

done. I wish Teresa could have been there for all of those thank-yous because she was the one that made it all work.

So what is her secret sauce? Well, as we know, it is all about systems. Teresa is known for being incredibly organized and developing the systems that have made the office run. If she sees a problem or something that can be done better, she works with the team to find a better way to accomplish the goal. It could be something small, such as changing the days of staff calls so the week and information flow work better, to organizing huge, effective appropriations processes every single year.

If there is a system in our office that works well, it was Teresa that created it and made it work. If it didn't work well, then that staffer probably didn't check with Teresa.

During the pandemic, she regularly solicited feedback on what was working and what was not. She also took time to stop and ask important questions like: What did we learn from how we worked during the pandemic, and how should the office adapt going forward? Instead of just working in the same way we had before the pandemic, Teresa made sure our office adapted.

Some of these systems are so infamous that when staff have transitioned to new jobs, the No. 1 thing we hear is that these places don't have nearly the level of efficient organizing and that Teresa would be mortified by the lack of systems.

Teresa also knew then in order for all of this to work, we had to be a team. Teresa genuinely cares about the people she works with. Over the last few weeks, as I have been thinking about this speech, our team couldn't say enough about how Teresa supports them both professionally and personally. The best part of it all, despite all she has accomplished, Teresa doesn't take herself too seriously. Her sense of humor and levity helps keep things going.

She always made it a priority that the DC and State staff were connected as one team, making sure DC staff came to Michigan often and got to know their counterparts and were not afraid to pick up the phone, talk through an issue, and work together.

One of her tools for keeping us all together was our infamous staff retreats in Michigan. Teresa spent hours making sure every detail was just right; that we had a goal and a purpose for getting together, as well as having some fun.

Whether it was one of our staple boat cruises to ensure we experienced our Great Lakes to a few acting sessions where the very best DEBBIE STABENOW impression was made—while I was gone, by the way—Teresa organized all of it.

A common discussion in our office is what everyone's favorite staff retreat was over the years and swapping stories from gatherings. While they are

difficult and a pain to organize, especially as the team got larger and larger, I know she loved showing everyone what "Pure Michigan" really means. Whether it is our food, our water, our wine, our beer, or a freezing cold boat cruise, Teresa always lit up when the team was back in Michigan.

So let me just say—as you can see, I could go on and on about Teresa, but I want to end by saying the biggest thank you possible. I know her wonderful husband Geoff, her kids, Zach and Rachel, and grandkids, Oliver, Ellie, and Valerie, are watching from Michigan and are incredibly proud of her. I know our team is here, too, watching from the Gallery and watching from home and they, too, are so incredibly proud to have served with Teresa.

Maybe the word I am thinking of right now that sums it up is "legacy." Teresa's legacy for our staff and for the State of Michigan will be felt for many, many years to come. Together, we experienced more than either of us probably thought was ever possible, forgotten more amazing stories than we would like to admit—and we will keep some of the stories between just us. It has truly been a lifetime of memories and friendship.

Teresa, I can't thank you enough for being by my side through this amazing journey and for being with me these final days in the U.S. Senate. We said we would run through the tape together, and I am really grateful we have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to speak for up to 4 minutes and Senator KENNEDY be permitted to speak for up to 30 minutes prior to the scheduled vote.

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

LEONARD PELTIER

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, as President Biden considers candidates for clemency in the final weeks of his term, the Native American activist Leonard Peltier is among those who deserve grace and mercy.

Peltier was arrested in 1975 for his alleged involvement in the murder of two FBI agents in a shootout on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota. But the process that led to his conviction had major issues and inaccuracies from the start.

For example, one witness whose statements were used at trial said she was told to lie and say that she was in a relationship with Peltier and that she had witnessed him shoot the agents. She later recanted that statement saying:

I was forced into this, and I feel very awful. I just wish that Leonard Peltier would get out of prison.

In another instance, according to reporting, a juror who, on day two of the trial, professed her prejudice against Native Americans was allowed to remain on the panel.

If that wasn't enough, take it from the very U.S. attorney who tried the

case. The prosecutor who tried the case, James Reynolds, said Peltier had served his sentence on "the basis of minimal evidence, a result that I strongly doubt would be upheld in any court today." In the same letter, Reynolds urged President Biden to commute Peltier's sentence, writing:

I write today from a position rare for a former prosecutor. To beseech you to commute the sentence of a man who I helped put behind bars. With time, and the benefit of hindsight, I have realized that the prosecution and continued incarceration of Mr. Peltier was and is unjust. We were not able to prove that Mr. Peltier personally committed any offense on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

Peltier is now 80 years old and has been in prison for 50 years. He is in declining health, experiencing vision loss and other illnesses. And in spite of all that, earlier this year, Federal officials denied his request for compassionate release and parole.

And so even if you believe that he did, in fact, commit the crime, surely now, the time is now to let him spend whatever remaining days he has at home to die with his family. He has done his time. He is of old age and in poor health. This is what clemency is for. This is what mercy is for. He poses little threat to society.

