United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2021 *No. 16*

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 28, 2021, at 9 a.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2021

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, our Father, thank You for the gift of this day. Lord, we are grateful for the blessing of Your unfailing love, for Your mercies endure forever.

Keep our lawmakers on the proper path. Lead them to strive for righteousness and humility. As You show them the path to choose, give them the wisdom to live for Your honor. Remind them that You are a friend to those who possess referential awe. Rescue them from the traps of their enemies.

Lord, You are our hope for the years to come.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it has been 3 weeks since a mob of domestic terrorists stormed the U.S. Capitol in an effort to thwart our democratic system of government. In the weeks since, the underlying threat of violence to our government remains of great concern.

One of the most important responsibilities of the new administration—of any administration—is to protect our country and its citizens. The Senate must continue the process of confirming President Biden's Cabinet by installing Alejandro Mayorkas to serve as Secretary of Homeland Security. In truth, we should have been able to confirm Mr. Mayorkas days ago. He is supremely well qualified for the job. He is the son of immigrants whose family escaped from the Holocaust, a prosecutor, a veteran of 7 years who led the Agency's response on Ebola, cyber security, border security, counterterrorism, and domestic terrorism.

Just 4 years ago, President Trump had his Secretary of Homeland Security installed on Inauguration Day. As four previous Secretaries of Homeland Security under Presidents of both parties wrote recently: After the attacks on the Capitol on January 6, it is more urgent than ever to have in place an experienced, capable, and Senate-confirmed leader. That person is Mayorkas.

That was four previous Homeland Secretaries from both parties.

Unfortunately, because of the objections of one Member, the Senate has not been allowed to vote on this nomination yet. It is the Senate's responsibility to make sure national security officials are on the job and keeping our country safe.

My friends on the other side don't have to agree with Mr. Mayorkas on the finer points of every policy, but surely we can all agree that he knows the Department, he understands the threats to our Nation's security, and he has what it takes to lead DHS. The Senate must confirm his nomination in very short order, and we will make sure that happens.

We must continue on to the rest of the President's Cabinet as well. The President's nominee for Secretary of Transportation was voted out of committee this morning on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, 21 to 3. With cooperation, the Senate can and should confirm Mr. Buttigieg soon, as well.

CLIMATE

Mr. SCHUMER. On climate, today President Biden is set to announce a slew of Executive actions on climate, including critical measures to increase the conservation of Federal lands, reduce oil and gas development, and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

place environmental justice, green jobs, and, yes, science at the heart of our Nation's climate policy.

I think Americans are saying: Welcome back, science. We are glad you are playing a role in the decisions we make and not being ignored and trampled on like the previous administration did. Understanding that the United States cannot defeat a global threat on its own, the Biden administration has already wisely joined the Paris accords and will also propose convening an international climate summit this year, on Earth Day.

These Executive actions are a very strong opening push by the Biden administration to refocus our Nation's energy toward the threat of climate change. President Biden's commitment to deal with climate change is unquestioned. He is off to a fast start, and it couldn't come soon enough.

The Federal Government has a great deal of power to set the direction for our Nation's energy and environmental policy, but climate change represents an existential threat to our country and our planet. Every tool in the toolbox should be brought to bear. In my view, President Biden should consider the declaration of a national emergency on climate change.

Former President Trump, of course, issued an emergency declaration to divert funds toward an expensive and ineffective border wall when there was no emergency at all. Declaring one for climate change—an actual emergency—would be a giant step in the right direction, and it would allow President Biden to tap additional resources and pursue additional policies in the fight against climate change, even if Republicans in Congress remain intransigent and unable to recognize the severity of this crisis.

Japan, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and scores of regional and local governments have declared states of emergency on climate change. The United States would send a powerful signal to the world about our commitment to defeating climate change if we did so as well.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on COVID, as I mentioned yesterday, the Senate will soon begin the process of considering legislation to help the country defeat COVID–19 and provide relief to those Americans who are still suffering great economic hardship.

There has been a lot of action in Washington recently. We inaugurated a new President, a new administration is getting off the ground, and an impeachment trial of the former President will commence in a few weeks. But COVID–19 hasn't gone anywhere, unfortunately. Americans are still losing their jobs. American businesses are still closing. Americans are still getting sick. Americans are still dying.

The needs in our country are still great, and the Congress must pursue a bold and robust course of action to defeat the disease and get our country back to normal. We must not—we must not—repeat the mistakes of 2008 and 2009, when Congress was too timid and constrained in its response to the global financial crisis.

The Congressional Budget Office has told us last fall that COVID–19, the pandemic, has taken more than $17 trillion out of our economy—$17 trillion out of the economy. The danger of undershooting our response to COVID–19 is far greater than overshooting it. So Congress must pursue a bold response to the prevailing crisis of our time.

Here in the Senate, we want that work to be bipartisan. Let me say that again. We want the next legislative response to COVID–19 to be bipartisan. We want to work with our Republican colleagues, if we can, to include their ideas and input if they will offer them. That is our preference. But if our Republican colleagues decide to oppose the necessary, robust COVID relief that is needed, we will have to move forward without them. It is not our preference, but dealing with this crisis in a bold and sufficient way is a necessity. The Senate is going to respond to the country's needs and deliver help to the American people fast.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on impeachment, finally, I want to address the vote the Senate took yesterday on the point of order raised by the junior Senator from Kentucky. I regret to say, for 45 Republican Senators to vote for a spurious constitutional objection to the coming impeachment trial was deeply, deeply irresponsible.

The trial is still 2 weeks away. The constitutional objection has been completely debunked by more than 150 constitutional scholars representing the entire breadth of the political spectrum, including very prominent conservatives. But only five Republican Senators were willing to take a principled stand against this reckless and ill-advised effort by Members of this body who are eager to excuse President Trump's campaign to overturn the election and, apparently, to excuse his incitement of the mob that every one of us experienced in this Capitol.

I would simply say to all of my colleagues: Make no mistake. There will be a trial, and the evidence against the former President will be presented in living color for the Nation and every one of us to see once again. No one will be able to avert their gaze from what Mr. Trump said and did and the consequences of his actions. We will all watch what happened. We will listen to what happened, and then we will vote. We will pass judgment, as our solemn duty under the Constitution demands, and, in turn, we will all be judged on how we respond.

I am glad to see my colleague from Vermont here, as well as my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, we confirmed Antony Blinken, our new Secretary of State. Like the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury, it was another big, bipartisan vote here in the Senate.

Four years ago, Senate Democrats subjected mainstream nominees to lead State and Treasury to a full gauntlet of partisan delay tactics. They forced cloture votes. Those were nearly party-line. So were the final votes. Neither got on the job until February. But this President's mainstream nominees to key posts are receiving fair consideration and a timely process.

Republicans have no shortage of substantive policy differences with the new administration. We will be discussing them with Secretaries Austin, Yellen, and Blinken in the course of normal committee oversight.

But unlike what took place 4 years ago, Republicans are not gratuitously delaying people who are mainstream and qualified whom the new President has asked to serve in key posts. If we find somebody unfit, unqualified, or outside the mainstream, you bet we will oppose them.

But I have just spent 4 years arguing that Presidents deserve some latitude to assemble their team. I meant it, and I mean it now.

With my vote to confirm Mr. Blinken, I wanted to reinforce the need for a true bipartisan consensus on the core objectives of our foreign policy.

Yesterday, while discussing the legislative filibuster, I talked about the chaos that would ensue if every domestic policy swung wildly back and forth with every election. The same goes for our foreign affairs. American statesmen should make commitments and issue threats that can endure beyond their terms in office.

To be clear, Presidents bear the primary responsibility for foreign policy, and I am not suggesting different leaders should not have different ideas. But they will be more successful and their legacies more enduring if they make the effort to build bipartisan support among Congress and the American people.

Neither America nor our allies will like the world that results if the world's leading Nation starts over like an Etch A Sketch every 4 years.

For starters, in several important areas, the new administration should build on bipartisan consensus that actually already exists.

Let's start with China. The Trump administration helped build a long

overdue awakening to the reality that we are in strategic competition with the PRC, that Beijing will not magically conform itself to the so-called international community, and that these challenges demand fast and serious action from the United States and from our friends. President Biden and his new Cabinet must keep working with Congress to continue building a whole-of-government, whole-of-economy approach to checking China.

We need Secretary Austin to keep focus on modernizing our forces, deterring Chinese threats from the Indo-Pacific to space and cyber space, sustaining robust defense spending, and investing in defense partnerships across the world.

We need Secretary Yellen to keep focused on the coercive manipulation the PRC uses to ensnare the developing world in its orbit.

We need Secretary Blinken to keep clarifying the China threat to our allies and European partners, to focus on contesting their growing influence in Africa and the Middle East, and to hold Beijing accountable for its unacceptable repression in places like Tibet and Hong Kong and its hostility toward Taiwan.

Now, we know China is not the only great power with whom we need to hang tough. In concrete policy terms, the United States just spent 4 years developing a more clear-eyed approach to Russia. Rather than chasing naive ''resets'' with the Kremlin or worshipping arms control like a religion, we leaned into military assistance to Ukraine, serious sanctions, cyber countermeasures against meddling, and other strong steps.

The Biden administration will find willing partners on Capitol Hill if it builds on this process, keeps imposing real costs on Moscow, pushes back on expansionism in the eastern Mediterranean, and, importantly, encourages our allies to join in this effort.

Great power competition is key, but, of course, it does not exhaust the threats that we face. In the Middle East, I know President Biden will face political pressure from the left to rejoin Obama's Iran deal, just as President Trump faced pressure from the right to abandon it.

Had President Obama not tried to circumvent Congress and pursue a partisan policy, this critical national security challenge might not have become so polarizing, but that is where we are.

There is no question that Iran is the biggest threat the United States and our partners face in the region. It poses threats beyond just its pursuit of nuclear weapons: sponsoring terrorism, its sectarian agenda, its work to undermine its neighbors' sovereignty, its development of ballistic missiles and lethal drones, and its appalling—appalling—record on human rights.

Confronting this multifaceted challenge will take bipartisanship at home and solidarity with Israel and our Arab partners abroad. Those things need to exist before making major changes or racing to rejoin a deal.

And our new President must be ready to respond to violence with force, as the Trump administration did when they removed Soleimani from the battlefield.

Speaking of the Middle East, I have consistently and vocally stood up during administrations of both parties against withdrawing our limited forces in Afghanistan, Iraq, or Syria too rapidly or without a smart plan. A supermajority of the Senate joined me last Congress in warning against abruptly abandoning battlefields recklessly on bad terms.

Finally, all of this important work will require that we keep our friends close. The United States needs to be a partner that neither strains alliances unnecessarily nor hands out free passes. President Biden should continue prodding our partners to honor their promises, pay their share, and put real capabilities on the table—and reemphasize that we have their backs.

One early test for the new administration and congressional Democrats will be the defense budget. If President Biden and his team are serious about contesting China, Russia, and these other threats, they will need to show it. Without continued, robust investment in a modern global force presence, American leadership would be little more than hollow rhetoric.

I voted to get President Biden's top foreign policy advisers on the job swiftly. I hope and expect that our shared work will lead to frequent, close, and bipartisan work with the Senate.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The majority whip.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, January 27, marks an anniversary, in a way, of an event that occurred in this Chamber 3 weeks ago, an event on January 6, which some of us will never forget.

We are in the midst of preparing for an impeachment trial of President Donald Trump for any responsibility that he bears for that day's events. Some have said we shouldn't do that, that we shouldn't have an impeachment trial.

The former U.N. Ambassador and Governor of South Carolina, Nikki Haley, said in an interview on FOX television it is time for America to get over it—get over it. She is not the only one who has expressed that point of view.

I was in the airport in Chicago last week in a waiting area to get on a plane when someone seated nearby said: Hey, Senator, get over it. Let this President ride off into the sunset. Those were his words: Get over it.

It is hard to get over it if you lived it, and many of us in this Chamber did.

Last night, there was a vote as to whether we should go forward with the impeachment. All of the Democrats, 50, voted in favor of having the trial, since we received that Article from the House. Five—five—Republicans joined us. Forty-five Republicans voted to end the impeachment proceeding, voting in favor of the point of order that was raised by the junior Senator from Kentucky.

I don't know what was going through their minds when they joined that point of order from the Senator from Kentucky. I don't know if it truly was a constitutional issue they were thinking about, whether it was loyalty to Donald Trump, or whether it was fear of Trump's followers in their home States that led them to vote to end the impeachment inquiry.

But we should move forward. We should go forward, as Lincoln reminded us, because we cannot escape history, and we certainly shouldn't be party to rewriting history.

When almost 50 percent of Trump loyalists refuse to believe that the events 3 weeks ago in this Capitol occurred or, if they occurred, that they had anything to do with President Trump, we need to make a record, a record of fact, not just for our current deliberations but for history.

How can anyone who was in this Chamber on January 6 really argue that nothing critical and important and horrific occurred?

Do you remember at 2:15, when the Secret Service went up and grabbed the Vice President by his arms and pulled him down, out that door, so they could take him to a secure place? We were stunned by that. I was.

They told us to sit here. And do you know what I saw next? Two men, plainclothes security people—I don't know what Agency they were working for—came right down here, right down in the middle of this well. Why do I remember that they were there? Because one of them had an automatic weapon around his neck, in the Senate Chamber.

Then we were told by a Capitol policeman who stood in front of us: Sit down. Stay in your seats. We are bringing in your staff and locking the doors. This will be a secure room. Then they closed the doors off to the public, and we sat here for a few minutes.

And then the same policeman said: Leave. Evacuate quickly, out the doors. The crowd, the mob, was advancing and getting closer to the Senate Chamber.

We went out the back corridor and down the steps. As you go down the steps, there is a window that looks out on the sidewalk near the Capitol Building, and I saw this mob coming at us with Trump flags and American flags and signs—coming right at us. We hurried down those steps and through the long tunnel to, we hoped, a safe location in one of the office buildings nearby.

I will never forget it. Do the 45 Senators who voted against the impeachment trial last night still remember it? I certainly hope they do, and I certainly hope they can recall it as they watch the videotapes, the mountain of videotapes of what happened that day.

And, of course, I hope we all remember what the Capitol Police went through. For those who say they love law and order, take a look at what they went through when this mob came after them. They were beaten. One gave his life. And we can never forget.

So how did this come about? Was this just a spontaneous gathering of people who decided to come to Capitol Hill? Far from it. The President of the United States, Donald Trump, requested his followers to come to Washington on January 6. Why did he pick January 6? Because the Constitution says that is the day when Congress will count the electoral votes and determine who will be the next President.

And because President Trump refused to accept the reality of his loss on November 3 and continued in every imaginable way to try to change the numbers coming out of States like Georgia, he called his followers to Washington on that day and held a rally on the Ellipse.

We have a tape of that rally, and it should be part of the record as to what this President said to his followers who had gathered on that day, how his rhetoric inflamed them. We can see it. It is a matter of record.

