

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there is a regrettable and un-Presidential thread that has been woven throughout the whole Biden Presidency. Whenever this President finds himself facing bad headlines, he tries to change the subject by fearmongering about civil rights and voting rights and pretending we are in the 1950s or sixties.

Remember early last year when the full impact of the Democrats' inflation was coming into focus? That is when President Biden flew to Georgia, screamed that Jim Crow was coming back and our democracy was on death's doorstep, and compared Republicans—listen to this—to Bull Connor and Jefferson Davis. He compared us to Bull Connor and Jefferson Davis.

Well, here he goes again. Last weekend, down in Alabama, the President suggested that the right to vote in America is “under assault” today, on par with Bloody Sunday on the Edmund Pettus Bridge nearly 60 years ago. Nobody believes this. Nobody seriously believes that race relations or voting laws or any of these issues are anywhere near—anywhere near—where they were back in the 1960s. This is utter nonsense.

President Biden again referenced the Republican State's voting laws that he last year called Jim Crow 2.0, as if all of that hysteria had not been completely disproven in the meantime.

Last November, the exact same Georgia voting law that the Democrats called evil and racist and the death knell for democracy created record-high turnout, lightning-fast voting lines, and a supermajority of African-American voters reporting that the voting experience was—listen to this—excellent.

Do you know the share of Black voters in Georgia who described their voting experience under the new Republican law as poor? Let me say that again. Do you know the share of Black voters in Georgia who described their voting experience under the new Republican law as poor? It is zero. Zero. President Biden said this law was the second coming of segregation, and zero percent of Black voters said they had a poor voting experience.

Ah, but here he goes again with the same lies, the same hysteria. We are back in this bizarre, bizarre twilight zone where the President of the United States periodically says these utterly absurd, apocalyptic things with zero basis in reality, and everybody just carries on like it really didn't happen: Well, there goes the leader of the free world, shouting unhinged—unhinged—and false things about the end of democracy one more time. Oh, you know, just another day. What else is on TV?

It is utterly surreal and, frankly, embarrassing, the President walking on stage every couple of months, shouting angry things and appearing confused—confused—about whether it is 2023 or 1963—utterly confused. And nothing

happens. The world keeps turning. The Republicans keep passing popular, commonsense laws that make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. Voters of all races continue having good voting experiences. The President, his advisers, and a few radical activists are the only people stuck—stuck—in this fake parallel universe.

Our democracy is in fine shape no matter what a few extreme voices are shouting. It is this White House's grip on reality that is truly concerning.

DC CRIMINAL CODE

Now, Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, a man stabbed to death in a public library, a woman kidnapped and mugged in broad daylight, a construction worker assaulted by suspects who fled in a stolen car—this is just a small sampling of life in Washington, DC, in recent months.

Carjackings and car thefts have become a daily routine. Homicides are racking up at a rate of four—four—per week. There have been so many attacks on people riding public transportation that civilian volunteers have had to create their own patrols on Metro trains and platforms.

We are the greatest superpower Nation in history, and this is our Capital City, but local politicians have let its streets become a danger and an embarrassment.

Earlier this year, local Democrats tried to respond by going even softer on crime and putting violent convicts back on the streets even more rapidly. Well, Republicans say: Enough is enough. Enough is enough. We have brought forward a resolution here in Congress that will overrule the left's effort to make this catastrophe even worse.

Democrats were not happy. The White House put out a formal statement opposing us. The vast majority of House Democrats voted against us. But then President Biden had an epiphany. He reversed himself. The public pressure was so great that the President now says he wants to sign the same Republican bill that he had previously announced he opposed.

The headlines tell the story: “Biden's About-Face on DC Crime Bill Shows Democrats on [the] Defensive.”

The Democrats' flip-flop is good news for the residents of the District of Columbia and the 300-plus million Americans who deserve—deserve—to be able to visit their capital in peace.

But our Democratic friends are not getting off the hook this easily. They are not going to be able to duck the heat for the violent crime surge to which their policies, their rhetoric, and their political movement have directly contributed. What about all of the Americans who live in cities and neighborhoods all across our country? In my hometown of Louisville, violent crime has become an unwelcome daily fixture. Since the start of the pandemic, over 500 lives have been lost to homicide—dozens of the victims have been children—and last fall, a car was sto-

len, on average, every 2.5 hours. Minneapolis has seen 19 percent more vandalism than at this point last year; San Francisco, 18 percent more robberies. In Chicago, this year's rate of car thefts is already 138 percent higher than last year's. In St. Louis, kidnappings are up 113 percent.

