

much more that she had to say about Senator Graham.

Ms. Westercamp accused Senator COLLINS of Maine of prioritizing her “own personal political power” over loyalty to President Trump and called for her removal, as well as the removal of Senators MURKOWSKI and CASSIDY following their vote on the second impeachment effort against the President.

Ms. Westercamp even posted a sexually explicit image and joke about former House Speaker NANCY PELOSI—a post that Ms. Westercamp herself later described as “not safe for work.”

Notably, it appears some of her inflammatory, overtly political posts were made while Ms. Westercamp was on duty, actually, as an attorney at the Department of Justice; she was tweeting away. That would violate Federal law.

Last week, Leader THUNE filed closure so that we could move more quickly to Ms. Westercamp’s nomination. After you have heard about her background, what do you think as a Senator?

Despite her disrespectful and inflammatory comments, she is a priority for the other side. It is a disgrace that Senate Republicans are moving forward on this nomination while Senator MCCONNELL is still in the hospital and so soon after Senator Graham’s passing.

Judges are chosen for judgment, for character, for maturity, for competence, for independence, and most especially, for their temperament. Ms. Westercamp does not meet that standard. I urge my colleagues to oppose her nomination.

NOMINATION OF TODD BLANCHE

Mr. President, on a separate topic, last week the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing that I will never forget. On the second day of Todd Blanche’s nomination hearing to be Attorney General of the United States, the committee convened an outside panel of witnesses to discuss his fitness to serve in that office.

I invited one of the witnesses. Her name was Dani Bensky, a young woman who is a dance teacher and a mother. She was a victim of Jeffrey Epstein. She was sexually abused by him when she was 17 years old.

A group of about a dozen Epstein survivors and their loved ones sat behind Dani when she testified. They were urging that the predators responsible for these horrific crimes be held accountable. Their stories are heart-breaking.

Instead of helping them, the Trump Justice Department has retraumatized these survivors with its careless and cavalier attitude. When this administration finally released information pertaining to Epstein’s trafficking ring after missing the Epstein Files Transparency Act deadline, many of the survivors’ personal identifying information became publicly available.

These survivors already suffering unspeakable abuse were forced to relive

their trauma as one of the most painful moments of their lives became public for anyone, including their friends, family, and coworkers to see.

There was a time when the Department of Justice turned 1,000 attorneys loose on the Epstein files to find any references to the President. They were so careful, they went through it page by page for millions of pages.

And yet, when it came time to finally release the files, they were so slipshod and haphazard that they released the identities, the addresses, the telephone numbers, and even photographs of the Epstein victims.

The victims of Epstein’s abuse attended both days of the hearing to demand accountability from the man who oversaw that botched release of files that put private information online—Todd Blanche.

They wanted the opportunity to speak with him to tell him their stories and to push him to hold the predators responsible for their abuse accountable.

When I asked Mr. Blanche on Wednesday if he would meet with these brave individuals, he responded with babble about lawyers and regulations. He wouldn’t just say: I will meet with the victims.

It was fortunate that he did do the right thing. It took the threat of one Republican Senator who said he would not support Blanche’s nomination for Attorney General unless he met with the survivors. Then, reluctantly, he did.

You would think Mr. Blanche would go out of his way to meet with them to apologize for the harm he caused victims, for the information that they disclosed, and to present them with a plan for changes going forward to protect victims while pursuing perpetrators.

Instead, he arrived at the meeting ready to deny any blame for himself, with little or no concern for the survivors according to their reports. Those in the room described him as dismissive. They said that speaking with Mr. Blanche was like “beating your head against the wall.”

The impression that the victims had upon leaving the meeting was that Mr. Blanche was only there to check the box for his promotion; nothing was going to change.

Is this the man we want to confirm to be head of the premium law enforcement Agency in America? With Mr. Blanche, it is clear that justice is secondary to loyalty to the President.

Under Blanche, hundreds of FBI personnel were directed to troll through those Epstein files to find any mention of the President but could not exercise the same level of care to ensure victims’ information remain protected.

When pressed in an interview why more Epstein accomplices had not been charged, Blanche insisted “it isn’t a crime to party with Mr. Epstein.”

Survivors deserve more than that type of flip comment. They deserve a DOJ committed to ensuring that it will

never happen again. They deserve an Attorney General who treats them with respect and compassion.

Mr. Blanche’s behavior surrounding the Epstein investigation is just one of the many reasons he should not lead the Department of Justice. I urge my colleagues to oppose his nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STOP INSIDER TRADING ACT

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, people generally in this country—and Nebraskans in particular—expect when they send their elected officials to Washington, DC, that they are going to serve the communities. Sadly, that belief that we are coming here is undermined by some of our policies that we have.

For example, 80 percent of Americans believe that Congress does not do a good job of keeping the inside information that we have separate from our finances. Consequently, the approval rating of Congress is about 17 percent.

And it is not just the polling that shows that we have got a problem; so does history. We can look on social media and see that regularly, publishing the trades of Members of this body is something people try to profit off of.

In fact, the former Speaker’s trades were published quite regularly. And as crazy as it sounds, that became a legitimate investment strategy because it was making people money.

We also had a former member of the Senate Intelligence Committee who sold about \$1.5 million in stock in 2020 that occurred right before the market tanked because of the COVID pandemic.

Even the appearance of impropriety undermines the credibility of the House and the Senate, that it gives the—even if we give the perception that we are using inside information to benefit financially, it undermines the public’s trust in our democracy and may depress people from wanting to vote, keep them home, and it certainly undermines the faith they have in our institutions.

I have a solution. My Stop Insider Trading Act. My Stop Insider Trading Act would go beyond our current disclosure laws. What it would say is that if you become elected to the Congress—either the House or the Senate—that you would not be allowed to buy any more stocks.

