many, many, many Native American families have either experienced a job loss or a pay cut.

All across this country, working families are standing up and saying: You know what, we have served in the military. We are doing our best to raise our kids in this unprecedented moment in history. We need help.

I want to thank not only my friends in the Congressional Progressive Caucus in the House of Representatives—JAYAPAL, TLAIB, OMAR, OCASIO-CORTEZ, RO KHANNA, and many, many others—I also want to thank the millions of Americans who have stood up and demanded that the government respond to the needs of working families.

I want to thank the over 60 groups representing millions of working families, progressives, the elderly and young people, including Public Citizen, the Center for Popular Democracy, the Sunrise Movement, Social Security Works, Presente, and People's Action, for pushing a progressive agenda forward and for demanding that this government respond to the needs of our people.

So here we are, as this proposal continues to be negotiated. As I said earlier, it is my hope that not only do we make sure that unemployment benefits are extended for another 16 weeks at $300 per week, it is my hope that we can see some light here and get to the $1,200 direct payment that adults in this country desperately need. I am going to do my best in the coming days to make sure that happens. I hope the American people will join with me and get on the phones and call up their Members of the House and Members of the Senate and say that in this unprecedented moment in American history, government has to respond to the needs of working families.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote take place now.

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

All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Dawson nomination?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 270 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Grassley	Risch
Barrasso	Hawley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hoeven	Romney
Blunt	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Boozman	Inhofe	Rubio
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Burr	Jones	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	Moran	Toomey
Daines	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Gardner	Portman	Young
Graham	Reed	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Feinstein	Peters
Bennet	Gillibrand	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hassan	Sanders
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Enzi	Harris	Perdue
Fischer	Loeffler	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

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 Charles Edward Atchley, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Mitch McConnell, James E. Risch, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Tom Cotton, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Cory Gardner, Lindsey Graham, Todd Young, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, John Barrasso.

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 Charles Edward Atchley, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 271 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kelly	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	Moran	Toomey
Daines	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Gardner	Portman	Young

NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—5

Enzi	Harris	Perdue
Fischer	Loeffler	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Edward Atchley, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from New Jersey.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4711

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today and will soon ask unanimous consent for the passage of the Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2020. This legislation is about standing up for the independence of our Federal judiciary and the safety of all of those who serve it.

Many of you already know the terrible tragedy that recently struck Federal District Judge Esther Salas and her family in New Jersey. This summer, an unhinged and violent individual showed up at Judge Salas's home, impersonating a package delivery driver. When her 20-year-old son Daniel Anderl answered the door, the assailant opened fire, taking the life of her only child and seriously wounding her husband Mark Anderl.

Unfortunately, this tragedy is not the first attack on a Federal judge. There was the 1979 murder of Judge John Wood in San Antonio, TX; the 1988 murder of Judge Richard Daronco in Pelham, NY; the 1989 murder of Judge Robert Vance in Mountain Brook, AL; the 2005 murder of the husband and mother of Judge Joan Lefkow in Illinois.

And there have been other attacks as well. In June, 2013, Chief Judge Timothy Corrigan was targeted by a gunman who purchased the address of his Florida home on the internet for a mere $1.95—$1.95. The gunshot missed his ear by less than 2 inches.

Just last month, a judge's address was circulated on social media, urging people to gather outside his home while the judge was hearing a high-profile case.

According to the U.S. Marshals Service, threats against Federal judges rose by 500 percent between fiscal years 2015 and 2019. This trend should worry all of us who care about our Constitution. An independent judiciary in which judges can render decisions without fear of retribution and violence is essential to the integrity of our democracy.

Indeed, the idea that any judge at any level of government could be intimidated undermines the very concept of the rule of law. We expect all Americans to have respect for the rule of law, even when they disagree with the outcome of a case or a particular ruling. Unfortunately, that is not always the case.

Some individuals delude themselves into believing that violence is the answer. We may not be able to eliminate hatred from someone's heart, but what we can do is make sure that the men and women who serve on our Federal bench do not make for such easy targets. That is why, after Daniel's murder, I made a personal commitment to Judge Salas. I told her that I would develop legislation, along with my colleague Senator BOOKER, to better protect the men and women who sit on our Federal judiciary, to ensure their independence in the face of increased personal threats on judges, and to help prevent this unthinkable tragedy—unthinkable tragedy—from ever happening again to anyone else.

The Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2020 is a bipartisan, bicameral, and commonsense plan to safeguard the personal information of Federal judges and their families. And I want to thank my colleague Senator BOOKER, who has been there every step of the way, a member of the Judiciary, and Chairman GRAHAM—Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM—for leading this effort with me.

Our legislation makes it unlawful for data brokers to knowingly sell, trade, license, purchase, or otherwise provide personally identifiable information of a Federal judge or their family.

