

worked with Lindsey Graham on a number of different items; one is a conservation fund that also fights terrorism. He remarked that Lindsey, in his way, was able to boil down why this was so important and had hats created that said: "Good for animals, bad for terrorists."

And that was very typical of Lindsey because he could boil things down very simply to be able to make a point, almost like a country lawyer. He would say: How many people think that, for example, if Iran had a nuclear weapon, they would use it on us? Raise your hand. They would raise their hand.

And he would say: So how many people think it would be bad if they got a nuclear weapon? All of those people would raise their hand.

How many people think we should stop them from getting a nuclear weapon? They would raise their hand.

That is the simple way that Lindsey would make his point.

He was supersmart and had an incredible sense of humor. It was not often fun if you were on the other side of that sense of humor sometimes. In one of our Budget Committee hearings, Lindsey Graham was presiding, and we had one of our members who was going through all sorts of points and charts and so forth. And when the presentation came to an end, Lindsey Graham said something to the effect: Well, next time we are going to record that, and we are taking it down to Gitmo because it would be more effective down there. So you wanted to make sure that you were talking to the right audience and making your points quickly with Lindsey.

He was also very charming and was very direct. When he would go talk to foreign leaders, he would be able to get across those simple ideas the way he did with audiences back at home and be able to express directly through humor, through charming them, to help them understand where their interests were aligned with our interests, how we needed to work together to be able to keep the people of their country safe and the people of our country safe.

Lindsey was very clear-eyed about the dangers of dictators like Vladimir Putin. He understood, when Putin is losing, we are winning, we are safer. He was appalled by the invasion of Russia into Ukraine—that unprovoked, aggressive attack—and was a fierce advocate for supporting Ukraine, not only because of the injustice of what Russia is doing to Ukraine but because Lindsey understood what the threat to the United States and the people of America would be if Putin is successful; that if they are successful in Ukraine, they are going to go after a NATO member, and then we will have boots on the ground in Europe. Lindsey was trying to keep us safe by advocating for the Ukrainians.

When Lindsey would see an issue, he would hop on a plane and go fix it, whether it was overseas or to my home State of Nebraska. He came to Nebraska several times.

I loved the man. I had the privilege of spending time with him here over the last 3½ years. He liked Coke Zero and Riesling wines. He was charming, funny, intelligent, dedicated to this country. Our body and this country is losing a lot with Lindsey Graham. We are losing some of the humor we had. We are losing some the glue that holds us together. We are losing a fierce patriot, and our country is worse off for it.

Susanne and I are praying for DARLINE and the rest of her family and Lindsey's staff at this tragic time and, indeed, for our entire country as we have experienced the loss of this larger than life patriot, Lindsey Olin Graham.

Lindsey, I know you are looking down on us from upstairs, and you are going to do your best to guide us from up there. We really, really miss you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to use a prop during my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, it is actually fitting. I just had somebody in the cloakroom tell me the last person that came to the floor and used the chart to draw on was none other than Lindsey Graham, so I will dedicate these comments to Lindsey.

VOTER IDENTIFICATION

Mr. President, when I was elected in North Carolina and ran the campaign to get us to a majority and become speaker, one of the promises that I made to the people of North Carolina is that we would pass a voter ID bill; we would be smart about it; we would get it cleared through the Obama Justice Department; we would implement it in a methodical fashion so that we could further increase the already acceptable levels of election integrity in North Carolina.

It took a couple of years. It actually took a couple of losses before we got it done, but we got it done. So for anybody to accuse me of saying that I don't like voter ID, you ought to check your facts and take a look at the signature on the law that was ratified by then-Speaker THOM TILLIS in the State of North Carolina.

Why do I tell you that? To at least put forth my bona fides with respect to implementing complex legislation. I have been trying to explain for nearly a year that the SAVE Act—whether it

is the SAVE Act, the SAVE America Act, the new SAVE legislation that is being proposed in the House, "SAVE Goes to Hollywood," "SAVE Goes to Hawaii," whatever the sequels are—all of them are fundamentally flawed and impossible to implement by this election.