If there was ever a case that merited compassionate release, Leonard Peltier's is it. This is exactly what this awesome Presidential power is for—to right a historic wrong. And if not that, then just to show mercy and let an old man die with his family.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use a prop during my remarks.

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

U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. KENNEDY. I am going to try not to use my full time, Madam President.

It has become in vogue in Washington to talk about government waste, and I am glad. I think that is a good thing. It has become in vogue to talk about inefficiencies and reducing spending, and I think that is a good thing.

I remember when I first got here back in 2017, one of my early Appropriations Committee meetings. I was green as a gourd. We had just passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I thought to myself, you know, we are going to run some deficits for a while because we just cut taxes.

And there was an item in the budget for, I think, a 3- or 4-percent automatic pay raise for our Federal employees. They get it every year. I am not saying they don't deserve it. A lot of people deserve more money. I never heard anybody around this place stand up and say: I have a bad idea, and I need money for it. It is always a great idea. So I am not begrudging Federal employees.

But I told my colleagues: You know, if we are going to run deficits, maybe we ought to skip the pay raise this year. And I made a motion.

I remember some of my colleagues looked at me like I had a sexually transmitted disease or something. I mean, I made this motion, and I didn't think it was that big a deal. I got—I don't know how many members on the Appropriations Committee there are—35, 40. I got two votes. Everybody else suddenly had an important message on their phone.

So I learned a good lesson. I like to say my mother didn't raise a fool, and if she did, it was one of my brothers. But I was a fool then. But I am glad things have changed, and I hope we follow through.

Now, government waste takes many forms. But I will tell you one form. It is the purest form. It is when the Federal Government has taxpayer money and it doesn't belong to the Federal Government, but the Federal Government refuses to give it back. And that is the case we have in the Department of Treasury.

I don't want to be too hard on my friends at Treasury because they have come around. It has taken 8 years, but they have come around. The Department of Treasury is holding 95 million—not 950,000—95 million unredeemed and fully matured savings bonds.

I will explain what that means in a second.

The value is \$38 billion. Now, there are only 335 million Americans. So this is probably not realistic, but if one unredeemed bond—if you assess one unredeemed bond to one individual American, that is 30 percent of our country.

What is a matured, unredeemed savings bond? A savings bond, as you probably know, is just a loan to the government. That is all it is. You want to invest your money, and you want to help the government. Say you want to—in World War II, we sold a lot of bonds to help pay for World War II. You say, give money to the government, and over a long period of time—usually 20 or 30 years, sometimes 10 to 15—at the end, you will get back money, plus interest.

It is not like a regular bond where you get quarterly interest payments. You give your money to the Federal Government. The Federal Government takes your name and address. You get a piece of paper. And at the end of however long of a bond you buy—say, 20 years—you get back your principal, plus interest.

A good example is—there are all types of savings bonds, and I don't want to get too far down in the weeds. But let's take an EE U.S. savings bond. Suppose I buy one. I go to the Federal Government, I give the Federal Government \$200. They take my name; they take my address; they give me a sheet of paper. They used to give you an actual bond. They don't do that

anymore. I say, great, I just invested 200 bucks. In 20 years, I can go back to the Federal Government, and they will give me 400 bucks—my original 200 bucks, plus the interest. It is a great deal. It used to be parents would buy savings bonds for their children. And during World War II, the government financed part of the war selling savings bonds.

There is just one problem with this scenario. I have known this for a long time. The Federal Government has 95 million—\$38 billion worth of savings bonds over at Treasury. They have the names, and they have the addresses of all of these people. And the people who are owed that money, many of them are dead. But when those bonds matured, they didn't come get their money. You say: Well, that is OK. If you gave them \$200, it will just keep earning interest. No, it won't. It becomes interest-free. If I buy a 20-year bond, at the end of 20 years, if I don't come get my principal and my interest, I don't get any extra interest.

For a long time, the Department of Treasury has had the names of these 95 million people or their heirs, and it totals \$38 billion.

So, naive as I was, I went to the Department of Treasury and said: We need to give this money back to people. What is the problem? You have got names. You have got addresses.

After a while, you didn't have to be Einstein's cousin to figure out they weren't going to cooperate.

Now, finally, I got—I want to give him full credit—I got Secretary Mnuchin's attention. I mean, I understand Steve was busy. It wasn't a priority. But he directed his people to cooperate with me, and some of them did, and some of them didn't.

Then President Trump got defeated, and Secretary Yellen came in. Secretary Yellen—she tried to help, but multiple people opposed my idea.

So I finally just went and passed a bill. I passed the Unclaimed Savings Bond Act—and I want to thank President Biden for signing it—directing Treasury to give people's money back. I mean, how hard can this be?

Well, after I passed the law, I went to see the folks over there, and they said: Well, there is a problem we didn't tell you about. All of these records, these names and addresses, are in storage, and they have to be digitized. They are just a mess, OK. They have to be digitized.

