



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2021

No. 21

Senate

Due to the Senate being in session until 5:39 a.m. on Friday, February 5, 2021, the proceedings of the Thursday, February 4, 2021, Congressional Record and Friday, February 5, 2021, Congressional Record are hereby combined in the Friday, February 5, 2021, Congressional Record.

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty Redeemer, today, show our lawmakers Your unfailing love. Surround them with the shield of Your divine protection. Keep their steps on the right paths, providing them with wisdom to serve You and country faithfully. May they not hesitate to fulfill Your purposes.

Lord, guard them with Your omnipotence and fill them with the power of Your Spirit.

Arise, O Lord. Stand with those who seek to protect freedom. Let the smile of Your face shine on this land we love.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 5, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO ANN BERRY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I want to offer congratulations to longtime Senate staffer Ann Berry, who will soon be taking over the responsibilities of a very important job as Secretary of the Senate. This is a position that dates all the way back to April 8, 1789, 2 days after the Senate achieved its first quorum for business.

Ann's nomination was approved by the Senate yesterday afternoon, making her the first African American and only the eighth woman to ever serve in that position. It would be an understatement to say Ann knows the Senate well. She brings four decades of experience in the Senate to her new office, having worked with Senator LEAHY for many years, and, more recently, with Senator Jones from her home State of Alabama.

She is going to do a fantastic job helping the Senate through its day-to-day responsibilities, and I look forward to seeing her up here on the dais when she assumes her new title in a few weeks.

Once again, another ceiling has been broken, and we welcome Ann Berry as Secretary of the Senate.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, next, COVID. One year ago, the United States reported 11 confirmed cases of COVID-19. A few days later, a woman from California became the first American to die from this disease.

Today, those numbers stand at over 26 million Americans infected and over 450,000 Americans dead. Along the way, COVID-19 has turned life as we know it

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S413

upside down. It triggered the greatest economic emergency since the Great Depression, tens of millions of lost jobs, shuttered schools, collapsed businesses, and the greatest healthcare crisis since the Spanish pandemic flu.

Congress has come together on several occasions to pass important relief measures—measures that did a lot of good. They saved jobs and lives and businesses. But it has not yet been enough. The crisis is still with us. The economy has weakened. Everyday Americans are struggling with the basic costs of living, of necessities.

So today the Senate is going to take the next strong step forward in passing a rescue plan to lift the country out of a crisis and set it back on the path to normal. Starting this afternoon, we begin the process of debating amendments to the budget resolution. When that process is complete at whatever hour, we will vote on final passage and pave the way for Senate committees to begin crafting the rescue plan itself, in coordination with House committees as well.

The amendment process here today will be bipartisan, it will be open, and it will be vigorous. Democrats and Republicans alike will have the opportunity to share their ideas. We welcome that. Of course, what amendments our friends in the minority propose is entirely up to them.

Now, the Republican leader hinted yesterday that his conference is preparing several messaging amendments that they hope might score political points. That is fine. That is their right. But I sincerely hope our Republican colleagues approach our work today with the intention of having serious ideas considered, not using the debate over pandemic relief to sharpen ephemeral, partisan talking points. This should be a very serious debate, a very much needed debate. We are in one of the greatest crises America has ever faced. If there are good-faith amendments from the other side, we look forward to them.

What we can't do, however, is think small in the face of big problems. We cannot repeat the mistakes of the past. We cannot do too little. We cannot lock our country into a long and slow recovery. We must instead respond to the urgent needs in our country and chart a bold path back to normal.

We must make sure that our country and its citizens have the resources to survive the remaining months of challenge; that struggling businesses can access loans and grants; that State and local governments and, yes, Tribal governments are not forced to cut essential services and millions of essential employees; and that our doctors and medical workers can administer the vaccine as quickly and as widely as possible. That is how we get back to normal. That is how we survive the months in between until we get back to normal. And that is what this budget resolution and the rescue plan are all about.

IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, now on impeachment, a few weeks ago, I laid out the agenda for the Senate's opening few weeks: first, nominations; second, major legislation to rescue the American people from the continued effects of COVID-19; and third, an impeachment trial for Donald J. Trump.

The Senate has made steady progress on the first two agenda items, confirming several historic and exceptionally qualified nominees to President Biden's Cabinet.

Tonight, we will be voting on the budget resolution—the first step in giving the Congress the tools to pass a major relief bill.

On Tuesday, the Senate will begin to fulfill the third responsibility that I outlined: the second impeachment trial of Donald J. Trump for inciting a violent mob against the Capitol on January 6. They were right near all of us—right near all of us.

It has been nearly a month since the attacks on the 6th. Time will do its part to heal the scars left by that day, but we cannot allow it to dull our sense of responsibility for holding to account those who perpetrated and motivated the attack.

We were all witnesses to the events that day when a group of insurrectionists, White supremacists, and domestic terrorists fed a cavalcade of lies about the legitimacy of the American elections by the former President, told to come to Washington by the former President, whipped into a frenzy and directed toward the Capitol by the former President, invaded and desecrated this sacred temple of democracy with the intention of denying the counting of the electoral college vote—the final act in certifying the former President's defeat.

The horrors of that day may have faded for some, not for others. Many in this Chamber, staff, Senators, House Members, and House staff alike, still live through this every single day—every single day. So it has not faded for a lot of us. But as a country, even for those for whom it has faded, we cannot simply move on.

The U.S. Capitol Complex has been militarized, patrolled by the National Guard, surrounded by a fence to safeguard the people's house from the people themselves. Five people are dead. Just yesterday, we held a memorial service in the Rotunda of this building for a Capitol Police officer who was tragically killed during the attack.

There cannot be any healing without truth, without accountability. The idea that we should sweep this under the rug and move on—one of the greatest acts of perfidy against this government, against the American people in our grand 200-some-odd-year history—no sweeping under the rug.

So the trial will commence on Tuesday. Senators have already been sworn in as judges and jurors. The House managers have filed their brief. The former President's counsel have filed

their answer. The constitutional objection raised by some of my Republican colleagues has been completely debunked by more than 150 scholars representing the entire breadth of the political spectrum, including very prominent conservatives like Steven Calabresi, the cofounder of the Federalist Society.

We will move forward with a fair and speedy trial. The House managers will present their case. The former President's counsel will mount a defense. Senators will have to look deep into their consciences and determine if Donald Trump is guilty and if so, ever qualified again to enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

We will pass judgment, as our solemn duty under the Constitution demands, and in turn, history will judge how the Senate and each Senator responds.

STUDENT LOANS

Madam President, now on student loans, finally, later this morning, I will join several of my Democratic colleagues from the House and Senate to reintroduce our proposal to cancel up to \$50,000 in Federal student loan debt, a life-changing measure—life-changing—for Americans struggling to stay afloat during this pandemic and secure financial independence.

For tens of millions, especially people of color, college education has represented the surest path to the middle class, but now that often means taking on a mountain of debt that can take decades to pay off. It makes it harder to own a home, save for retirement, and provide a better life for loved ones. In the midst of a once-in-a-century crisis, these Americans need relief fast. College has always been the ladder up. For too many, it is now an anchor weighed down by huge amounts of debt they almost can never see repaid in full.

I look forward to joining Senator ELIZABETH WARREN, as well as Representatives ADAMS, OMAR, and JONES, this morning to present our plan for student loan debt cancellation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

S. CON. RES. 5

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, this pandemic hit our Nation with compounding layers of crisis. American families have faced a health crisis, a jobs crisis, a small business crisis, an education crisis, and, frankly, a social

and community crisis—all piled on top of one another.

In response, Congress has built the largest Federal response to any crisis since World War II—by far. In the last 11 months, we have passed five major bipartisan rescue packages that sent about \$4 trillion to fight the virus and to help American families.

For context, total net spending by the entire Federal Government back in 2019 was \$4.4 trillion. We have borrowed and spent almost as much fighting COVID-19 as the Federal Government spent on everything in 2019. Our national debt is now larger than the size of our entire economy for the first time since World War II.

This crisis has been historic. So has the Federal response. The American people deserve for the conversation about the next steps to begin with them and their needs—not partisan rush jobs, not talking points. We need to start with the needs of our country. The most recent package, another \$900 billion, was literally passed 6 weeks ago—just 6 weeks ago.

Let's talk about, then, where we are right now. On the health front, we have come through a terrible year. We have lost more than 450,000 Americans and counting. But our healthcare heroes held the line. The genius of science plus Operation Warp Speed produced vaccines in record time. The science and Operation Warp Speed produced vaccines in record time. This administration's stated goal of 1 million shots per day is exactly the pace they inherited from the prior team.

As we speak, nearly half of the money Congress has sent for testing and about two-thirds of our funding for vaccine distribution is still in the pipeline. That money has yet to be spent.

Let's talk about jobs. Last year, States had to take one of the best job markets in American history, with layoffs and firings at 20-year lows, and literally slam on the brakes to protect public health.

We spent historic sums to soften that blow. Two waves of direct payment hit families' bank accounts. Multiple rounds of the Paycheck Protection Program have helped small business workers stay employed. We passed and extended extra Federal jobless benefits. As a result, even as economic production fell last year, total personal income actually went up. We saw the largest annual increase in disposable income in almost 40 years. Household savings have shot up. Things are even looking up in the service sector, where literally yesterday a key measure of optimism hit a 2-year high.

There is no doubt that some families are still struggling. This isn't finished, but experts agree the remaining damage to our economy does not require another multitrillion-dollar, nontargeted bandaid.

Then there is education. Temporary emergency measures have sadly become an enduring new normal for our students, parents, and teachers as well,

but, again, the horizon looks bright. Mounting evidence confirms that in-person schooling is remarkably safe with smart and basic precautions.

Let me say that again. The Biden administration's own scientists say school can be quite safe and kids should be back in person. Dr. Fauci says:

We need to try and get the children back to school. It's less likely for a child to get infected in the school setting than if they were just in the community.

The new CDC Director, Dr. Walensky, says:

I . . . want to be clear that there is increasing data to suggest that schools can safely reopen, and that safe reopening does not suggest that teachers need to be vaccinated . . . [as] . . . a prerequisite.

These experts are not looking at hypothetical data conditioned on Congress pouring even more huge sums into schools. They are describing the science right now. They are describing the science right now.

Just 6 weeks ago, Congress sent another huge sum to help schools. It brought the total for K-12 to about \$68 billion. As of the latest update, only \$4 billion of the 68 had been spent. Ninety-four percent of the K-12 funding we have already provided is still in the pipeline, unspent.

So our Nation stands at a turning point on all these fronts. A dark year is in the rearview mirror. Brighter days are already starting to dawn, and much of the groundwork for a strong recovery is already in place.

