

Rubio	Shelby	Toomey
Sasse	Sullivan	Wicker
Scott (FL)	Thune	Young
Scott (SC)	Tillis	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Feinstein	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Rosen
Brown	Heinrich	Schumer
Cantwell	Hirono	Shaheen
Cardin	Jones	Stabenow
Carper	Kaine	Udall
Casey	King	Van Hollen
Coons	Leahy	Warner
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Merkley	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—9

Burr	Sanders	Smith
Klobuchar	Schatz	Tester
Markey	Sinema	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 actions.

The Senator from Kentucky.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
H.R. 35

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the expedited passage of H.R. 35, the Emmett Till Antilynching Act, as amended. I seek to amend this legislation not because I take lynching lightly but because I take it seriously, and this legislation does not.

Lynching is a tool of terror that claimed the lives of nearly 5,000 Americans between 1881 and 1968, but this bill would cheapen the meaning of lynching by defining it so broadly as to include a minor bruise or abrasion. Our Nation's history of racial terrorism demands more seriousness from us than that.

W.E.B. Du Bois wrote in his autobiography about the 1899 lynching of Sam Hose in Georgia. Du Bois wrote that, after the lynching, Hose's knuckles were viewed on display at a store on Mitchell Street in Atlanta. His liver and heart were even presented to the Governor of Georgia as a souvenir.

Sickening, grotesque—the images of lynching.

In 1931, Raymond Gunn was lynched in Maryville, MO. The spectacle drew a crowd of almost 4,000 people, including, if you can believe it, women and their

children. In the tragedy of lynching, the author writes that one woman even held her little girl up so high so she could better see the victim who was “blazing on the roof.”

Sickening and grotesque, these images.

In the summer of 1955, 14-year-old Emmett Till was visiting family in Money, MS, when he went to a country store and bought some candy. While in there, he was accused of flirting with a White woman, and for that offense, Emmett Till was kidnapped in the middle of the night and bludgeoned so badly that, afterward, his body was unrecognizable. He could only be identified by the ring he was wearing. After seeing her son's remains, his mother insisted on having an open casket funeral so the whole world could see what the killers had done to her son.

We must remember the murders of Emmett Till, Raymond Gunn, Sam Hose, and the thousands of others whose lives were destroyed by the barbarity of the lynch mob, but this bill will not do that. This bill would expand the meaning of “lynching” to include any bodily injury, including a cut, an abrasion, or a bruise, physical pain, illness, or any other injury to the body, no matter how temporary.

Words have meaning. It would be a disgrace for the Congress of the United States to declare that a bruise is lynching, that an abrasion is lynching, that any injury to the body, no matter how temporary, is on par with the atrocities done to people like Emmett Till, Raymond Gunn, and Sam Hose, who were killed for no reason but because they were Black. To do that would demean their memories and cheapen the historic and horrific legacy of lynching in our country.

As Congressman AMASH stated, “To be clear, the bill does not make lynching a new Federal hate crime. Murdering someone on account of their race or conspiring to do so is now illegal under Federal law. It is already a Federal crime, and it is already a hate crime.”

He is right. We have had Federal hate crime statutes for over 50 years, and it has been a Federal hate crime to murder someone because of his race for over a decade. Additionally, murder is already a crime in 50 States. In fact, rather than considering a good-intentioned but symbolic bill, the Senate could immediately consider addressing qualified immunity and ending police militarization.

We can and must do better. That is why no one in the Senate has been more involved in criminal justice reform than I have. No one has introduced more criminal justice reform bills. In my time in the Senate, I have authored or cosponsored at least 22 unique criminal justice reform bills. I am acutely aware of the injustices perpetrated year in and year out in our cities, but reform needs to be more than window dressing.