Since its introduction, we have worked with several stakeholders, including the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the U.S. Marshals Office, the American Civil Liberties Union, among others. Together, we carefully updated legislative language in order to uphold the First Amendment right of the press to report on matters of public concern and balance that right with our urgent need to better protect the safety of Federal judges and their families.

Federal judges and their families will continue to be able to seek relief through the courts for the knowing and willful publication of their personal information, and the party responsible for the violation will have to pay the cost and reasonable attorney's fees.

The bill enjoys widespread support among judicial and attorney organizations, including the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Judicial Conference, the Federal Judges Association, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, the American Bar Association, the National Hispanic Bar Association, the National Bar Association, and several others.

America's Federal judges must be able to render rulings without fearing for their lives or the lives of their loved ones. We must better protect Federal judges' personal information from those who would seek to do them harm. That is exactly what the Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2020 will do. This legislation will not bring Judge Salas's son back. But we must ensure, as Judge Salas said, that his death not be in vain.

As she recently wrote in the New York Times, ''Daniel's death is speaking to us, but will we listen? For the sake of my brothers and sisters on the bench, Congress must act now. Every day that goes by without action leaves our federal judges, our justice system and our very democracy in danger.''

We must protect the independence of our courts, the safety of our judges, and prevent this sort of tragedy from ever happening again. This is a commonsense bill. It will save lives, and I urge my colleagues to approve it without delay.

Before I ask for consent, I want to turn to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CORY BOOKER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of my senior Senator's unanimous consent request to pass the Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act.

As Senator MENENDEZ pointed out, this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It is bicameral. It will take important steps to safeguard the personally identifiable information of Federal judges and their family members from individuals who wish to do them harm.

As Senator MENENDEZ said, it is named after Daniel Anderl, the son of Judge Esther Salas and Mark Anderl, who was senselessly murdered in July of this year by a hate-filled gunman. The gunman was able to access personal information, as Senator MENENDEZ said, by going to Judge Salas's information, getting it—including where she lived, the routes she took to work, and even her place of worship and her home address. As a result, Judge Salas and her husband have gone through something that no parent ever, ever should have to go through.

No person who takes on the responsibility of serving as a Federal judge should ever have to live in fear that they or their family could be targeted by someone wishing to do them harm, who is able to easily access their personal information. Passing this bill today in memory and in honor of Daniel Anderl will mark a commitment of this body to safeguarding the privacy and security of our Federal judges and their families so that we can make sure we are doing everything in our power to prevent this from happening to another family.

Our bill, as Senator MENENDEZ said, has broad support. It has been endorsed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Federal Judges Association, the Federal Magistrate Judges Association, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, the Federal Bar Association, the National Association of Attorneys Generals, and others—people from all backgrounds, people from both parties, Independents. We have a unanimous chorus of support of people who believe that this is justice and will help keep judges safe.

James C. Duff, the Administrative Director of the U.S. Courts, said in his statement of support of this bill: ''It is crucial in our system of justice that judges can decide cases without fear for their safety and that of their family.'' He is absolutely right.

I echo Senator MENENDEZ's request to pass the Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 4711 and the Senate

proceed to its immediate consideration; further that the Menendez substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I agree that members of the judicial branch need better protection. In fact, I have been active in this issue for the last couple of years, and each time this has come forward, at the end of the year, with very little time to do the normal process, I have advocated that an amendment be added that would include protection of Members of Congress. I really think that it is important that we protect addresses for our judges, but it is also important that we do this for our elected officials.

In recent years, what has happened has taught us that the legislative branch needs better protection as well. That was clear in 2011, when Congresswoman Gabby Giffords was tragically shot while doing the most important part of the job—meeting with constituents.

Words cannot express how happy and inspiring it was to see Congresswoman Giffords here in the Chamber as her husband, Senator KELLY, was recently sworn in as a Member of the body. But words also cannot express the pain felt by the family of the people who were killed and wounded that day. That should have been a wakeup call to better protect Members of Congress and, in doing so, better protect the people around them.

But just a few years later, a shooter nearly killed Congressman STEVE SCALISE during baseball practice for the annual charity baseball game. I was there, and I said at the time that our lives were saved by the Capitol Hill police. Had they not been there, things might have gone much worse.

But the Capitol Hill police are not stationed at our homes where our families live while we serve in Washington. Extending the provision of this bill to the Members of Congress would better protect all of us—our families, our neighbors, and our constituents.

It is a very minor request that I am asking. It is an amendment that would not change anything or lessen anything about the bill. It is a very reasonable request, and I don't understand exactly why we can't make this bill better by applying it to both judges and Members of Congress.

My substitute amendment, which I will offer for unanimous consent, will make simple changes to the legislation. It would extend the same protections it would offer to the judicial branch to the legislative branch.