It will not serve Americans to pile another huge mountain of debt on our grandkids for policies that even liberal economists say are poorly targeted to current needs. It will not serve Americans to ram through a one-size-fits-all minimum-wage hike that CBO says would kill more than a million jobs for the most vulnerable workers, affect States unequally, and already has bipartisan opposition.

This is no time to send wheelbarrows of cash to State and local governments that simply, factually, do not need it. Nonpartisan economists say States and localities are already "well positioned to weather the storm," with "additional needs that are far less than the \$500 billion . . . in the Biden [plan]."

By the way, State and local tax receipts already fully rebounded—fully rebounded—in quarter three to their highest level in American history.

This is no time to ignore the science on school safety in order to chase moving goalposts from Big Labor and pour endless sums into school districts that unions will not allow to reopen.

If you combine the Democrats' new proposal with what just became law 6 weeks ago, the Democratic law plus this new proposal would dwarf the size of the CARES Act, which sustained the country through months of lockdowns.

This is not the time for trillions more dollars to make perpetual lockdowns and economic decline a little more palatable. Let me say that

again. This is not the time for trillions more dollars to make perpetual lockdowns and economic decline a little more palatable. This is the time to focus on our smart, targeted bridge to the day when we end this chapter and win this fight.

Notwithstanding the actual needs, notwithstanding all the talk about bipartisan unity, Democrats in Congress are plowing ahead. They are using this phony budget to set the table to ram through their \$1.9 trillion rough draft.

Last year, the Democratic leader kept saying we need a true, bipartisan bill. He said: "Sitting in your own office, writing a bill, and then demanding the other side support it is not anyone's idea of bipartisanship." That was the Democratic leader last year. Well, that was then; this is now. Now Democrats reject the bipartisan approach that built all five of our historic COVID packages. All five of them were bipartisan.

So let's hope President Biden remembers the governing approach he promised and changes course. In the meantime, if we are to debate this phony, partisan budget, we will create some clarity for the American people. We are going to put Senators on the record.

Expect votes to stop Washington from actively killing jobs during a recovery, like terminating the Keystone Pipeline; that job-killing, one-size-fits-all minimum-wage hike; and whether to bar tax hikes on small businesses for the duration of this emergency.

Expect votes that would help target this plan towards Americans' needs, issues like stimulus checks for illegal immigrants, pouring money into schools where unions are blocking reopening, and the commonsense step of delaying new spending until existing funds have actually gone out the door.

We will see what this resolution looks like on the other side and what signals Democrats send to the American people along the way.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

DREAM ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, someday I will write a book—maybe—and one of the topics that I have thought of, because I spent most of my adult life in the world of legislating, is what motivates or inspires the idea to introduce a bill that might one day become a law.

I think many people would be surprised at what the motivation could be. For example, on health issues, I have found Members who were inspired because of the knowledge of someone in their family or a friend who went through a challenge with a medical

condition and asked them if they would help in the field of research. Of course, many bills come to us from constituents who contact us and have problems and challenges, and we realize the only real recourse is a change in the law. That is the case with the bill I am introducing today.

It was 20 years ago that we got a phone call in my office in Chicago, and a woman who was the director of a music program in the city of Chicago asked for some help. The program is known as the MERIT Music Program, and a very kind lady left some money to the program with the instruction that it should be used to teach students—low-income family students—in public schools how to play a musical instrument and to actually buy the instrument for them.

It has been spectacularly successful. And, of course, we learned that many students, if they take up music, turn out to be not only musicians but very good students.

The MERIT Music Program has quite a history. Well, they called and told us 20 years ago that they had an amazing young woman who was part of the MERIT Music Program, who had started playing the piano at the age of 12 and was nothing short of a phenomenon. She had applied for music schools that she might attend, and the major music schools—like Juilliard and Manhattan Conservatory of Music—had expressed an interest.

They had run into a problem, though, because when she filled out the application form and they asked for her citizenship status. She said, unfortunately, that she didn't know what it was, and her mother said: Why don't we call Senator DURBIN's office?

And that is how we got into the picture.

Her name was Tereza Lee. Tereza Lee was Korean American. She was brought to the United States on a visitor's visa at a very early age, at the age of 2, to Chicago. And when the visa expired, no effort was made to renew it or to file any papers with the Federal Government.

She was a classic case of the undocumented alien. Her parents, some of whom were here legally, and her siblings, some of whom were citizens, did not spare her the problem that she faced in determining her own status, and that is why they called us.

We learned that, even though she was 17 or 18 at the time and had been in the United States all of her life that she could remember, she did not have legal status. And the law said that Tereza Lee, at the age of 17, had to leave the United States for 10 years and apply to come back in legally.

I couldn't believe it when I heard it. My staff told me that they didn't know what to tell her to do, and I soon realized the only thing to do was to change the law and to give to young people brought here as infants and toddlers and babies and young kids a chance to become legal in America. That is why

20 years ago I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act was for Tereza Lee.

I am going to interject here part of the story because I always forget to tell the happy ending. Tereza Lee ended up applying to music school in New York. She was accepted, and she went to school because of the kindness of several families in Chicago who were so impressed with her talent. She finished the 4 years of education at that music school and was so good that she played in Carnegie Hall and then married an American-born jazz musician in New York.

She is now the proud mother of three children. She is a music teacher herself and an American citizen, by virtue of her marriage to the other musician.

Tereza was the first Dreamer, but there were many just like her who didn't have as much luck. They are still in a suspended animation status when it comes to immigration and citizenship. So for 20 years on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I have introduced this bill and told the stories of the Dreamers.

I think I have gotten through to a number of people because the word "Dreamer" now really signifies more this citizenship status than anything else. I joke that when I first started this mission, if you were to ask people who were the Dreamers, older folks would have said: Why, that is a British rock group, with a fellow named Freddie who is the lead singer. But today when you mention the word "Dreamers," people automatically think of these young people and their situation in the United States, which, to this day, because of our failure to pass the Dream Act, is still unresolved.

They came to the United States as kids. They are American in every way. They went to our schools, and they stood up every morning and put their hand over their heart to pledge allegiance to that flag—the only flag they have ever known. They thought they were just like the kids next to them, and then one day, the parents sat down and told them the reality.

They go to school with our kids. We see them in church. We know that they stand by the beds of our neighbors and relatives who are fighting COVID-19. We know that they are injecting life-saving vaccines in the arms of our parents and loved ones. And they are giving back to America as teachers, nurses, engineers, and soldiers, but they are not citizens of the United States.

Today, I will once again reintroduce the Dream Act with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, Republican from South Carolina, as my cosponsor. I want to thank him for doing this and making it a bipartisan effort. We have a long history of working together—though we disagree on many things, but on this issue, we believe that Congress has an obligation to fix our broken immigration system.

It was, as I mentioned, many years ago that I introduced the bill, but it

was 11 years ago that Republican Senator Dick Lugar, of Indiana, on a bipartisan basis agreed to call on President Obama and ask him to do what he could do to protect these young people from deportation. President Obama created the DACA Program. The DACA Program meant that these young people came forward, identified themselves, paid a substantial fee, went through a criminal background check and a national security check, and, if approved, were given a 2-year renewable protection from deportation and a 2-year renewable right to work.

More than 800,000 of these Dreamers came forward and received the protection of DACA. It unleashed their full potential. I can tell you over and over and over again, they will say to me: DACA changed my life; I finally thought I had a chance to be part of America.

And so they became soldiers and teachers and business owners and everything imaginable.

In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, more than 200,000 DACA recipients are essential infrastructure workers. That is not my term. That is the definition of the Department of Homeland Security under President Donald Trump.

Among these essential workers are 41,700 DACA recipients in the healthcare industry: doctors, intensive care nurses, paramedics, respiratory therapists—all of them in a suspended immigration status because the Dream Act is still a bill and not a law.

On September 5, 2017, former President Trump repealed DACA. Hundreds of thousands of these Dreamers faced losing their work permits and being deported.

Last summer, the Supreme Court rejected President Trump's effort to end deportation protection for Dreamers. In an opinion—an amazing opinion—by Chief Justice John Roberts, the Court held that President Trump's attempt to rescind Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, known as DACA, was "arbitrary and capricious."

In one of his first official acts—I can't thank him enough—President Biden signed an Executive order on January 20 to restore DACA. I want to thank him from the bottom of my heart for making DACA one of his highest priorities.

Without DACA, hundreds of thousands of talented young people who have grown up in our country cannot continue their work and are at risk of deportation to countries they barely remember, if they remember at all. But the resumption of DACA is just the first step toward justice for Dreamers. Only legislation by Congress can provide a path to citizenship for Dreamers.

We know now that there are still efforts under way to eliminate DACA protection in the courts of America. A recent case in Texas is a reminder that a law has to pass.

I am honored that I have a chance to serve as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee in this new Congress.

As the child of an immigrant, I never dreamed that I would have this opportunity to lead the committee in the Senate that writes our Nation's immigration laws.

To all of the Dreamers out there, let me tell this: Passing the Dream Act is still my highest legislative priority.

There was a fellow named Jack Valenti who worked for LBJ years ago, and he used to say: "Every good speech has six words in it." And so he told me those words, and they are these: "Let me tell you a story." I have come to the floor of the U.S. Senate to tell the story of the Dreamers 128 times.

Today, I want to tell you about Ana Cueva. She was born in Mexico and came to the United States when she was 5 years old. She grew up in Utah. What a student—she was president of the National Honor Society at her high school, graduated in the top 10 percent of her class, and volunteered at local hospitals in her junior and senior years.

Ana's dream? She wanted to become a nurse. Ana wrote me a letter, and here is what she said about her dream:

My mom became very sick. She required emergency surgery for a brain tumor. It was one year after arriving to the U.S., so her English was [very] limited. After her recovery, she has always said the nurses who cared for her were kind and patient. Even though they couldn't communicate very well, they touched her very deeply.

Ana said:

I wanted to do for others what these nurses did for my mom.

Driven by that commitment, Ana earned an associate's degree and a bachelor of science in nursing at Utah Valley University. Thanks to DACA, she became an ICU registered nurse. Most of her nursing career has been in her home State of Utah, but during the COVID-19 pandemic, she has become a travel nurse and has worked in California, Massachusetts, Idaho, and Texas.

Here is what Ana said about the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic:

My soul aches. I have seen more people die in the past year than my five years [before] as a nurse. I have held more hands as people passed away alone and cried with families through FaceTime and on the phone. I became numb for a short while [there]. But as I find myself again, I remembered why I do what I do.

