

I was mentioning the issues of disparity across our country for those who don't have access to broadband. The Makah Tribe, located on the northwest point of the Olympic Peninsula, 90 percent of those households don't have broadband.

I know Ms. Rosenworcel committed to both Senator WICKER and myself she would work with us on the issue of broadband mapping. I know in one county in Mississippi, the home of my colleague, that it is estimated the FCC broadband mapping overestimates internet coverage by a whopping 80 percent. This is unacceptable. We need accurate mapping, and we need the broadband funding to move forward.

I know the Biden administration understands the importance of affordability of broadband. I know they want to deploy broadband and make it more affordable, and we want to work with them to make that happen.

Chairwoman Rosenworcel also looked at the issue of healthcare and the fact that the internet is now access to doctors, to medical information, to monitoring patients, to delivering healthcare, and keeping the lights on. This is also why I think her nomination is so important.

She took time to firsthand visit telehealth in Washington—the State of Washington—and Seattle and saw how we were pushing forward. Yet the FCC is going to do more in this particular area.

Her leadership, I believe, will help ensure that our spectrum policies continue to spur innovation and economic prosperity. I know that she will be able to look forward to these developing technologies and how best to include innovation, including the next 5G wireless technology communications.

All of this, I believe, means that we in the United States have a desire to keep pushing the envelope and to have an FCC that understands how to resolve these problems.

I ask my colleague to support her nomination and to move forward on these important policies so we all can work on them together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I, as well as Senator CANTWELL, rise in support of Jessica Rosenworcel, President Joe Biden's nominee to serve as the Chair of the Federal Communications Commission.

In her time on the Commission, Chair Rosenworcel has been a tireless advocate for consumers in today's fast-changing media and digital landscape.

She stands up for consumers. She stands up for competition. She stands up for children. That is what the job of Chair of the Federal Communications Commission is all about, is standing up for all of those core principles that our country believes in.

She has made it very clear that she does believe that title II of the Communications Act is something that can

be and must be used in order to ensure that we give full protections to broadband users in our country.

Now, more than ever, we need strong leadership at the Federal Communications Commission, as Senator CANTWELL was just speaking.

We have 12 to 17 million children in the United States who did not have the internet during the first year of the COVID crisis, and we were able to build in huge funding that has reduced dramatically the number of children who do not have the internet at home, but more work must be done.

The best way to do it is to add even more money into the Build Back Better bill. If we do that, we will see that we are dealing with the fact that especially Black and Brown and immigrant children in our country have access to the tools which they are going to need to be able to get an education.

The coronavirus is coming back. It is taking a U-turn, and its implications for the education of poor children in our country is dramatic. That is why Chair Rosenworcel is the right person at the right time in order to serve as the Chair of the Federal Communications Commission.

We have to ensure the competition is at the heart of our policy. That is Chair Rosenworcel. We have to make sure the consumers benefit from these innovations in technology. That is her agenda. And we have to make sure that children—every child in our country—gets access to the technologies that are going to be necessary for every one of them to maximize their God-given abilities. That is what Chair Rosenworcel is all about.

I recommend with the strongest possible voice that I have to have a very strong vote on the floor of the Senate to confirm her for the Federal Communications Commission.

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. 567, Jessica Rosenworcel, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2020. (Reappointment)

Charles E. Schumer, Richard Blumenthal, Richard J. Durbin, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Gary C. Peters, Tammy Baldwin, Maria Cantwell, Mark R. Warner, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray.

VOTE ON ROSENWORCEL NOMINATION

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 Jessica Rosenworcel, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2020. (Reappointment), 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 Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) would have voted "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 478 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Romney
Booker	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Sullivan
Collins	Lujan	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cornyn	Markey	Warner
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warnock
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Fischer	Ossoff	
Gillibrand	Padilla	

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Hoeven	Paul
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Braun	Johnson	Rounds
Cotton	Kennedy	Rubio
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Lee	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lummis	Shelby
Daines	Marshall	Thune
Hawley	McConnell	Tillis

NOT VOTING—9

Blackburn	Merkley	Toomey
Cassidy	Sasse	Tuberville
Hagerty	Sinema	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENRICH). On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 27.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Ohio.