Second, the laudable goal of this legislation is to protect personally identifiable information from being sold and posted online by data brokers. Allowing at-risk individuals to file private action against data brokers for declaratory and injunctive relief, plus reasonable attorney's fees, will achieve that goal.

I ask the Senator to modify his request to, instead, include my substitute amendment at the desk, and that my substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object to the modification, I appreciate the Senator's concern to expand the universe of people covered by this bill, including Members of Congress. While that is a laudable goal, I personally think it would be more appropriate to legislate that in another bill.

This bill is for the Federal judiciary because of the special threats they face and the importance of ensuring their independence in terms of being able to make judgments based on the law and the facts, not upon some fear that lurks outside of their home or outside of their chambers.

I also understand that the amendment would strip out—and if I am wrong, I would be happy to be corrected—would strip out the ability to seek redressing the court as it relates to the provision that we provide for judges. Without a threat of some damages, there is little incentive for a data broker to remove the personal identifiable information of a judge and his or her family. This is not about frivolous suits. This is about protecting the Federal judiciary.

In addition to that, we had made several good-faith efforts before we got to this point to address the concerns of my colleagues across the aisle. We actually had the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts engage in conversations directly with our colleagues.

My colleagues had concerns about a new grant program to States. Well, we changed that language to a report. Senator LEE was part of those concerns. To better understand the proper Federal role, we changed it to a report.

They don't want to deal with some of the questions that we had for the U.S. marshals. Again, this is about protecting the Federal judiciary. Guess what branch protects the Federal judiciary. The U.S. marshals. We changed that.

It never seems to be enough. It never seems to be enough. It is unfortunate that the Federal judiciary will pay the price of this recalcitrance, but I cannot, at this time, agree to the modification. Therefore, I object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, I would like to offer across the aisle that we are willing to compromise with the Senator from New Jersey. We are willing to work with him on getting the bill passed. The only thing that we would like to do is to have it include Congress, as well.

The other points you had mentioned that you object to, as far as changing, I would be willing to discuss. I think there would be a middle ground.

I think this could be passed. When we pass something unanimously, there has to be a little give and take. No one gets their way. I am not saying that you can't have it. I am for your bill in general.

I think it ought to be expanded to Congress. We had at least two people shot. Gabby Giffords was shot. We had STEVE SCALISE shot. We had other threats. Congress is threatened and families are frightened.

I don't know about you, but, routinely, the sheriff and police have to come to our house for threats to my house. I am not alone. This happens to other people. There is no reason why we should do this only for one branch of government. They put the satellite picture of my House on the nightly news, basically pointing out where every crazy person in the world can go to find my house.

We do need to do something. This isn't a new request. I requested this a year ago when a very similar bill came up a year ago for special protections for the judiciary. I said, once again: Good idea, we should apply it to Congress.

We go forward a whole year, and now we are doing the same thing again, and nobody seems to be listening.

I will tell you that I am willing to compromise on this and willing to work with you to pass it, but I think we should extend it. It is not that hard. If we extend it to Congress and flip it back, then, I think it would pass unanimously in the House, as well. But I object to this version.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I just say to my colleague that I certainly am concerned about his safety and security and, for that fact, the safety and security of all of our colleagues. I appreciate his concern and understand it and look forward to working with him on that.

I will say that the other elements that Senator LEE had incorporated into his amendment just renders the security—whether for a Member of Congress or for the judiciary—useless, in which case, I don't want to give false security to anybody that they are being protected if, in fact, they don't have the wherewithal to do so.

I look forward to that opportunity.

I promised Judge Salas that her son's death will not be in vain. We may not have achieved this tonight with Senator BOOKER, but we are going to make this happen, hopefully, sooner rather than later. But we will make this happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, last week, I came to this floor on two separate occasions with Senator SANDERS to talk about the need for direct assistance to working families in my State—in the State of Missouri—and all across this country. I said that I was willing to use every tool at my disposal to make sure that this body acted to give direct assistance to working people in need as part of COVID relief. I said then, and I say it again today, that working people should be first in line for COVID relief, not last. They should be the first consideration, not some afterthought.

I am pleased to report that we were told today, as negotiations are ongoing about a COVID relief bill, that direct assistance to working people and working families is in the bill, that working people will be getting assistance.

I want to say once again here on this floor, as that package continues to take shape, how important it is that working families be able to count on some relief and how important it is for this body to prioritize working people over government, over big businesses, over government programs, and to give assistance directly to the people themselves.

Look, people know how to spend their money and what is best for their own families. The quickest way to help people in need is to give them direct assistance and let them make the choices for their own families, for their own kids, not to have to wait in line for some program, not to have to talk to some bureaucrat but to be able to make their own choices direct, with assistance that comes direct to them. That is going to be in this bill, I understand.