I want to thank Ana for her service on the frontlines of the coronavirus pandemic. She is a health hero. She is an immigrant health hero. She is the face of DACA.

She has put her life at risk and her family at risk to protect others. She should not also have to worry about whether she is going to be deported and her family ripped apart.

So some people think we would be a stronger country if Ana Cueva would leave: Go back to Mexico; you are not one of us. We have numbers of immigrants we can accept each year, and you are not in that number. You are illegal, you are undocumented.

What a loss that would be. If we lose Ana and people like her in the middle

of a pandemic, what would we be thinking? The fight is on for Ana and for hundreds of thousands just like her who simply want a chance to earn their way to legal status and citizenship in the United States of America.

It would be a tragedy for us to turn away these brave, talented, and determined professionals in the midst of this pandemic. So we have to get to work in the Judiciary Committee and on the floor of the Senate. This is the year. This is the time when we can come together and make a difference in the future of America.

To Ana, we need you. We want you. We want to make you part of the future of this country because you are such an important part of America today. This Dream Act means a lot to me. We need to make it the law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in his victory speech and in his inauguration address, President Biden pledged to be a President for all Americans. He said:

I pledge to be a President who seeks not to divide, but to unify. Who doesn't see Red and Blue states, but a United States. And who will work with all my heart to win the confidence of the whole people.

He reiterated that sentiment at his inauguration stating:

On this January day, my whole soul is in this: Bringing America together. Uniting our people . . . uniting our Nation.

It is a sentiment that I honor. As I said the day after the inauguration, if President Biden can truly be a President who governs for all Americans and who respects all Americans and who works to win the confidence of the whole people, he will have done our Nation a great service.

But it is not enough to talk about unity. It has to be matched with action. Too many of the President's actions so far have been more calculated to appeal to the far-left wing of the Democratic Party than to unite Americans. In his 2 weeks in office, the President has signed off on a long list of Executive actions, many of which read like a wish list of leftist priorities.

In a nod to the far-left environmental wing of the Democrat Party, the President issued a new moratorium on oil and gas leasing on Federal lands and called a halt to the Keystone XL Pipeline, even though we are a long way from significantly reducing or eliminating our need for oil and natural gas.

Domestic oil and gas production is essential to maintaining an affordable and reliable energy supply here at

home. Halting new oil and gas drilling could jeopardize the stability of other affordable energy supply and will definitely jeopardize American jobs supported by this industry.

As for the Keystone XL Pipeline, stopping this project—which I would point out is well underway—is nothing more than a symbolic gesture. America will still need reliable sources of oil, and a modern pipeline is a cleaner way to transport.

Keystone XL has been through multiple exhaustive environmental reviews, and, on top of that, its builder has committed to fully offsetting its operations with \$1.7 billion in renewable energy purchases. The oil trains, trucks, and other pipelines still moving crude oil today aren't doing that. In fact, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, a staunch liberal, included the pipeline in Canada's clean energy plan.

It is also worth noting, in addition to eliminating an environmentally responsible means of transporting oil, canceling the pipeline project will cost thousands of jobs, which is particularly unfortunate given the many jobs that have been lost during this pandemic. On day one of his Presidency, President Biden effectively fired 2,000 pipeline workers and told another 9,000 never to show up.

Then, of course, there is the President's order halting construction of the border wall on our southern border. The Biden administration has plans for sweeping immigration reform but does not seem to be placing much of an emphasis on border security. Instead, they have reduced the wall to a symbol of the Trump administration and chosen to satisfy immigration activists by halting construction without offering adequate alternate ways to secure our borders against the flood of illegal immigration or drug and human trafficking and other criminal activity.

Then, of course, there is the President's decision to overturn the Mexico City policy, which prevents taxpayer dollars from being used to fund abortions in other countries. The majority of Americans do not believe in unrestricted abortion. A new poll released last month showed a majority of Americans do not want their tax dollars going to fund abortions, yet the President has acted to ensure that American tax dollars can go to fund overseas abortions whether Americans want them to or not.

In addition, this administration has given every sign that it intends to pursue a radically pro-abortion agenda that is out of step with the views of the majority of Americans.

Last week, the New York Times published an editorial urging the President to slow down the Executive orders and to embrace policymaking. The Times correctly pointed out that permanent legislation on issues like immigration is better for the country than wild policy shifts between administrations, and the Times urged the President to focus

less on Executive orders and more on legislating.

The editorial noted the President's pledge to seek unity and that on the campaign trail he "often touted his skill at finding compromise, and his decades as a legislator, as reasons to elect him over Mr. Trump."

Now is the time for the President to show that he does really mean to live up to his inaugural pledge and to unify our Nation. That means not just talk, but action. It means working with lawmakers of both parties to develop legislation, not pushing exclusively Democrat measures. It means urging Democrat congressional leaders to actually negotiate with Republicans instead of trying to force through an agenda that lacks the support of half or more of the country. It means focusing less on checking off the priorities of the far left and more on actually representing the views of the majority of Americans.

The President has a chance to genuinely unify our Nation, but he will have to decide whether or not he wants to take it.

S. CON. RES. 5

Mr. President, yesterday, I came down to the floor to talk about Democrats' decision to pursue a partisan budget resolution designed to pave the way for a partisan COVID relief measure, despite the fact that Congress has produced five—five—prior COVID relief packages and appropriated trillions of dollars on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis.

Republicans put forward several ideas to improve the measure: an amendment to protect small businesses hit hard by the pandemic from sudden tax increases; an amendment to ensure that schools actually open, especially after teachers receive the vaccine; an amendment to ensure that States deal honestly and transparently with the tragic COVID deaths that had happened at certain nursing homes; an amendment to protect healthcare workers who travel to other States to help during the pandemic from getting surprise tax bills from those States as a thank-you note.

I would like to think the Democrats would support some of these amendments. My amendment to protect healthcare workers is based on legislation I advanced that has received strong bipartisan support, although it has been opposed by a handful of States, like the Democratic leader's, that aggressively tax mobile workers.

So far Democrats have not shown much of an inclination to entertain Republican ideas, no matter how much they would help address the effects of the pandemic. Democrats have indicated that they may allow a handful of amendments that enjoy some Republican support, but that doesn't change the essentially partisan character of this undertaking, which is designed to allow Democrats to pass the legislation that they want on an entirely partisan basis.

Will we see political amendments on the floor during this process? Sure, we will, from both parties.

Democrats have chosen a political maneuver instead of seeking to replicate the bipartisan success we had with COVID bills like the CARES Act. We did five—five—COVID bills while we were the majority at the 60-vote threshold, which is required for most legislation here in the Senate, but with bipartisan support. Here we are in a purely partisan legislative exercise on the floor of the U.S. Senate. So yes, Republicans will offer some political amendments, but we will also offer COVID-related amendments the Democrats should support if they truly want to deliver help to those in need.

It is deeply disappointing that Democrats are heading down this partisan path. If they really wanted to govern for all Americans, they would work with Republicans to pass yet another bipartisan COVID bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to support the budget resolution and to underscore the need for us to keep moving forward on helping the American people during this pandemic.

It is clear to me from the people of the Northwest that we have to do more to help them, whether it is vaccines, more PPE equipment, helping our small businesses continuing to move through this process. It means helping to also understand individuals most hard-hit by the pandemic and sectors of our economy most hard-hit. It means helping to put kids back into school. It means making sure that we fund the E-rate Program and do more on broadband. And it also means we have to avoid more layoffs, if possible, to help make sure Americans have jobs to pay the bills at home.

I hope that we can find a bipartisan compromise and move forward on these. There are issues that we have been able to do in the past two COVID packages to get bipartisan support. I hope that our colleagues will continue to look for those paths, but we have to keep helping the American people within the Congress's jurisdiction.

I know some of my colleagues from the committee are going to come out here and talk today. We have really focused on the issues of our transportation sector and how hard-hit our transportation sector has been.

I know that people see today's headlines even about airlines that are issuing furlough notices as part of their requirement to do so. But when we have these furlough notices, basically, what you are doing is you are disrupting our transportation delivery system. People who end up getting furloughed end up having to set retraining and reestablish before they can go back to the sector.

We want to keep our transportation sector moving because, obviously, the

movement of goods and services of people is critical to delivering on the pandemic and to helping our economy not suffer even greater economic impact.

We have seen how important the transportation sector is. We have seen even recently out in the West how our dockworkers, the ILWU and others, have suffered major infection rates of COVID, and this now starts to threaten our delivery of goods and products through those systems. We need to do more to get them vaccines and to make sure that we are moving Americans' products through our ports as well.

I want to talk about the fact that the aviation sector represents 5 percent of our GDP. That is 11 million jobs and \$1.6 trillion in economic activity. The aviation sector is important to us, overall, and continuing to maintain our competitiveness there and to grow the economy of the future is very critical. That is why we continue to work for and look for ways to keep the aviation system going during the pandemic and why we are continuing to move the support for airlines in this package. Congress has twice acted to provide critical relief to airline workers, pilots, mechanics, flight attendants, and we will continue to do so as part of this budget reconciliation.

As I mentioned, avoiding furloughs keeps highly skilled pilots and crew members trained and ready to go as part of the transportation sector.

As we have seen with this economy, we are now—I think the sector is back to almost 40 percent of where it was prior to the pandemic. Helping to preserve that commerce and trade has helped our economy and our U.S. airports, which also have been impacted by this and have had continued economic losses, and we want to help them with moving forward on this plan.

We also want to work on a bipartisan basis to do more to help aviation manufacturing that has been greatly impacted by this. The aviation aerospace sector has lost so many jobs, and there are hundreds of thousands more at risk.

I know my colleague from Kansas and my colleague from Virginia, Senators MORAN and WARNER, have been working on a proposal. We certainly want to continue to work on a bipartisan basis to make sure that as much of the aviation workforce can keep going, so as we return to the very competitive environment of aviation, we have a workforce that is skilled there to do it.

We also have to do more to help Amtrak. The revenues of ridership dropped 97 percent compared to the 2019 ridership, and Amtrak has been forced to furlough over 2,000 employees. It has had to cut essential services on long-distance and State routes. Trust me. My colleagues from Montana, Senator TESTER and Senator DAINES, have brought these issues up. Without additional relief, essential services that connect rural communities will be cut further. I can tell you, in Montana,

where people go to see Glacier National Park and the wonders of that great State, having this essential service is key.

We don't want do more damage to the economy, as we continue to deal with the pandemic, by underinvesting in the infrastructure that has to keep operating to help our economy. So I am going to continue to work with our colleague Senator WICKER in his efforts on Amtrak and continue to move forward.

