

time, online bullying and harassment run rampant. And the statistics on teen suicide and mental health paint an alarming picture for the next generation.

The bill that passed today includes two important pieces of legislation to help address that crisis. The Kids Online Safety Act, introduced by Senators BLUMENTHAL and BLACKBURN, provides children and parents the tools and safeguards they need to keep harmful content out of children's social media feeds. More than two-thirds of the Senate sponsored these bills, including this one. And I am proud to be one of them.

We also passed another bill that I was proud to cosponsor called the Children and Teens' Online Privacy Protection Act, introduced by Senators MARKEY and CASSIDY. That bill prohibits internet companies from collecting personal information from their youngest users and establishes better safeguards to protect children's privacy. It protects and prevents Big Tech from tracking and targeting kids with the most addictive content possible.

Congress has been working on legislation in this area for many years, and I want to commend Senators BLACKBURN and CASSIDY for getting us to this point.

There are a number of other bills that have passed the Judiciary Committee on a bipartisan basis, as the Presiding Officer knows. And I hope we will be able to turn to those soon. But these bills we passed today struck the right balance between the First Amendment and safety, which is no easy task—which is, perhaps, one reason why it has taken us so long to get here.

But I appreciate these Senators' leadership. And I am proud the Senate has finally taken an important step to help keep America's children safe online.

#### U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. President, on another matter, I want to speak briefly about President Biden's proposal to, essentially, unconstitutionally transform the Supreme Court into another political branch of government.

Every student of government, every high school civics class, teaches that ours is a government of three coequal branches: the two political branches being the Senate and the House, the legislative branch, and then the executive branch. The reason they are political is because they are accountable to the public through regular elections.

Conversely, the Judiciary is unique in that it is unaccountable to the voters. Judges are nominated by the President and then confirmed by the Senate. But as long as they are conducting themselves appropriately, they can serve as long as they live—literally, have life tenure. Rarely—very rarely—there is remedy of impeachment for extraordinary cases. But, as I said, that happens almost not at all.

But in recent years, our Democratic colleagues have floated a litany of in-

stitutional changes to try to tilt the balance of power in the Judiciary in their favor. They are not content to allow the Courts to do their job, which is to call balls and strikes. Again, judges are supposed to interpret the law and the facts and apply that to a given case and not decide ahead of time who should win and who should lose.

Judges don't take public opinion polls and decide what is popular, because they take the same oath we do to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States. But they do so in a framework of judicial independence.

Former Justice Scalia used to say that the independent judiciary is the gold standard, is the secret sauce for the United States form of government, because there has to be some neutral arbiter to basically decide contested cases, and that is our independent judiciary.

But our Democratic colleagues, since they have been upset about some of the decisions of the Court, have gone so far as to suggest that the Court be restructured. This was tried back in the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the famous court packing cases. He wanted to add additional Justices to the Supreme Court because he thought that would change the receptivity of the case to causes that he supported.

But we have also seen changes advocated here in this Senate, institutional changes by our Democratic colleagues who were unhappy with the fact that they don't win 100 percent of the vote. They have advocated eliminating the filibuster to clear the path for radical and unpopular policy ideas. They have attempted to federalize or nationalize our voting laws and take over America's elections as opposed to having those decided at the State level. They pushed for statehood for the District of Columbia as well as Puerto Rico. And, presumably, each of those would get two United States Senators and a Member of Congress and thus tilt the balance of power here in the Senate.

But when it comes to the Supreme Court, it is clear that the left is outraged over some of the Court's recent decisions. As a matter of fact, not that long ago, the majority leader stood on the front steps of the Supreme Court and called out two sitting Justices by name and, essentially, threatened them if they decided these cases in a way that he disagreed with.

That was an extraordinary act of bad judgment by the majority leader. He actually went so far as to say: Justice Gorsuch, Justice Kavanaugh, you won't know what hit you.

Again, it was shocking to, I think, most of us who regard the Court as an independent and separate branch of government immune from politics.

But, of course, many Democrats are upset that the Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* has now returned the issue of abortion to the States, where on a State-by-State basis, legislators and voters will decide what the appropriate

limits are on abortion, which divides much of our country.

