

led this effort on the Republican side, and I want to commend our colleagues for their leadership. They have put in countless hours over the last few years to reach this compromise. Obviously, it was not easy. The fact that this bill already has more than 20 bipartisan cosponsors speaks volumes about their success.

We couldn't have gotten to this point without the dedication of our friend, the senior Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, who has been engaged in these discussions from the beginning. I appreciate the hard work that she and Senator DURBIN, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have put into this bill and their willingness to make sensible compromises so we can, hopefully, get this signed into law without further delay.

Like all legislation, this bill is not perfect, but as the saying goes, you can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Throughout the negotiating process, I have raised concerns about some of the provisions, and I have seen our colleagues work in good faith with us to address many of those issues. There is no question, in my mind, that this is a good bill that will go a long way to modernize the Violence Against Women Act and ensure that it continues to serve survivors.

The VAWA Reauthorization Act extends this legislation through 2027 and builds on the advancements made in previous reauthorizations. It improves access to services, especially those in rural communities with fewer resources. It promotes partnerships with law enforcement and victim services organizations to provide victim-centered training for law enforcement officers. It improves grants that help school-based professionals connect students with victim services, and it strengthens existing campus grant programs for colleges and universities. It establishes a pilot program to support domestic violence victims seeking employment. It takes aim at relatively new threats, including cyber crimes, by establishing a national resource center on cyber crimes against individuals.

This legislation also invests in a broad range of grant programs, trainings, and resources to support survivors of domestic violence and prevent similar crimes from occurring in the future.

I am glad this legislation includes provisions from a number of bipartisan bills that I have introduced with colleagues here in the Senate.

One example is a bill that the Presiding Officer will appreciate, which I introduced with Senator COONS, called the NICS Denial Notification Act.

If someone attempts to purchase a gun—in other words, they lie about their legal qualification to purchase a gun—but is denied when the NICS background check system comes back with a hit, indicating that they are disqualified for one of a variety of legal reasons, right now, local law enforce-

ment is not notified that somebody tried to buy a firearm and lied about it and was denied access to that firearm because of the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Under current law, Federal officials are notified when individuals, including convicted felons and domestic abusers, fail a background check, but they are not required to notify State and local law enforcement—the people in the best position to actually be on the lookout for people who may be a danger to their communities and to themselves.

This legislation will change that. This legislation will require the Department of Justice to notify the relevant State and local authorities within 24 hours of a failed background check.

Now, there are some organizations that are disparaging this particular provision. They are basically misrepresenting what it does. So I want to be clear about what it does do.

What it does do is address somebody who lies in the course of filling out a background check, indicating that they are not disqualified, only to find out, when checking the system, that they, in fact, are. Obviously, these folks are up to no good if they are lying about their ability to purchase a firearm under current law. It just makes sense, in addition to Federal officials being notified of convicted felons and domestic violence abusers, that State and local law enforcement be notified as well. This notification would include the name of the individual as well as when and where they attempted to purchase a firearm. This information gives law enforcement the ability to investigate and intervene before a potentially deadly attack occurs. It should set off all sorts of alarms when a convicted felon or domestic violence abuser lies when attempting to purchase a firearm.

The Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act also includes legislation that I introduced with Senator DURBIN, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is called Supporting Access to Nurse Exams Act.

Sexual assault nurse examiners, known as SANEs, are on the frontlines of our fight to support victims of sexual assault. These are the nurses who perform the forensic examinations on rape victims and who help to identify and convict sexual offenders.

This provision improves an existing grant program that funds sexual assault forensic exam programs. We don't have enough of these SANEs, or nurse examiners. This bill will put more money into the field in order to train more of these SANEs, to provide for their salaries, and to increase access in areas of the country that need SANEs more, particularly in rural areas.

These men and women are crucial to our efforts to deliver justice, and this is an important step we can take to address the nationwide shortage of sexual assault nurses.

Over the years, the Senate and the Congress have done a lot to eliminate the rape kit backlog, which at one point totaled a reported 400,000 in backlog rape kits. These rape kits are forensic examination kits that contain DNA, which is so essential in identifying the perpetrators of sexual assault and which has the miraculous ability—or seemingly miraculous ability—to actually exonerate some people who may be misidentified through visual identification.