Then he pointed to the Capitol Building, this building, and told them to come up here. Why? Because we were in the process of counting the electoral votes, which would finally and constitutionally announce that he had lost the election. It was his last desperate gasp to keep the White House, even at the expense of the Constitution and reality.

Then the crowd turned and advanced on the Capitol. We have seen those videotapes as well, as they overran the flimsy barricades that were set up in the hopes that they would discourage and stop them. And they broke through windows and doors, came into this building, invading it for the first time since 1814.

It was 1814 when the British forces came into this building, burned it, as an invasion. Well, this was a new invasion, an invasion by those who were either inspired by this President or, for whatever political reasons, decided to try to stop this government.

It is the first time that has ever happened since 1814. I will never forget it. I am sorry to say that the 45 Senators who said stop the investigation, stop the impeachment, may not have as clear a memory as I do.

Each year, we have a commemoration of George Washington's Farewell Address, and a different Member of the Senate is asked to read it on the floor of the Senate. I have to tell you that, honestly, I don't come to the floor and listen carefully. It doesn't have the impact it once had. It is a commemoration which is honorific but doesn't have the real power to create a memory.

Doug Jones is a former Senator from Alabama, and he said on Martin Luther King's birthday, or nearby, we should all come to the floor and hear a reading of King's letter from the Birmingham jail, and I think that is appropriate and it is good.

How will we remember and commemorate January 6? Maybe it is too soon to think about that, but how can we forget what happened that day? How can we possibly get over it?

I don't want to get over it. I want to face it squarely and honestly with the facts. History demands it of us. Those of us who are honored to serve in this Chamber bear a responsibility to keep the facts alive, not let those who wish to ignore them or rewrite history have the last word.

We now have a responsibility to go forward with this impeachment trial, to make a record and decide as a U.S. Senate. We owe it to the people we represent. That is for sure. But, more importantly, we owe it to future generations to show them just how fragile a democracy can be when a mob turns on the U.S. Capitol and tries to stop the business of this government.

The good news is this. If there is any source of elation, it is this: We returned to the Capitol that same day, January 6, and finished our business of counting the electoral vote. In the early hours of the morning of January 7, Joseph Biden was announced the winner of the Presidency, and just 2 weeks later—2 weeks later to the day—he was sworn in as President of the United States.

Our democracy survived this mob that came forward in insurrection against our government, and we are now in the beginning of the second week of the Biden Presidency. He has spoken to the American people and told them we are going to come together; we are going to unify. Bless him for doing that.

We owe him this opportunity. We owe it to our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ROE V. WADE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last Friday, we observed the 48th anniversary of Roe v. Wade—the Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion through all 9 months of pregnancy. It is a somber day every year, as we contemplate the millions of lives lost to abortion since the Roe v. Wade decision.

Gallup has been polling on abortion for decades, and if you look at the polling on the issue, one thing becomes clear: The majority of Americans do not believe in unrestricted abortion. Some believe that abortion should be completely illegal. Some believe abortion should be legal under certain circumstances. But the majority of Americans do not believe in unrestricted abortion.

Why is that? Why, despite the best efforts of the far left, do the majority of Americans think there should be at least some restrictions on abortion? I suspect the answer is that every person knows on some level that when we are talking about abortion, we are talking about a baby, a human being. It is not rocket science; it is biology 101. Human moms and dads have human babies. Take one look at an ultrasound, at a baby girl sucking her thumb or a baby boy kicking his feet, and it is pretty hard to argue that is just a clump of cells.

I believe that is why, despite years of fierce abortion advocacy from the far left, the majority of Americans do not believe in unrestricted abortion, because they know—they know—the unborn child is a human being, and they know a human being deserves to be protected even when they are small and weak and vulnerable—especially when they are small and weak and vulnerable.

The truth is, advocates of abortion are fighting an uphill battle. It doesn't always feel like that. After all, they have a lot of support from the entertainment industry and magazines and media outlets and Democratic politicians. The pro-abortion left has a lot of money. They have won too many victories, and too many babies have been killed. But despite their money and platform and advantage, in 48 years, advocates for abortion have not won their fight. They have not managed to convince anywhere close to a majority of Americans that abortion is an unqualified good and should be available unrestricted and on demand, and that is because, for all their advantages, they are fighting an unwinnable battle because they are fighting against reality, they are fighting against truth, they are fighting against science, and they are fighting against the knowledge that is written on every human heart, a truth that gets obscured but is hard to completely erase, and that is, every human being has value and deserves to be protected.

Last week, I came down to the floor to praise President Biden's call for unity, and I suggested that one way he could show that commitment was by

nominating individuals for key posts who represent a majority of Americans instead of the far-left wing of his party. I think several of the President's nominations have demonstrated his commitment to unity. While perhaps not the people I would have chosen, I believe that a number of his nominees will serve Americans well, and I have voted accordingly, casting votes in favor of President Biden's choice for Director of National Intelligence and Secretary of Defense, among others.

But unfortunately President Biden has also nominated some individuals who represent the extreme left of the Democratic Party rather than mainstream Americans, and nowhere is that more true than with his radically pro-abortion nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, Javier Becerra accumulated an overwhelmingly pro-abortion voting record, even opposing a ban on partial-birth abortion—a procedure so heinous and repulsive, it is difficult even to describe. As attorney general of California, he used his position to advance the pro-abortion cause.

On top of that, he has shown a disturbing tendency to use his position to attack freedom of religion and freedom of conscience. As California attorney general, he sued an order of nuns who care for the elderly poor to try to force them to offer health insurance benefits that violate their faith. That is right—he thought it a good use of his time as attorney general to sue an order of nuns who care for the elderly poor. He also enthusiastically sought to enforce a California law that forced crisis pregnancy centers to advertise abortion services. The case went all the way to the Supreme Court, which overturned the California law because it violated the free speech protection of the First Amendment.

It is bad to support evils like abortion. It is worse to not only support an evil but to attempt to force others to participate in it in violation of their consciences.

I know the President is a man of faith, which makes it particularly perplexing why he would choose to nominate an individual who has used his position to attack freedom of religion and freedom of conscience. As head of the Department of Health and Human Services, Mr. Becerra would have the ability to not only push an extremist abortion agenda but to roll back important progress made to protect individuals' conscience rights. I am disappointed by the President's choice. Javier Becerra's pro-abortion views do not represent the views of the majority of Americans.

I am also very disappointed by the announcement that President Biden will overturn the Mexico City policy, which protects taxpayer dollars from being used to finance abortion in other countries. This is not a unifying action. Americans were not clamoring to have their tax dollars start supporting abortions abroad. This is only a priority for the pro-abortion lobby.

As I said, I am disappointed in the President's actions, and going forward, I hope he will not let his Presidency be hijacked by abortion extremists. But whatever policies this administration pursues, I and many of my colleagues will continue to work to promote a culture of life in this country. The arc—the arc—of the moral universe is long, but I believe it does bend towards justice. I look forward to the day that we will secure justice for unborn human beings by ensuring that they are protected.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, as we move through what is appearing to be a choppy start to the 117th Congress, I think it is worth reminding ourselves of the standards that guide our work here. The mandate that we have does not come from the 24-hour news cycle or from lobbyists or advocacy groups, but it comes, very simply, from the Constitution. It is the foundation of the rule of law, our Nation's Constitution, and it really serves as a pretty good policymaking guideline.

The American people are looking at what is going on here, and they see the cracks that Washington has made in the foundation of this Constitution. These realizations have eroded their confidence in our ability as a body to perform the basic functions of government without devolving into partisan chaos when faced with disagreements.

Many times I will hear Tennesseans say: What happened to robust political debate? What happened to being able to agreeably disagree and have a discussion? Are those days totally lost, or can we return to them? They are asking themselves how many shortcuts—like Executive orders—Washington is going to take before the shortcut becomes the rule or the norm and how many times can Washington chip away at the standards that govern our country before those standards start to crumble or are not relevant.

Restoring the trust of the American people will not be easy because this fundamental lack of faith in our institutions has caused Americans to question their very safety and security in the physical space and also in the virtual world that they have been forced into by the COVID–19 pandemic.

I like to say we have a lot of security moms who are out there—moms and grandmoms like me—and, quite frankly, they are out in full force, alongside millions of other Americans who now have cause to wonder if their own government will bother making their security a priority. What about their communities? What about their neighborhoods? What about the universities where their children go to school? What is going to be done about riots? What about the virtual space? As they have seen their children move to online school, more of their daily functional life and their transactional life has moved online. How do they keep their families safe? How do they protect their rights to privacy?

In the physical space, yesterday we got the good news that a Federal judge has granted a temporary restraining order barring the Department of Homeland Security from implementing a nationwide pause on most deportations. That pause was mandated by a DHS memo signed by the Acting Secretary on day one of the Biden administration—not such a great start for the administration's immigration policy team, but the American people will benefit from having the time that has come to them to ask questions about proposed shifts in existing policy. People want to be safe.

I would like to just stipulate for the record that immigration law is very complex. While most Americans aren't experts in the finer points of immigration law, they do have and most of us have a very common touchstone that we relate to; that is, having a secure border.

This should be a basic concept—let's secure the border; let's secure our country—but somehow we have managed to politicize that point that advocates at the highest levels of the Federal Government—for what? A weakened border. Just imagine that. You have individuals at the highest level of the Federal Government who are saying: Let's weaken our border. That is stunning, absolutely stunning to Tennesseans.

Why would you not protect your border? Why would you not want to know who is coming into your country? Why should I be forced to accept a lax border? Why should I be accepting of allowing drug cartels to run those drugs into the country? Why should I be told I should accept human trafficking; I should accept gangs; I should accept sex traffickers coming in across the border?

When we have a weak border, this is what you get. Every town—every town—becomes a border town. Every State becomes a border State because of the impacts—the negative impacts—of drug trafficking, sex trafficking, human trafficking, and the toll that that takes on our communities.

Last week, I introduced two key pieces of legislation that attack specific vulnerabilities in our body of immigration law that thousands of bad actors use to game the system every year.

The first is the Stop Greenlighting Driver Licenses for Illegal Immigrants

Act. It does exactly what it sounds like. It blocks certain Federal funds from reaching the coffers of sanctuary States. This includes States that defy Federal immigration law or that allow individuals to obtain a driver license without providing proof that they are here legally or without providing proof that they are who they claim to be. This is no small penalty, and here is why.

In 2020, our Nation had 15 States plus the District of Columbia that have decided to give illegal immigrants a valid State-issued ID, a driver license. These 15 States and DC got $53 million in JAG grants from the Department of Justice. These are funds—these are Justice Assistance Grants that are given to local law enforcement and criminal justice projects to do what? Enforce the law. So if you are not going to enforce the law, why should you get the money? Those funds should go to entities that have said: We will abide by the rule of law. That is where those funds should go.

Now, the second bill is the Ban Birth Tourism Act. This would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit pregnant foreigners from obtaining a temporary visitor visa they could use to enter the United States specifically for the purpose of giving birth here. Yes, you heard me right. There is a loophole in the law, in the Immigration and Nationality Act. Because of this, we have some pregnant foreigners, primarily from Russia and China, who circumvent the law, and they get a temporary visitor visa, and they come here working with some of this multimillion-dollar-a-year birth tourism industry. They get coached. They come here. They go to a facility. They give birth. The child becomes a citizen, and then they return. As I said, primarily these are wealthy Russians and wealthy Chinese.

Our citizenship is not for sale. No, indeed. It is hard-fought. It is hard-won. It is hard-kept. The American people are right to expect better than this. Tennesseans want to see something done about this. That is why I, once again, have filed this legislation.

The American people are not unreasonable. They do not lack compassion. They just don't understand why officials who are charged with upholding the law would act in their official capacity to undermine something as basic as border security, as basic as national security.

We have a lot of security moms out there who understand that it is no small task keeping things secure at home. All of these security moms out there know that there are plenty of threats online—threats that they cannot see, but they know that there are a lot of these threats that come into their homes and onto their computer screens and onto the devices of their children because of a lack of privacy online.

How we curate and protect our virtual use, as I call it, is critically important because it defines who we are to the people who we do not see in person. And as I mentioned earlier, more of our functional and transactional life is now online. So tomorrow, to mark National Data Privacy Day, I will once again reintroduce the BROWSER Act.

Mr. President, as you and I served in the House together, I know you remember how I would introduce this bill, the BROWSER Act, to secure online privacy for millions of Americans. Now, at its heart, this is an effort to inject awareness, transparency, and accountability into the relationship between technology platforms and their users.

This legislation sets up a very basic Federal compliance framework that tech companies can use as a guide to update their privacy policies online, make it something that is going to give you the ability to say: This is information that I want to share.

It would require companies to secure an opt-in from consumers before collecting their sensitive data. And for less sensitive information, you, the consumer, would have the ability to opt out and not share that browsing history with that company.

Companies would not be able to deny you service if you want to practice your right to privacy. That makes common sense. It happens in the physical space every single day, and it should also be a right reserved to the individual in the virtual space.

This also would put the Federal Trade Commission, our online privacy regulator, in charge of watching what is happening in the virtual space, applying these rules equally across the entire internet ecosystem. A right to privacy, being secure in our communities and our homes, is something that not only Tennesseans but millions of Americans are wanting to see.

TRIBUTE TO HEATH HUCKABAY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, this week Team Blackburn is saying goodbye to Heath Huckabay, who came to us last January as part of a fellowship program between my office and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is located in Oak Ridge, just outside of Knoxville, TN.

It has been an interesting year to say the least, but Heath has risen to the occasion and impressed each and every one of us with his breadth of knowledge and his ability to adapt to the hectic pace of life in the Senate. We did our best to persuade him to stay with us a little longer, but I am confident that his colleagues at Oak Ridge will be happy to see him return, as well as his wife Emily and little Elliot. They are looking forward to having him home.

It was an honor working with him this past year. We will miss him, and we wish him all the best as he heads back to Tennessee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADVICE AND CONSENT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, the Senate is focused on one of its constitutional roles right now, which is meeting with and discussing with the new Biden administration's Cabinet—our advice and consent role. The consent role, obviously, is confirmation votes here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, which we are doing a number of these on the floor and in committee. But there is also the advice role, given to us by the Founding Fathers. On the advice, we are providing whether we vote for some of these nominees or not to the Cabinet. It is a big part of the Senate's role. So I am going to take a minute to provide a little bit of advice to some of the new, incoming Biden team.

Now, look, we are seeing it particularly in the foreign policy realm. A lot of the Biden team has actually come from the Obama-Biden team—maybe too many. You worry about stale thinking, because when they were in power 4 years ago, or a little bit over 4 years ago, there are a lot of things that have changed in the world—particularly on foreign policy, a lot that has happened in the world. So you need fresh views, but we are where we are.

But an example of this kind of stale thinking that I was shocked to see recently at the White House is the use of the term ''strategic patience'' as a foreign policy concept. Now, this was the phrase the Obama administration used to describe its policy toward North Korea, and I think most people would recognize—Democrats and Republicans—that that was not a very successful policy, a pretty failed policy.