I said: OK.

I went and got money put in the budget to digitize the records, and we have done that. About 97 percent of them have been digitized.

Then Treasury said: You know, it is not really our job to go look for people. We can put up a toll-free number.

I said: Here is what we will do. I want you to cooperate with the States. Every State has an unclaimed property program.

What is unclaimed property? When a business or government—supposed to

be the case—has your money and they can't find you, they can't keep it. If you go rent an apartment, for example, and put down a \$1,000 deposit and you move, that apartment owner is not supposed to keep your \$1,000. That apartment owner is supposed to turn it over to the State treasurer and the—all State treasurers do a wonderful job. They put your name on a website, and people can go and look it up and see if they have money.

Every State has an unclaimed property program. I mean, it is old bank accounts; it is stocks; it is bonds; it is mutual funds; it is royalties, royalty payments; it is health insurance proceeds; it is old tax refunds. Every treasurer—you can go to their website and put in your name or a friend's name and check to see if they have money.

When I was State treasurer, I had a program—it is a long story—when I was State treasurer and even before then, when I was a State tax collector, we returned about \$400 million to people in Louisiana.

So there is an infrastructure set up. Treasury doesn't have to do a thing—not a damn thing. Again, I want to give Secretary Mnuchin and Secretary Yellen full credit because they have been great, but it has been hard to get some of their people up off their ice-cold, lazy butts. But we passed the law, we got the records digitized, and my purpose of being here today is to try to tell folks after 8 years, we are—this summer, in about 6 months, we are going to take all those digital records, names and addresses, and they are going to be sent to the State treasurer in every State. The State treasurers are anxious to put names and addresses on their websites. They already publicized their programs. They are going to encourage their people to go to their State's website, and if they have an unredeemed, matured savings bond or, more likely, their mom or dad did or even their grandmother and they can prove that they are the child or the grandchild, as the case may be, they can get the money. They can get the money.

I know some folks at Treasury are upset about me. They loved having \$38 billion of taxpayer money sitting there on the books that they can use. But it is not right. You can call it waste if you want to. You can call it inefficiency if you want to. I don't care what you call it—it is not right.

So, this summer, I will be back to tell you when we turn the program on, but we are going to send 95 million names out to every State treasury in the Union, and they are going to start giving this money back. I hope all people have to do is go to a website and check their name, and the treasurer will take it from there.

I want to thank Secretary Yellen and I want to thank Secretary Mnuchin for working with me on this. I want to thank President Biden, and I want to thank President Trump. I want to

thank the people at Treasury who cooperated. I am sorry those who made it so difficult did, but we finally got it done.

So thank you. I think I did that quicker than 30 minutes.

With that, I either yield to Senator DURBIN—well, he doesn't want to speak.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH CHERYL COOMBE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Elizabeth Cheryl Coombe to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of New York.

Born in Ridgewood, NJ, Ms. Coombe earned her A.B. from Hamilton College in 1989 and her J.D. from the University of Michigan Law School in 1992.

After graduating from law school, she clerked for the Honorable Diana E. Murphy on the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

Ms. Coombe began her public service career as a staff attorney at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission from 1994 to 1996. There, she focused on the investigation of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., and of abusive market making activities in the Nasdaq Market.

From 1996 to 1997, she worked as a trial attorney in the Civil Division, Commercial Litigation Branch, National Courts Section at the U.S. Department of Justice.

Then, between 1998 and 2003, Ms. Coombe served as an assistant U.S. attorney (AUSA) in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia.

Since 2003, Ms. Coombe has held several roles of increasing responsibility in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of New York, including as: AUSA; team leader and Plattsburg office supervisor; deputy criminal chief; criminal chief; and most recently as first assistant U.S. attorney. In her current role, she oversees all criminal, civil, and appellate litigation conducted by more than 50 attorneys throughout the district.

Throughout her 30-year public service career, Ms. Coombe has tried approximately 19 cases before a jury and 20 bench trials.

The American Bar Association rated Ms. Coombe as "well qualified," and her nomination is strongly supported by her home State Senators, Mr. SCHUMER and Mrs. GILLIBRAND.

With more than 20 years of experience serving as a Federal prosecutor in the Northern District of New York, Ms. Coombe is well-positioned to continue her service to the district on the Federal bench.

I am proud to support her nomination.

VOTE ON COOMBE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Coombe nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 312 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Helmy	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Butler	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Lujan	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Van Hollen
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Welch
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cramer	Sinema	Vance
--------	--------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). 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 senior assistant 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. 844, Sarah Morgan Davenport, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Ben Ray Lujan, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Peter Welch, Jeff Merkley, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Chris-

topher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine.

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 Sarah Morgan Davenport, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Ohio Mr. VANCE and the Senator from Missouri Mr. WICKER.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 313 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Helmy	Rosen
Booker	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Butler	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Lujan	Van Hollen
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Welch
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—5

Manchin	Stabenow	Wicker
Sinema	Vance	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sarah Morgan Davenport, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.