Also, I know of the impact of transportation on the State budget that we have seen. In the State of Washington, for example, there is a whole list of projects that is now going to be delayed—projects that are not finished, are not done—just because of the loss of revenue from ridership and transportation. So our transportation infrastructure needs to be kept going, and the workforce that keeps it going needs to be supported. This is going to be a key aspect of the next budget reconciliation package and what we are going to work on.

I hope our colleagues can understand how important this is to our economy and how important it is to the men and women who serve in the transportation sector. If I could just say, there are so many people in the transportation sector that just went and did their jobs. We have lost lives in aviation. We have lost lives in transit. We have lost lives with dockworkers. People have just showed up to continue to do their jobs, so we need to do better by passing this package and giving them support, more vaccines, more equipment, and more support in funding so we can keep Americans working in jobs but working safely. That is what this next package will be about.

I yield to my colleagues who are going to talk about other priorities within this particular sector. I see my colleague from New Mexico on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. President, the funding provided in the American recovery package is critical to New Mexico's students, workers, and families.

Among many measures important to New Mexicans, the budget resolution provides emergency funds to close the homework gap for K-12 schools and libraries, including those on Tribal lands. It provides emergency funding for our rail and air infrastructure, including maintaining essential air service in rural areas and passenger rail throughout the Southwest. It includes emergency grant funding to support local newspapers and broadcasters, who continue to provide fact- and evidence-based reporting on local and national issues as advertising revenues plummet.

New Mexico faces a digital divide, and the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated existing disparities between the students who have broadband access and the one in four who don't. Failing to address these disparities

risks widening the homework gap and making it harder for students, especially those living in rural and Tribal communities, to catch up. The budget resolution under consideration does right by students, not only by helping them survive the public health emergency but also by thriving long term.

By providing emergency funding for rail and air infrastructure, it also saves jobs and communities in New Mexico. Our small airports and rail stations are hubs of commerce that connect rural New Mexico with markets across the United States and the world. As a new member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am ready to get to work and get the job done on these New Mexico priorities.

What Congress is working toward today—providing essential support to help fight and recover from the coronavirus pandemic—matters little if those most in need do not trust in America's institutions enough to benefit from this support. That is why I am particularly proud of the resolution's support for local journalism. With this resolution, Congress has an opportunity to help our students, protect jobs and businesses, and fulfill our moral duty. The Senate must do everything in its power to provide the tools for the American people to recover and to rebuild.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am here to emphasize just how important this budget resolution is to unlocking opportunity for millions of children across our country. I am here to shine a bright light on a problem that predates the coronavirus but that has been severely exacerbated by the ongoing pandemic. I am speaking about the homework gap experienced by as many as 12 million children in the United States, who, right now, today, nearly a year into this public health emergency, still do not have internet access at home and are unable to participate in online learning.

This is a national disgrace, and it is going to come back to haunt our Nation for a generation. Children should not be missing the third grade because they are not connected. They should not be missing the fifth grade. They are going to pay a huge, long-term price because of that lack of connectivity. Before the pandemic, these students were at an educational disadvantage already because they could not complete homework assignments that required internet access after class, but, today, the problem is exacerbated with most schools being closed and household kitchen tables becoming virtual classrooms during the pandemic. Even as we try to safely reopen schools in the weeks and months ahead, distance learning is not going away both because of the continuing health crisis and the need to make up for severe learning loss during these past 11 months.

The bottom line is that, if a young student has no internet connection or device, she cannot learn. That means that those 12 million students in America, right now, without connectivity, who are disproportionately from communities of color, low-income households, and rural areas, are falling further behind in their studies every single day that this pandemic continues.

There is no reason the country that invented the internet cannot provide it to children who need it to learn and to develop. We as a society simply cannot allow an 8-year-old to miss the third grade because she does not have the internet at home. These vulnerable students are no longer facing just a homework gap; they are facing a learning gap, and it will likely become an opportunity gap for the rest of their lives because those opportunities come from a good education. To close this gap and correct this educational injustice, we must immediately connect these students to the internet. Given its history and success, it is just common sense that we use the E-rate Program as a guide to connect students where they are currently learning—at home.

The E-rate, which already connects schools and libraries to the internet, is a trusted program, deliberately designed to require an equitable distribution of funding to our most vulnerable communities, urban and rural, blue and red. I created the program more than two decades ago, and it has since invested more than \$52 billion in the educational connectivity for children, especially in the poorest communities, and that has unleashed another \$50 billion. From the State and local levels, which is \$100 billion from that E-rate Program that I authored out of the House of Representatives in 1996, it is still the greatest educational technology program in the history of our country.

It has led to the deployment of this technology on school desks at the same rate for poor children as rich children. That is the first time that has ever happened. Yet, today, there is a gap because many of these children—millions of them—do not have it at home. That is the gap. In many instances, it is not a digital divide; it is a poverty divide that is leading to this crisis. It is a poverty divide. Because their parents cannot afford the connectivity and because they cannot have this service for their children, we are going to see an absolute disgrace which will befall our country when we look back and see what has happened to these kids.

That is why we need in this reconciliation package billions of dollars which are going to be included. We have to make sure that the funding is there for every city, for every school system, for every parent to have a kid who is connected for as long as this takes, and we don't know how long it is going to take. Children are only 20 percent of our population, but they are 100 percent of our future, and, right now, we

are leaving behind millions of them who will have much less of an opportunity to be able to maximize their God-given abilities.

I am here to say that the one thing we must do this time, which the Republicans forced out of the package in December, is put the billions of dollars in in order to make sure that all children have access to the internet at home for their educational opportunities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am really honored to follow my colleague from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY, one of the premier founders—the father—of E-rate, who knows better than anyone how investment in online learning and connectivity can make a crucial difference in all of our lives—in the lives of seniors, in the lives of people who live in communities of color, and in other underserved areas of our country. Most importantly, it can make a crucial difference in the lives of schoolchildren. Most crucially, right now, the simple, stark fact about this pandemic is that it has locked out of classrooms millions of students around the country. We need to get those students back into the classroom, and it has to be done safely.

In the meantime, online learning is going to be critical for them. Yet substantial numbers—most especially in communities of color—lack the connectivity and the devices they need to open classroom doors. In many of those households, working parents simply can't be around to supervise their children. It is more than just the nuts and bolts of devices; it is learning about how to learn online, but at the very least, the nuts and bolts have to be there, and that is why this American rescue program is so critical to the lives and learning of these millions of students.

The simple fact is that this homework gap is no longer a gap—it is a chasm. The homework gap has turned into a homework chasm and a homework crisis that threatens to set back students by months and even more. The fact is, right now, students are estimated across the country to have lost 3 to 5 years. In communities of color, that loss may be even worse, and once students have suffered that loss in learning, catching up, overcoming it, and bridging that gap is very difficult and sometimes impossible to do, which is a lifelong potential setback for them.

We are, in effect, disadvantaging American education by allowing this homework chasm to continue.

The American rescue program provides a model—it provides money but also a model in how the homework gap can be bridged and the chasm avoided.

We have made a promise. America makes a promise to its students that the basics of education will be provided so they can have an equal chance at the American dream. We are failing to keep that promise.

Now, there is really nothing mysterious about how to bridge this gap. In fact, I am proud to say that my State of Connecticut has done it very significantly—I am tempted to say “has done it,” but nobody is perfect.

Connecticut has built a program called Everybody Learns at the initiative of our Governor, Ned Lamont, who has used Federal money from the CARES Act. We have used significant private philanthropy—for example, from Ray and Barbara Dalio, great citizens of the State of Connecticut, and their foundation, which has contributed mightily, particularly in the Hartford area, where the leadership of Mayor Luke Bronin has been absolutely critical. What they have done, very simply, is provide tens of thousands of tablets, the kind of devices that are necessary for students to connect, and they have provided hot spots so that students have that way of reaching the internet. No mystery—simply hard work and money. Most important, commitment.

I am asking my colleagues today for that same commitment to our Nation and to Connecticut, which needs to finish the job of connecting.

The Secretary of Education—or the nominee for that position—Miguel Cardona, knows very well the importance of online learning. He has championed it in Connecticut. Yesterday, he testified about it to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, and he is going to be a very steadfast advocate, a trusted champion for online learning. But he, too, needs the tools and the resources.

Think of it not as a spending item, not as a funding measure; it is an investment. It is an investment in the basics of devices and connectivity. It is an investment in our young people.

Connecticut has made that investment, and we should not be skimping or cutting corners on our young people. We should not be, in effect, short-changing them at this critical time when connectivity, broadband, online learning are really the lifeline for them.

Let's put them online with this lifeline and give them the ability to continue their education, even as the pandemic locks them out of classrooms. They may be physically no longer in person, but online, they can connect. If they are denied that online access, they will be truly locked out of learning, not just locked out of their classroom, and that would be a disgrace for this Nation.

I thank my colleagues for what I hope will be their commitment to continuing American teaching and education online during this unparalleled, uniquely painful and difficult time in our Nation's history. We can make it easier for students. We can save them the homework chasm and the homework crisis.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—TRIAL OF DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized, in relation to the pending impeachment trial of former President Trump, to print as Senate documents those documents filed by the parties to be immediately made available to all parties, and that at the conclusion of the trial, those documents be printed together as a Senate document.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

S. CON RES. 5

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to address the body today about the bill we are to take up and debate and advance this evening and about several different provisions that are of specific concern and interest to me, to the residents of the State of Delaware, and to our Nation.

Let me just remind all of us the moment that we are in. There are 26 million Americans who have been infected by COVID-19, a dread, deadly, global pandemic, and 445,000 Americans have been killed so far in this pandemic—far too many.

In my little home State of Delaware—just 900,000 people—we not too long ago passed 1,000 deaths, and, like many other States, we are racing to deliver vaccines and to address the economic and the human wreckage of this pandemic and the recession caused by the bungled mishandling of this pandemic by the now previous administration. I am encouraged because there is also a positive number: 34 million Americans have been vaccinated.

Delaware has been at the forefront of delivering vaccines quickly and safely, and now with President Biden and his team at the helm, they are pulling together the resources of our Nation—using the Defense Production Act to deliver needed PPE, testing capabilities, and vaccines to every corner of our country. They have a lot of work to do. They are behind because of some of the failures of the past, but I am excited by the promise of the future.