Now, granted, North Korea is difficult. There is no doubt. But the policy that was known as strategic patience was the policy that enabled the North Korea rogue regime to massively build up a nuclear arsenal. So kind of like leading from behind, the Obama administration's term ''strategic patience'' became synonymous with a passive and even weak foreign policy approach as it related to North Korea, certainly.

So I was very surprised yesterday to hear the White House Press Secretary trot out this term again, ''strategic patience,'' but this time when talking about the Biden administration's policy with regard to China.

Now, this is almost certainly music to China's ears—the leadership of China—because it is kind of a subtle green light to Xi Jinping and the other authoritarians in China of its failure to uphold promise after promise to the United States—something I refer to as

''promise fatigue'' that we have here—or continuing to call itself a developing country, when it is not, or continuing its attempts to dominate the South China Sea with the militarization of that important strategic sea lane, or continuation of intellectual property theft, or all the challenges that we have with China. The idea that we are going to have strategic patience, I think, sends a signal to the Chinese that we don't take these issues urgently, and that is the wrong message. These are urgent issues.

In my discussions during the confirmation process and in hearings with now-Secretary of Defense Austin and Secretary of State Blinken, I sensed they had a sense of urgency. As a matter of fact, they both acknowledged that the previous administration—the Trump administration's national security strategy, national defense strategy that says we need to turn to great power competition, with China as the pacing threat for the United States, they agreed with.

Even in General Austin's—now-Secretary Austin's—confirmation hearing, one of my colleagues, Senator BLACKBURN, actually said this term, ''strategic patience,'' doesn't seem to be the right term and pressed him on it.

So here is some continued advice. In the Senate's role, in terms of our constitutional role of advice and consent, words matter, especially from the White House podium. We need a strong, bipartisan, and lasting China policy from the United States of America. This is the biggest geostrategic issue we will be facing as a country for the next 50 to 100 years, but it is also a challenge that is here and now, a challenge that needs immediate action. So here is my advice: Ditch the ''strategic patience'' phrase.

The vast majority of the Senators in this body, Democrats and Republicans, want to know the Biden administration is focused on this challenge now. It is a serious challenge that China poses to the United States now, and ''strategic patience'' sends the wrong message to the Senate, to the American people, and to China's leadership. So they need to do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, let me express my gratitude to the Senator from Alaska for his words. I could not have said it better than he did, and I am grateful to him for coming and articulating that important message so clearly and emphatically.

Chris Wray, the FBI Director, is a pretty laid-back guy. As a matter of fact, I frequently tell people he reminds me of the typical G-man—you know, not a lot of emotion, not a lot of animation. But the FBI Director, who I think is doing an outstanding job and has been doing an outstanding job, gets positively animated when it comes to China and the threats presented there. Of course, the FBI is principally in charge of the counterintelligence mission against foreign countries like China that try to steal our intellectual property, spy on our country using a number unconventional means. I just want to say to our friend from Alaska: Thank you for making that point. It is really, really important.

NOMINATION OF ANTONY JOHN BLINKEN

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday afternoon we confirmed another one of President Biden's Cabinet nominees. Antony Blinken has led an impressive career in the public sector and is well versed in both the vast responsibilities of the State Department, as well as the diplomatic challenges we will face in the months and years ahead, the most important of which is China, but it is not China alone.

While Mr. Blinken and I have policy differences—some of them very serious—I have confidence in his ability to represent our Nation on the global stage. It is important for a new President, whether they be a Republican or a Democrat, to have qualified, Senate-confirmed officials in their Cabinet without delay.

Over the past week, we have worked to confirm nominees for some of the most critical Federal Departments and Agencies. The Secretaries of State, Defense, Treasury, as well as the Director of National Intelligence, have each been confirmed by the Senate with broad bipartisan support. And we will continue to process more of the President's nominees in the days ahead.

Four years ago, our Democratic colleagues approached President Trump's nominees with a grab bag of antics, including everything from intentional delays to brazen theatrics. In most cases, this behavior wasn't a reflection on the nominee or their qualifications, but of our colleagues' antipathy toward President Trump.

Clearly we are adopting a different approach, and I hope it is one that will deescalate these battles and one that will serve the national interest rather than harm it.

Throughout my time in the Senate, I have tried to evaluate nominees based on their qualifications, their integrity, and their ability to carry out the responsibilities for the job they have been nominated for, and I will continue to either support or oppose nominees based on those merits and those criteria, not based on the party of the President.

NEW START

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we know it has been the tradition of the Senate to prioritize nominees for national security positions, and there has never been a more critical time to ensure that President Biden is surrounded by an experienced and capable team. From the threats posed by an increasingly hostile Iran to those by an unpredictable North Korea, there are many, many challenges on the horizon.

One of the first the administration must confront is the expiration of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, also known as New START. This is the only remaining bilateral strategic arms agreement between the United States and Russia, which are the world's most powerful nuclear states, and it is set to expire in a matter of days.

Last fall, the Trump administration advocated for a 1-year extension of New START, with the condition that both countries would cap nuclear weapons—nuclear warheads during that period.

Unsurprisingly, Russia preferred a clean, 5-year extension with no warhead limitations. President Putin delayed the final stages of talks in the hopes that the potential Biden administration would strike a deal more favorable to Russia. And it appears now, at least as things stand today, that President Putin has hedged his bets correctly.

Following a call yesterday between President Biden and President Putin, the White House announced that the United States and Russia are set to extend New START for 5 years, with no conditions attached. This was President Biden's first major foreign policy test, and, unfortunately, he played right into Russia's hand.

For starters, it is no secret that New START was deeply flawed from the beginning. And it is no secret that Russia cheats, which is why verification is so essential.

The counting mechanisms in New START don't effectively keep our countries on a level playing field, which is the primary goal of any arms treaty because it promotes mutual deterrents. The treaty limits the number of bombers each nation could possess but places no limit on the number of warheads each bomber can support. Making matters worse, the limits only apply to strategic, not tactical, nuclear weapons. Russia has taken advantage of this loophole in New START, amassing some 2,000 tactical nuclear weapons compared to only 500 for the United States.

Russia's nuclear doctrine signals its increasing willingness to use those tactical nuclear weapons in a conflict, particularly in Europe, as it warily eyes NATO. Another 5 years under New START will allow Russia to continue growing its arsenal of tactical weapons and cement its advantage over the United States, perhaps permanently.

Once that happens, the likelihood of Russia deploying and ultimately using these weapons goes higher. These treaties ought to make the world safer, not a more dangerous place due to imbalances, the potential for mistakes, or miscalculation.

Beyond sheer numbers, there is also the question of trust or, I should say, of verification, because it is hardly controversial to say Russia isn't the most trustworthy partner. Last fall,

the Kremlin attempted to poison a Putin opponent using a nerve agent. Russia has launched massive cyber attacks against private companies and government agencies here in the United States, the latest being the SolarWinds hack. And last year, it attempted to steal coronavirus vaccine data from the United States and some of our closest allies.

In short, Russia does not play by the rules, and New START does little to prevent further cheating. By granting Putin's request for a clean 5-year extension of New START, the Biden administration will not only be rewarding Russia for its hostile actions against the United States and our allies but also enabling Russia and other nuclear states to continue growing their stockpiles while the United States plays by outdated rules: no cap on nuclear warheads, no enhanced verification measures—in short, no need for assurances for Russia to follow the rules laid out in New START.

The expected treaty extension by the Biden administration wouldn't address any of those blinking red lights. The biggest failure of a clean, 5-year extension, though, is relinquishing the leverage we currently have to take a more comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament.

As I said, the United States and Russia are the most powerful nuclear states in the world, but together we account for only two of the five nuclear armed states recognized by the nonproliferation treaty. Two of the other countries, the United Kingdom and France—both of whom provide regular information about the size and makeup of their nuclear arsenal—are not a problem.

The fifth and final power is China, one of the world's biggest secret keepers. It is a police state and opaque, as we learned once again when it came to the virus from Wuhan Province.

As if we needed a reminder of the critical information China withheld from the rest of the world, all we need to do is look at the COVID–19 pandemic. The first cases of COVID–19 appeared in China as early as November of 2019, and the Communist Party of China willfully withheld the information from the rest of the world, and it sought to downplay the potential impact of the virus. China repeatedly silenced the brave men and women of its own country who tried to sound the alarm, and, as a result, countries around the world were ill-prepared for these critical early stages of the fight against COVID–19. Now, more than 2.1 million people have died from this virus, including more than 420,000 Americans.

It is impossible to gauge how many of those lives could have been saved by earlier intervention, but this should serve as a cautionary tale when it comes to managing threats from China. We cannot allow China to continue sitting on the sidelines while the four other nuclear states play by the rules as we hope they will. The administration must push to get China to the negotiating table—at the negotiating table.

The thick cloak of secrecy surrounding the Chinese Communist Party has made it nearly impossible to verify information about the breadth and the depth of China's nuclear capabilities. What we do know is that China continues to pursue a nuclear triad, and experts estimate China to have about 300 nuclear weapons.

Assuming that figure is correct, it puts China slightly ahead of France and the United Kingdom in terms of raw numbers. That would make China the third most powerful nuclear state in the world, and we have every reason to believe that the size of its arsenal will continue to grow.

In May of 2019, then-Director for the Defense Intelligence Agency, GEN Robert Ashley, said China is likely to at least double the size of its nuclear stockpile over the next decade. He referred to this effort as ''the most rapid expansion and diversification of its nuclear arsenal in China's history.''

Despite this already large and constantly growing nuclear threat, there are virtually no measures in place to hold China accountable or to bring them to the table. A simple extension of the New START leaves in place a framework in which the Russians cheat, the Chinese are not at the table, and the United States is playing by the rules of a bygone era.

This must change. It must change. If you think about the fact that since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nuclear weapons have not been used on this planet, it is a result of tough negotiations and a system of mutual deterrence because we know, were nuclear weapons to be used, that it could result in the extermination of the planet.

So that is why deterrence is so important. That is why reciprocity and transparency are so important. The Cold War-era approach to nuclear disarmament does not make sense in the modern world. Rather than enter a 5-year extension of New START, the administration should use its leverage to convene multilateral talks. America should invite the other nuclear nonproliferation treaty states—Russia, China, France, and the UK—to the negotiating table and encourage multilateral talks aimed at limiting the growth of nuclear arsenals globally.

There is far too much at stake to merely cave in to the demands of President Putin in Moscow and cave in as well to the recalcitrance of Beijing to come to the table. The administration must pursue a multilateral, comprehensive approach. It is the only practical and workable solution to the vast nuclear threats posed by both China and Russia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

48TH ANNUAL MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this week is the 48th annual March for Life. It is an event when thousands of Americans come together to advocate for the value and protection of unborn human life.

They will be coming together this year differently than they have for almost 50 years, but for almost 50 years, millions of people have marched to Capitol Hill to try to build a culture wherein every human life is valued and every human life is protected. That includes tireless women and men and children from my home State of Missouri who come to Washington, both individually and along with the Missouri Life Caravan, every year. It will be the first year in a long time I haven't spoken to that group in person, but as they meet virtually, their cause is still as resonant as it is in person.

I know that Missourians will continue to advocate for life. They will continue to remember the unborn and those whom we have lost from abortion. This year's theme of the march is ''Together Strong: Life Unites!'' It is a pretty hard theme to argue with no matter how you feel about this particular topic. ''Unity'' doesn't mean believing the same thing about everything, but it does mean agreeing about one very important thing in terms of this event, and that important thing, of course, is the value and protection of life.

This belief in life cuts across religion. It cuts across party lines. It cuts across geographic boundaries. People and organizations from all religious backgrounds—and even those who have no religious affiliations—are part of the pro-life movement, and they oppose abortion in almost all cases. Polling shows that more than a third of Democrats in America support protections for life, and there are groups dedicated to showing that pro-life is not a partisan issue. Frankly, that is a move in the right direction to where you don't feel like you are included in one party or excluded from one party because of your view on this issue.

Last year's Geneva Consensus Declaration brought together more than 30 countries to promote women's health and strengthen the family, including the preservation of human life. We need to do everything we can to save the lives of babies and of mothers. Maternity mortality is a big problem in our country and around the world. It has become a focus of the Congress in recent years and needs to continue to be. Even though the issue of life so often is polarized in the U.S. Congress, I am still encouraged that we see a powerful commitment, over and over,

to protect the unborn and how that breaks through in other areas outside of the Congress. For the past 4 years, we have seen an unprecedented advance in the protections for the unborn in State legislatures.

In the next few years, we can expect to see efforts to try to move things in another direction, to weaken or remove life protections in, for instance, the title X family planning program or in our foreign aid programs. There is a well-funded effort to abandon even the longstanding Hyde amendment, which prevents taxpayer funding of abortion or abortion coverage in Federal healthcare programs.

As the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Committee, I oversaw the yearly renewal of the Hyde amendment, which has been included in that bill for the past 40 years. Now I won't be the chairman of that committee in this Congress, but I will still be fighting to see that we maintain this area where there has been great consensus that went beyond political parties.

I will continue to support and advocate for the Hyde amendment and for permanent Federal protections for the unborn through legislation like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, among other things.

Although the pro-life movement can expect challenges in this Congress, there are still many signs that one day we will succeed in creating a culture where every human life is valued and protected. For now, however, I want to thank the men, women, and children who dedicate their time and talents to making this happen, who today are marching virtually as they join together to talk about this important cause and remember the theme of this year, which is ''Together Strong: Life Unites!''

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, today the world comes together to remember the horrors of the Holocaust. We honor the 6 million Jews and 5 million others—Roma, Afro-Germans, gay men and women, people with disabilities and more—whom the Nazis brutally murdered. And we stand in awe and celebration of those brave souls who managed to survive.

It is difficult to comprehend the terror that took place in Europe between 1939 and 1945, but we carry on an obligation to those who perished and those who survived to prevent further genocide and mass atrocities. It is critical that we understand what happened to them so we can prevent it from ever happening again.

One of the most important things to understand about the Holocaust is that while a limited group of particularly evil monsters orchestrated it, they could not have succeeded without the active or tacit support of millions of average people. Men and women agreed to turn over their neighbors, patrol the ghettos, drive the cattle cars, guard the death camps, and line people up to shoot them down. Men and women decided to avert their gaze and do nothing to stop the atrocities.

I don't believe that all those people were born villains. I think they were taught by their communities to adopt a level of anti-Semitism and prejudice that likely would have been recognizable to many of us today and that the Nazi propaganda masters exploited those feelings. That terrifies me because it means that the Holocaust was not an anomaly. It means that under the right conditions, a similar atrocity could happen again.

