

want.” Senator Joe Biden made this statement:

Folks who want to see this change want to eliminate one of the procedural mechanisms designed for the express purpose of guaranteeing individual rights, and they also have a consequence, and would undermine the protections of a minority point of view in the heat of majority excess.

But now he says: No. I am in the majority. I should get my way.

Senator Joe Biden said:

I have been here 32 years, most of the time in the majority. Whenever you are in the majority, it is frustrating to see the other side block a bill or a nominee you support. I have walked in your shoes, and I get it. . . . Getting rid of the filibuster has long-term consequences. If there is one thing I have learned in my years here, once you change the rules and surrender the Senate's institutional power, you never get it back.

Senator Joe Biden said:

Simply put, the nuclear option would transform the Senate from the so-called cooling saucer our Founding Fathers talked about to cool the passions of the day to a pure majoritarian body like a Parliament. We have heard a lot in recent weeks about the rights of the majority and obstructionism. But the Senate is not meant to be a place of pure majoritarianism. Is majority rule what you really want?

That is what he said as a Senator, but as President, his demand was, majority rule or we will break every rule in the Senate to get what we want.

Senator SCHUMER, in his public statements, has been very clear. “It would be doomsday for democracy,” he said, “if you change the filibuster.”

This is the statement Senator SCHUMER made in 2017, the same Senator SCHUMER who has spent the last 12 months trying to find a way to tear down the filibuster. In 2017, when there was the debate going on around this, Senator SCHUMER said on the floor of the Senate, standing right there, “I hope the Republican leader and I,” he said, “can, in the coming months, find a way to build a firewall around the legislative filibuster, which is the most important distinction between the Senate and the House. Without the 60-vote threshold for legislation,” Senator SCHUMER said, “the Senate becomes a majoritarian institution like the House, much more subject to the winds of short-term electoral change. No Senator would like to see that happen so let's find a way to further protect the 60-vote rule for legislation.”

That was Senator SCHUMER in 2017, but now it is: I am in power. I am going to do what I want.

This is not a flippant issue, and as I have spoken to some of my Democratic colleagues, they seem to believe we will just take this vote and no one is going to care. In fact, some of my Democratic colleagues are saying: We know we are going to lose. Senator MANCHIN and Senator SINEMA have already made public comments. They are not going to go with this, or, we are going to take this, make a statement. Our progressive base wants us to be able to do this. It has no consequences. It is not going to pass anyway, so we

will just do it—except they are forgetting that 5 years from now, 10 years from now, there will be another time just like this. Maybe Democrats will be in a slightly larger majority. Maybe Senator SINEMA and Senator MANCHIN won't be here at that moment, and the majority leader, Democrat Senator, at that point will step forward and say: You voted on this in 2022. It is time for us to vote on it now.

Democratic activists will rush at you and will say: Don't you dare change what you did. Tear the place down. Let's get what we want.

I have spoken to so many of my colleagues and said: Don't do this.

They have quietly responded back to me: I don't want to do this.

I am not here to attack my colleagues. You each make your own decisions. But these are decisions that matter. These are the decisions that 100 years from now will still guide the direction of the Senate. These are the decisions that will direct our Republic.

We are the only body that has a protection for the minority voice; I think the only legislative body in the world that is designed like this. It has been part of the secret sauce of America that the minority in America, however large or small it is, has a voice.

My Democratic colleagues are now saying: We no longer want the minority to have a voice in America. If you are in the minority opinion, you don't count. Sit down. Shut up. We are in the majority.

That has never been the American way, not in 250 years. This has been the place where we have argued, debated, and where, yes, I have talked to House Members who have said good bills went to die. But the Senate has been the spot where all Americans get to speak. And my Democratic colleagues are seriously considering this week saying: No more, because we want to pass a voting bill that gives Federal dollars to House candidates and gives felons the right to vote and takes away voter ID.

What in the world? What has this body become that people who signed this document, page after page of it—I mean, I could bring out page after page of Senators who have signed this and have said “Do not take away the legislative filibuster” but now are just flipping and flippant and saying it won't matter. Yes, it does. One hundred years from now, this week will still matter.

I encourage my Democratic colleagues to think carefully on this one because this one counts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. SINEMA. Madam President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 1 on the motion to invoke cloture on Anne Witkowsky to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations).

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 2 on the confirmation of Anne Witkowsky to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations).

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 510 on the motion to invoke cloture on Jinsook Ohta to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of California.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 511 on the confirmation of Jinsook Ohta to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of California.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 512 on the motion to invoke cloture on David Urias to be U.S. District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 513 on the confirmation of David Urias to be U.S. District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 514 on the motion to invoke cloture on Maame Frimpong to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 515 on the confirmation of Maame Frimpong to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 516 on the motion to invoke cloture on Jane Beckering to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 517 on the confirmation of Jane Beckering to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 518 on the motion to invoke cloture on Shalina Kumar to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 519 on the confirmation of Shalina Kumar to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 520 on the motion to invoke cloture on Jennifer Thurston to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 521 on the confirmation of Jennifer Thurston to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 522 on the motion to invoke cloture on Katherine Menendez to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 523 on the confirmation of Katherine Menendez to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 524 on the motion to invoke cloture on Mary Dimke to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 525 on the confirmation of Mary Dimke to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 526 on the confirmation of Rahm Emanuel to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 527 on the motion to invoke cloture on Gabriel Sanchez to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present I would have voted yes on rollcall vote 528 on the motion to invoke cloture on Holly Thomas to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL L. HANNA

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate and honor the retirement of one of my senior staff members and friend who has served in my home State of Idaho for the last 13 years as the regional director of my Lewiston office, Michael "Mike" L. Hanna.