I am sure as heck going to continue to fight to see that it is in the bill and that any relief that is passed by the Senate prioritizes working people with direct relief.

Some have questioned whether this is really necessary. Some have said: Well, it is not an emergency, and this bill is only for emergencies, and direct assistance isn't an emergency.

To that I say: Is it not an emergency that working people are having to line up for food—literally, line up for food—in this country, in this day and age, because they don't have enough money to go purchase nutrition for their own children?

Just think about what is happening in my own State.

Let me tell you about Monark Baptist Church in Neosho, MO, down in Southwest Missouri. They had a food distribution program. They have done this for years, by the way, but as COVID intensified this past year, they stood up their efforts. Neighbors came together and donated. They got all the food that they could. They went out there in Neosho, MO—not a huge town. Monark Baptist Church went out and started distributing food.

Do you know they distributed food to hundreds of families for hours. When they had run out of the food, there were over 50 cars—not individuals, cars. Fifty cars were still in line, as far as the eye could see, having driven miles and miles around from neighboring counties to come for the help.

These are working people. These are not folks who want some handout. These are working people. These are proud people. These are people who don't want government to do stuff for them. They want to be able to get back up on their own feet and provide for themselves.

Government shut down their businesses and took away their jobs this past year and put them in this position of, in some cases, outright desperation.

Let me tell you about a gal from Kansas City, 22 years old. Her first name is Mars. I won't share her last name just for her own privacy. You know, she has talked to me and told me about her plight. She moved to Kansas City earlier this year, right around the time the pandemic started. She got an apartment. She was getting set up and getting going. Then, the pandemic hit. Then, the shutdown hit. Then, she lost her job. Then, she lost her plumbing. The water wouldn't work. She complained to the landlord. They wouldn't do anything. The ceiling collapsed. The landlord wouldn't do anything. Then she didn't have enough money to make rent, and, the other day, she woke up with a 10-day eviction notice out on her front door.

These are people who need help, not because they don't know how to work but because they do know how to work and the government has put them in the position that they are facing today. This pandemic has put them in the position they are facing today. What they want is the ability to get back up on their own two feet and to provide for themselves by the work of their own hands. That is what direct assistance to working families will do.

So to those who say it is not an emergency, I urge you to open your eyes and to look around at the people who are hurting, who are struggling, who are desperate for help.

I have heard that it is said: Well, it is not stimulative. What a word—direct assistance isn't stimulative, as if the American people are knobs and dials to be twisted and turned around to get a desired outcome, as if the economy is something to be micromanaged in Washington, DC.

I am not interested in stimulus. I am interested in helping working people survive. I am not interested in micromanaging this economy. I am interested in getting working people back up on their feet so they can manage their own lives. That is what this is about. That is why the need is so great. That is what we are trying to accomplish.

We have a chance to do this, to get this done, to get accomplished here something that we can be proud of before Christmas, to send a message to the American people that they matter, to send a message to working people in my State and in every State in this Country that they matter and that we are here fighting for them; that we look forward to the day when they are back at work, ready to work, able to support themselves and their families, and that we are on the path to getting there.

That is the message that we can send. That is the message that we must send. I will not leave this body until it is accomplished.

I promise you this. If I have anything to say about it, we will not be leaving here before Christmas until direct assistance is on the way to the working people of this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

TRIBUTE TO TOM UDALL

Mr. REED. Madam President, I want to take some time to thank and commend my colleagues who are departing the Senate. All of these Members have devoted themselves to serving the Nation and serving their States. We are all better off for their service.

Let me begin with my friend and colleague TOM UDALL. TOM inherited a family tradition of fighting for the American West and its citizens. His time in the Senate only added to the Udall legacy.

TOM has been one of our Chamber's leaders on conservation and the environment. He championed the creation of monuments and worked to block the Trump administration's harmful environmental policies. And, this year, he helped secure permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was pioneered by TOM's father, Stewart Udall.

TOM's commitment to the health of our Nation's environment has always been evident, and I was proud to hand off my role as the Democratic leader of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee to TOM in 2015. During his tenure, funding for the Interior appropriations bill grew by 25 percent, and more than 100 anti-environmental riders were blocked. These victories would have been impossible without TOM's ability to connect with his fellow Members and get things done. They are also a testament to TOM's deep knowledge of America's lands and resources.

Of course, TOM's successes go beyond his environmental work. TOM has worked tirelessly to ensure our Nation's Native Americans receive the respect and support they are entitled to. He salvaged and ultimately passed bipartisan legislation updating the Toxic Substances Control Act for the first time since 1976, which was a big victory for public health. I was also pleased to work with TOM to pass legislation in 2016 to help reduce and prevent suicide among adolescents and young adults.

Finally, I am especially grateful for TOM's efforts to increase resources for