The hatred that gave rise to the Holocaust is still very much alive. The Anti-Defamation League's 2014 Global Index of Anti-Semitism found that more than 1 billion people—nearly one in eight—around the world harbor anti-Semitic attitudes. Over 30 percent of those surveyed said that it was ''probably true'' that Jews had too much control over financial markets, that Jews think they are better than other people, that Jews are disloyal to their country, and that people hate Jews because of the way that Jews behave. Such sentiments often translate into violence, leading 40 percent of European Jews to report in 2018 that they lived in daily fear of being physically attacked.

Sadly, these trends bear out closer to home too. Jews make up fewer than 3 percent of the American population, but the majority of reported religion-based hate crimes targeted Jewish people or institutions. In 2019, the ADL reported that anti-Semitism in America had hit a four-decade high. According to the 2020 survey by the American Jewish Committee, more than one-third of American Jews say they have been verbally or physically assaulted during the past 5 years simply because they are Jewish.

I believe that the world looks to the United States for moral leadership. When we allow anti-Semitism or racism or other kinds of intolerance to flourish here, other countries take that as a license to do the same. Moreover, we need to recognize the nexus between and networking among those who traffic in hate and conspiracies in the United States and other like-minded individuals and groups around the globe. Combating the most dangerous forms of this bigotry will require understanding the ways in which such groups are reinforcing and learning from each other.

Unfortunately, the last 4 years—beginning with White nationalists chanting ''Jews will not replace us'' in Charlottesville and ending with an insurrectionist wearing a ''Camp Auschwitz'' sweatshirt while storming the Capitol—are a dark stain on this country's record. By allowing such vicious hatred to take root and to grow, we fail ourselves, and we fail the rest of the world.

Now we have the opportunity to redeem ourselves—to become leaders once more in the fight to eliminate anti-Semitism and all forms of hatred around the globe. It will not be easy, but it is something we have to do, and it starts with education.

In the ADL's 2014 global survey, 35 percent of the respondents had never heard of the Holocaust, and 28 percent of those who did know of it believed that the number of Jews who died in the Holocaust had been greatly exaggerated. Meanwhile, the AJC's 2020 Survey of the General Public found that nearly one-quarter of Americans know nothing or not much about the Holocaust, and nearly one-half are not even sure what the term ''anti-Semitism'' means.

How can we hope to learn as a society from the horrors of the Holocaust if so many people do not know or do not believe that it happened? How can we root out anti-Semitism if almost half of us don't understand what it is?

We must educate the next generation on the horrors of the Holocaust and the dangers of intolerance. I am proud to have led efforts to provide the full funding of a bill, which our Presiding Officer was very much involved with, the Never Again Education Act, and I thank our Presiding Officer for her leadership on this issue. That bill expanded the reach of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum's world-renowned education program. This will allow educators across the country from K–12 through college to access age-appropriate curriculum on the Holocaust. It will also bolster the Holocaust Memorial Museum's continued collection and use of survivor testimony so that tomorrow's leaders will see and hear for themselves why we must never again allow hatred to thrive.

At the same time, we must fight against Holocaust denial in any form in any part of the world. As the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe's Parliamentary Assembly's Special Representative on Anti-Semitism, Racism and Intolerance, I am committed to countering attempts to erase or revise the events of the Holocaust, such as Poland's efforts to punish those who speak the truth about the 3 million Jews killed there. I am deeply disturbed, for instance, by the news of a slander lawsuit against two Polish scholars for their writings on Jews forced into hiding during the Nazi occupation. I am also appalled that Hungary's Viktor Orban has erected a monument that tries to whitewash Hungary's wartime role in the murder

of more than a half-million Hungarian Jews. On a day we remember the liberation of Auschwitz, I remember, too, that one out of every three Jews who died there were Hungarian.

The Holocaust happened, and it can happen again. It can. We made a promise to our grandparents and to our grandchildren that it would never happen again. I believe that we are all each responsible for keeping that promise. So let us heed the lessons of the past in order to build a more peaceful, just, and compassionate future for all.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

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

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

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss some of the first actions that have been taken by the new administration.

At his inauguration, President Biden spoke about the importance of uniting the country, bringing us together, the importance of unity. Well, I agree. We have been much too divided as a nation. We need to bring America together.

In just a few hours after his inaugural address, President Biden issued one Executive order after another that I believe is only going to drive America further apart. He hasn't really reached out and hasn't really tried to work with us.

At a time when millions of people across the country are struggling with unemployment and the effects of a global pandemic, President Biden has taken actions that will actually raise the cost of living for people all across the country. In particular, President Biden has taken aim at American energy.

Now, in Wyoming, energy production does a lot more than just keep the lights on. It puts food on the table. It does it for thousands of families. It pays for our schools, education, and our roads.

In Wyoming we produce coal, oil, natural gas, and uranium for nuclear power. We also have incredible renewable resources. Wyoming, in many ways, has world class wind. We are experiencing that today in Casper, WY.

Wyoming has some of the largest reserves of energy in terms of resources anywhere in the country. In Wyoming we produce 15 times more energy than we use in our State. It actually makes us the country's largest net energy supplier to the rest of the country. Energy production is the economic lifeblood of Wyoming. It is a major source of revenue for, as I said, our schools, our roads, our bridges, and essential services for all of our citizens.

Wyoming is very proud of our energy workers. Remarkable men and women every day get up and go to work to put food on the table, put clothing on their kids' backs, and the whole country benefits from the energy that comes from Wyoming.

Thanks to America's energy workers, in 2019, America became energy independent. It was the first time we had become independent in over 60 years. That makes it easier for families to make ends meet. It makes us stronger on the world stage. It decreases our reliance on energy from other sources, like foreign powers who want to do us harm.

Thanks to our American energy workers, America is an energy superpower, and I believe we should be acting like one. That is why it is remarkable when I see President Biden painting a target on the back of American energy. That is what he has been doing with his Executive orders, including today.

Despite all of the talk about unity, one of the first things that President Biden has done in office is to directly attack—attack—energy-producing States like Wyoming. It has actually turned out to be his No. 1 priority.

The White House is calling today ''climate day.'' This morning, President Biden stopped all new oil, gas, and coal leases on Federal lands—today. Well, half of the State of Wyoming is federally owned. Even a greater percentage of that, Madam President, in your State is federally owned.

Experts tell us that the long-term ban could cost us 33,000 jobs in Wyoming. We are a State of only a half-million people.

Earlier today, at a hearing of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, where I am the ranking member, the senior Republican, I asked the President's nominee for Secretary of Energy about how the President's ban would affect jobs, and she admitted that in terms of jobs—she said some ''jobs . . . might be sacrificed.''

Saying no to American energy production means less energy, less economic activity, and less money in the pockets of American workers. It is not going to do a thing to lower emissions. It won't bring down global temperatures, but it will bring down workers' wages. It won't cool down planet Earth, but it will cool down our Nation's economy. Energy producers will simply go elsewhere while families in our country will suffer.

President Biden has also put a stop to the Keystone Pipeline. It has been in the headlines. The pipeline creates jobs. It reduces energy prices, and it strengthens our bonds with our neighbor to the north, with Canada.

The Prime Minister of Canada, Justin Trudeau, is no conservative. He is known to be extremely progressive. Even he has said he was disappointed in the decision by President Biden to cancel the pipeline. President Biden's very first phone call with a foreign leader since becoming President was with Prime Minister Trudeau. The Prime Minister raised the issue on the call. President Biden shut down the pipeline anyway.

It has also been reported that TC Energy warned the President's administration that the Keystone Pipeline means thousands of construction jobs, many of those union jobs. They are gone. They are gone. President Biden shut it down anyway.

President Biden has also begun the process of putting us back into the Paris climate accord. Now, under that agreement, the Biden administration is going to set unworkable targets for American businesses.

So what does it mean? Well, it hurts America, but it means China and Russia can continue with business as usual. It is a bad deal for our country. It makes us less competitive. It sacrifices energy jobs to try to stop climate change, which it will not do.

The Paris climate agreement is based on the fantasy that climate change is America's fault—blame America first. In reality, the United States is the leading driver of innovative climate solutions. President Biden's actions aren't just targeting American energy, they are also going after American small businesses.

President Biden is calling on this body to vote to double the Federal minimum wage to $15 an hour. Now, maybe the President's idea of national unity is national uniformity, but that doesn't work in Wyoming or for the people of Wyoming. Maybe he thinks that imposing top-down regulations on every American would bring us all together. It is not the kind of unity that the American people are looking for. We want to stand shoulder to shoulder but not in the unemployment line.

In 2019, well before the pandemic hit, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that mandating a $15 minimum wage nationwide would lead to 1.3 million fewer Americans working—1.3 million Americans. At a time when 10 million Americans are unemployed due to our pandemic, 1.3 million Americans more can't afford to lose their jobs.

The CBO also says it will lead to higher prices for consumers—paying more wages, passing on prices to consumers. Now this could hurt America's small businesses all across the country. I talked to a small business owner from Lovell, WY, Jimmy Minchow, who has a Sinclair station there. He called me on Sunday. He said $15 an hour—there is a station and a food court next to it in Lovell. He said we would have to shut down the food court. We can't afford $15 an hour for the young people who are working there. Putting money in their pockets and providing food services to the people of the community, $15 an hour will shut it down. So the jobs ticker is now on President

Biden's watch, and the President will be judged by his decisions.

Now, the Senate, right before Christmas, passed another round of Paycheck Protection Programs we all supported. These are loans to help small businesses. I voted for it, and the Presiding Officer voted for it to help our small businesses.

Doubling the minimum wage is going to hurt small businesses and going to force them to lay off employees like will likely happened in Lovell, WY, and all across the Cowboy State. It is going to hurt the very people these loans are supposed to be helping.

A bill to provide $900 billion of relief was signed just in late December. President Biden now wants to double that amount of funding. Now, Democrats may try to ram the bill through the Senate using a process called budget reconciliation. Now, of course, this entire cost will be added to our national debt, and if it occurs, it will likely be done without a single Republican vote.

This isn't unity. It is not bipartisanship. It is not healing our divisions. This is a time for President Biden to heed the words of his own inaugural address. We need to work together to lower the cost of living, to produce more energy, to create more jobs, and to create more opportunities for every American. That is how we bring our Nation together. That is what we ought to do now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABORTION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, if you buy a new GM car, a Nissan, Honda, Kia or Toyota, even a Hyundai, you will notice they have started installing a new feature in their cars. It is a reminder, when you turn off the engine, to check your backseat.

Quite frankly, I rented a car not long ago, and it started dinging, and I kept trying to figure out what I had done and kept looking around until I saw the little monitor on the dashboard. It just said, ''Check the backseat,'' which I thought was great because the makers of those cars all believe every child is precious and they shouldn't be harmed.

We have all heard stories like this, but I distinctly remember last summer seeing in the news a story about an infant who died because they were left in a hot car. That is why these carmakers are making this feature now.

I remember, as I saw the story on the news, just the reports and how angry people were in the community. And they were angry at the store, and they were upset on the news. They couldn't believe that a mom had left a child in the backseat of a car and they had slowly died in the heat, because no one wants to see a child harmed. Everyone believes that every child is precious.

I remember, when I saw the story on the news last summer, turning to my wife and saying: I can't figure out our culture sometimes because that same mom and that same baby could have gone into an abortion clinic just a few months before and that child's life could have been ended, and it wouldn't have made the news. In fact, no one would have flinched.

In fact, the very same people who were furious at that mom for leaving her child in the hot car to die would have argued for her right to destroy that exact same child—in fact, would have called it her reproductive right or even the new euphemism out there, ''reproductive care.'' Same child, same mom—nothing was different but a few months in time.

''Reproductive care'' seems like such a nice little euphemism, but what it really means is paying someone in a clinic to reach into the womb with a surgical instrument, to pull the arms and legs off of a child in the womb so that they will bleed to death in the womb and then suction out the little boy or girl's body parts one at a time.

That is what ''reproductive care'' means, and I don't understand why that is normal but leaving a child in the backseat of a hot car is a tragedy.

Maybe it is because, as a nation, some people are afraid to answer the most obvious question: Is that a baby? That is the most obvious question. That face, that nose, those two eyes, that mouth, that chin, those fingers—is that a baby? That is really the only question: Is that a child?

Maybe there is a second question that needs to be answered: Are all children valuable, or are only some children valuable?

We seem to have a great deal of debate today in our society—and we should—about facts. People say we can't seem to agree on the same set of facts and truth. You can't have your facts and my facts; we just only have facts. The media, Big Tech, activists have all decried our loss of ability as a nation to just accept clear facts in front of our face—the obvious truth.

So let me ask the question again: Is that a baby? Yes or no? Because if we are all supposed to say, ''Let's at least agree to the most basic of facts,'' how about that one? Is that a human child with a future and a purpose and a name? Are all children valuable or are only some?

Gold is valuable. It doesn't matter its size. I have gold in my wedding ring. Many people have gold in their wedding rings. If we found a small piece of gold on the floor, it would be valuable. It wouldn't matter its shape. It wouldn't matter its size, small or large. We don't discriminate. Gold is valuable because everyone universally recognizes its worth. Every single Senator in this room recognizes the worth and value of gold. It is around $1,800 an ounce right now to be able to get gold. We all seem, no matter how small or large, to agree gold is valuable, but we can't seem to agree that all children are valuable. Literally, gold is more precious to some people in this room than children are.

Children aren't valuable only sometimes or only certain children. Children are valuable. It can't be just that if a mom or dad wants a child, they are valuable and, if they don't want a child, they are not valuable; they are disposable. The mom or dad gets to choose who are precious and who is medical waste.

Is that a child? That is really the only question that has to be answered, because everything else flows from that.

There are political conversations in this room about the value of children, and every time it comes up, it gets noisy. People will say: Well, you don't fund enough money for education or childcare or healthcare in communities. So you don't love children.

I would say I have voted for the exact same bill you did last year, for billions of dollars for assistance in childcare, billions of dollars for early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, higher education. We did additional assistance for SNAP benefits last year and assistance of benefits for moms in need, increased healthcare for all communities, for federally qualified health centers to make sure we get healthcare to every single community. I voted on those exact same things multiple other people did in this room. I care about children outside the womb.

But those questions really aren't the question. They are distractions to the question. And I get it, because if I ask, ''Is that a child?'' people will respond: Well, do you spend enough for childcare or healthcare? And I still say: Wait. Stop and answer my first question. Is that a child?

Maybe I should ask a more basic question: Does everyone in this room believe in the principle that we should do unto others as we would want done unto us? What would you have wanted done to you when you were in the womb?

I don't address this issue lightly. This is a difficult issue for some people. I don't think an abortion is a flippant thing, that anyone walks into an abortion—I don't mean anyone who had an abortion is somehow gleeful about it. Quite frankly, I can't imagine that anyone who had an abortion would ever forget the sights and sounds and the smells of an abortion, knowing that a helpless child is dying at that moment.

I grieve for the moms and dads who will never ever forget that they went into a clinic and paid someone to get

rid of their child in the name of reproductive care. I can't imagine what their emotion is. But we as a society have to answer this question still for every child who has yet to come.