They are upset with the decision on Presidential immunity. They want the President to be subject to ordinary litigation on a regular basis, using what has now come to be known as lawfare to achieve political objectives.

And they are concerned that the Court has done away with something as arcane and relatively poorly understood as Chevron deference, basically saying if an Agency decides something, there is not much that the courts or that Congress can do about it.

Our colleagues don't want to keep losing cases in the courtroom. So they have adopted a new strategy: If you can't win the game, change the rules. And their playbook has gone something like this: No. 1, villainize the Supreme Court. I mentioned the comments of the majority leader, which are not unique. The strategy is to make the Justices seem evil or biased out of touch when they rule against progressive causes in the courtroom.

The second step in the playbook is to offer a solution—or a proposed solution—to address the problem that Democrats have manufactured. That involves an act which itself is unconstitutional and irresponsible, which is the overhaul of the Court-packing I mentioned a moment ago.

And, No. 3: It is to go on the attack and stay on the attack and vilify anyone who dares oppose these changes as somehow corrupt and anti-Democrat.

From packing the Court with liberal Justices to dictating recusal requirements for the Justices to holding security funding hostage if the Supreme Court doesn't do what our Democratic colleagues want them to do, our colleagues have offered many plans to fully assert control over this independent branch of government—the Judiciary.

For a long time, these proposals were only supported by a fringe of the Democratic Party. But now, they have become more commonplace and infiltrated the Oval Office itself.

President Joe Biden used the pages of the Washington Post to advocate for exactly the sorts of dramatic and unconstitutional changes that I just mentioned. He wants to somehow establish term limits for Justices. He wants to craft a schedule for new appointments, force a code of ethics on the Justices written by Congress, and destroy the longstanding precedent of Presidential immunity.

These proposals are not to enhance the fairness of the Court or promote equality or justice or any other good government objective; they are about power, about control. They would turn our most independent branch of government into a partisan branch to ensure that our Democratic colleagues are the ones who ultimately wield the power.

It is bad enough that President Biden has promoted these radical changes, but even more concerning is that his

protegee, Vice President HARRIS, has fully embraced them. She made it clear that if she is elected in November, the assault on the independent judiciary—the Supreme Court—will not go away; it will accelerate. A potential Harris administration would stage a full-blown coup to overtake the Supreme Court and eviscerate judicial independence. She basically would disregard the Constitution itself and attempt to turn the Court into an institution that serves at the pleasure of a political party—hers.

We need to call it what it is. The Biden-Harris proposal is not about protecting democracy or ensuring accountability; it is about consolidating power and undermining institutions that stand in the way of their agenda.

If these radical ideas were to become a reality, they would dangerously shift the balance of power and erode the independence of the Supreme Court—again, the crown jewels of our form of government. They would ultimately politicize the one branch of government that was designed to be insulated from partisanship.

Our Founders deliberately designed a Federal Government with three distinct but equal branches. They established a set of checks and balances to prevent any one branch from forcing another to bend to its will, but unfortunately, that is exactly what President Biden and his party are trying to do today—to blur the lines between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches to secure partisan political wins and accrue more power.

But here in the U.S. Senate—an institution created for this purpose—cooler heads must prevail. We cannot stoop to the level of the mob. We have to stand up for an independent judiciary and the Supreme Court as an essential institution in our form of government regardless of how we feel about the decisions.

Many decisions by the Supreme Court I have disagreed with in the past, and I am sure I will in the future, but as one Justice said, “The Supreme Court is not final because it is right; it is right because it is final.”

That is the only way to preserve the integrity of the judiciary and our invaluable checks and balances, is with an independent judiciary—one that isn’t politicized and doesn’t bend to the will of a political party.

Republicans will continue to fight to protect the integrity of America’s judicial system, and we will not allow this President or any President or any political party to hijack the Federal judiciary for their own partisan benefit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

TRIBUTE TO ALEV KELTER AND THE U.S.  
OLYMPICS WOMEN’S RUGBY TEAM

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have a resolution that I am looking forward to passing here on the Senate floor. I am pretty sure no one is going to object to it, but we will see in a minute.