BUILD BACK BETTER ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor again this evening to talk about the so-called Build Back Better legislation.

This is legislation that Democrats are trying to push through the process here on a purely partisan basis under what is called the reconciliation process.

I believe this massive tax-and-spend bill is irresponsible at a time when we

see an uncertain economy, thanks in large measure to all of the challenges we are now finding with regard to COVID, and Omicron in particular, at a time of really high inflation that is hurting my constituents and everybody's constituents in this Chamber, and at a time of record levels of debt. Certainly, this is not a time for us to put out another piece of legislation that spends dramatically more money and also has big tax increases on the economy.

This is the 10th consecutive week while Congress has been in session that I have come to the floor to talk about reasons I believe this legislation is bad for America.

As we have talked about before, this massive new spending bill represents the largest amount of spending of any legislation ever passed by the U.S. Congress. This is a big deal.

Now, some would say: Well, the official score is only \$1.7 trillion so it is the second largest because the first largest would be the \$1.9 trillion that was already spent earlier this year. That is fine. You can say that, but what sets this legislation apart, as a number of analysts have shown us, including the Penn Wharton study, is that a lot of the spending in this bill, the costs of the bill, have sunsets. So it camouflages the full cost of the bill.

I will give you an example of one of the major spending priorities that is going to end up costing a lot more than estimates say. The enhanced child tax credit from the March spending bill is extended for 1 year in this legislation, which means that after next year, this new benefit people have come to expect would be cut off.

Based on the history here in Congress, that is not how it operates. Benefits like this are not ended. So if it doesn't end, and these programs ended up not being sunset, Penn Wharton estimates that the total spending on this bill goes from around 1.75 trillion to about \$4½ trillion. Wow. More than double the largest spending bill ever considered by the U.S. Congress.

At a time of record debts and deficits, my hope would be that Democrats and the Biden administration have come up with a responsible way to pay for this multitrillion-dollar reconciliation package.

Unfortunately, some of us have been arguing for months that this legislation is about as far as responsibly paid for as you can get. One of the primary sources of proposed revenue is a series of tax hikes that, despite what Democrats might say, hits the middle class, hits families in the middle class, hits small businesses the hardest.

As an example, the proposed Medicare surcharge on active investment income is going to hit millions of small businesses that structured themselves as passthroughs with a new, across-the-board, 3.8-percent increase on all income.

Proposed corporate tax increases will hit American workers based on the

analysis of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation. They say that when you increase the taxes on businesses, the main impact is to increase taxes on workers.

Why? Because wages and benefits are reduced because of it. Costs will be passed down to working families. This means higher prices for everything.

What is even worse is that, while the worker making 20, 40, 60,000 bucks a year is getting hit hard having to pay more because of inflation for gas, groceries, and clothes, at the same time, wealthy Americans, under this legislation, would get a tax break worth hundreds of millions of dollars, thanks to the Democrats' insistence on raising the cap on what is called the SALT, the State and local tax, deduction.

As part of the tax cuts back in 2017, we decided to limit the deduction you could take for State and local taxes to \$10,000 per year.

Why? Because it was very expensive to have that deduction out there because it is progressive, helps wealthier Americans much more because it is an effective policy that leads to an incentive where States are incentivized to raise their taxes because people get a corporate—a Federal tax deduction for it, and it is just not fair.

My constituents in Ohio are subsidizing New York and California for their high taxes. That doesn't seem to make sense to people.

However, under this Build Back Better bill that was passed by the House, they raised that cap from \$10,000 up to \$80,000. Over the next 5 years alone, that provision would cost \$285 billion. The vast majority of that tax benefit would go to the wealthiest Americans, with one recent analysis from the Tax Policy Center finding that almost no benefit will go to Americans not in the top 10 percent of income earners.