Forty-eight years ago this week, the Supreme Court made a decision that has now resulted in the deaths of 62 million children in America—62 million. That is hard to fathom. Unlike so many other Supreme Court decisions, America has not forgotten about this one. Our culture has not just moved on and accepted it.

Every year since 1974—the first year after the Roe V. Wade decision—individuals from across the country have gathered in Washington, DC, in defense of the unborn. Friends, families, church leaders, community folks—they have all marched in the rain, in the sleet, the snow. It is cold every year this week in January, but they come.

This year will be different. Due to COVID–19 and the ongoing security concerns in Washington, DC, marchers are staying home, and they are engaging virtually. Maybe this is one more moment where even more people can get involved online, because I expect the rally this year will draw an even larger number of people—students, families, people, quite frankly, from all over the world—to ask a simple question: Will we recognize the most obvious thing in front of our face—that is a baby.

President Biden this week celebrated the passage of Roe v. Wade by declaring that he wants to pass a Federal law requiring abortion to be provided in every single State in America. It is not just trust a Court decision from 1973; he wants us to proactively require in statute that every State demand abortion in their State and that Federal taxpayers, with hard-earned tax dollars, should actually be required to pay for those abortions all over America.

It wasn't long ago that Senator Biden was saying things like, taxpayers shouldn't be required to pay for abortion; they shouldn't be required to pay for something that they find so morally objectionable. It wasn't that long ago that Senator Biden was talking about abortion being safe, legal, and rare. But now, as President, within the first week, he is moving as fast as he can to promote abortion and demand taxpayers pay for it.

In fact, painfully so, President Biden's nomination for the Secretary of Health and Human Services has actually no healthcare experience at all. It was a little surprising to a lot of us when we saw it because we are used to seeing the leader of Health and Human Services be a physician or scientist, which would make sense in the time of an enormous global pandemic to have a physician leading Health and Human Services. But he actually nominated someone whose biggest qualification is that he is one of the most radical advocates for abortion in the country. He did it as a House Member. He did it as an attorney general in California. And clearly the promise was made that he will do it if you put him in Health and Human Services.

Let me just give an example of what I am talking about for Mr. Becerra. I can't process some of these things. Mr. Becerra, when he was the attorney general for California, actually went to Mississippi to be able to lead a suit against Mississippi—another State, obviously—because that State was talking about limiting abortion to only the earliest days. Their belief was, after a child feels pain, we should at least not tear a child limb from limb in the womb when their nervous system is developed. Mr. Becerra led a coalition of State attorneys general to fight Mississippi and say: You can't protect children that way.

He actually argued before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit against the Little Sisters of the Poor, trying to require that group of nuns to provide birth-control services—literally attacking the Little Sisters of the Poor to kind of push this whole agenda.

When he was a Representative in the House of Representatives, he voted against the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. So if a child, in a botched abortion, is actually delivered instead of destroyed, he wanted to say, no, even after they are fully delivered, that child can still be destroyed, even though they are fully delivered, which would make sense because he also, as a Representative, fought against the partial-birth abortion ban. It was a rare procedure, but it was a procedure where they would deliver the child—all but the head—and then penetrate the head with scissors and kill the child. He fought against that.

He fought against the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, which really is odd to me. All it did was criminalize—if someone attacked a pregnant woman and killed her child, they could also be liable for that death as well. He also didn't want to recognize the child as a child even if the mother saw the child as a child.

He also fought against crossing State lines for minors, saying they shouldn't have to get their parents' permission if they crossed State lines to go get an abortion somewhere else.

As the attorney general in California, he fought to require churches to pay for abortion care in their healthcare plans when it directly violated their religious belief.

Unbelievably so, he also fought to be able to require pro-life medical claims, where you could go and say: I don't want an abortion, but I do want a sonogram. I want to be able to get some more information about this child.

If you went into one of those pro-life centers and got a sonogram, he fought to require there to be a poster on the wall that would say: If you would rather have an abortion, here is the place that you would go.

This is beyond just protecting abortion; that has moved to promoting abortion, encouraging the death of children.

It got even so bizarre that in California, when there was a video taken of a Planned Parenthood group of folks who were trafficking the body parts of children and it was caught on video, instead of confronting the folks who were trafficking the child body parts, he went after the folks who took the video, the whistleblowers, and exposed them.

This is not an attack on Mr. Becerra. It is just a shock to me that all of those things seem normal. I don't understand that culturally. I don't understand how the person who is being appointed to lead Health and Human Services can say that children are subhuman: I don't have to recognize that as human, although I am leading Health and Human Services. That is apparently optional tissue, not a human child.

I believe that children are human and that we should honor every child's life. It should be baseline for us to be able to say that if a child is actually delivered in a botched abortion and has been fully delivered outside the womb, we should help that child get medical care. I don't understand why that is so hard.

I don't understand why it is so hard to say that some people are actually appalled by the taking of a child's life. Don't force them, with their tax dollars, to pay for it. I don't understand why that is controversial.

I don't understand why it is controversial that when a child can feel pain in the womb, we shouldn't dismember a child in the womb. I don't understand why that is controversial.

I don't understand why it is controversial to some that if a healthcare provider who has sworn to protect life—that that person shouldn't be compelled to take life in an abortion procedure by their employer. I don't understand why that is controversial, but for some reason, it is.

Among our most basic rights in America are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. One of the most basic things that come out of our founding documents says these things are referred to as ''self-evident.''

Facts are facts, especially when those facts have a face. How can you look at that picture and say that is not a human child? How can we not acknowledge the simple facts?

I do understand for some people this is very difficult because they fought for years for abortion, and they don't want that to change because if it changed, they would have to admit there have been the deaths of millions of children on their watch. That is not a simple thing to admit. But please do not tell me you are following the science, because that child has 10 fingers and 10 toes and a beating heart and a functioning nervous system. That child has DNA that is different from the mom's or the dad's. That is not random tissue; that is a separate person, and science

would confirm that. So please don't follow tell me you follow the science wherever it goes because some facts are obvious, and the science is clear.

This all gets resolved when we answer one simple question: Is that a child or not—because everything else goes from that.

For those of you joining the March for Life online this week, good for you. Keep going. Don't give up. Defend the facts that are self-evident. Speak out for those who can't speak for themselves because millions of future Americans are counting on it, and they are watching for someone to admit the facts—the facts that have a face.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

ABORTION

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I could never match the eloquence of the Senator from Oklahoma, who just spoke about the same topic about which I rise at this moment.

I remember when Democrats running for office would tell the American people that they were pro-choice, but they felt that abortion should be safe, it should be legal, but it should be rare—safe, legal, and rare. I remember when Bill Clinton said that to the American people. And I think about how far the left has gone from that to the attitude that my friend from Oklahoma has described.

I first encountered the March for Life when I was a staff member up here in Washington, DC, working for then-Congressman Trent Lott, 1981. It was wonderful to see those people, and it will be wonderful to join them online in a virtual march this Friday.

I can tell you also that those people who say ''We follow the science'' are those of us now who are pro-life because, as the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, as more and more information comes out about DNA, about the pictures—about the pictures that my wife and I have had on our refrigerator of our unborn grandchildren—more and more Americans, more and more people around the world understand that the science is on the side of those of us who are pro-life; that the beating hearts, the faces that we see in these young unborn children are, indeed, humans made in God's image and that they are entitled to the protections that our Founders outlined, protecting life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Twenty-five years ago, 56 percent of Americans considered themselves prochoice. Only 33 percent said they were pro-life. I was glad to be part of that 33 percent, but I am certainly glad to see our numbers have risen. Today's prolife movement has closed that gap completely. The country is now evenly split.

But I will say this for some of my fellow Americans who call themselves pro-choice: There are differences within that group.

Gallup reports 81 percent of Americans think abortion should be illegal in the third trimester. Why can't we get Democrats and Republicans and Independents of the right and center and left to agree to that—where 81 percent of Americans said we should make abortion illegal in the third trimester. Sixty-five percent say it should be illegal in the second trimester.

In addition, a Marist poll last year found that 60 percent of Americans are against using taxpayer dollars to fund abortion. Even if some of them believe abortion should be legal, 60 percent of Americans—a supermajority—are against using tax dollars to fund abortion. That is up from 54 percent just 1 year before.

Because the science is moving in our favor, the evidence is moving in our favor, public opinion is moving in our favor. That same poll found 35 percent of Democrats oppose using taxpayer funds for abortion. Many of these Americans might check the box saying they are pro-choice, but they are willing to draw an important distinction between abortion being legal in some circumstances and taking taxpayer dollars from pro-life Americans to actually fund abortion.

In essence, these people are saying: We can disagree about abortion being illegal, but let's not force pro-life Americans to pay for a practice they find abhorrent and morally reprehensible.

That is a view that I do not agree with because I am solidly pro-life, but it is an eminently reasonable view.

Why can't we enact that into a permanent statute in the United States? It is a position that Congress has adopted every year when we pass the Hyde amendment to keep Federal dollars from going toward abortion.

I regret that our present President does not seem to share this view, although he once held this view. Days ago, in one of his first acts in office, our new President reversed the Mexico City policy, allowing American tax dollars to begin funding abortions in foreign countries once again. This decision showed disregard, to me, for the consciences of millions of American taxpayers who are pro-life. I was appalled by this decision. I know many of my constituents were. I think Congress should pass legislation enshrining the Mexico City policy in statute.

But at this moment, I rise proposing a more familiar and direct and, I think, politically popular step and that would be to put no taxpayer funding of abortion legislation into the permanent statute rather than passing it each year as the Hyde amendment. Of all the abortion-related bills that reach the Senate floor, this one should be the least controversial. The Hyde amendment is standard policy. It has passed annually for more than 40 consecutive years, during terms of Republican Presidents, terms of Democratic Presidents, during Democratic majorities in the House and the Senate and when it was, indeed, the other way around. It has stood the test of time and enjoys broad consensus in this body and in the United States of America. Passing this legislation to make the Hyde Amendment permanent would keep taxpayers from having to worry each year if their money is going to be used for an abortion in this country.

I stand this Friday with millions and millions of Americans who will join in supporting life, and I urge my colleagues to send an important signal to all of the American people that Congress is serious about seeking unity and healing.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation as we work to build bipartisan consensus for life in the days ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT MAGUIRE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, when we have a new administration, lots of changes take place—changes in offices, changes in committee assignments—but for all of us here in the Senate, perhaps the most challenging change is when members of our team decide to open new chapters in their lives. We celebrate those new chapters and wish them well, but we will also miss them greatly.

I come to the floor to talk about three of my team members who are headed to a new chapter in each of their lives.

Scott Maguire has been a central part of our team since day one. He is my good friend, a valued team member who is preparing a new chapter in his life in the form of a well-deserved retirement.

As of yesterday, January 26, he completed 12 years on our U.S. Senate team as our State operations director. The Boy Scouts of America that have a motto: ''Be prepared.'' They also have a slogan: ''Do a good turn daily.'' These are attributes that I always have held dear, and they are qualities I looked for when setting out to build a team to serve the people of Oregon when I was elected to the Senate in 2008.

Scott was at the top of my list because I knew that these were qualities that define who he is. I knew this because I have known Scott for a very long time. We met through Boy Scout Troop 634 back when we were 11 or 12 years old. We recognized and respected each other's leadership skills, and I admired Scott's growth in character and capabilities as he advanced to the rank of Eagle Scout.

When we were 15, Scott and I were dissatisfied with how the district council was running their annual First Aid Meets, so we proposed to the council executive that we take over and run the weekend event. To our surprise, the staff of the council agreed.

I think the resulting weekend event, which included dozens of troops, hundreds of Scouts, was a tremendous success. It was the type of mutual project that has bonded us over our lifetimes.

Scott did many things in his career before joining my team. He served as operations director of the Northwest Christian Evangelistic Association; as executive director of the Oregon Lions Sight & Hearing Foundation; as a reporter and editor of the Gresham Outlook.

He got involved in many volunteer roles, including with the Gresham Breakfast Lions Club, the Gresham Early Risers Kiwanis Club, and he has volunteered millions of hours just so much to serve the Civil Air Patrol and is now a lieutenant colonel in the Civil Air Patrol.

Looking back to 2009, I can't imagine how we would have gotten our Oregon team off the ground or built the operation we have today without Scott Maguire.

Over the years, he has kept the computers computing and the supplies supplied, but he has done so much more. He pioneered and built our Oregon internship program, which has been a pipeline for hundreds of Oregonians who have been going on to do great things serving in State and national government, in community organizations, and in business to make that intern program the best possible.

Scott cultivated strong relationships with Oregon's colleges, and he could work with them. He was always on the search to give young Oregonians with a passion for public service the opportunity for public service. He cared deeply about their experience and success throughout their time in our office but in the time beyond as well.

Scott stepped in to serve as my field representative for a number of Oregon counties, organizing the townhalls they hold in those counties every year to hear from our constituents. He has not only helped to plan in organizing these events but saved them from going off the rails as unexpected challenges arose.

Back in 2017, when we were debating the future of the Affordable Care Act, we knew that citizens were passionate and angry, so we anticipated a large turnout, planning for 1,000 attendees—twice what was ever seen before. And imagine our shock when 4,000 Oregonians showed up. Constituents were packed in like sardines. Hundreds crowded into a courtyard outside watching through the windows, but there was Scott swooping in to save the day.

He reworked the sound system. He opened the windows. He figured out how to put speakers outside the windows so everyone could hear and participate. Crisis averted. That was just another day for Scott, working behind the scenes and taking care of things that most people don't even know were going wrong to ensure things were running smoothly.

Last year, before the pandemic shut down so much of our lives and our offices went remote, we saw massive shortages on essentials like hand sanitizer, disinfecting wipes, and tissues. But Scott, seeing the crisis developing, raced around the metro area to gather supplies to keep the members of our team healthy and safe. That is who Scott Maguire is: the kind of person who goes above and beyond for everyone in every situation; the kind of person who is prepared and always goes out of his way to do a good turn daily for others; the kind of person who, regardless of who you are, treats you like a VIP.

I speak for all members of Team Merkley, for all the interns who have come through our office, for all the folks Scott has worked with over the years, when I say that he will be deeply missed, and it will not be the same without him.

We wish our dear friend Scott Maguire and his wonderful wife Beth all the best as they begin a new chapter of their lives together.

I picture Scott, who has had a business, Shorty's BBQ, catering barbecue, Texas style, during his years in Oregon—you will probably see him firing that grill up a lot more often in the years ahead. It will be a chapter undoubtedly filled with loving friends, family, great traveling adventures, and, of course, as much barbecue as they can possibly handle.

We will miss you, Scott Maguire.

TRIBUTE TO LAURA UPDEGROVE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I have two other team members who are leaving.

Laura Updegrove is leaving us to work with the Biden administration. She came to us after serving in various foreign policy roles at the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the White House. She joined our team 4 years ago to bring her extensive expertise to bear on our foreign policy portfolio, and I am sure glad she did.