That is why I am on the floor today to offer the expedited passage—pass it

today—of the Emmett Till Antilynching Act, as amended. Lynching is a particularly vicious kind of murder, and a Federal law should treat it as such. For these reasons, the Emmett Till Antilynching Act should be adopted with my amendment, which would apply the criminal penalties for lynching only and not for other crimes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 35, which was received by the House. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment at the desk be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, the idea that we would not be taking the issue of lynching seriously is an insult, an insult to Senator BOOKER, to Senator TIM SCOTT, to me, and to all of the Senators, past and present, who have understood that this is part of the great stain of America's history.

To suggest that anything short of pulverizing someone so much that the casket would otherwise be closed except for the heroism and courage of Emmett Till's mother, to suggest that lynching would only be a lynching if someone's heart were pulled out and produced and displayed to someone else is ridiculous—and on this day, the day of George Floyd's funeral and a day that should be a day of national mourning.

In 2018, the Senate unanimously passed bipartisan antilynching legislation, which I proudly introduced with the only other Black Members of this body—Senator CORY BOOKER and Senator TIM SCOTT. It was a historic moment. It marked the first time in the history of our country that Federal antilynching legislation had been passed by the U.S. Senate. It passed again by unanimous consent in 2019.

Senator PAUL is now trying to weaken a bill that was already passed. There is no reason for this. Senator PAUL's amendment would place a greater burden on victims of lynching than is currently required under Federal hate crimes laws. There is no reason for this. There is no reason other than its being cruel and deliberate obstruction on a day of mourning.

On this very day, at this very hour, there is a memorial service to honor the life of George Floyd, who was murdered on a sidewalk by a police officer, with a knee on his neck. For 8 minutes 46 seconds, George Floyd pled for his life, called for his late mother, and said he could not breathe. The pain experienced not only by that man, that human being and his family and his children, but the pain of the people of America witnessing what we have witnessed since the founding of this country, which is that the Black lives have

not been taken seriously as being fully human and deserving of dignity—and it should not require a maiming or torture in order for us to recognize a lynching when we see it and recognize it by Federal law and call it what it is, which is that it is a crime that should be punishable with accountability and consequence.

So it is remarkable and it is painful to be standing here right now, especially when people of all races are marching in the streets of America, outraged by the hate and the violence and the murder that has been fueled by racism during the span of this country's life. America is raw right now. Her wound exposed. Raw from the fact that in the history of our country, Black people have been treated as less than human.

I stood here with Senator BOOKER when we first proposed this lynching law, and we talked about the pain and the history of the pain of this issue in America. The fact is that the country is raw because America has never fully addressed the historic and systemic racism that has existed in our country.

Our bill, in its current form, is an opportunity—it is an opportunity for this body to acknowledge the seriousness of this, to acknowledge that if someone places a noose over someone else's neck, why would it be required that in addition their heart would be pulled out or their body pulverized to the point beyond recognition?

Our bill is an opportunity to right a wrong and an opportunity for a reckoning in Federal law. We cannot pretend that lynchings are a thing of the past. Ahmaud Arbery was a victim of a modern-day lynching. He was murdered on February 23, 2020, 3 months ago. Today, we learned that one of the men who killed Mr. Arbery used a racial slur after shooting him. He should be alive today, and his killers should be brought to justice. No longer should the crime of lynching go unpunished. No longer should victims and their families go without justice.

In closing, Ida B. Wells once said:

Our country's national crime is lynching. It is not the creature of an hour, the sudden outburst of uncontrolled fury, or the unspeakable brutality of an insane mob. It represents the cool, calculating deliberation of intelligent people who openly avow that there is an "unwritten law" that justifies them in putting human beings to death without complaint under oath, without trial by jury, without opportunity to make defense, and without right of appeal.

Our country has waited too long for a reckoning on this issue of lynching, and I believe no Senator should stop the full weight of the law in its capacity to protect these human beings and human life.

Senator BOOKER and I are working on a comprehensive bill to address this hurt and the tragedy at the heart of this national day of mourning, and I object to Senator PAUL's efforts to weaken this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to Senator PAUL's request?

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator HARRIS for her words, and I want to thank her as the lead Senator on this bill. I want to thank her for her partnership and leadership. I also want to thank Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina, who has shown extraordinary commitment to this legislation as well. On the House side, I want to thank BOBBY RUSH, former Black Panther. I want to thank him for his leadership and generational commitment to racial justice in America.