Conversely, child tax credit expansion, which Democrats argue was designed to help lower and middle-income Americans, costs \$185 billion. So \$285 billion for the SALT, which primarily goes to the wealthier individuals; 185 billion is put in place for what is viewed as the cornerstone safety and social net program in this whole bill.

So there are \$100 billion more in the regressive tax cut than there is in this cornerstone social safety net program.

As Marc Goldwein, with the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, put it:

We're debating about whether to give lower- and middle-class families a thousand dollars more a year through the child tax credit, while giving upper-class families \$10,000 or more through SALT.

That is pretty accurate.

Through lifting the SALT deduction and a number of other poorly planned tax overhauls under the so-called Build Back Better legislation, almost 70 percent of people making \$1 million or more a year—almost 70 percent of them—that is over 68 percent will get a significant tax cut.

So if you make over a million bucks a year, 70 percent are going to get over—are going to get a significant tax cut.

Nearly 90 percent of taxpayers earning between \$500,000 and a million dollars are going to get a significant tax cut.

Contrast that to people who make 30,000 bucks a year, as an example. While 70 percent of those making \$1 million or more are getting a tax cut, only 30 percent of those making 30,000 bucks a year or more are going to get a tax cut.

And guess what. That is in the first year. In the second year, it goes down to 12 percent. In the third year, it goes down to 10 percent or less, and then it goes to single digits.

So if you make 30,000 bucks a year or more, you got really no significant benefit here at all. But if you make a lot of money, you get a huge benefit. That doesn't make sense.

For example, in California, where there are graduated income tax rates of over 10 percent—that is the State income tax rate—that would amount to a \$47,000 deduction, on average, for somebody making 500,000 bucks a year—that is a lot—while the average taxpayer in California is only seeing a \$20-per-year benefit.

So, again, you are getting a deduction of about 47,000 bucks if you make over 500,000 bucks; whereas, the average taxpayer is only going to get about a \$20-a-year benefit. This doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense to Americans as they learn more about this.

The people I represent in my home State of Ohio are very concerned right now about the economy, particularly about inflation. They are worried about rising prices for everything, from gas to groceries. And they are worried about the fact that their hard-earned paychecks aren't going as far as they did just a few months ago.

Back in March, when the Democrats pushed through that \$1.9 trillion spending package, many of us on this side of the aisle tried to warn them that this stimulus was not needed to get the economy moving. The economy was going ahead on its own at that time, and yet this stimulus was thrown into the economy, which we said would overheat the economy. And it wasn't just Republicans.

Larry Summers, who served as the Treasury Secretary for President Clinton and Director of the National Economic Council under President Obama, warned that injecting so much money into the demand side of the economy would lead to inflation. He was right.

Now those same lawmakers are gearing up to do it again. Not only does Build Back Better deal an unfair hand to the working families they claim to champion, giving a tax break to the wealthy and leaving other Americans struggling to get by, it will stoke more inflation by pumping more money into the demand side of the economy. That is not what we should be doing now.

Ultimately, the American people are going to have to look at this reconciliation package—this bill called Build Back Better package—with its job-killing tax hikes, tax breaks to the wealthy, and stimulus spending and judge whether this is the right thing for the economy right now as we grapple with high inflation and struggle to get out of this pandemic.

It certainly is not the right thing. It is not in our national interest to be providing tax breaks to the wealthy and burdening our businesses and everyday taxpayers with higher taxes while stoking more inflation.

We are dealing with a host of economic challenges right now, from inflation to supply chain delays, to Omicron, to workforce shortages. As we seek to overcome these challenges, let's not build back worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2021.

To the Secretary of the Senate: PN1155 the nomination of James Arthur Jemison II, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, having been referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee with a quorum present, has vote on the nomination as follows—

1. On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed 12 ayes to 12 noes; and

In accordance with Section 3 paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote and ask that this notice be printed in the RECORD pursuant to the Resolution.