Before I begin, I want to do a huge shout-out and congratulations to Alaska’s own Alev Kelter and the U.S. women’s rugby team. Thanks to Alev’s score late in the first half, the Americans beat the vaunted Australians in rugby to deliver the women’s rugby team’s first Olympic medal in rugby sevens.

So great job, Alev. Great job to the American women’s rugby team in getting some medals there for our great Nation.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE COURAGE  
AND SACRIFICE OF VETERANS  
OF THE VIETNAM WAR AND EX-  
PRESSING REGRET FOR THE  
MISTREATMENT OF VETERANS  
RETURNING HOME FROM THE  
WAR

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to ask unanimous consent for a long, long overdue resolution. It is a resolution that I guarantee most Americans are going to be like: What? Wait. What? We haven’t done that yet? The Senate, the Congress, hasn’t done that yet?

It is a resolution on this: recognizing the heroic service of our Vietnam veterans and finally issuing an apology—yes—for the way in which tens of thousands of them were treated when they came home after serving their Nation.

So that is what I am going to do right here. I was told a couple of minutes ago that someone was going to object, and I was like: Whoa. Really? Let’s have that debate. Let’s have that debate.

But good news: no objection. So what I wanted to do briefly is just explain the reasoning behind this resolution.

I think, as a country, when you look at the broad sweep of American history, we have always rightfully respected, lionized, and celebrated America’s veterans—think about it—in the last several decades.

The World War II generation—we even have a name for them: the “greatest generation”—sacrificed over 400,000 Americans killed in action, saving the world from dictatorships in Europe and in the Pacific. The “greatest generation” literally defended freedom all over the world. When they came home—and to this day—we celebrated them, and we lionized them with ticker-tape parades, as it should be. At that moment in our history, the respect for our veterans was sky-high.

Then you had the Korean war, and unfortunately, in my view—I am a Korean war history buff, and I have studied this a lot—you had kind of an attitude of benign neglect. Even the phrase the “forgotten war,” which I don’t

like—it should be called the noble war, actually—kind of indicates this benign neglect. The veterans came home. People didn’t really celebrate what they did. It wasn’t really like World War II. It was just kind of, OK, get on with your life; you did your duty. They sacrificed, of course, but there wasn’t a lot—it was kind of benign neglect, as I mentioned.

Then the Vietnam war happened, and we all know what happened, but to this day, I think most Americans maybe don’t even understand what happened, but there is no doubt our country went off-kilter, and the respect given to our servicemembers—World War II was certainly at the high level, even the Korean war with its benign neglect—this respect hit rock bottom. It hit rock bottom.

You know, it is just really sad. We all have heard stories of veterans coming home—corporals, enlisted guys, young officers. They did their duty. Some of them were drafted and said: It is my turn to go. For whatever reason—Vietnam was, of course, very contentious, but for whatever reason, when they came home, a lot of people in the American public took it out on them—slandered, spit upon, all kinds of horrible epitaphs.

I remember one of my first mess nights as a Marine officer—I was a brandnew second lieutenant, and we had a mess night with a lot of these old retired marines—a very formal, sacred setting in many ways. One of the officers there talked about how he came home from Vietnam. His dad was a World War II vet. He had been in 12 months of combat. He came home to see his father. He hugged his dad. They were walking outside of the airport, and somebody threw red paint on him and his dad. Could you imagine that? You just sacrificed for your country. You are in uniform with your father, who is a World War II vet. What did we do that for? I don’t know if there is ever going to be an answer. But this happened literally to tens of thousands of Vietnam veterans. It shouldn’t have happened, but it did.

So what we can do here in the Senate is just say: Hey, we recognize your great service. It wasn’t easy. You were doing your duty. And if you were treated horribly—which a lot of them were when they came home—again, maybe you go attack President Johnson or President Nixon—not attack but criticize them—but why take it out on the lance corporal? That is what happened, and it shouldn’t have happened.

So what we can do here—and we are going to do it in a second. I am really glad no one is objecting. I hope no one is objecting. My resolution, S. Res. 778, has a lot of Senators supporting it. It is simply acknowledging the courage and sacrifice of our veterans from the Vietnam war and apologizing for the treatment that so many of them received when they came home—pretty simple—and welcoming them home, finally, from the U.S. Senate.