I also want to recognize the tireless advocacy of Airickca Gordon-Taylor, who is the actual relative of Emmett Till and founder of the Mamie Till Mobley Memorial Foundation. She was here the last time this bill was before this body. She is dead now. I know she is looking down and hoping that we don't disappoint her.

In February of 2019, this body did something historic—and I don't mean to be emotional. I am raw this week. But I stood here with KAMALA and we wept. We talked about the hundreds of years—over a century, excuse me, of effort to pass legislation which was brought up and defeated time and again by this body by avowed segregationists. How proud I was that at a time when partisanship is high in this country we gathered together in one voice, 100 Senators, to pass this exact same bill, because there are good people in this body on both sides, and we were correcting a wrong of history.

Nobody in this body needs a lecture on lynching and how horrible it is. Everybody in this body abhors racism and believes that this violence is unjust. There are friends of mine here. Unanimously, we passed that legislation. We made history on this floor.

This is why I am confused because this bill has been passed unanimously, and here we are on a day of a memorial service for another person whose murder was condemned by people on both sides of the aisle. I have sat where the Presiding Officer is sitting, and I have watched the differences between the Republican leader and the Democratic leader. I don't go back that long in this body, but I have watched Harry Reid and MITCH MCCONNELL and CHUCK SCHUMER disagree so deeply time and again, but, God, we came together and passed the bill unanimously. MITCH MCCONNELL let the bill come to this floor, didn't try to block it.

My colleague RAND PAUL was one of the first hands I shook on this Senate floor. He is my friend, and everything he said about his commitment to criminal justice reform is right. One of the first bills I wrote here I wrote with RAND PAUL, and then he went further at another time like this when America was raw, when another unarmed Black man was shot. He went as far as to, in Time magazine, stand up and

talk openly about the ProPublica data about a Black man in America being about 100 times more likely to be shot by the police than someone who is White.

He has said—and he is shaking his head, if I may recognize. He said that there must be something more going on there if it is that much. So I do not question—I do not question the sincerity of his convictions. I have had too many conversations with him to question his heart, but I am so raw today, of all days, that we are doing this—of all days, that we are doing this right now, having this discussion when, God, if this bill passed today, what that would mean for America; that this body and that body have now finally agreed because I know when Congressman White, the last Black person to serve in Congress before the God-awful fall of the backlash after Reconstruction fell. He gave this famous speech. We were talking about the Phoenix will rise; that one day Black people will serve in this body. And here we are in the Senate for the first time in history, when three African Americans serve together, Republican and Democratic, and we all came together on KAMALA's bill.

There is something about us that we knew it was something more than the legalistic issues my colleague now wants to bring up; that we are a nation that needs this historic healing. If we passed this, it would not only do something substantive to make a difference on the books of the American system, but, God, it would speak volumes to the racial pain and the hurt of generations.

I do not need my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, to tell me about one lynching in this country. I have stood in the museum in Montgomery, AL, and watched African-American families weeping at the stories of pregnant women lynched in this country and their babies ripped out of them while this body did nothing. I can hear the screams, as this body's membership can, of the unanswered cries for justice by our ancestors. Every one of us is sensitive to that anguish. Everyone is sensitive to that pain, as is the Senator from Kentucky.

This week, the Senator from Kentucky mentioned a colleague, JUSTIN AMASH. I want to tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, he was only one of four Congressmen of a 435-Member body to vote against the anti-lynching bill. That means that this bill was supported by the leader of the Democrats, the Speaker of House. It was supported by the leader of the Republicans, the whip of the Republicans, the whip of the Democrats—400-plus votes supported this. Yet my colleague thinks this bill is wrong.