Now, let me explain why. In addition to actually having experience with legislating, ratifying, and implementing voter ID law in North Carolina, I also happened to be a partner at Pricewaterhouse, PricewaterhouseCoopers, and IBM Global Business Services. My entire career has been founded on implementation.

When you look at implementation, you look at the complexity of what it takes to get anything done—even the most simple thing. The reason why businesses pay firms like Pricewaterhouse to do what we do is because details matter, planning matters, execution matters.

Now, let's talk about the SAVE Act or the SAVE America Act or whatever the heck they are calling the next thing that they are talking about putting in the reconciliation bill.

States fit into two categories when it comes to how they administer elections. There are 41 States that administer at a county level—and I'm doing this to better explain it to my friend the senior Senator from Utah—41 States at the county level. What does that mean? Well, in North Carolina it means that we have 100 counties, and we have the State. We have 101 election entities that would have to implement whatever we put into law in North Carolina.

If you multiply that by the 41 States that do it the same way, we have almost 4,000—let's narrow it because somebody will say: Oh, you overestimated. We have over 3,000—it is actually somewhere around 3,600—3,000 governmental entities that have to implement the letter of this law, OK?

So we will just go with 3,000. Keep it low. Now, we have nine States that actually administer at the State, county, and municipal level. That actually adds about another 7,000 governmental entities that would have to implement the letter of this law—whatever the law is, all right?

The election is going to be held on the second Tuesday of November, right? We are August, September, October, right? So we have fewer than—let's just call it 100 days before the election. You are telling me that whatever proposal is being considered in the House can come and get done in the House, which it hasn't done, come to the Senate and get passed, go to the President's desk—let's say all of that—let's just say a miracle occurs. We can take it out of the Crock-Pot, put it in the microwave—we get it done in 2 weeks, right? OK. Well, 2 weeks from now happens to be about the first week of August, so that would be August, September, October—3 months after

ratification to implement complex voter ID policy that is generally administered at the State level in time for this election. Well, it can't be implemented on day one, right? South Dakota actually starts voting 46 days before the election.

No. 1, you have got to go back and tell these 10,000 different entities: We don't know what the timing is. We have got to implement this stuff.

So your early voting, your absentee ballot voting, the people that requested ballots, the military members overseas that are actually getting teed up with the current laws—that is all off the books, and we are going to get you something new in 60 days.

Folks, I have done implementation work. The math doesn't work. I have to believe that these people who are Ivy League educated, qualified to go to the Supreme Court, can do basic math.

It can't be done. It can't be a serious effort. And if it is a serious effort, I would suggest that they engage somebody who has actually implemented it before, instead of assuming that they can because they simply can't.

And so when I have somebody put a microphone up in my face and say: Why are you against voter ID? I would say: First, do your homework. I ratified it. I fulfilled a promise. We have solid elections in North Carolina.

I am against it because people are selling you a bill of goods. When I had this discussion with the senior Senator from Utah, it was like: Well, you know, I understand that it doesn't work in practice, but it should work in theory.

He didn't say that, but that is effectively how he responded to it. I don't work in a theoretical world. I grew up in a trailer park. I worked as a management consultant. I work in a practical world. And in a practical world, I don't care how much you want voter ID done, the only thing you are going to have in this election is 72 Members of the Senate who already have voter ID in their States—did you know that? You would think that we didn't have any.

Mr. President, 36 States already have voter ID. You want to sit down here and talk about how you upped the bar, and you give people a year or two to get it implemented, fine. But don't fool the American people into thinking you can implement something of this complexity over 60 days. My God, it needed to happen 2 years ago.

As a matter of fact, the senior Senator from Utah's legislature has recently changed their policy, which I think they should have called for years ago, of mass mailing ballots to everybody, right? This should be fairly simple. You are only going from mass mailing ballots to saying: Hey, we have got to request it, right? They decided to take 3 years to implement that.

I would ask the senior Senator from Utah: Why don't we speed it up? Why don't we do it this year? If we can do something as expansive as all this that they have tried to do in the three dif-

ferent sequels to the SAVE Act, you can certainly do that in Utah, can't you? Because the effect of this bill would be to eliminate it anyway. So get 'er done. Do it now. Or let's start being honest with the American people.