Yesterday, I had the honor of meeting with President Biden in the Oval Office for an hour first thing in the morning, and we talked about this pandemic and his plan, the American Rescue Plan, the \$1.9 trillion in badly needed relief that will touch almost every American family and move us quickly out of this pandemic and back toward growth and security, health and

prosperity. And his determination, despite all the back-and-forth about numbers—his determination, at the very core of what we do, is to keep in mind the middle class of this country, the folks who have been overlooked, underserved, and most disadvantaged. He is passionate about seeing the ways in which this pandemic has revealed the deep inequities in our country and making sure of how we respond to educational needs, to housing needs, to transportation needs, and to healthcare needs, that we combat the profound inequalities of our society and Build Back Better.

As Senator CARPER and I were sitting with President Biden, going over \$1,400 checks and this many months of unemployment extension and this much for housing and homelessness or this much for transit, he said: Wait, wait. Just remember at the end of the day, keep in your mind's eye a family—a plumber and a teacher with two kids at home, one of them laid off, desperately trying to pay their rent, trying to figure out how to pay their bills, trying to figure out how they can keep a roof over their kids' heads. Remember the people we are trying to help and serve.

I am reminded of Mark from New Castle, who called my office to tell me he had been laid off, and he was desperately afraid, that he was struggling because he was fighting cancer, a health condition, and fighting homelessness, concerned about losing his home. Fighting housing and homelessness, combating homelessness and ensuring security of housing has got to be at the center of how we respond to this crisis.

Economist Mark Zandi says there is \$57 billion in owed back rent unpaid. One of the best things we have done as a body is to extend the eviction moratorium that the CDC imposed last year. A key piece of the bill we are taking up and debating is to ensure that more Americans have an opportunity to safe, sanitary, decent, and affordable housing. Before this pandemic, more than 17 million American households spent more than half their money on rent or mortgage, unaffordable to any household—those 17 million households stretched to their limits. The pandemic has made the risk of eviction or foreclosure greater than ever.

Some know my early years were spent working around issues of housing and homelessness. I served with the National Coalition for the Homeless in New York and in five other States around the country, staying in homeless shelters in the late eighties, when homelessness was an explosion, a crisis across this country that impacted families and communities of all types and backgrounds.

People experiencing homelessness are particularly vulnerable to COVID-19. Homeless individuals infected are twice as likely to be hospitalized, four times as likely to need critical care, and three times as likely to die.

In Delaware, on Martin Luther King Day, as part of a service project, I got

a chance to visit the Hope Center. The Hope Center used to be known as the Sheraton. It was a hotel in foreclosure, and an innovative county executive used some of the CARES Act money that we provided federally to the State and local governments to buy it at auction and to reopen it as a source of 192 emergency housing rooms that can have up to 400 people in it. It was great to tour that center on Martin Luther King Day, to be part of those delivering personal items and material for those who are now resident at the Hope Center. But it is just one of many examples of how Federal resources we provided last year have been used creatively to help keep people in rental housing, in emergency housing, or in their homes.

The CDC Federal eviction moratorium was extended in the bill we passed in December, but it runs out in March; thus, the urgency of our acting. And President Biden's American Rescue Plan includes \$30 billion in emergency rental assistance and \$5 billion to prevent further outbreaks of COVID-19 among America's homeless population. We need to make this a key piece of this provision, an important part of this bill, and it is my hope we can find support on both sides, but if we don't, we must move forward.

Let me speak to two other topics before I yield the floor, if I might.

Those of us on the East Coast, and my colleague from Maryland and my colleague from New Jersey are certainly among them, travel by Amtrak frequently. Before this pandemic, Amtrak carried a record 32 million passengers just 2 years ago. But just like the airlines when the pandemic hit, it lost the vast majority of their passengers. So, too, did Amtrak and commuter rail all over our country. It has been a key piece of our society, our competitiveness, our interconnectedness for over a century, and there are millions who depend on it as their way to commute up and down the East Coast corridor in particular.

My office recently heard from Ken Potts, the Delaware representative for the Rail Passengers Association, about the urgent need for funding; and, frankly, this is a warning notice for those of us who don't realize that I-95, right as it goes through Wilmington, DE, is about to be shut down for most of the next 2 years on a generational repair project. There is going to be 100,000 people deterred off of the highway, and hopefully onto rail, but only if it can keep running.

There are 1,200 furloughed Amtrak employees on the east coast and other places around the country. Those are the folks I interact with on the days when I commute from Wilmington to Washington. I get a chance to talk to the staff, the conductors, the people who work at Union Station or in Wilmington's Joe Biden Station. Twelve hundred furloughed employees and families struggling, just like the airlines, every bit as deserving of relief,

and the budget resolution would allow for the \$2 billion over the course of this pandemic that they need. We have provided relief before. We need to provide relief in this bill and going forward.

As I mentioned in my opening, getting the vaccine distributed as quickly as possible is the most urgent thing before us. Last Saturday, I had the chance to volunteer for several hours at a vaccination site with Drs. Coker and Hockstein, put together at ENT & Allergy of Delaware. They vaccinated over 150 people, and they had connected to and reached out to some churches that I am familiar with and fond of—Seeds of Greatness, Bethel AME.

But we are under pressure because there are new variants of this virus emerging around the world. What viruses do is they mutate. Some of you know there are new variants from South Africa, from Brazil, from the UK that are more transmissible and, potentially, more deadly. So one of the things we have to keep an eye on is that we cannot close ourselves off from the world. Something that is missing from the Republican proposal and that is urgently needed that is in the Biden American Rescue Plan is \$11 billion to help with global vaccination relief.

I recently spoke with Strive Masiyiwa, a dear friend from Africa who is leading the African Union's plans for how to vaccinate the 54 countries on the Continent of Africa. Sure, the Russians have offered their Sputnik vaccine, which was not fully and transparently developed and tested. The Chinese are offering their vaccine. But what I believe the developing world would welcome with open arms, if we would just fund it and provide it, is the rapid scale-up, production, and manufacturing in countries like South Africa, India, and elsewhere of the tried, true, tested, scientifically sound vaccines made available by Pfizer, by Johnson & Johnson, by Moderna, by the Western companies like AstraZeneca and others that have shown that their vaccines are safe.

The United States has long been a leader in world health. We have inspired the world in the way in which we have brought our medical advances, our scientific capability, and our humanitarian commitment to the world. This should be another chapter in that long and great history.

And we must remember that no one in this world is safe from this pandemic until the entire world has been successfully vaccinated. If we do not contribute to the global vaccine campaign of COVAX, if we do not participate in the World Health Organization in meeting the needs of the developing world, it will simply come back to the people of the United States.

Of course, we must prioritize vaccinating our Nation, our people, Delawareans. But just as Joe Biden in the Oval Office earlier this week asked me to keep in my mind's eye that family sitting around a kitchen table, worried, struggling with finances, with their

health, with their future, we have to keep our eye on the horizon, on having passenger rail available to recover when our country recovers, on having housing and affordable housing options for families who are struggling with homelessness, and our eye on the horizon of the potential threat from the rest of the world of more dangerous variants, which is why we need to contribute to a global campaign to ensure that all of the world's people are safe from this pandemic.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to these three connected concerns, all of which touch on Delaware's families and our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, let me start by thanking my colleague from Delaware for outlining the urgency of the moment and reminding us that the United States is not an island; that we have to address these issues together. And I am pleased to see President Biden reasserting American global leadership on all sorts of fronts, including the healthcare front.

Mr. President, I come to the floor today to support the budget resolution that is before us. As our country together fights the COVID-19 health crisis and the economic fallout, more than 450,000 of our fellow Americans have died of COVID-19—200,000 more than the country that has experienced the next highest death toll. It is an unacceptable toll of suffering, and the economic fallout is painful as well.

Main Street is struggling. We have seen thousands of small businesses shuttered. Our students are facing an ever-widening education gap. Families are contending with mounting bills and food insecurity. It is a crisis that has upended every part of American life and which has disproportionately harmed working families, communities of color, our children, and the elderly.

I am glad that this Congress has been able to come together on a bipartisan basis before to deliver important emergency relief, but now is not the time to pat ourselves on the back and say we are done and throw in the towel. We need to go big, and we need to do it before it is too late, so we can beat this virus, get help to those who are hardest hit, and put our economy on the road to recovery. We must pass a package that meets the moment, and that is what the Biden proposal does: beating the pandemic by accelerating the delivery of vaccines and testing, helping to get our students back into school as fast as possible, and do it safely, and get our economy moving again—an economy that continues to suffer the wounds of the pandemic that has killed jobs and ballooned unemployment.

Right now, we are seeing a K-shaped recovery, a tale of two economies. Some people are bouncing back just great, like a V shape, but many others are flatlined or actually going further and further under. At the very top, the

wealthy are doing just great. The stock market had a good year in 2020. The S&P 500 went up 16 percent. But it is no secret that stock holdings are concentrated among the very elite and that almost half of all American households have no stock holdings at all, including in 401(K) or other retirement plans. So don't tell me that the country is doing well because the stock market is up because the stock market conceals the whole other economy.

Here is a little story that illustrates the point, which is that in Baltimore City, per capita income is roughly \$54,000, but if last year Jeff Bezos moved to Baltimore City, the average per capita income would be \$175,000. People struggling in Baltimore City would be no better off, but it would appear that way if you simply look at the averages.

So, as we look at these economic figures, let's remember that averages conceal the real hurt being experienced by so many people. In fact, over 18 million of our fellow Americans are relying on unemployment benefits right now to sustain themselves and their families, and that relief will begin to expire in mid-March if we don't act.

Four million Americans have been out of work and looking for a job for at least 6 months. The harsh reality is that the longer someone is unemployed, the harder it is for them to get a new job, and when they do, it is often at a much lower wage, and that lower pay then follows them for decades. That is the story of countless American families holding on today against the torrent of financial hardship.

So to those who claim "Don't worry. This is all going to blow over. Let's just delay our efforts to provide urgently required relief" or "Let's provide less," I say let's look at the hard facts.

If you look at the projections that just came out from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, they indicate that unemployment will remain above 4 percent until the year 2025 unless we do something different. That means that even after the last vaccine shot goes into the last arm, we may be caught in the wake of this economic down tow for years unless we act now.

So we shouldn't get complacent. We shouldn't look at those overall average numbers. We shouldn't look at the stock market. We should listen to the stories of people who are suffering, and if we don't act, they will be suffering for much longer than they have to. That is why it has been said that the risk is not that Congress might do too much but that we might do too little.

I remind my colleagues that we have been in this place before. Many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle have scar tissue from 2009. Remember, we were facing a financial meltdown that was taking the entire economy under, and here in the U.S. Senate at that time, then-President Obama was working to get a big economic relief package through. They

had plenty of Democrats—at least 57 Democrats were on board; a majority of this body—but needed just some Republicans to join in this effort. Well, what happened was that the proposal, the bold proposal, got negotiated down and down and down and then barely squeaked by the U.S. Senate.