It also helps, over a period of a long time, to identify people who may have evaded prosecution because of the statute of limitations. Many of these individuals who commit these sexual assaults will do so on a serial basis. So once we have been able to identify them through successful rape kit evaluations, we can bring them to justice.

Once again, I want to commend Senators Ernst and Murkowski for their tireless efforts, on behalf of victims nationwide, to get us to this point.

The Violence Against Women Act has changed the lives—improved the lives, actually—of countless survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. So it is time for us to come together and reauthorize this crucial program.

I am proud to support this legislation, and I hope Senator SCHUMER, the majority leader, can find time to put it on the Senate's calendar and vote it out without delay.

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.

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

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

REMEMBERING LELAND CHRISTENSEN

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I am just profoundly sad and also humbled and proud to honor the memory of a cherished son of Wyoming. More than anything, I rise to honor my longtime friend Leland Christensen.

Leland was most recently State director for my U.S. Senate office. Truly, his death cuts me to the depths of my heart. I have known Leland for decades, and there are few losses in my life that I have ever felt as deeply as this one. Leland was all Wyoming. He was tough as nails, endlessly patient, and unwaveringly kind.

Prior to his time in my office, Leland served the people of Wyoming and our great Nation in a number of roles. He was formerly a member of the Wyoming National Guard; a sheriff; a county commissioner for Teton County; a State senator and chair of our State senate's Judiciary Committee; a deputy director of the Wyoming Office of Homeland Security; and, of course, most recently, State director for our U.S. Senate office.

When I was elected to the U.S. Senate, I knew I needed Leland on my

team because he loved Wyoming people. He loved to help his fellow man. He cared about the challenges faced by our State and its people. His smile would light up every room, and his laugh was infectious. He was a joy to be with. He was my dear friend.

He even guided my daughter and me into the Teton wilderness, along with his own family, on horseback to Hawks Rest, the most remote place in the lower 48 States—in tents, in the rain, fishing, with mules, panniers, packs. It was an incredible experience. We also floated the Snake River together, with Leland at the helm of his own raft.

His knowledge and skill had a timeless quality to them. He rescued people in swollen rivers. He rescued their horses. He searched for people in wilderness areas because he knew the wilderness areas like the back of his hand.

He was a totally unique human being. His knowledge and skill were so timeless, he would have thrived and excelled had he lived 200 years ago just as surely as he did in the 21st century, where he skillfully navigated legislation, people issues, computer issues, and listened to endless books on tape while he traveled all over Wyoming. He was a timeless, wonderful individual.

I can honestly say I never worried about whether my team was taking care of the needs of my constituents in Wyoming because I always knew that Leland was watching. He always made sure that anyone who needed help with a Federal Agency was assisted and that our team was doing everything possible to help them resolve their problems. By every estimation—certainly by my estimation—he was 10 feet tall and bulletproof.

But, in His own good time, God calls all His children home to be of service there. Leland was prepared for his service in Heaven each and every day throughout his entire life in Wyoming. I can remember Leland praying before a meal out in the wilderness with such gratitude that you had heard a sermon in gratitude by the time he was done offering grace over a meal.

I have talked a lot about Leland as a public servant and a friend, but he was first and foremost a loving and devoted father and husband. I am mourning his loss with his wife Anita; children Hunter, Brittany, Simone, Jed, and Wyatt; their spouses; and his grandchildren.

My staff and I, many of whom are here today joining me in this Senate Chamber, along with the entire Wyoming community, tens of thousands of whom knew Leland and loved Leland, are all praying for Leland's family. Words cannot truly convey the loss that we as a team feel since Leland passed away.

I have worked with hundreds of colleagues, many of whom I have cared for very much, but rarely do I come across someone whose sincere humility, generosity, and selflessness come close to those of Leland Christensen. Every day spent with Leland was a better day. He was the definition of both "civil servant" and "statesman."

On behalf of the people of Wyoming, I want to say thank you for his service to our State and our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I overheard some of my colleagues here on the Senate floor complaining about what happened at the Senate Banking Committee today, and I want to address this, set the record straight, and provide a little historical context, which I think is important.