During her tenure in my office, I have been astonished, time and again, by the depth and breadth of her knowledge, her work ethic, her strong organizational and management skills, and the way she approaches each and every task with a very positive attitude. Those traits make her not only a top-notch legislative staffer but a terrific partner as we work to address a variety of issues.

On two occasions, we had the chance to travel on international issues—one trip to many different countries in Africa to better understand the root causes and impacts of the four famines on that continent and to understand how American policy could be changed to assist in these desperately difficult situations.

Then, some years ago, we had the genocide carried out against the Rohingya people in Burma. Aung San Suu Kyi came and spoke to the United Nations, and she said: We have nothing to hide. Come and see for yourselves. So Laura went to work in organizing the congressional response, the congressional trip. We really thought we were going to see exactly what had gone on in those villages, and she worked incredibly hard to arrange everything from boats to helicopters to get us to the right places. Then, the day before we left, Burma denied us the ability to see those villages.

We had backup plan after backup plan to explore what had happened both in Burma and the conditions at the refugee camps in Bangladesh. She reworked everything in a short period of time to direct attention by our congressional delegation and through our delegation to the world to the traumatized, difficult circumstances of a community that was the subject of genocide by Burma. Again, the whole goal was to figure out how the United States could do more to help. Laura really understood and cared about and helped with the plight of people in some of the most difficult circumstances around the world.

The same passion and dedication and strategic thinking that Laura dedicated as a policy staffer are also what have made her an outstanding legislative director for the past 2 years. She has not only continued to lead our efforts on critical issues from rules reform to social justice but has been a daily example of the power of teamwork and mentorship to other staffers.

Her departure is a big loss for Team Merkley but a really big win for the Biden administration, particularly the State Department, where she will be able to utilize her enormous talents on behalf of our country and on behalf of our country's building a better world.

Laura, we wish you all the best.

TRIBUTE TO BEN WARD

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, our third team member who is leaving is Ben Ward.

I think of Ben as our appropriations wizard. He knows that system inside out, and he is the master of Tribal issues and natural resources issues and so much more. He is heading off to serve as the Office of Management and Budget's Deputy Director of Legislative Affairs. I think the whole world noticed his extraordinary talents, and we are looking forward to continuing to work with him as we strive to make the appropriations efforts as effective as possible.

I think that virtually no one in Oregon has gone untouched by the work that Ben has done over the past 5 years. He has worked to get piping money to Central Oregon to assist the farmers. The farmers not only get more water, but more water gets left in the Deschutes River.

He has worked very hard to advance the improvement of Native fishing sites, treaty fishing sites, on the Columbia River and the preparations to

rebuild communities that were wiped out by the building of dams some 70 years ago that have never been properly addressed. He has proceeded to help the Klamath Tribes secure the funds to improve the habitats for their sacred c'waam and koptu fish and to improve the whole, entire water ecosystem in the Klamath Basin for all of the stakeholders.

When we had a big problem with sea lions that were blocking the fish ladders and blocking the mouths of streams and tributaries, he concocted probably more than a dozen plans to try to find one that could move through this legislative process and address the challenge, and he succeeded.

He helped get funding so that we could have more people fighting fires on the frontlines, and he helped to get funding so we could thin the forests and treat the forests so that they would be less likely to burn in the first place.

He helped us get money for the coastal ports so they could be drudged and so they would continue to operate appropriately and safely for the economy of the coastal ports.

He helped us make sure we got help for the diverse agricultural research stations in Oregon and for the mass timber project that is developing whole new categories of engineered wood products that can build buildings that are 14 stories high out of wood rather than concrete and steel, utilizing our incredible supply of amazing wood in the Pacific Northwest. He also assisted our universities in getting funding for all kinds of programs.

The list is almost inexhaustible, but I think we all understand the point. He is incredibly talented at seeing opportunities and is incredibly persistent in seizing those opportunities. That is Ben's way of getting things done. That is why he has been so valued, and that is why we will greatly miss him.

Ben, we wish you all the best as you work on behalf of the Biden administration and the larger OMB process in coordination with the U.S. Senate.

To each of these team members, I say that, once you are a member of Team Merkley, you are never not a member. You will always be part of our family. We so much appreciate what you have contributed to the team and what you have contributed to building a better world.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Brian Schatz, Robert Menendez, Thomas R. Carper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Patrick J. Leahy, Cory A. Booker, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Dianne Feinstein, Jack Reed, Christopher Murphy, Martin Heinrich.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture vote be waived.

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

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

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am particularly glad to see the senior Senator from New Mexico presiding on what, for me, is a sentimental moment, because he has been such a terrific friend and colleague and advocate in the battle of climate change.

I am here today because, at last, it is time to say farewell to my battered ''Time to Wake Up'' image board here and to a run of more than 275 weekly climate speeches. It has been one of the Senate's longer runs, I believe, but I think it is time to say farewell.

This long run began in the dark days of 2012, after Speaker PELOSI had passed a serious climate bill and the Senate had refused to take up anything, not even a blank bill to go to conference with and see what could be done in conference. As some of us remember all too well, when Speaker PELOSI passed that bill in 2009 over on the House side, we had here in the Senate a filibuster-proof Democratic majority. This was climate change, and we just walked away. I was told then that it was because the Obama White House told Leader Reid to pull the plug, that after the ObamaCare wars, the White House was tired of conflict and didn't want another big battle. It was not going to take on any fights it wasn't sure it could win.

Think about that. Think of history's great battles and contests, legislative or otherwise, and consider in how many of those battles either side was sure it would win. If you limit yourself to battles you are sure you can win, you are pretty much sure to miss the most important battles, and we lost this one for that most lamentable of reasons—the failure to try. The fossil fuel industry, sure enough, knew it won this one once it saw the Obama administration walk off the field, abandoning Speaker PELOSI's hard-fought victory.

Then years went by in which you could scarcely get a Democratic administration to put the words ''climate'' and ''change'' into the same paragraph in which we fussed, idiotically, about whether to call it ''climate change'' or ''global warming''; in which the bully pulpit—the great Presidential megaphone in the hands of one of our most articulate Presidents—stood mute. We quavered about polling showing climate as issue 8 or issue 10, ignoring that we had a say in that outcome. When we wouldn't even use the phrase, let alone make the case, no wonder the public didn't see climate change as a priority.

Those were, for me, dark, desolate days, so I made a commitment to speak about climate change every single week we were in session—no matter what. The kitchen was dark; the oven was cold, but maybe, somehow, one little pilot light's clicking on every week would help.

Six years after the Waxman-Markey climate bill passed the House, the Obama EPA finalized its marquee climate regulation, which was quickly killed dead in the starting block by the five Republicans on the Supreme Court.

The Clean Power Plan never even went into effect. It had no regulatory core or backstop that was indisputably within EPA's authority. So when the Clean Power Plan's novelties got smacked down, nothing was left.

John Kerry, bless him, led us into the Paris Agreement, but it wasn't signed until the last year of 8 years of that administration. It being so late, the fossil fuel interests behind Trump hauled us right back out of it.

So there we were, after 8 years in which Democrats sometimes controlled both Houses of Congress as well as the White House, and we had, at the end of the day, no law, no regulations, no treaty.

I am hanging up the ''Time to Wake Up'' poster after more than 275 of these speeches because I am going to trust that we bring more spirit and determination to the climate crisis this time, as President Biden has promised that we will.

His opening Executive orders are a fine start. I appreciate particularly the restoration of the social cost of carbon, but perhaps the most important signal is not any specific policy but the

breadth of the scope of the emphasis on climate across the new Biden administration.

Then we had to deal with the Trump years, when sins of omission became sins of commission, and questions of commitment became questions of corruption.

I am personally confident that evidence will reveal that the Trump administration was, in fact, corrupt on climate issues—and not just corrupt in the meaning of the Founding Fathers but corrupt in the meaning of the U.S. Criminal Code, and I will do my level best to make sure we find out. Thank goodness, we can put that disgraceful period of our history behind us.

What did I learn along the way? I traveled to many of my Republican colleagues' home States on climate trips to help me understand the climate change problem there. There is no State whose big State universities deny climate change. Most all of them teach it. So I knew it wasn't lack of knowledge that was blocking progress.

I learned that oceans are at the heart of the climate threat. First, they bear incontrovertible testimony to the dangers. Try arguing with thermometers that measure ocean warming. Try arguing with tide gauges that measure sea level rise. Try arguing with pH tests that school children can do that measure the acidification of our oceans.

I learned that the oceans are suffering extraordinary injury from warming at the rate of multiple nuclear explosions per second and acidification at rates unprecedented in human existence, and from the fossil fuel industry's plastics contaminating our oceans.

In every State I went to, there were businesses alarmed by climate change, whether it was wildfire or flooding or the loss of iconic views and species, upheaval of fisheries and growing conditions of crops or business risk and recreation imperiled.

I heard from western fishermen about warming trout streams and a Glacier National Park with no glacier, and saw ancient western forests dying by the square mile to the bark beetle.

I heard from coastal States about new pests and poisonous algae and flooding risks and fisheries in upheaval. And the Great Lakes, I heard, face similar threats as the ocean coasts.

I heard in the Presiding Officer's State of Nordic ski trails made mud because you can't do artificial snow like on ski slopes, and moose tours—moose tours—that visitors promised never to do again because once you made it down the mud trail, the moose were crawling with thousands of ticks, eating them alive. Things that winter used to clean up but did no longer.

One day I wept in National Airport, sitting at one of those little round linoleum-topped food tables, reading Pope Francis's new encyclical, ''Laudato Si: On Care For Our Common Home.'' Climate effects were everywhere. That wasn't the problem.

So I began looking at the fossil fuel industry and studying the dark money apparatus that it uses to spread climate denial and to obstruct climate progress.

I recalled our bipartisanship here in the Senate before Citizens United, and I saw the death of bipartisanship after, when the fossil fuel industry upgraded its weaponry from political muskets to tactical nukes and set about subjugating the Republican Party.

I came to like and admire Bob Inglis, a conservative the fossil fuel industry could not subjugate. So, instead, they made an example of him for his climate heresy and crushed him politically.

I came with groups of Senators to the floor to identify and call out this corrupt and corrupting fossil fuel web of denial. I came to know and admire the tough band of investigators, writers, and academic researchers who examine and document this corrupt apparatus.

I saw how this apparatus insinuated itself into the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers and turned those two business groups into America's two worst climate obstructors.

Thank you, InfluenceMap, for that research.

I learned the ways the industry hid the money trail leading to its front groups through shell corporations, through Donors Trust, through 501(c)(4)s. And I finally came to the realization that this industry was running a massive, covert operation—probably the biggest covert disinformation and political intimidation op in history, and it was running this covert op in and against our own country.

Another thing I learned was how little political effort America's corporations put into doing anything about climate change here in Congress. A lot of them put happy green talk on their websites. They had their consumer relations and public relations and investor relations people spread the happy green talk around. Many of them actually hired sustainability officers and, where it made them money, began changing their internal behavior to actually be more sustainable.

Sometimes more attention was paid to heralding those sustainability programs than there actually was to sustaining anything, but sometimes it was sincere. Bravo to those companies that have really changed the way they operate within their corporate bounds. And a few took climate change seriously enough to start pushing sustainability out their supply chains.

But none—none—took climate change seriously in Congress. This was a battlefield they avoided. Their trade associations were a nightmare. Every one of them—beverages, insurance, banking, chemical, agricultural—you name it, every one of them was silent or worse. Now at last—at last—that seems to be changing.

Here is the 2020 lobbying pitch for Silicon Valley tech giants—the biggest corporations in America, many of the most successful corporations of America, hundreds of American corporations, almost all of which pride themselves on their greenness. They lobby us through a group called TechNet. Here is their pitch sheet—13 pages of bulleted priorities they wanted Congress to achieve, and not one mention—not one mention—of climate change. Not one, not even a mention of renewables from a trade association that has renewables companies in its membership—until now. Until now. I was just notified that TechNet has noticed this omission in its document and that it intends to rectify the error. Good.

Change has even come to the biggest and most obstructive lobby group of them all—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I spent a lot of time chasing them with hashtag ''chamberofcarbon.'' I stood out in front of their headquarters and put up a sign that said ''Carbon'' blocking where it said ''Commerce,'' so their own building said ''U.S. Chamber of Carbon.'' They were my nemesis—hostile to climate action in the legislative branch, hostile to climate action in the executive branch and regulatory agencies, hostile to climate action in the judiciary in cases that were being brought about climate. They were the beast.

Well, last week, the chamber announced a dramatic reversal—that it will now support a serious, market-based climate solution. That—that—is a big shift. And if they fight for climate action anywhere near as forcefully as they fought against it, it could make a big difference. So TBD as to how this turns out over at the chamber, but a tentative big thumbs up.

So as I close my run of Time to Wake Ups, where are we? Well, we again control the House, and the Senate, and the White House, and this time I hope we will be serious.

Senator MARKEY has joined me, and I mentioned earlier in the speech NANCY PELOSI championing an actual serious climate bill through the House and lamented the Senate's failure to do one damn thing once we had the House bill over here to act on.

That bill was called Waxman-Markey. It was the work of Congressman Waxman and Congressman, now-Senator, MARKEY. With Senator MARKEY over here, maybe this time we will be serious in the Senate with all of these departments of government control.

The latent bipartisanship here in the Senate that the fossil fuel industry suppressed is still there. It has been there all along. Talking to some of my colleagues about climate change has been a little bit like talking to prisoners about escape, but the latent bipartisanship did not go away. With these other changes—with corporate America beginning to show up, with the big trade associations becoming less horrible, I am hopeful for a serious bipartisan bill. And if we can't get good-faith bipartisanship, well, we have got reconciliation.

Senator MCCONNELL can't block bipartisan climate bills from coming to the floor any longer. So there is a point to legislating. There is a point to advocates showing up. So maybe corporate America will show up and push back on fossil fuel's subjugation of the Republican Party. A good, hard look at the fossil fuel climate denial machinery can put that corrupt machine back on its heels. In my view, it would be dereliction and malpractice to ignore that apparatus and its treacherous role.

In trade associations, revolts are already taking place, within the chamber and NAM, by members horrified to be outed as supporting America's worst climate obstructors. Want faster change there? Disclose the fossil fuel money that bought the climate obstruction. That will speed things along.

The finance and agriculture sectors and our coastal economies all are looking down the barrel of multiple and serious economic crash warnings. Banks, insurance companies, Freddie Mac, sovereign banks, wherever you look in the world of finance, there are dramatic, dire warnings from sober, serious bean-counter people who are not there to be green. They are there to make green. So corporate climate concerns have moved from the communications shop to business operations and the C-suites.

The famous author Mary Renault, who wrote wonderful historical novels, said: ''There is only one kind of shock worse than the totally unexpected: the expected for which one has refused to prepare.'' There has never been a crisis or a catastrophe more warned about by more and more credible sources than the looming climate crisis, and it is going to clobber these businesses. Now they just need to align their political effort with their own stated policies. How hard is that?