Even after all that long, bipartisan negotiating, in the House of Representatives, not a single Republican Congressperson voted for that bill. So we ended up with a divided Congress and an inadequate recovery bill, and our Republican colleagues spent the next many, many years complaining that the economic recovery after the downturn had taken too long. It was the longest and slowest economic recovery in history, when if we had been permitted to go big and bold, we could have changed that trajectory.

That is why Secretary of the Treasury Janet Yellen said that now we have to go all in. She said:

Neither the President-elect—

This was her earlier testimony—

nor I propose this relief package without an appreciation for this country's debt burden. But right now, with interest rates at historic lows, the smartest thing we can do is act big. In the long run, I believe the benefits will far outweigh the costs, especially if we care about helping people who have been struggling for a very long time.

Even President Trump's former top economist, Kevin Hassett, supported that assessment and has said that if we don't act now, we could end up in a negative spiral for the economy.

The American public sees this very clearly. If you just look at recent polls, 70 percent of the American public is fully on board with President Biden's bold plan. That is reflected in a Quinnipiac poll that came out just today. The Navigator data said the same thing. The American public recognizes that we have to act big and we have to act now to make sure that we beat this pandemic and that we get our economy back on track just as soon as possible.

We all would like to have our Republican colleagues as partners in this effort. President Biden has made that very clear. But the overriding priority must be to meet the moment and take care of the needs of the American people. That is what the American people are telling us. I hope all of us will listen.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Federal Government has become too big and too expensive, and it has been this way for quite a long time. It is not without its impact. It has been borrowing and

spending far too much money and doing too many things even before the COVID-19 global pandemic, but this emergency has really shown how badly we need to return to some semblance of federalism, some semblance of Federal restraint with respect to what it does and particularly what it spends.

I say this because emergencies, national emergencies, will arise from time to time. It happens. And when those things happen from time to time, the Federal Government will need to expend some significant resources and borrow money. That is exactly why we should not be running multitrillion-dollar deficits at the top of the business cycle to begin with.

During a period of significant economic expansion, not a recession, we were already spending more than we had. It makes it much harder for us to respond, be nimble, and do the things we need to do. This has been a long-term problem because Washington, DC, has been centralizing political power and political decision making now for generations. It has not made the Federal Government more effective but, rather, weaker and less effective. It has made it slower, less nimble, more rigid, and inflexible.

We need to start turning policy in the other direction, localizing more decisions so all Americans in red States and in blue States alike, regardless of where they live, can live under policies that they are more likely to agree with. That is the beauty of federalism. It allows more Americans to have access to more of the kind of government they want and less of the kind of government they don't want.

That is the goal of the budget resolution amendments that I will be introducing this week. I will be introducing a number of amendments, and I will cite a few examples here.

First, I am going to propose an amendment to ensure that Congress's voice and the voices of our State governments are heard in the designation of national monuments.

Utah has been home to two significant, massive national monument designations over the last 25 years. One thing they both had in common was they were made contrary to the expressed will of local and statewide elected officials and Utah's congressional delegation at the time they were made.

These two monument designations in and of themselves are larger than two Delawares. Yet they were made without any input from Congress and without any input from the host State's legislature. The Antiquities Act currently allows this to happen. My amendment would propose that we allow the people's elected representatives in Congress and the affected State legislature to have input.

I will also be filing an amendment to ensure full funding for a program known as PILT. PILT is an acronym; it stands for payment in lieu of taxes. It is something very important to public land States like mine.

You see, the Federal Government doesn't pay property tax on land that it owns. In a State like mine where the Federal Government owns most of the land—two-thirds of it, in fact—it can be very difficult for many of our communities to survive because without that property tax revenue, they find it difficult to fund everything from schools to search and rescue operations, police and fire services, and so forth.

The Federal Government makes up for some of this through this payment program that is supposed to in some ways replicate the property taxes that the taxing authority would otherwise receive, and they call it payment in lieu of taxes. The problem is, they haven't accurately assessed the value of the land. My amendment would call for a more accurate assessment of the land so that these taxing jurisdictions can get what they need.

I will also be proposing a significant amendment to increase access of the American people to health savings account systems. HSAs, health savings accounts, do nothing to undermine the efficacy or the prominence of government-run healthcare systems. They do, however, do a lot of good for those who have them. They simply add a private option for American families who would like to make some of their own decisions about how they would like to spend their healthcare dollars. If they would like to spend more on nutritional supplements, they should be able to do that. If they would like to spend more on preventive care, they should be able to do that. HSAs give them the answer, and one of my amendments would expand their opportunities.

I will be offering an amendment to streamline the regulations under the environmental law known as NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act. NEPA has achieved significant environmental gains in this country, but it needs to be updated and modernized so as to make it easier for us to complete infrastructure and construction projects, which have become too slow and too expensive.

I have a number of other amendments, including one that would increase the child tax credit significantly in order to further diminish a little-known but pernicious aspect of our Federal Tax Code known as the parent tax penalty.

I will be introducing another amendment to increase the recognition and the credit that Americans receive for making charitable contributions—especially important during a global pandemic like this one.

I have another amendment protecting Americans' Second Amendment rights, one protecting religious freedom, and one dealing with gasoline tax, which I don't think should be increased, especially during difficult times like these and especially given the regressive nature of the fuel tax.

I have another amendment dealing with some legislation I have developed

called the PROMISE Act. This would help to make sure that interactive online providers—entities including but not limited to social media platforms—make clear what their standards are, what they will be doing to moderate speech on their platforms, for example, how they will be enforced, and gives them incentive, with possible penalties under law if they deceive their customers about what their policies are and how they will be enforced.

The bottom line here is that the Federal Government's size has not been making it stronger or more nimble or more effective; its size and its bureaucracy have undermined its work, from our COVID response to our entitlement crisis, to our dysfunctional welfare system, which, while intended to alleviate poverty and make it rare, has instead sometimes made it longer lasting.

Reform doesn't mean just doing the same exact things but spending a little bit less; it means modernizing and streamlining processes and devolving, where appropriate, certain government functions to State and local governments that are closer and more accountable to the people.

The way we serve the American people is not just by letting bureaucrats and politicians make decisions for them thousands of miles away in Washington, DC. The way we achieve true, effective government and fair government is by giving all Americans up and down the income scale and across the political spectrum the power to make their own decisions and to make them as locally as possible.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we all know, over the last year, coronavirus relief has dominated our work here in the Congress. To the surprise of some, Republicans and Democrats have worked closely together to bolster our response on both the public health and economic front so we can bring an end to this crisis as quickly as possible. Not surprisingly, there were some disagreements along the way—there always are—but both sides understood the importance of action and reaching a bipartisan deal.

Part of the reason was pure function. With a divided government, every piece of legislation involves compromise. You are forced to work with folks on the other side of the aisle to reach an agreement. That is a good thing because that is what it requires to reach the President's desk and earn the President's signature.

But the reasons for working together on COVID-19 relief are more than just the practical or functional requirements. Over the last year, I have spoken with countless Texans who have faced incredible challenges and dealt with unimaginable hardship. There are folks who have lost their jobs and have lost loved ones, who fought this virus on the frontlines in hospitals, and who have tried to support their communities throughout this crisis. I know

colleagues throughout the Chamber have heard similar stories from their constituents back home because every State and every community has been impacted by this virus.

Regardless of politics, we all realize this virus has taken a devastating toll on the American people, and we need to remain committed to providing relief. There have been big disagreements, of course, about the best way to do that, but in the end, if we share the same goal—to bring an end to this pandemic as quickly as possible and minimize the pain and suffering of the American people—we can figure out how to make this happen.

That common goal has led to five bipartisan relief packages that have represented the best ideas of each party.

None of these bills are perfect, but I am sure both sides will agree that, in the end, every COVID package that has been signed into law has received overwhelming bipartisan support. As a matter of fact, none of the bills have received less than 90 votes, and one passed unanimously. That is spending close to \$4 trillion. That is a remarkable, remarkable accomplishment.

In the beginning, President Biden appeared to agree that a continuation of this bipartisan approach was the best for the country. After all, his campaign was built on a theme of unity, and he has consistently talked with great eloquence about the need to heal our divisions and work together and compromise.

To his credit, he has met with a number of our Republican colleagues at the White House earlier this week to discuss what a compromise package might look like. Ordinarily, that would be seen as an encouraging development. We have a Congress with a record of bipartisan COVID-19 bills and a President who talks about the desire to broker deals that could win the support of both political parties.

But, unfortunately, what might seem like good news and a positive development really isn't because in the mix you have the Democratic leader, who is not on board with the President's call for unity and bipartisanship.

Less than 24 hours after the bipartisan meeting at the White House and just 15 days after the President's inauguration, the majority leader laid the foundation to pass President Biden's massive \$1.9 trillion package with zero Republican votes. They are not interested in doing the hard work it takes to build consensus. Rather than take the normal legislative process, which was used for each of the bipartisan bills that had previously passed, the Democratic leader is preparing to use the budget reconciliation process to pass this controversial legislation.

And please note: We passed a \$900 billion bill in December, and only 20 percent of the money that we appropriated is even out the door yet.

This is not the time to try to make political statements. This is the time to try to parse where the needs are and

to target those resources to the people who need them—not a time to pass your liberal outbox and agenda.

So, unfortunately, this reconciliation process is designed not to encourage bipartisanship, not to encourage negotiation, not to get bipartisan buy-in. In short, it is not designed to achieve unity at all—just the opposite.

Well, after spending almost a trillion dollars this December, just about a month ago—again, with only 20 percent of that money actually out the door and on the way to the people who need it—our Democratic colleagues are prepared to spend nearly double that amount when a huge portion of the previous funding hasn't even reached its intended target.

As of a couple of weeks ago, States had spent just \$4 billion of the \$68 billion we appropriated for K-12 schools—\$4 billion of the \$68 billion. And what do our Democratic colleagues want to do? They want to continue to shovel money out the door.

The CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, has distributed only about a third of the \$9 billion we have already appropriated for vaccine distribution—only a third. And then there are tens of billions of dollars in unspent funds for everything from COVID-19 testing to the Paycheck Protection Program. So it is hard for me to see—and I am sure I am not alone—the justification for spending tens of billions of dollars more in places where previous funding is still waiting to be spent.

There is also the question of whether the current funding is even serving its intended purpose. Federal funding has helped K-12 schools prepare for a safe reopening, and in Texas these have been used to update the ventilation systems, purchase masks and personal protective equipment, and make other investments in classroom safety.