Last week, the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, Chairman BROWN, indicated that he wanted to have votes on six nominees within the Banking Committee jurisdiction. Five were to be Governors of the Federal Reserve—they had been nominated to Federal Reserve posts—and one was the Director of the FHFA.

Now, I told the chairman last week that as far as Republicans on the committee were concerned, we were perfectly fine proceeding to votes on five of the six. Five of the six nominees we were ready to have votes on. Those five included the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jay Powell; Vice Chair Lael Brainard; nominee Professor Lisa Cook; nominee Professor Philip Jefferson; and the nominee to be the Director of the FHFA, Sandra Thompson. All of those, we were fine with a vote.

By the way, some of those nominees have significant Republican support. At least one, I think, has no Republican support on the committee, but that didn't matter. We were prepared to go and vote on these nominees.

But the sixth nominee whom Chairman BROWN wanted to have a vote on was Sarah Bloom Raskin, and I told him then—this was like last Thursday—that she had chosen not to answer quite a number of important questions that we had. That is the normal part of the vetting process that a committee goes through when there is a nominee. In particular, she chose not to answer questions about a highly unusual transaction that occurred at a company on whose board she sat after she left her position as a Governor at the Fed and then a senior Treasury staffer.

Chairman BROWN said he would help us get answers to these questions, but we have been stonewalled. We were stonewalled before. We have been stonewalled since. So, today, I informed the chairman that it is the view of the Republican members of the committee that we can still go ahead and vote on the five.

I have heard them talk about how important it is that we populate the Fed with Governors. Four out of the five nominees we were prepared to vote on are Fed Governors. We could have had that vote already. We could have had that vote tonight. We could do it tomorrow. There is no problem with that. But rather than advance five nominees through the committee, Chairman BROWN decided he would rather have

zero, so we are at zero. That is his choice. We could have had five advance through the committee.

You have to ask yourself, why would it be so important to my Democratic colleagues that we forgo the opportunity to move five along the process if it means that, for now, Sarah Bloom Raskin doesn't get a vote for what, by the way, would be a 10-year term on the Fed? And there is only one plausible explanation for why they would be willing to leave all these vacancies when they could go down the road through the process of filling these vacancies. Apparently it is because getting a climate warrior into this spot on the Fed Board of Governors—specifically, the Vice Chairman of Supervision; that is the spot for which Sarah Bloom Raskin has been nominated—getting her there must be the most important thing. In fact, it must be more important than getting all five of the other people confirmed because that is the decision they made today.

So then you have to ask yourself, why would it be that important? Why would it be so important to get Ms. Raskin in this spot at the Fed? Well, again, I think it is pretty clear what is going on here, and that is that our Democratic colleagues have a climate agenda for which they don't want to take responsibility. We are seeing this manifest itself. It is the energy policy of this majority, the Democratic majority and this administration, that has contributed significantly to this huge surge in energy prices. It is kind of causing a panic over there because the American people don't really enjoy paying \$5 a gallon or more for gasoline. They are not looking forward to a 20-, 30-, 50-percent increase in the cost of heating their homes. They are not in favor of the policies that our Democratic colleagues advocate, which is to shut down pipelines, ban drilling, make sure we make less energy, make sure we produce less oil and gas, the energy we need for our daily lives, because when you do produce much less, prices go up. The American people are not that enthusiastic about this.

So for our Democratic colleagues, it is a bit of a dilemma, right? How do you satisfy the climate warriors who absolutely want much higher prices, absolutely want to shut down energy production—but how do you do that without getting crosswise with the voters who really don't think that is a good idea? How could you balance that?

Well, there is a way to do it. Just shirk your responsibility and put it on the Fed. Perfect. Don't deal with legislation. Don't let the American people know what you want to do. And certainly don't take responsibility for the consequences of your actions. Let the Fed do it. And then if the Fed does these policies and prices go through the roof, blame them. It is perfect.

And, lo and behold, we have the nomination of Sarah Bloom Raskin. She has very impressive credentials. She is