All of this can break the right way. The dark castle of denial can fall, and Congress can rise in bipartisan force to stop the harm and cure the damage. But that is not foreordained. We can still screw this up. No doubt about it. So let's not. Let's do our duty. The conditions are at last—at last—in place for a real solution. A new dawn is breaking, and when it is dawn, there is no need for my little candle against the darkness. My little ''Time to Wake Up'' pilot light can now go out.

So instead of urging that it is time to wake up, I close this long run by saying now, it is time to get to work. Whitehouse ''Time to Wake Up'' run, farewell.

Whitehouse at least on time to wake up—out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Before my friend leaves, I just want him to know that I relished the opportunity to be here for his, what, 400th or however long it has been—but his final speech. And I am excited about the final speech because I have got it pretty well memorized now. And while I have to say this—I say this about another person who has been on the committee with me for a long period of time—that while I don't agree with very much of what you say, you say it so well. That goes with you, I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, because we cover a lot of issues in that committee.

I think it was—we have a new majority now. We will see some things that you will seize upon as opportunities that may make some changes. And I will be there to try to keep that from happening, but, nonetheless, we will enjoy it. There are so many issues right now in the committee, I say this to my friend from Massachusetts, that we are involved in. You know, one of them is an issue we discussed in some detail about the Western Sahara and some things that have gone on there. We find so many things that we can agree on. And I look forward to being in the new position of being in the minority and combating from a different perspective.

So congratulations on the commitment that you have made to your cause and the time and the effort and the eloquence that you have used over the years.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Senator INHOFE. I am grateful to the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

We are, indeed, fairly fierce adversaries on the issue of climate, but it is a fervent prayer of mine that that might change because I have had the experience of working with Senator INHOFE on issues on which we are not adversaries, and let me tell you, the man is a senatorial Caterpillar tractor at getting things done when our interests align. Whether it is cleaning up kleptocracy or fixing the enforcement of pirate fishing overseas or our ocean plastics work, Senator INHOFE has been enormously valuable in those things. And I will confess, because we have had these wars with one another on climate change, that when Senator INHOFE came to Senator SULLIVAN's and my hearing on ocean plastics, my heart sank. I thought, oh—I won't say the word. This was such a good hearing. It was going so well. Why did he have to show up? Because I thought he was going to ruin everything—not a bit. He listened. And when it came time to ask questions, he asked terrific questions.

He described an experience in his childhood along the Texas gulf coast and the little sea turtles trying to work their way to the ocean from their eggs, and he asked how he could help. He was an original cosponsor of our bill. He was a strong supporter of the bigger, better 2.0 bill.

So I will close with reiterating my prayer that perhaps in the most marvelous of all worlds, the good Lord can find a way to bring us to work together to solve this climate problem. If so, we may very well have a miracle in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, there are many other areas, I recall so many times, during a long period of time when Democrats were in the majority, Barbara Boxer was the chairman of our committee; and when Republicans were in the majority, I would be the chairman and then she would be the ranking member. But I have to say this, in that committee, we got things done.

You overlooked the infrastructure thing and how important that was. And I have a confession that is good for the soul. I have to admit, every time we had a new infrastructure bill, I started off on the Democratic side because they seemed to be more interested in some of the things that I was interested in. Anyway, that is the way it works around here, and we all love each other. All right?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Senator INHOFE, for your courtesy for coming to say those words. I truly appreciate it.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INHOFE. I will yield, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you for rising because I do believe what you are saying about Senator WHITEHOUSE is accurate. In my opinion, like Lou Gehrig, like Cal Ripken, he will go down in history in this longevity streak in highlighting, spotlighting like a true North Star the need for us to take action on these issues, and he is, without question, a climate change hall of famer.

And I agree with you, there is a new dawn which has now arrived, with our fingers crossed. And I share your hope, the Senator from Rhode Island, that we might be able to find a way to persuade the gentleman from Oklahoma that it is sunny most of the time in Oklahoma and it is windy most of the time in Oklahoma and there are tens of thousands of jobs yet to be created. And we can work in partnership in order to accomplish that goal.

But for today, I just wanted to come over and honor the great SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for his incredible leadership during this time we have been going through with the climate ''denier in chief'' now gone, and there is hope alive. Your leadership is absolutely hall of fame and historic. Congratulations, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. You are the Hank Aaron. You are the Roger Maris. So I appreciate it and thank you.

Mr. INHOFE. Don't forget Cal Ripken, the Cal Ripken of climate. That is pretty good.

Well, Madam President, that is not what I came to talk about. I came to listen.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, one of the best presentations I have heard in a long time was just a couple of hours ago by JAMES LANKFORD. What he was talking about, I have never heard a presentation more heartfelt

and compassionate than he did on the unborn, and I couldn't touch that. But there are a couple of things I wanted to add that perhaps were not on his—he didn't have time to get around to.

It is really important that we recognize celebrating this March for Life that is taking place. It is something that has happened each year for a long time now. I have always enjoyed being a part of it. We have large groups of people coming up from Oklahoma.

However, it is virtual this year as everything else is. It is more important than ever under this new administration and its radical abortion practices and the personnel that have been suggested to be part of the administration. So it is going to be maybe a greater fight than it has been in the past.

In light of that, I am introducing a bill I have introduced before, but we have never been able to get it passed. It is called Protecting Individuals with Down Syndrome Act, which will prohibit abortions being sought because the unborn baby has Down syndrome.

All abortion is tragic, but this population has been specifically targeted. In the United States—it just turned out this way, and there is no law that influences it—in the United States, approximately 67 percent of the unborn babies diagnosed with Down syndrome are aborted. All lives have inherent worth regardless of their chromosome count. I think we all understand that.

But my fight does not stop there. I am also joining my colleagues in introducing several pro-life bills as we prepare for March for Life, including Senator SASSE's. He has a bill that is the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. His bill ensures that a baby who survives an abortion will receive the same treatment as any child naturally born at the same age.

People don't realize this, but babies who have been in an attempted abortion and they survive the abortion, they don't get the medical treatment that they normally would get, which this bill directly addresses. This has been going on for a long time. I have a feeling that we have an opportunity. The numbers are changing in our direction in terms of the unborn and have been for some time.

Now, my wife Kay and I have been married 60 years. We have 20 kids and grandkids, so I know something about babies. I know something about babies who are born. And I looked up and I saw—because of the great presentation that Senator LANKFORD gave, I was looking for some material I had used in the past.

It was 28 years ago that I came down here to tell the story about Ana Rosa Rodriguez. This is what I said. I was in the House at that time. This was in the House RECORD, and this is what I said at that time. I said:

> Mr. Chairman, there is a big misconception regarding abortion and the issue of women and their right to protect their bodies. It is not that right that I object to, but the right that is given them to kill an unborn fetus—an unborn [baby].
>
> I want to share with you a story that my colleague, Chris Smith told some time ago on this very floor. Ana Rosa Rodriguez is an abortion survivor. At birth she was a healthy 3 pound baby girl except for her injury—she was missing an arm.
>
> Ana survived a botched abortion. Her mother attempted to get an abortion in her 32nd week of pregnancy when she was perfectly healthy—8 weeks past what New York State law legally allows. In the unsuccessful abortion attempt the baby's right arm was ripped off [from her body], however they failed to kill Ana Rosa. She lived.
>
> And I got to know her after that.
>
> Pro-life supporters agreed that nightmare situations like the Rodriguez case are probably not [all that] common, but abortion related deaths and serious injuries occur more [often] than most people are aware.
>
> It is amazing that we can pay so much attention to issues such as human rights abroad and can allow the violent destruction of over 26 million children here at home. We are fortunate that Ana was not one of those children—she survived.

That was in 1992. I was in the House at that time. But today we still don't have explicit Federal protections for babies who survive the brutal abortion process.

Now, as I said, this issue is not about abortion but about caring for a baby outside the womb. These kids are—they failed an abortion, so they are alive. In most cases, they are in a hospital setting—in many cases, anyway—and yet they don't get the same care. They don't look at them as someone you can save. You don't want to use lifesaving talents on these babies.

The need for these protections become even clearer as we see States like New York and Illinois that allow abortion for virtually any reason up to the point of birth and support infanticide by removing protectants for infants born alive after a failed abortion.

Just a few years after that speech I gave in 1997, I was on the floor with my good friend former Senator Rick Santorum to try to pass a partial-birth abortion ban and end the horrific practice of late-term abortions. Fortunately, we won the battle against partial-birth abortions and finally ended that practice in 2003. That ban was upheld by the Supreme Court in 2007.

But we have yet to pass legislation banning late-term abortions. Only seven countries allow abortion after 20 weeks, including the United States and North Korea. Now, that is horrific. The United States is supposed to be an example in regards to global human rights. Yet we are on par with North Korea when it comes to protecting the unborn.

Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would help roll back this horrific practice by prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks postfertilization. That is when we know that babies can feel. It is not even debatable; they can feel pain at that time.

It is another commonsense bill that should not divide us along party lines. A baby is a baby whether in or outside of the womb, and each baby deserves a chance to live as an individual created in the image of God.

There is still much more we need to do to end the abortion-on-demand culture. Under the last administration, we protected the Hyde amendment, reinstated and expanded the Mexico City policy, and stripped abortion providers like Planned Parenthood from using title X funding for abortions. Unfortunately, President Biden is trying to undo all those accomplishments that we made in the last administration.

The need to stand up for our babies is as important today as it has ever been—certainly in 1992 and 1997 when I quoted from talks I made back at that time. We will overcome evil with good by upholding and affirming the dignity and inherent worth of every human being. We will just keep fighting, and we are going to win this one.

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. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DOMESTIC TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, 76 years ago today, scouts from the Soviet Red Army pushed their way through Poland. They stumbled on a place that haunts the world to this day—a place of incomprehensible suffering, cruelty, and depravity—Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Auschwitz was the largest of Nazi Germany's death camps—40 sprawling acres of hell on Earth.

Between 1940 and 1945, 1.1 million men, women, and children were transported to Auschwitz from Nazi-occupied lands; 1.1 million were murdered there. More than 950,000 of those were Jewish.

At the height of the Nazi concentration and extermination camp's operations, an average—average—of 6,000 Jews were poisoned and cremated every day in the gas chambers and crematoria of Auschwitz. It was mass murder on an industrial scale.

The first Soviet soldiers who entered Auschwitz on January 27, 1945, were met with an eerie stillness. Most of the camp's prisoners—nearly 60,000 of them—had been evacuated days earlier by Nazis and dispersed to other concentration camps, where they continued to be exploited as slave labor. Only about 9,000 prisoners remained. They were the ones who were too sick to endure the evacuation, simply left there to die—no food, no water, no heat, no medical care.

In a frantic effort to conceal their monstrous crimes, the SS had tried to dismantle that killing machine before they abandoned it. They forced prisoners to dismantle the barracks and demolish the gas chambers and ovens, but the fires still burned in Auschwitz.

Three weeks ago today, on January 6, 2021, an angry mob attacked this Capitol Building and this Congress as we gathered to fulfill our constitutional obligation to certify the results of the 2020 Presidential election. That siege on the Capitol was an attack on American democracy itself. Sadly, it was incited by then-President Donald Trump.

So many scenes from that day still haunt us: police officers trying to maintain order, battered with American flags, threatened to be murdered with their own service weapons; a scaffold erected on the Capitol grounds; calls to hang the Vice President of the United States; a Confederate battle flag paraded through the halls of the Senate—a desecration that never happened during our Civil War. But for many, the most painful image of that day was of a middle-aged White man proudly wearing the sweatshirt that read: ''Camp Auschwitz,'' and then the words: ''Work makes you free''—a translation of the cruel slogan atop the black iron gates leading into the Auschwitz concentration camp.

For one retired dentist and grandfather in the Chicago area, that despicable neo-Nazi hate symbol, shown during the Capitol insurrection, and the chants of ''Jews will not replace us'' 3 years earlier in Charlottesville were shocking reminders. George Brent is 91 years old now, but he was 15 years old and living in Hungary when his parents and his little brother saw a Nazi invasion on March 19, 1944.

Two months after that invasion, on May 19, 1944, Hungarian townspeople sympathetic to the Nazis woke George and his family in the early morning hours and told them they had 2 hours to get out of their home. The family was taken to the Jewish ghetto. The following morning, they and the rest of the town's Jews were loaded onto open cattle cars. After 6 days traveling on the railroad, the doors of the cattle cars were opened to reveal dogs and whips and SS officers barking commands.

George and his father were ordered to walk in one direction. Out of the corner of his eye, he saw his mom and his little brother Peter being herded in the opposite direction. He never saw them again. They almost certainly died that day in Auschwitz.

George and his father were spared immediate death because they happened to be strong enough to work. George's father was sent to clean up destruction and carnage in the Warsaw Ghetto. George was given different jobs at Auschwitz. He remembers the smoke that billowed from the crematoria.

In mid-January 1945, as the Allies pushed into Poland, George and 56,000 other prisoners were evacuated from Auschwitz. The emaciated men and boys were forced to walk hours in the freezing cold and snow, clad only in rags and wooden clogs. They called it ''The March of Death.'' A fourth of the prisoners died along the way.

The survivors were loaded into box cars and shipped west. George was sent to Mauthausen, a notoriously brutal camp in Upper Austria. A few days later, he was sent to Ebensee, a satellite camp.

The official policy of both camps was ''extermination through labor.'' It was a cruel mockery of the sign that greeted the prisoners as they entered Auschwitz: ''Work makes you free.''

At Ebensee, George was put to work digging tunnels in which the Nazis could hide their war armaments from Allied bombing.

On May 6, 1945—11½ months after George was ripped from his home and family, Ebensee was finally liberated by George Patton's 80th Infantry Division—the last of the Nazi camps to be liberated. George was then 16 years of age. He weighed less than 70 pounds.

After the war, George stayed briefly with two of his aunts in Budapest. Together, they discovered their father was still alive but desperately ill in a tuberculosis sanatorium in Munich. Several months later, George was able to visit him. He settled into a displaced camp for Jewish children near Munich.

In October 1949, he moved to America to live with his great-uncle, who owned a small grocery store on the South Side of Chicago. George slept on a recliner chair in the storeroom. He was even happy to be there. He had reached the age of 20.

In May of 1950—7 months after arriving in the United States—he enlisted in the U.S. Air Force Reserve and served 2 years during the Korean war. In 1951, George's father moved to Chicago, and they were reunited for nearly 20 years before his father passed away.

After the war, George married and raised a family. He graduated from the University of Illinois College of Dentistry in Chicago. He later taught dentistry at the college for 29 years and practiced dentistry for 50 years.

After he retired in 2010, he became a volunteer lecturer at the Illinois Holocaust Museum, where he tells his story mostly to kids.

George Brent is a proud American. He is not really political. But when he saw the clothing and the symbols at the Capitol siege glorifying the murderous Nazi regime, he was outraged. How could this happen in America, he asked?