Over the weekend, in Atlanta, dozens of rioters attacked and laid siege to the site of the city's future public safety training center—public safety training center. These people lit construction equipment on fire and aimed fireworks and Molotov cocktails at police officers. Twenty-three of these radical leftists have been charged with domestic terrorism.

This is what happens when the political left spends years—years—spotlighting anti-law enforcement rhetoric.

This is what happens when Democrats at all levels decide we need fewer arrests, shorter sentences, and more generosity to criminals at the expense of less justice for victims and for families.

This is what happens when far-left dark money flows to radical candidates for district attorneys' offices and the liberal DAs simply refuse to prosecute whole sections of the Criminal Code.

This is what happens after every single Senate Democrat voted on party lines against additional police funding just last year. Every Democratic Senator voted in lockstep against Senator RUBIO's amendment that would have redirected some of their massive, reckless tax-and-spending spree to actually fund law enforcement.

Look, nobody will confuse Washington Democrats' last-minute reversal on this one resolution for a “road to Damascus” moment on the crime issue. The American people are a lot smarter than that.

VOTE ON KUNESH NOMINATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kunesh nomination?

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Illinois (MS. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Hoeven	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kelly	Rounds
Booker	Kennedy	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Capito	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Cramer	Merkley	Thune
Daines	Moran	Tillis
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warnock
Hassan	Murray	Warren
Heinrich	Ossoff	Welch
Hickenlooper	Padilla	Wyden
Hirono	Peters	Young

NAYS—35

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Graham	Ricketts
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hagerty	Romney
Britt	Hawley	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Tuberville
Crapo	Lummis	Vance
Cruz	Marshall	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	

NOT VOTING—8

Cardin	Feinstein	Van Hollen
Carper	Fetterman	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). 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.

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. 61, Daniel I. Werfel, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2027.

Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Margaret Wood Hassan, Raphael G. Warnock, Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Lujan, Elizabeth Warren, Christopher A. Coons, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin.

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 Daniel I. Werfel, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2027, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Cassidy	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Grassley	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	Young

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Ricketts
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Budd	Johnson	Rubio
Capito	Kennedy	Schmitt
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lee	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lummis	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Vance
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Mullin	

NOT VOTING—5

Cardin	Feinstein	Van Hollen
Carper	Fetterman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel I. Werfel, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2027.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Tennessee.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—H.J. RES.

26

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I move to discharge H.J. Res. 26 from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE REVISED CRIMINAL CODE ACT OF 2022

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 26) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now up to 10 hours of debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I am looking forward to a robust debate today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I am so glad the Senator from Tennessee is on the floor with H.J. Res. 26. I want to thank him for being insightful to know how important this is going to be to this Congress, to this city, to this country. So I thank the Senator for his steadfast work on this issue, and I look forward to supporting the resolution. We are also going to be talking a lot on the floor about this. So I thank him very much.

I rise today to talk about an issue that I actually came to the floor on 3 weeks ago and that is just very, very relevant, especially today, and that is out-of-control crime and a disregard for law and order that, unfortunately, President Biden has enabled in his own backyard.

Under the Biden administration's soft-on-crime agenda and rhetoric, Washington, DC, the capital of our beautiful country, has seen a 25-percent increase in crime, a 33-percent increase in homicides, a 121-percent increase in sexual abuse, and a 108-percent increase in motor vehicle theft—just this year, and we are just starting.

To make matters worse, in the midst of ongoing crime, the DC Council thought that now was an appropriate time to rewrite the Criminal Code. Instead of enforcing law and order in light of all of these statistics and supporting our police officers and making residents and visitors of the District feel safe, the DC Council found it fitting to lessen the punishment for violent criminal offenses—hard to believe, isn't it?—and embolden those who dare to break the law instead of heeding local calls for increased safety and policing from their residents.

It really doesn't get any more tone-deaf than that. Believe it or not, when the DC Council originally passed their irresponsible Criminal Code overall,