Now, if you owned it already, you would be allowed to keep those. But if you wanted to sell those, you would have to give 7 to 14 days’ notice so that the public would be able to see what you intended to do and be able to take

appropriate action well ahead of what you would be able to do.

So you would not be able to take advantage of any inside information ahead of what the public had. You would not be able to sell until the public knew well in advance, and, of course, you would be prohibited from buying stocks as well.

My bill also has real teeth in it, a minimum of a \$2,000 fine or 10 percent of the cost of the proceeds.

So, for example, if you went and sold a stock after getting elected, without giving the proper notice, and say it was a million-dollar transaction, you would have to pay a \$100,000 fine. In addition, you would have to forfeit all of the profits. The Stop Insider Trading Act has real teeth in it to back up the policy.

By making sure that Members of Congress cannot buy stock on inside information and would have to notify the public if they wish to sell any stock well in advance of their actually being able to do that, we can help restore the faith of the American people that we are keeping separate the inside information that we get for very good reasons from our finances.

Let's be clear, no Member of the House or Senate should benefit from inside information. They should not be allowed to profit from it. This is supposed to be a public service, and we need to take steps to restore the credibility with the American people.

The Stop Insider Trading Act is the solution to be able to help restore that credibility, to let the American people know that we are not financially benefiting from inside information. It would apply to not only Members of the House and Senate but their spouses and their dependent children as well.

The President has called on us to pass the Stop Insider Trading Act. The Vice President just last week, in addressing House Republicans, said we need to pass the Stop Insider Trading Act. It is time for Congress to act on this important piece of legislation that will help restore people's faith in their institutions.

I call on my colleagues to support this bill and send it to the President's desk.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 (Mr. ARMSTRONG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a bill that, at its core, asks for something almost embarrassingly simple: That the person registering to vote in an American election is actually an American citizen and that the person showing up to cast

the ballot is actually who they say they are.

The SAVE Act does not reinvent our elections. It does not add redtape for the sake of redtape. It asks for documentary proof of citizenship at registration and identification at the ballot box—the same basic verification we already accept without complaint when we board an airplane, open a bank account, or pick up a prescription.

If we trust that system to protect a checking account, we should trust it enough to protect the vote. That is not extremism. That is common sense, and it is long past time this Chamber treated it that way.

This past Saturday, I was riding in the Cheyenne Frontier Days parade alongside Senator BARRASSO. Cheyenne is my hometown. It is the world's largest outdoor rodeo. And we have great parades—four of them—during the course of the week of the world's largest outdoor rodeo. It is an exceptional tradition in my hometown.

Senator BARRASSO and I are riding along the parade route, the same parade route Wyoming has watched for generations. And as we came down the street, I could hear it from my constituents over and over: Pass the SAVE Act, Senator. Pass the SAVE Act. Not once. Not from just one corner of the crowd, all along the parade route. That is not a talking point; that just happened last weekend. That is the people of Wyoming telling us what they want.

So, I came home from that parade wondering if Wyoming was maybe a little ahead of the country on this.

It turns out, Wyoming is right where the country already is. And it turns out these constituents aren't just in line with the people of Wyoming; they are in line with the country.

A Gallup poll found 84 percent of U.S. adults favor requiring photo identification to vote. In that same poll, 83 percent—just one less—support requiring proof of citizenship for new voter registrants. Mr. President, 83 percent. That includes 71 percent of self-identified Democrats and an overwhelming majority of Independents. In this town, we can't get 83 percent of anybody to agree on the weather.

This is not controversial outside the walls of this building. It has simply become controversial inside them.

Would we expect to go to Mexico or Canada and walk into an election booth and have them let us vote in their elections without an ID, without proving we're a Canadian citizen or a Mexican citizen? They would have nothing to do with the process that allowed a U.S. citizen to vote without identification in their elections. No country would.

So is the opposition to this bill just another symptom of Trump derangement syndrome, where any policy this administration touches becomes reflexively toxic the moment it reaches this floor? Or do my colleagues across the aisle actually believe it is bad policy for only American citizens to decide

American elections? Because, really, those are—as near as I can tell—the only two explanations on offer.

The same is true of protecting girls' and women's sports. Gallup has found 69 percent of Americans believe athletes should compete on teams that match their biological sex. I am surprised it is not a higher number, but it is 69 percent. This is not a fringe position. It is the plainly stated view of most people in this country, arrived at through a basic, widely shared sense of fairness: That girls who train and compete deserve a level playing field where they can compete safely. They don't have to worry about a man who identifies as a woman or as a transperson spiking a volleyball so hard that it does brain damage and causes concussions and lifelong injury to a young high school athlete. We owe that to our female athletes.

Wyoming didn't send me here to just spew political jargon, to play politics, because these things are simple; they are timeless; they are understood values. We can't bend and shape thousands of years of common sense with new, woke ideology. Wyoming sent me here to conduct myself in a manner that reflects their common sense, their values.

So it is time to send the SAVE Act to President Trump's desk. I heard that on the parade route in Cheyenne, WY, last weekend, and I hear it on this floor. We need to pass the SAVE Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

RECESS

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled recess begin immediately.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:17 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 807

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here today with a very straightforward, simple resolution. It is about enforcement. For most of my career, I was an enforcer: a Federal prosecutor, U.S. attorney for Connecticut, and then attorney general of the State of Connecticut for 20 years. So I know—we all know—that the law is dead letter if it is not enforced.

And there is a very, very profoundly important law—in fact, our Constitution—that needs enforcement. That is the task that brings me to the Senate floor today.

I am asking for a resolution to direct the Senate legal counsel to bring a civil action in the name of the U.S. Senate to enforce the foreign emoluments clause contained in article I of