If this bill is wrong, then the Republican leadership of the House is wrong. If this bill is wrong, then the Democratic leadership of the House is wrong. If this bill is wrong, 99 Senators are wrong. If this bill is wrong, then the

NAACP is wrong. If this bill is wrong, then the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law is wrong. If this bill is wrong, then the Urban League of America is wrong, legal organizations, civil rights organizations, Democrats and Republicans. Tell me another time when 500-plus Congresspeople, Democrats, Republicans, House Members, and Senators came together in a chorus of conviction and said that now is the time in America that we condemn the dark history of our past and actually pass anti-lynchings legislation. And now one man—and I do not question his motives because I know his heart—one man—one man is standing in the way of the law of the land changing because of a difference of interpretation.

This doesn't talk about bruising someone. It is a difference of interpretation.

Does America need a win today on racial justice? Do the anguished cries of people in the streets?

I have had children break down with me this week wondering if this would be a country that values their lives as much as White people's lives. I had to explain to grown men this week that there is still hope in America; that we could make change in America; that we could grow and heal in America; that we could make this a more perfect Union.

Well, today is a day we can do it—to have one Member to yield for once, like he did in February of 2019, yield for 1 day and give America this win. Let us pass this piece of legislation today of all days. Let's give a headline tomorrow of something that will give hope to this country that we can get it right. It may not cure the ills that so many are protesting about, but, God, it could be a sign of hope.

So, Mr. President, I object to this amendment. I object. I object. I object on substance. I object on the law. For my heart and spirit and every fiber of my being, I object for my ancestors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator for Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. I think it is important to know and let the record show that I have been working with Senator BOOKER's office for 3 months on the amendment of this bill; that I am willing to have unanimous passage of the bill today, but I think it is incredibly important that we get this right.

A Black woman in New Jersey assaulted three Jewish women and slapped them. It was terrible. She uttered racial epithets about these Jewish women. She was charged with third-degree misdemeanor assault with up to 1 year in prison, which to me sounds pretty significant for slapping, but she was then charged with a hate crime in addition to that, which was 4 years in addition.

If slapping someone and hurling racial epithets gets you 10 years in prison, this is exactly what we have been fighting about in criminal justice re-

form. We set up a system and didn't pay attention to the penalties, and all of a sudden things we didn't intend happened. So we have to be smart about this.

I am willing to pass the bill today, as amended, which would simply say not that you even have to harm someone—you have to attempt to harm them, but it has to be an attempt to harm them.

So all the discussion about bruising while trying to lynch someone—yes, that is attempted murder. It would be covered by this bill. Nothing in the bill would stop or prevent the prosecution of heinous behavior. That is what it is intended for.

What I am trying to do is to make sure we don't get unintended consequences. We fought the battle against mandatory minimums for a decade now because we tie up people in sentencing that makes no sense. Ten years for slapping someone would be an abomination, and it could happen to anyone. Do we want a Black woman who slapped three Jewish women in New Jersey to get 10 years in prison? If there is a group of them, it is now a conspiracy to lynch.

We have to use some common sense here. We should not have a 10-year prison sentence for anything less than, at the very least, an attempt to do bodily harm. The statute lists what bodily harm is, but it could still be an attempt. It doesn't mean you actually have to have it, but what it would preclude is when somebody shoves somebody in a bar and they fall down and have an abrasion and they say: "He did it because of a racial animus toward me," and then you have a 10-year penalty. That is not right.

All of us are advocates on the same side of criminal justice reform. We have all argued on the same side that the law is screwed up and has incarcerated too many people unfairly. That is what I am trying to prevent here. So the point is, I understand the emotions about this. Do you think I take great joy in being here? No. I am the sponsor of 22 criminal justice bills. Do you think I am getting any good publicity on this? No. I will be excoriated by simpleminded people on the internet who think I don't like Emmett Till or appreciate the history and the memory of Emmett Till. I will be lectured to by everybody that I have got no right to have an opinion on any of these things, and I should be quiet.

But we cannot just not read our bills. I have worked in an honest way with Senator BOOKER's office for 3 months on this bill. We have gone back and forth. We gave them some language. They came back to us and said it wouldn't work, and I said: What about this, and we haven't gotten any more responses. We haven't gotten responses back in a month or more.

