiency.

And if you have the sort of transparency that comes because whistleblowers are ready to stand up for what is right, that transparency brings accountability to our government, and you can't have a democratic government that is not accountable.

These whistleblowers help those of us in Congress to identify problems in the government so we can fix them through oversight and, if necessary, passing legislation.

And so whistleblowers help keep government transparent and accountable to the people, and they help us find ways of saving taxpayers' dollars.

As much as Carl accomplished during his Senate career helping whistleblowers, and as much as we have accomplished together over the years, there is still more that needs to be done to ensure that whistleblowers remain protected.

One important resource for whistleblowers is the Merit Systems Protection Board, where whistleblowers can go if they face retaliation for blowing the whistle.

And let me tell you, too many whistleblowers face retaliation for doing just what is right. We ought to see them as partisans for good government.

Now, this Merit Systems Protection Board has been without a quorum for more than 2 years, and it has developed a significant backlog of cases. I am not sure what is keeping President Biden from sending us nominations for that board. I certainly believe he needs to do that without delay.

There is also still work to do to make whistleblower protections stronger and more robust. I am working on several pieces of whistleblower legislation in this Congress. One of my bills will strengthen incentives and protections for whistleblowers who report potential money laundering.

And I also have legislation to further strengthen the False Claims Act and an act entitled Program Fraud Civil Remedies by giving Agencies more resources to directly take on people who defraud the government.

In addition, I am working on legislation that will establish stronger whistleblower protections for our FBI employees. Wherever there are still gaps in our existing laws, I am working to fill those gaps.

This year, on Whistleblower Appreciation Day, the Senate Whistleblower Protection Caucus welcomes two new Members: Senators COLLINS and HASSAN.

As chair of the caucus, I am pleased to welcome my colleagues. I look forward to working with these new colleagues and our caucus co-chair, Senator WYDEN of Oregon, as we continue our joint effort to make sure the whistleblower laws and protections we have in place next year and the year after are even stronger than the ones that we have in place today.

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

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

H.R. 3684

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it is 2 o'clock on a Friday afternoon, and it looks like we are going to grind through this bipartisan infrastructure bill this weekend, as Senator SCHUMER has ordained, but we have now had a couple of votes—actually, three votes now—to proceed to a bill that hasn't even been written yet in totality, and indeed the reason we were delayed this morning was because some of the text that was written did not comport with the agreement between the negotiating parties.

I have said this from the beginning; that Senator SCHUMER should not rush a bill to the floor before it is ready. It is simply not a good practice. And we are talking about more than \$1 trillion in spending that will affect every man, woman, and child in America. It is more important to get things right than to get it done fast.

For weeks now, the bipartisan group of Senators who have been negotiating this bipartisan infrastructure package have been engaged in intense negotiations with the White House to find common ground. Over the last several days, in particular, colleagues have logged countless hours to nail down specific provisions and how it would be paid for.

I want to commend all of them for their efforts on both sides of the aisle. It has been a long road, but we still have a long road ahead, and I appreciate both sides working in good faith to try to reach an agreement.

Like all my colleagues, I am eager to see the text in the bill to understand the specifics and how it impacts my State, what is included and what is not included. To gain my support, this legislation must accomplish two things: First, it must send sufficient resources to Texas to build and maintain our vast network of infrastructure projects. We are the fastest growing State in the Nation, with 29 million people, and we need to make sure our infrastructure is up to the need. We have the largest network of roadways of any State in the country, with more than 680,000 lane miles. We are also home to more than 55,000 bridges, far more than any other State.

We have water ports along the gulf coast, as the Presiding Officer knows, having lived in Houston, and ports of entry along the border with Mexico and Canada, all of which are critical to our economy, as well as airports, levees, waterways, and countless other infrastructure projects that are vital to our communities across the State.

The pandemic has also highlighted the importance of broadband, including the need to expand access in unserved parts of the State. It is figured that we have about a third of our State without adequate access to broadband, and, of course, that became critical when our children were studying remotely from home or when people attempted to see their doctor using telehealth. Broadband has gone from a convenience to a necessity.

It is going to take a little while to comb through the specifics of this massive bill—I think at last count it was 2,600 pages long—to see if it meets my two criteria. But that is my priority No. 1.

But my second criterion is this bill must include a real plan to pay for these infrastructure investments in a responsible way. We have had to spend a lot of money in the last 18 months. A lot of this money was borrowed money because we were engaged in an emergency, a pandemic. But now our debt to gross domestic product is really roughly to what it was after World War II, and I agree that most of that was necessary, at least the bipartisan bills that we passed. I think there were a total of five last year.

But now is not an emergency when it comes to infrastructure. Now, this is the bread and butter of legislating, and we have got to come up with a responsible way to pay for the money that we intend to spend.

The current draft of the bill, I think, is lacking in adequate pay-fors. Senator PORTMAN, the Senator from Ohio, said that the Congressional Budget Office would not give the writers of the bill credit for some of the money that is in fact real, some of the repurposed money from COVID-19 that was not used for Federal bonuses to State unemployment, which was, at one point, rejected by the Governors because people were being paid more money not to work than to work. So there wasn't a pot of money to offset some of the spending.

But I think there are additional pay-fors that have been overlooked. So I am in the process of drafting amendments to this bill, including new pay-fors, and I hope these amendments will come to a vote on the Senate floor.

I support the efforts of our colleagues on a bipartisan basis to negotiate the current package. I think they have done us a great favor. But the fact of the matter is, the rest of us, the 80 of us who did not participate in those negotiations, have a right and a duty to participate in writing this legislation too. So it would be a terrible mistake for the majority leader to refuse to