TRIBUTE TO ANN "ANDI" MATHIS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I stand today to extend my heartiest congratulations to Ann Mathis—"Andi"—as she prepares to retire from

the National Endowment for the Arts—NEA—after 42 years of dedicated service.

A resident of Bethesda, MD, Andi has served as the NEA's program specialist for States and regions, using her expertise in arts management and best practices in grantmaking to support the work of 50 State arts agencies, six regional arts organizations, and six U.S. Territories.

Andi first joined the NEA after graduating from Cornell University and then earning a master's degree in community arts management from the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Andi began her career in the NEA's Grants Office and Office of Management Analysis before settling into her role with States and regions in the Partnership Division.

During her distinguished tenure, Andi has nurtured partnerships with State arts agencies and regional arts organizations, building a network that has extended the reach of Federal support for the arts. As a guiding force in the NEA's Partnership Division and a font of institutional knowledge, Andi's expertise, dedication, and sense of humor have made her a beloved icon in national arts funding. Often, State and local officials would line up, literally, to obtain Andi's guidance and insight.

Andi's efforts have included extensive work with both the Maryland Arts Council and Maryland's Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation. She was also instrumental in centering the role of arts and culture in Federal disaster relief and recovery efforts, representing the NEA on disaster preparedness task forces and Federal Government working groups. Her outstanding work at the NEA has earned her numerous Distinguished Service Awards and other commendations over the years.

Andi's greatest pleasure has always been her beautiful family. While at the NEA, she married, had two daughters, Allison and Melinda, and now delights in her daughters' growing families, which enabled Andi to become "Grandi." A devoted mother and grandmother, Andi is renowned for her sewing prowess and her own line of "Grandi" children's clothing.

After more than four decades in the Federal Government, Andi plans to continue her legacy of service in retirement, working in the area of adult literacy, which will include tutoring through the Literacy Council of Montgomery County. We know that she will take seriously the Jewish tradition of tikkun olam, repairing the world, as she continues to make a difference in the lives of others.

I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our gratitude to Andi Mathis for her outstanding service to our Nation and in sending our best wishes to her as she begins her next adventure.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SEAN McDONNELL

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Coach Sean McDonnell, who recently announced his retirement after leading the University of New Hampshire football team for the past 23 years. I am deeply grateful for his leadership on and off the field and the impact that he has made on countless students.

Coach McDonnell has been a staple of UNH football for decades. After playing defensive back for the Wildcats from 1975 to 1978, he later returned to serve as an assistant coach, before taking over as head coach in 1999.

Under his leadership, the Wildcats saw much success. The team made 14 consecutive appearances in the NCAA's Football Championship Subdivision—FCS—playoffs and reached the semifinals in 2013 and 2014. As a result of his hard work, Coach McDonnell was named a two-time national coach of the year in the FCS.

But his reach goes far beyond the scoreboard. Known as Coach Mac, he served as a mentor and role model for countless young people. Above all, he was deeply proud of how those students and players represented the University of New Hampshire and our entire State.

Coach Sean McDonnell has left a lasting legacy in the Granite State. I thank him for all of his hard work and wish him the best in his well-deserved retirement.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the city of Royal Oak, MI. Situated in Oakland County, Royal Oak is a city endowed with natural beauty and rich traditions, built on a strong agricultural base and populated with dedicated citizens and entrepreneurs.

The vibrant history of Royal Oak began in 1819, when it was explored by Michigan Governor Lewis Cass as part of his survey of the land that now comprises Oakland County. In contrast to the surrounding marshes, Royal Oak sat on lush, high ground. Near the intersection of the modern Crooks and Rochester Roads, Cass and his companions found an imposing oak tree that brought to mind the tale of England's King Charles II, who was said to have taken refuge under a grand oak tree from enemy forces. For this reason, Cass and his fellow explorers christened the tree the "Royal Oak," and the city received its name.

Early settlers in the area were principally farmers focused on clearing the land in order to build homes and plant crops. The introduction of the railroad into Metro Detroit and Michigan's Bay area soon brought with it an increase