The situation now is they are litigating in the press and trying to accuse me of being in favor of something so heinous that it makes my skin crawl and makes me sick to my stomach to

even read the accounts about what happened.

But we also ought to be fair and honest about this. Lynching is illegal. People who say there is no Federal law against lynching are not telling the truth. The law says that if you kill somebody and you have racial animus, under the hate crimes statute, it is illegal. You can't do that. It is also illegal in all the States. This bill does not make lynching illegal. So for all the discussion of that, this bill creates a new crime called conspiracy to lynch. Oh, yes, I am for it. If there is a crowd, let's arrest the whole mob. All four policemen should be responsible for what happened to Mr. Floyd.

The thing is, when we do that, we have to be careful that we don't then put a crowd of people in where someone pushed into someone or someone slapped someone.

There has to be justice. People are chanting "justice." Justice has to have a brain and has to have vision and can't be hamstrung into something that could give someone 10 years in prison for a minor crime.

This is a very minor attempt. Everything we left in here we have worked with Senator BOOKER's office to make sure it is inclusive. They came back and said: What about attempted? We said: Let's change the language. So we have in there "attempt to cause serious bodily harm."

So there could be no injury, but someone will have to have a discussion of whether there was an attempt and it was an attempt that looked like it would be serious. So I think slapping someone isn't, but under the current statute as is—people say: Ah, nobody will ever do it. Maybe, but we are putting it on the books.

The mandatory minimums have kept people in jail for decades. There are people who have life for nonviolent crimes. All of us have worked on the same side of that issue.

I am asking for a very minor change. I will pass it right now. I am completely out of the way. I am for the bill. I am asking unanimous consent to pass the bill today with one amendment that just says let's be careful not to arrest people for slapping someone or not arrest somebody for pushing into someone and get them 10 years in prison.

This isn't about someone trying to kill another person or someone attempting bodily harm. Those people would be included in this language even if they did not have a mark on the person. But if they were rounding him up, tying him up, and they had thrown a rope over a tree, that is attempted murder. They would still be included under this bill, even without a mark on them.

What we have to preclude and what we are trying to preclude is that the bill doesn't get used for the wrong purposes. We are all on the same side about whom we want to punish and whom we should prevent. We are also

on the same side on the symbolism of this, but we can't pass laws that do exactly what all of us have said is wrong with our penal system, all of the unintended consequences. There is one here, and I ask, in a very polite way—I have been asking for 3 months—for one small change, and I will let the bill go today, on this day, if we can have it.

The changes have been out there. They are not brand-new. They have been in Senator BOOKER's office for 3 months. We have tried to, as he has had objections, work with him on his objections.

So I would ask unanimous consent, once again, to pass the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, this is a bill that has already passed this body. Same bill, same language. There was no objection. Only four Members of the House of Representatives objected. Same bill, same language.

I have heard this objection. We disagree with this. The truth is, what is being proposed is not just opposed by me, but our Republican colleagues who are sponsoring this bill, in this body, oppose these corrections as well.

In addition to that, changes to this bill now would send it back to the House of Representatives. This is a tactic that will send this bill back over to the House, where again it would have to be voted on.

This idea that somehow someone would be brought up on lynching charges for a slapping is absurd, especially as you see, with hate crime legislation, how difficult that is even to prove.

So I am deeply disappointed by the objections we have heard that were not made manifest last year, in 2019, but somehow seem to be stopping it in 2020. So I object, with this prediction: We, as a body, will correct historic ills and pass lynching legislation through this body, through the House of Representatives. One day in this Nation, this legislation will pass.

Perhaps it will have to wait until I am not here, until Senator PAUL is not here, unless he decides to go back to the 2019 Senator PAUL.

The question is, What side of history will we ultimately be on? I pray that it happens in this Congress. I pray that the President signs legislation against lynching. How historic that would be. But today it is not going to happen, obviously.

I am telling you right now, this celebration will come. This moment in American history will come. The frustrating thing for me is, at a time when this country hungers for common sense, racial reconciliation, an acknowledgement of our past and a looking forward to the better future, this will be one of the sad days where that possibility was halted.