One effort that I believe is needed—in fact, it is long overdue—is for Congress to pass legislation aimed at addressing the significant threat of domestic terrorism—domestic, homegrown American terrorism. That is why I have introduced the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act in each Congress since 2017. I will be reintroducing it soon in this Congress.

For far too long, we have failed to adequately monitor the dangerous groups that threaten us, the violent White supremacists and other extremist groups. While we looked the other way, the threat grew.

Intelligence experts have now warned us that such groups constitute a serious and growing threat to America's security. Unfortunately, instead of addressing this threat, the Trump administration spent 4 years downplaying it, and the former President made appalling, incendiary, and embarrassing statements that only served to further incite these violent extremists. We can't waste another moment. Congress has to act against this hateful extremism.

As the incoming chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am going to hold hearings on this matter.

I brought it up to the head of the FBI before. He acknowledged the problem, but little or nothing was done during the Trump years. I trust that President Biden will take a different approach. This is a serious threat to security in America.

I feel badly for George Brent, a man who miraculously survived Auschwitz, the concentration camps, and everything the Nazis threw at him. He came to the United States because he dearly loved this country and the freedoms that are part of it. He made a great life and a great contribution. He still does with his work at the Holocaust museum. Can you imagine what went through his mind when he saw that photograph of the demonstrator in the Capitol—the United States Capitol—with a sweatshirt mocking his life experience, a sweatshirt which bore the words ''Camp Auschwitz''?

It was a sad day for America when that group, that mob, overran this Capitol. I am sorry for the pain that it brought to so many people.

But let me add quickly: We cannot ignore it. It is not a question of getting over it. It is not a question of letting President Trump ride off into the sunset. We have got to come to grips with the reality of what occurred 3 weeks ago today—3 weeks ago today—when we ran out of this Chamber, and we were told to move as quickly as possible with the fear that this mob was going to overtake us and harm us.

After we left the building, they overran this Chamber. They went through the desks. They posed in the chairs where the Presiding Officer is sitting, took videos and photos of themselves and were just dumb enough to put them on Facebook. So we have them, and many of these people are going to pay the price for this criminal invasion of the Capitol that they were part of.

Again, to George Brent's family: I am sorry for what you had to go through. We are better than that. America is better than that. We are glad that you are a part of this great country.

I will work to pass this bill and to get President Biden to sign it into law. And as I do, I will remember George Brent.

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. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 1:45 p.m., tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, the Senate vote on cloture on Executive Calendar No. 4, Alejandro Mayorkas; that if cloture is invoked, the vote on confirmation be at 5 p.m., Monday, February 1.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 became public law on January 1, 2021, and included reforms to the U.S. Agency for Global Media outlined in section 1299Q. The FY21 consolidated appropriations act became public law on December 27, 2020, and included language that would have delayed those reforms had they already been in law, but they were not. Reserving any concerns about the lawfulness of insulating Senate-confirmed officers from removal, I believe it is Congress's intent that these two provisions should not be understood concurrently and that the reforms outlined in section 1299Q shall take effect on the date of enactment of the fiscal year 2021 NDAA.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Peter Paul Montgomery Buttigieg, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Transportation.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 56. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support services for families and caregivers of people living with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASEY, Ms. ERNST, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 57. A bill to increase the ability of nursing facilities to access to telehealth services and obtain technologies to allow virtual visits during the public health emergency relating to an outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID–19), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 58. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 59. A bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 60. A bill to provide for the effective use of immigration detainers to enhance public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LEE):

S. 61. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 62. A bill to implement recommendations related to the safety of amphibious passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 63. A bill to establish an Office of Emerging Markets within the Small Business Administration that will strengthen the development of small business concerns in emerging markets, including those owned by women, minorities, veterans, and those located in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 64. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to spur entrepreneurial ecosystems in underserved communities; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COTTON, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROMNEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 65. A bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 66. A bill to require the Inter-Agency Task Force on Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia to develop a plan for reducing, mitigating, and controlling harmful algal blooms and hypoxia in South Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 67. A bill to support efforts by international financial institutions to provide a robust global response to the COVID–19 pandemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SASSE, Mr. LEE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 68. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 69. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require annual lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico region of the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 70. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize cybersecurity operations and missions to protect critical infrastructure by members of the National Guard in connection with training or other duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LEE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 71. A bill to expand the use of E-Verify to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. MARKEY,

Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 72. A bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 73. A bill to ban the Federal procurement of certain drones and other unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. Res. 17. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that clean water is a national priority and that the April 21, 2020, Navigable Waters Protection Rule should not be withdrawn or vacated; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. Res. 18. A resolution in support of an international investigation into the handling by the Government of the People's Republic of China of COVID–19 and the impact thereof on the people of the United States and other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 42

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 42, a bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

S. 50

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 50, a bill to temporarily designate Venezuela under section 244(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit eligible nationals of Venezuela to be granted temporary protected status.

S.J. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 4, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of not more than 9 justices

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 58. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the ''West Coast Ocean Protection Act.''

This important legislation would prohibit oil or gas drilling in federal waters off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington.

After four years of an Administration intent on allowing drilling off the West Coast and in waters across the United States, I am hopeful we will finally pass this bill to ensure no drilling ever occurs in Pacific waters.

I'm pleased to be joined today by Senators PADILLA, WYDEN, MERKLEY, MURRAY, CANTWELL, MENENDEZ, BOOKER, MARKEY, and SANDERS in introducing this bill, which has been introduced in every Congress since the Deepwater Horizon disaster in April 2010.

11 people were killed and 17 others injured when the Deepwater Horizon well blew out. Oil and gas spewed into the Gulf of Mexico for 87 days.

Oil slicks covered the Gulf. Tar balls and toxic sludge covered beaches and wetlands. More than one-third of federal waters in the Gulf were closed to fishing.

While the Deepwater Horizon disaster reminded the world of the dangers of offshore drilling, Californians never had to be convinced; before Deepwater Horizon and Exxon Valdez, there was the tragic 1969 oil spill in Santa Barbara.

A well blowout on an offshore rig spilled more than 3 million gallons of crude oil according to some estimates—the worst spill in U.S. history at the time.

The spill closed local beaches—which were covered by a thick layer of oil—and thousands of marine mammals and birds were killed.

Tourists were turned away and commercial fishing operations were halted, hurting the local economy.

After the Santa Barbara spill, California had enough. The State blocked all new offshore drilling in state waters—which extend three miles from the shore—and in 1994 enacted a permanent offshore drilling ban.

Through local ordinances, congressional opposition, and presidential moratoria, all new drilling in federal waters off California has been blocked since 1984.

Today, opposition to offshore drilling is higher than ever. A 2018 poll found that nearly 70% of Californians oppose new drilling off our coast. The evidence is quite clear: Californians do not want any more drilling.

The California coast is an economic engine of growth for the state and the nation. A 2015 report produced by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration found that California's 19 coastal counties created $662 billion in wages and $1.7 trillion in GDP in 2012.

Overall, California's ocean economy supports over 1 million jobs and generates significant growth for the U.S. Because of the unique nature of the West Coast ocean shelf, potential drilling would occur near the coastline and directly threaten the environment and robust economy.

It is long past time to respect the view of California and our fellow West Coast states by passing the ''West Coast Ocean Protection Act'' to permanently ban offshore drilling and protect the Pacific coast for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 67. A bill to support efforts by international financial institutions to provide a robust global response to the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 67

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Support for Global Financial Institution Pandemic Response Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR A ROBUST GLOBAL RESPONSE TO THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICIES AT THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(2)) to use the

voice and vote of the United States at that institution—

(A) to seek to ensure adequate fiscal space for world economies in response to the global coronavirus disease 2019 (commonly referred to as ''COVID–19'') pandemic through—

(i) the suspension of all debt service payments to the institution; and

(ii) the relaxation of fiscal targets for any government operating a program supported by the institution, or seeking financing from the institution, in response to the pandemic;

(B) to oppose any loan, grant, document, or strategy that would lead to a decrease in health care spending or in any other spending that would impede the ability of any country to prevent or contain the spread of, or treat persons who are or may be infected with, the SARS–CoV–2 virus; and

(C) to require approval of all Special Drawing Rights allocation transfers from wealthier member countries to countries that are emerging markets or developing countries, based on confirmation of implementable transparency mechanisms or protocols to ensure the allocations are used for the public good and in response the global pandemic.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies shall include in the annual report required by section 1701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r) a description of progress made toward advancing the policies described in paragraph (1).

(b) IMF ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS.—

(1) UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to support the issuance of a special allocation of not less than 2,000,000,000,000 Special Drawing Rights so that governments are able to access additional resources to finance their responses to the global COVID–19 pandemic.

(2) AUTHORIZATION TO VOTE FOR ALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding section 6(a) of the Special Drawing Rights Act (22 U.S.C. 286q(a)), the United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund may vote to allocate up to 2,000,000,000,000 Special Drawing Rights under article XVIII of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund.

(c) TERMINATION.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall have no force or effect after the earlier of—

(1) the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report stating that the SARS–CoV–2 virus is no longer a serious threat to public health in any part of the world.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 17—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CLEAN WATER IS A NATIONAL PRIORITY AND THAT THE APRIL 21, 2020, NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE SHOULD NOT BE WITHDRAWN OR VACATED

Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 17

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) clean water is a national priority; and

(2) the final rule of the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''The Navigable Waters Protection Rule: Definition of 'Waters of the United States''' (85 Fed. Reg. 22250 (April 21, 2020)) should not be withdrawn or vacated.

SENATE RESOLUTION 18—IN SUPPORT OF AN INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE HANDLING BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA OF COVID–19 AND THE IMPACT THEREOF ON THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER NATIONS

Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 18

Whereas the novel coronavirus, hereafter referred to as COVID–19, emerged in the People's Republic of China and began to spread as early as November 2019;

Whereas, by late December, dozens of citizens of the People's Republic of China had fallen victim to COVID–19;

Whereas, on December 30, 2019, Wuhan health authorities identified, interrogated, and reprimanded multiple doctors in response to their decisions to warn other Chinese citizens of the danger posed by this new disease;

Whereas, on January 1, 2020, the Wuhan Public Security Bureau questioned eight Chinese doctors who had posted information on COVID–19 on WeChat;

Whereas, on January 1, 2020, the Hubei Provincial Health Commission ordered laboratories to stop testing for COVID–19 and destroy samples of the same;

Whereas, on January 2, 2020, the Wuhan Institute of Virology mapped the genome of COVID–19 in order to inform development of public health interventions and medical treatments for COVID–19, but the Government of the People's Republic of China withheld genetic information on COVID–19 until January 9;

Whereas, on January 11, 2020, the Wuhan Health Commission insisted that there were no new cases of infection by COVID–19;

Whereas, on January 13, 2020, the first identified COVID–19 case outside of the People's Republic of China was announced in Thailand;

Whereas, on January 14, 2020, the World Health Organization announced that the Government of the People's Republic of China had seen ''no clear evidence of human-to-human transmission of the novel coronavirus'';

Whereas, on January 23, 2020, the Government of the People's Republic of China began to implement quarantine measures to stem the spread of COVID–19, at the same time as the disease had already begun to proliferate throughout the world;

Whereas, on March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization declared COVID–19 a global pandemic, with at least 118,000 persons infected and at least 4,291 dead in 114 different countries at the time of the announcement;

Whereas, by January 21, 2021, one year after the first COVID–19 case was confirmed in the United States, COVID–19 had infected at least 97,061,592 persons and killed at least 2,080,009 in 191 different countries;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China argues that COVID–19 did not originate in the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has alleged that the United States Army may have delivered COVID–19 to the city of Wuhan and that COVID–19 may have originated in Italy or ''separate outbreaks in multiple places in the world'';

Whereas the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has said, ''China's endeavor to combating [sic] the epidemic has bought time for [international] preparedness.'';

Whereas a University of Southampton study found that earlier intervention by the Government of the People's Republic of China could have ''significantly'' limited the geographic spread of COVID–19;

Whereas more than 120 nations have called for an investigation of the origins of COVID–19; and

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to prevent a credible international investigation of the origins of COVID–19, including by restricting access by investigators to certain locations and information in the People's Republic of China: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the decision by the Government of the People's Republic of China to hide the emergence and spread of COVID–19 within its borders during the initial weeks of the pandemic;

(2) assesses that the decision by the Government of the People's Republic of China to hide the emergence and spread of COVID–19 during that period almost certainly contributed to the rapid spread of that disease throughout the Indo-Pacific, Europe, and the rest of the world;

(3) finds that the Government of the People's Republic of China should be held accountable for the impact of its decision to hide the emergence and spread of COVID–19 on the lives and livelihoods of the people of the United States and other nations;

(4) calls for an international investigation led by public health officials from the United States and other affected nations and free from any restrictions by the Government of the People's Republic of China to determine how the handling by the Government of the People's Republic of China of the COVID–19 outbreak prior to March 11, 2020, contributed to the emergence of the COVID–19 global pandemic; and

(5) calls on the international community—

(A) to quantify the harm caused by the handling of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the health and economic well-being of the people of the United States and other nations; and

(B) to design a mechanism for delivering compensation from the Government of the People's Republic of China to all affected nations for the harm caused by its decision to hide the emergence and spread of COVID–19 during the initial weeks of the pandemic.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 27, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 27, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 27, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 27, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 27, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, January 28; further, that following the prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:32 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 28, 2021, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 28, 2021 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 2

Time to be announced
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 117th Congress, and the nomination of Denis Richard McDonough, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
TBA

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Kathleen Holland Hicks, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.
SD–G50

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Thomas J. Vilsack, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Agriculture.
SR–301

FEBRUARY 3

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 117th Congress, and the nomination of Gina Marie Raimondo, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce.
SR–325
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine data and analysis by the United States' and world's leading authorities on global climate trends from energy related sectors, focusing on where and how progress has been made in addressing climate change.
SD–G50
Committee on Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–106

2 p.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Michael Stanley Regan, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.
SD–106

FEBRUARY 4

10 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SR–325

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S157–S179

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 56–73, and S. Res. 17–18. **Pages S176–77**

Mayorkas Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Homeland Security. **Pages S171–76**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Wednesday, January 27, 2021, a vote on cloture will occur at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, January 28, 2021. **Page S171**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S171**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, January 28, 2021, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination; and that if cloture is invoked on the nomination, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, February 1, 2021. **Page S176**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S176**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S177**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S177–78**

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S179**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:32 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 28, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S179.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Peter Paul Montgomery Buttigieg, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Transportation.

NOMINATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Jennifer Mulhern Granholm, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Energy, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Stabenow and Representative Upton, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of the Ambassador, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, and to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Cassidy and Coons, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Denis Richard McDonough, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Klobuchar, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m. on Thursday, January 28, 2021.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Marcia Louise Fudge, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Cecilia Elena Rouse, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 1 p.m., Webex.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10 a.m., Thursday, January 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

At 1:45 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Thursday, January 28

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.