Following his retirement from the timber industry, Mike came to my staff after my first election to the U.S. Senate in May of 2009. I knew right away that he was a perfect fit for the regional director position in my Lewiston office. As a result, my chief of staff and I hired him immediately following his interview.

Mike was born in Boise, ID, and was raised there and in the Emmett Valley, where his parents' families worked as farmers and sawmill workers. Growing up in a farming and timber family eventually led him to the University of

Idaho, where he graduated with a bachelor of science degree in forest management in 1976.

Upon graduating from U of I, Mike began his 33-year career in the timber industry as a forester with the Idaho Department of Lands. After 12 years with the State of Idaho, he transitioned to the private sector, where he worked for Empire Lumber Company, Weyerhaeuser, and Three River Timber.

Given his expertise and vast knowledge of the timber industry, Mike was frequently called upon to participate in and lead collaborative groups and natural resource associations and organizations. To name but a few, he was a founding member of the Clearwater Basin Collaborative, president of the Intermountain Logging Conference board of directors, president of the Resource Organization on Timber Supply, or ROOTS, president of the Clearwater Resource Coalition, and the chairman of the Forestry Committee of the Intermountain Forestry Association. He was also recognized by the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation for his U.S. Forest Service stewardship contract work.

With his deep roots in Idaho and the timber industry, he was the perfect representative to the natural resource communities of the Clearwater Region, stationed out of my Lewiston office. During his 13 years of service as my regional director, he advised and guided my office through many complicated issues, like the Idaho roadless rule implementation, the salmon and steelhead management plans, Columbia River Treaty, Good Neighbor Authority, tribal relations, and too many other issues to name.

Mike and his wife Nancy have been married for 45 years and have made their home in Orofino, ID for 44 years, where they are an integral part of the fabric of the community. They have two children, Lindsay and Adam, and five grandchildren.

It is always difficult to lose a trusted staff member of Mike's character, experience, and knowledge, and I wish him and Nancy nothing but the best in their retirement and look forward to our continued friendship in the years ahead.

Congratulations and thank you for your outstanding service to my staff and the citizens of Idaho.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PALACE THEATER

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today I rise to recognize the Palace Theater in Waterbury, CT as it celebrates 100 years of artistic achievement and advocacy.

The Palace Theater originally opened on January 28, 1922. With the culmination of a \$1 million investment in décor by Sylvester Z. Poli and the remark-

able architectural work of Thomas Lamb, the theater soon became a hub for cultural activity in Waterbury before the onset of World War II.

The ornate building started as a movie and vaudeville house. Over the past century, the Palace has hosted a wide breadth of performances and productions, from silent films to rock concerts and everything in between. In 1983, the U.S. Department of the Interior honored the Palace Theater by listing it on the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1987, the theater closed for 18 years. However, a 3-year, \$30 million restoration, renovation, and expansion project impressively reshaped the Palace. When it reopened, the theater was a state-of-the-art, 90,000-square-foot arena. Now a vast complex, the Palace is known as Greater Waterbury's Center for the Performing Arts.

In its current state, the Palace hosts educational programming, Broadway tours, and a variety of family entertainment. The theater's team is committed to serving the greater Waterbury community by establishing not just a magnificent artistic site but also a highly regarded educational and cultural center.

The Palace Theater is recognized as one of the premier arts facilities in New England, and I have had the privilege of visiting on a number of occasions to speak with the staff there. I am continuously impressed by the Palace's record of achievement and the tireless dedication of everyone involved to furthering arts education and advocacy for countless Connecticut residents and visitors.

I applaud the theater on its extraordinary history of accomplishment, and I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Palace Theater on 100 years of excellence.●

TRIBUTE TO MARK BENNETT

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to commend Mark Bennett, who is retiring as chief of the water development division of the Arkansas Natural Resources Commission after a 34-year career creating and preserving access to water in our State.

Through his work, Mark has helped provide clean, safe, and reliable water to countless Arkansans and has been instrumental in the conservation of our State's land and water resources. Thanks to Mark's dedication and commitment to the people of Arkansas, he has ensured that future generations will be able to enjoy the beautiful land and wildlife the Natural State is known for.

Mark is a true Arkansas success story. Raised near Lake Village and a graduate of Lakeside High School, Mark earned a bachelor's degree in both agricultural economics and banking and finance from Mississippi State University. He continued his education at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock William H. Bowen School of Law