We should figure out a way to get every State to get to voter ID. We should put in grants that say: If you hit this threshold, we will help you with the implementation; and if you don't, we are going to spend that money to audit your elections.

That is fine. That is good governance. And that is giving the States the option to decide whether or not they want to up the ante and increase the integrity of their elections or expect an audit from the Federal Government if they don't.

That is what I would be advising my client. This is what I am advising my client right now—the President of the United States—like CEOs that I have advised before: Mr. President, these people are misleading you if they are telling you that this can be implemented by November. The only thing that will occur is an undermining of the integrity of our elections right now.

So, folks from North Carolina, our State motto is "Esse quam videri"—"To be, rather than to seem." This seems like a legit proposal, but it isn't, and it hasn't been for the last year because you couldn't have gotten it done with 10,000 election entities if we had passed it last July.

So let's be honest with the American people. Let's focus on getting every State to have voter ID. Let's provide funding that lets the States opt into it and have a consequence if they don't in terms of audit. But let's stop the charade. Let's stop the distraction. Let's get the government funded. Let's use reconciliation if we need to, but let's not clog it up with another piece of policy airdropped by a Member of this Senate or the White House that will undermine this bill, undermine what we need to get done before the election.

So the fact is, we are not going to have 10,000 people doing things radically by election day. What we are going to do if we continue down this path is to convince the American people that you can't count on your election results. And that is dangerous. That is irresponsible.

If you see voting improprieties in your State, report it. There are tools right now to investigate them. But don't further undermine the confidence of the American people by saying: My goodness, they can't get this implemented? The election must be invalid.

That is not an America that anybody should sign up for. We ought to do it right, and we have to do the work. So if I see a reconciliation bill come from the House with another failed attempt to confuse this election, I will use every device I have available to slow down the wheels of government until people cop a clue and do the math.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

INTEL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have a friend in Louisiana. He is the former State speaker of the house. And Charlie invented a new word in English. The word is "winky-doo." When the then-speaker of the statehouse wanted to describe someone acting dishonestly or denigrating your position or double-crossing you, the speaker would say: He tried to winky-doo me. He tried to winky-doo me.

I have always loved that word.

Intel, a fine American company, may be trying to winky-doo the American taxpayer. Last year—and let me say that again. Intel is a fine company. They have to compete in the market to manufacture chips like everybody else. I believe in free enterprise. I don't believe in state-supported capitalism, government-run capitalism.

But Intel was not doing a very good job competing, and so the Federal Government decided to bail them out. The Federal Government—the Department of Commerce—gave Intel \$8.9 billion cash, bought 10 percent of the company—not \$8.9 million, \$8.9 billion cash.

Now, a fairminded person, when the Department of Commerce did this, could have said: Well, why Intel? Why not some other company?

So that gave me pause. Fair point. I didn't like seeing the Federal Government picking and choosing among American companies about which should get \$8.9 billion of American taxpayer money. I didn't like that. I still don't like it. If there is a fair competition, fine. And I get that manufacturing chips are important to America. I get all that. But the government is still playing favorites.

When the government buys 10 percent of a company—\$8.9 billion. Did I mention that is how much money Intel got? When the Federal Government takes a 10-percent equity position in a company, you can bet that the politicians, of which I include myself, are going to give a whole lot of advice to Intel—or any other company they buy the stock in. Sometimes that will be sound business advice, but sometimes it will just be raw gut politics. I don't like it. I don't like it.

I know the new thing is neosocialism. I have watched new Members of Congress get elected, all of whom can—they all know the words to the Cuban national anthem, and they are all for socialism. I would ask them to take a look at the history of Cuba and the former USSR and China and Argentina and Venezuela—and I could continue going—and they should try to show me a country where socialism has worked. They can't.

But I digress. The reason I didn't like this idea of buying 10 percent of the stock of Intel was because, as far as I was concerned, it was in the foothills of socialism. If a company needs help and we decide as a government that company is vital to America, God made these things called loans that are