But there are other school districts across the country that have gladly accepted that funding but have zero plan to reopen their schools to in-person education. They have capitulated to the teachers unions that have demanded that schools stay closed. Some have said they refuse to go back until all students are vaccinated—not all teachers but all students. There is not even a vaccine approved for people under the age of 16, but that is the demand of the teachers unions, who have showed zero interest in their students but a lot of self-interest.

Some of these districts have gladly accepted the funding to prepare for a safe reopening and, in many cases, have put their teachers at the front of the line for vaccines, but somehow the teachers unions are appalled at the idea that schools would actually use these tools to get children back in the classroom.

Before we pass another multitrillion-dollar spending bill and add to our rapidly growing national debt, we need to determine where the needs truly are and whether the teachers unions are on board with our goal to get children

safely back into the classroom, which is our goal.

I will not support a COVID-19 relief proposal that sends hard-earned taxpayer dollars to places where they already have billions that they haven't even spent yet. One great example is additional funding for schools. Our Democratic friends would provide \$130 billion more for K-12 education when there is still \$64 billion remaining from the money we appropriated in December. They want to spend \$130 billion more when there is still \$64 billion available to be spent.

Well, even that is a high number because the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, estimated that schools only needed about \$22 billion. In other words, they have almost three times more than they already need, according to the CDC, but our Democratic friends want to spend another \$130 billion.

I will be the first person to advocate for additional relief when and where it is needed, but this massive relief package creates more problems than solutions. I continue to believe that targeted relief bills are the most effective way to support our country without driving up unnecessary spending.

Somebody is going to have to pay this money back, and we shouldn't be frivolous about the way we spend it. If there is a need, let's do it. But if there is not a need, it is reckless and irresponsible to continue to shovel money out the door. If there is a need to reinvest in critical areas like unemployment benefits, the reopening of schools, vaccine distribution, or the Paycheck Protection Program, we can and we should replenish those funds through targeted proposals; and I would hope, as before, we would be able to proceed on a bipartisan basis.

While Senator SCHUMER is clearly on the warpath to get this massive relief to the Senate on a partisan vote, at least one of our Democratic colleagues has shown some hesitation about going along with his plan. Senator MANCHIN, the Senator from West Virginia, said this week he wouldn't vote for a COVID-19 package that wasn't bipartisan. I hope he will stick by his guns.

Congress has passed five overwhelmingly bipartisan COVID-19 bills last year. We have overcome disagreements before, and I have no doubt that we could, if we were to try, do so again.

This crisis has affected Americans in red States and blue States alike. It would be a shame for the Democratic leader to shut out half of this Chamber in an effort to claim a reckless win for his party.

We need to remember, just like the teachers who teach our students, they need to keep their focus on the children and on their education needs and their safety, and we need to keep our attention on our constituents and what their needs are and try to be responsive to their needs—not try to gain some partisan advantage at their expense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to address the budget resolution we are going to vote on later today. To be clear, this is a device that makes it possible, subsequently, to pass this massive blowout spending bill that President Biden has proposed and to do it on a strictly party-line vote. That is what this is all about.

It is disappointing at many, many levels, not the least of which is that, just 15 days ago, President Biden made an impassioned call for unity. He said: "This is our historic moment of crisis and challenge, and unity is the path forward."

Well, there is nothing about unity in this exercise. This is designed to be a partisan exercise. It is designed not to find common ground. It appears not to be informed by any objective measure of needs. The only organizing principle in this bill that I can figure out is the desire to spend a massive amount of money on things that aren't required.

Oh, and it is worse than that. It willfully ignores the adverse impact some of these policies are going to have.

Part of what is so maddening about this is we have demonstrated—up until now, anyway—that we can pass major bipartisan legislation. We have done it five times already—but no more. President Biden and the Democrats, who control the Senate and the House, don't want to pursue bipartisan legislation anymore. I guess those days are behind us for now, according to them.

But I would remind my colleagues of what a dramatic departure that is from what we have been doing about this COVID crisis. Back in March and April, when States shut down their economies and we went into a full-blown economic crisis, we responded with massive, bold legislation, the biggest of which, the March bill, had a huge category that was designed and, in fact, did replace lost income for people who, through no fault of their own, were out of work. It had a huge category to deal with healthcare expenses for hospitals, for vaccine development, for PPE—all kinds of healthcare-related needs.

And we had a set of provisions that were designed to provide liquidity, provide loans and funding for businesses so that they could survive and people would have a place to go back to work after this was behind us. We did that. Actually, we did five bills altogether, every one of them overwhelmingly bipartisan.

In the Senate, each of the five got over 90 votes. The biggest of them didn't have a single "no" vote. My point is, we have demonstrated we can pass big, bold, unprecedented legislation if people on both sides of the aisle want to work together. We did it five times last year.

But our Democratic colleagues don't want to pursue that anymore because they have a different objective in mind. By the way, the last of the five was the second largest of all time, a COVID re-

lief package of almost a trillion dollars, and it was signed into law 39 days ago. Literally, hundreds of billions of dollars of that money is still unspent, yet we are told immediately we need to get another \$1.9 trillion.

This is unbelievable. Part of the reason it is so unbelievable is that the economy is not in the same place today that it was in back in March or April—not even close. We were in a situation we had never been in before. We had shut down our economy. It was absolutely devastating—very, very scary.

Fortunately, in part because of our response, I think, we were able to avoid a depression, an extended disastrous period, and we have begun a robust recovery.

Consider some of the data. In April of last year, the unemployment rate hit almost 15 percent. Today it is at 6.7. Most economists didn't think we would get below 7 percent until the end of this year, 2021. We got below 7 percent back in October. We have 18 States in the Union that have employment rates below 5 percent.

After a devastating drafraft of our economy in the second quarter, the third quarter came roaring back. The third quarter of the economy grew by 33 percent. That was a long way towards recovering what we had lost in the second quarter—not complete—and the growth has continued. The fourth quarter grew by 4 percent. The CBO's economic outlook for this entire year is nearly 5 percent.

We have a strong recovery that is underway. Look, we are not there yet. We are not back to the tremendously booming economy we had just before the pandemic hit, but we do know that the vast majority of the economic pain that people are going through is concentrated in a handful of very hard-hit industries. It is hospitality, travel, entertainment. We know that. What we should be asking ourselves is, have we done what we need to do for these particular sectors and the people who are in these sectors who are hurting? But \$1.9 trillion for the entire economy?

I mean, think about this statistic: Total employee compensation in the second and third quarters of last year was down. That is not surprising, right? Total employee compensation was down because so many people were out of work. It was down by about \$215 billion. Government transfer payments to individuals was up by almost \$900 billion. That is more than four times the lost income. And now we are told we need another whole round of these universal so-called stimulus checks—checks that go out to everyone regardless of whether you actually had any lost income.

Well, it happens that personal income is actually higher today than it was before the pandemic hit. Disposable, real per capita income rose last year at the fastest rate since 1984. The personal savings rate is at an alltime high for most of 2020—the highest since 1974 now—and that is all before the bill

we passed 39 days ago that sends still more money to people. So I don't see the data that suggests we need yet another round of these universal stimulus checks, but in President Biden's bill that we are in the process of facilitating today, that is almost half a trillion dollars we are going to spend this way.

This money is not lying on the shelf, by the way; we are either going to print it, or we are going to borrow it from overseas. President Biden has pretty much admitted this is about fulfilling a campaign promise.

The fact is, the vast majority of the 160 million Americans who have received checks already never had any lost income. They never lost their jobs. They never lost their checks. What Federal employee, for instance—of the many categories I could cite, what Federal employee lost their paycheck because of the COVID crisis? I don't know of them. My staff continued to get paid throughout this entire period, but they all got checks.

Think about this: If President Biden's plan passes as our Democratic colleagues want to pass it and the eligibility criteria for these checks follows the methodology from the previous two rounds of checks, a family of four with a household income of \$150,000 will receive \$5,600. That is on top of the \$5,800 they got from the previous rounds. It is a total of \$11,400 that we are going to mail out to a family who had a six-figure income and no income loss. How does this make any sense?

Consider the expanded unemployment benefits. I was all in favor of it. I remain in favor of expanding eligibility for unemployment benefits because we have a lot of folks who work in the gig economy. They are self-employed, and they have not been able to historically participate in the unemployment insurance program. I am in favor of having made those folks eligible, but we have already done that. They are totally eligible.

On top of eligibility, back in March when we passed the CARES Act, we added \$600 a week to unemployment checks. It turns out that 70 percent—according to the University of Chicago, their analysis, about 70 percent of everybody who was unemployed ended up getting paid more money not to work than they did to get to work. In what universe does that make sense?

We have had unemployment insurance for decades. Never anywhere, at any time, under any circumstances have we designed the program so that we would pay you more not to work than what you make working. The reason we have never done that is because it doesn't make any sense.

President Biden's plan is not for \$600, but it is \$400 of extra payments above and beyond what unemployment insurance pays. If that happens, then over half of all the beneficiaries will be paid more not to work than they would get paid if they actually worked. That will

only slow the economic recovery, as well as not make any sense—not to mention the invitation for fraud.

By the way, it is estimated that there have been \$10 billion in fraudulent unemployment insurance payments in California alone.

Speaking of California, State and local governments—now, this is rich—in this \$1.9 trillion spending bonanza, there is \$350 billion to go to State and local governments. We know many of our Democratic colleagues have wanted to bail out these fiscally irresponsible and insolvent States and municipalities for a long time, but here is what is unbelievable. We are told there is a fiscal crisis here. Just look at the numbers. The total of State and local tax collections in 2020 was up by \$21 billion over 2019.

Let me clear about this. In 2019—the amount of revenue collected by State and local governments hit an alltime record high in 2019. In 2020, they broke the record—alltime record amount of revenue collected.

This, by the way, does not include the \$572 billion that the Federal Government sent to these State and local governments through the five bills that we have already passed, so they have alltime record revenue on their own. We sent them \$572 billion more, and now we are told we have to send them yet another \$350 billion.

Look, let's not kid ourselves. This is just a complete bailout of insolvent and irresponsible States. That is what this is. This hasn't got anything to do with a pandemic.

Minimum wage—that is in this bill as well, the President's proposal. It is another terrible idea. A \$15-an-hour minimum wage—what this is guaranteed to do is destroy the jobs of lower income people. Guess what. A disproportionate number of them work in the hardest hit industries, like hotels and restaurants.

This isn't just my speculation; the Congressional Budget Office projects that if we have a \$15 mandatory minimum wage nationally, which is what the President's proposal would do, we would lose at least 1.3 million jobs and maybe as high as 3.7 million jobs. Of course, this will disproportionately affect young people just entering the workforce. That is the biggest category of people who are paid at the low end of the pay scale. So we will just take away the ladder that these folks need to step on to in order to build the ability to provide for themselves and their families.