As we all know, one of the great leaders that Republicans and Democrats all hail asked that question—How long will it take?—and the simple answer is not long because the truth crushed to earth will rise again; not long because you reap what you sow; not long because the arc of the moral universe is long but it bends toward justice.

We will pass this legislation. I pray that the Members of this body, as we are right now, are the ones to do it.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, before my colleagues exit the Chamber, I want to acknowledge their words. I want to say thank you. The passion, the emotion, the true rawness in your words are words that I think all of us, as Members of the Senate, should hear, reflect, and respect. I just want you to know I am thankful I was on the floor to personally hear. Because we can read words, but it is when we have the ability to hear and to feel those words that their true meaning comes out, so I appreciate and I thank you for that.

PROTESTS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I had asked to come and speak on the floor of the Senate on this day, June 4. I have been actually looking forward to it and planning speaking time for months now.

June 4 is a significant day in the fight for women's suffrage. It was on June 4 of 1919 that Congress approved the amendment and sent it to the States for ratification, and then it was in 1920 that the 19th Amendment was ratified by the States.

So this was to be a time of celebration, of recognition, of women's suffrage, this centennial event.

Since that time that I first looked to schedule this, my, how the world has changed. We have been in the midst of a pandemic—over 100,000 American lives lost to the COVID-19 virus. We are in the midst of an economic crisis the likes of which we haven't seen in decades and decades.

And, just a week ago now, we witnessed the killing of George Floyd on our streets, in broad daylight. And today, June 4, is not only a recognition of women's suffrage, but it is the funeral of George Floyd.

So before I speak to the matter I intended to speak on today, I want to just briefly comment on where I believe we are as a nation right now.

I was walking into work this morning, and in my neighbor's yard is a placard, a yard sign. It has been there for some years, actually, now. It is a partial quote of Martin Luther King that states: "We can't be silent about the things that matter."

You think about those things that matter: equality, justice, the fundamental truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by God with

certain rights. And when those rights are denied, when they are violated, it is our responsibility to address the injustice. It is not our responsibility as elected Members of the U.S. Senate; it is our responsibility as fellow humans, as Americans who believe in these principles of justice and equality.

President Bush had some words this week that I found very direct, very comforting at a difficult time when it is hard to be comforted, when our spirits are so discomfited and agitated right now. But he reminded us that achieving justice for all is the duty of all. It is the duty of all.

And we are hurting now as a nation. We have wounds from racism that have never been allowed to heal—and those words were just shared here on this floor moments ago—wounds that have never been allowed to heal, wounds that are still so open and raw. And healing can't take place until the hurt and the anger and the anguish that so many in this country still feel, so many African Americans, so many—so many who feel that the system is meant for somebody but not them; that there is not equal justice under the law; that it must be the law for somebody else.

This has been hard—hard on all of us, as we have seen the protests, many of them peaceful. In my home State, Alaskans are coming together with a shared sense of duty and responsibility to speak up about things that matter and doing so in a way that brings us together rather than divides.

We must condemn the violence we see on the street with the looting, but stopping the looting is not going to close this wound. We heal when we acknowledge our weaknesses, when we acknowledge our failures, and when we vow to address the things that matter, like equality and justice.

What we say and how we say it truly matters. I have been challenged by some. I have been chastised by some very close friends who have said: You are silent, Lisa. Why are you silent? Why haven't you—you—fixed what we are seeing?

And I have struggled. I have struggled with the right words. As a White woman born and raised in Alaska with a family who was privileged, I can't feel that openness and rawness that I just heard expressed by my friends CORY and KAMALA. I haven't lived their life.

But I can listen, and I can educate myself. And I can try to be a healer at a time when we need to be healed. That is my commitment and my pledge going forward to those I serve in Alaska and to those I serve in this country.

This is challenging for us. We know this, but we are an extraordinary country. We are an extraordinary people with extraordinary resilience.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me turn to the fight—the century fight