We have a moratorium on evictions from the CDC that gets extended. This is unbelievable. First of all, it is absurd to think that the CDC has the authority to impose this universally and throughout America. They just don't. It is also a terrible precedent to say that despite the fact that our unemployment rate is below 7 percent and we have more than replaced lost income, people don't have to pay the rent.

Let's be honest about the consequences. There is only one consequence that is going to happen as a result of this, and that is, we are going to have less affordable housing and higher rents because the landlord is going to have to think long and hard about how long he is going to go without being able to collect rents in the future, and so he is either going to get out of the business, in which case there is less affordable housing being built, or he is going to raise the rents to cover that period when the government pursues this senseless policy.

Health provisions are an area that is in a category unto itself here. Specifically, I think every single person in this body would agree that it is absolutely essential that we get as many vaccines into as many arms as quickly as we possibly can. That is certainly my view. For the sake of eliminating human suffering, to prevent unnecessary deaths, and at a much lower level of importance, but also to help restore the vibrancy of our economy, that is what we have to do. We have to put as many vaccines into as many arms as quickly as we can.

Today, there are around 260 million Americans who are eligible to receive COVID-19 vaccines. We have an average of about 1.34 million doses actually being administered every day. It is the highest daily rate of doses being administered anywhere in the world. I am trying to understand what more government spending now is going to do about that. In the Federal Government, we already purchased 600 million doses, which is enough to vaccinate 300 million Americans. We have multiple vaccine candidates. Some already have been approved, and some are about to be approved. We have already paid for them, and we have also paid for all the other related costs of administering the vaccine. We paid for the R&D in the first place. We bought the production—as they say, 600 million doses. The Federal Government pays for the transportation to deliver the vaccine to the site at which it is going to be administered. The Federal Government has paid for all the accompanying supplies—the syringes, the vials, the stoppers, the dry ice to keep it cold, all of that. Insurance—Medicare covers the cost of putting the vaccine into somebody's arm. We have even allocated money to fund the planning of the execution of this plan.

It is pretty clear to me that, in talking to Pennsylvania healthcare folks who are on the frontlines delivering this and actually vaccinating people, that the limiting factor now is production of the vaccine, and we are going all-out. I mean, you could take General Motors and get them to produce ventilators. General Motors can manufacture ventilators pretty quickly. They can do that. You can't get General Motors to produce vaccines—not in anything like the timeframe we would like.

So I am all ears. If someone can show me how we can spend money that will

actually result in getting more people vaccinated more quickly, then I am for it. I just haven't heard that explanation yet, and I haven't seen how it gets allocated in this bill to accomplish that.

President Biden had a commendable call to unity in his early addresses to the Nation, but this exercise we are going through today is suggesting that that kind of rings hollow. Just a few weeks into office and the President and our Democratic colleagues seem to be abandoning what had consistently been overwhelmingly bipartisan, successful, major responses to this COVID crisis. Now it seems they are on a one-party partisan track to pass a bunch of their liberal wish list items, much of which has nothing to do with the circumstances we face.

The fact is, what we ought to be working on is maximizing the speed of vaccinations and ensuring that we return our economy and allow people to get back to work so that we can have the prosperity that we had before this pandemic struck. What we shouldn't be doing is using the pandemic as the excuse to pass a longstanding partisan policy wish list.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this veterans COVID-19 relief package, to do right by the millions of veterans across our country struggling with this pandemic.

For months, I have been hearing from folks back home in Montana on the need for Congress to put together a smart, targeted package that will quickly provide communities across the country with the resources they need to weather this storm. This includes delivering assistance and vaccines to those who have worn the uniform and sacrificed for our liberties.

If this year has taught us anything, it is that we need to secure additional resources to expand medical services, mental healthcare, and telehealth capabilities to protect and support our most vulnerable populations.

And we need a distribution plan that will provide more predictability when it comes to administering vaccines. That way, we could get more vaccines into the veterans' arms as quickly as possible.

Today, we are putting a bicameral proposal on the table that delivers tangible relief to veterans and families and all Americans who need them. As we all know, proposals are rarely ever perfect, and this package is no different.

But the truth is, we have good provisions in this bill that allow us to provide serious relief to those who swore an oath to protect our country. It will slow the spread of the virus, and it will help save lives.

A previous package that was put forth by my Republican colleagues—I

would say, thank you for doing that, but unfortunately, that package didn't put as much as a dime to support our veterans and families.

Now, there are a lot of things we disagree upon in this body, but delivering for our Nation's veterans should never be one of them. That is why my colleagues and I worked with the Biden administration on this new relief package that allocates \$17 billion in critical resources and assistance to the men and women who have served this country.

The truth is that out of almost 7 million veterans that the VA serves nationwide, only 638,000 veterans have been vaccinated so far. Serious efforts need to be made to reach more veterans, especially those veterans who live in rural or country areas.

Additional funding under our proposal allows the VA to increase vaccine distribution and outreach efforts to remote areas, ensuring all veterans who want a vaccine can receive one.

It even goes a step further in accelerating the deployment of VA's supply chain modernization initiative to improve the Department's preparedness and response to public health emergencies. It takes an aggressive approach in assisting vulnerable veterans by providing mental health care options, medical equipment, and additional services to women vets, those at risk of homelessness, and those who face unemployment.

Make no mistake, this pandemic is taking a dangerous toll on our veterans. Veterans are experiencing job losses at unprecedented rates. The veteran unemployment rate for December was roughly double what it was this time last year, up from 2.8 percent to 5.3 percent. And with older veterans continuing to face more difficulty in the job market, it makes this package even more necessary today.

Our proposal helps tackle veteran unemployment by establishing a VA Rapid Retraining Assistance Program that will strengthen existing job opportunities and establish new resources to get veterans employed and back on their feet.

And for folks burdened by healthcare costs, our provisions waive copayment billing and debt collection, as well as costs for COVID-19 testing, treatment, and vaccine services, because no veteran should have to worry about choosing between accessing essential healthcare and providing for their family during a global pandemic and an economic crisis.

When veterans elect officials to Congress, they do so with the expectation that they will get the job done. So while this proposal is not a silver bullet, it is our best shot, however, at getting more folks vaccinated and our economy back on track.

There should be no excuses. Veterans and all Americans are looking at us to do the right thing. We do need bipartisan support in this Chamber if we are going to put this pandemic behind us, and we do need it today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. 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 Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I joined some of my colleagues at the White House yesterday to talk with President Biden and Vice President Harris about what it will take to make real progress against the pandemic and to make a real difference in people's lives. Our country is in the middle, as we know, of a once-in-a-generation crisis, and this is our opportunity to deliver for them.

Yesterday, I came to the floor to talk about the need for direct stimulus checks and for rental assistance and tax cuts for working families and to use the Defense Production Act to get more people vaccinated more quickly.

Today, I am here to talk about the critical help in this plan, the Biden plan, for our Nation's veterans and their families.

Since the beginning of the pandemic, 9,300 veterans have died of COVID-19. Right now, at least 9,000 veterans are sick with this virus. Our plan would ensure that frontline VA employees would have the protective equipment they need to continue to do their jobs every day as they care for our veterans. It would help us get more veterans and VA workers vaccinated. We know that nothing is more critical now than getting vaccines into people's arms, especially as we face new, more contagious variants. So far, the VA has provided some 800,000 initial doses of vaccines to veterans and employees. Additional funding would ramp up both vaccine distribution and COVID treatments for those who answer the call to service.

In order to continue to meet our Nation's and veterans' medical needs, the VA has shifted to new methods of caring, including expanded telehealth. We know the need for expanded capabilities will only continue to grow. The VA will need additional funding to meet veterans' needs where they are—so they can stay home and so they can stay safe whenever possible—and provide them with the healthcare they have earned.

In many cases, the VA was able to freeze bills, if you will, to veterans who accrued copayments and fees for care during the pandemic. That was the right move. In discussions with VA Medical Center directors in Ohio, I said we should use as much flexibility as possible to waive these debts. Some of these copays and fees amounted to \$2,000 for some vets. For them to have the bills come due right after the holidays was cruel as we were seeing cases spike and uncertainty continue. We

know that any large medical bill can be a shock, and during these uncertain times, we can work to lessen that burden and especially take away that stress on our veterans. That is why our plan would provide copayment relief to all veterans as the pandemic continues. If a vet were charged a VA copay, regardless of whether the care was COVID-related or not, that copay would be waived. It would reimburse veterans who have already paid their bills to the VA.

I thank Chairman TESTER and Chairman SCHATZ for their work on this plan as many of our Nation's veterans have fixed incomes, and it will mean so much to them not to have to worry about another medical bill.

Last week, Denis McDonough came before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He is the nominee to be the VA Secretary. He was asked about a proposed program that would require military borrowers who are coming out of COVID-19 mortgage forbearance to pay back their missed payments with interest within 10 years. This VA program would be more expensive than what other Federal mortgage programs are offering.

Think about that. We charge veterans more than others through this program. It makes no sense. It would make it more likely that VA borrowers will fall behind on these new, higher monthly payments.

He gave me his word that he would look into the program and would work with me to ensure that no VA homeowner is left with a worse option than borrowers in other federally backed loan programs.

We are about to have new leadership at the VA, leadership that understands that the decisions made in Washington impact veterans in Portland, ME, in Cincinnati, OH, in Columbus, in Dayton, and in Chillicothe. Veterans in Cleveland and Toledo don't care how the Senate passes this. They don't care about regular order or reconciliation. They just want the help that they need. That is why we need to go big. Veterans care about when they get the vaccine, when they can get an appointment with their mental health professionals, and whether their VA providers have enough personal protective equipment so they can continue to do their jobs.

So I say to my colleagues of both parties: Let's get this done. There is no time for squabbling over Senate procedure. The Senate has used these fast-tracking budget measures over and over in times far less dire and far less stressful than what we face today.

That is why it is so important that we just go back and remember what Senator MCCONNELL had no problem with in 2017 during the leader's first term. He had no problems pouring money into corporations' coffers with their tax cuts. There was no emergency. The only emergency was that lobbyists were lined up out in front of Senator MCCONNELL's office, asking for

tax cuts for their corporations. Now Senator MCCONNELL claims he can't afford to help everyone else.

We didn't win World War II by worrying about whether or not we could afford it. General Eisenhower didn't call President Roosevelt in early June 1944 and say: We have enough dollars for D-day. Of course not. Our veterans know that. They know we are in a global crisis. They know we have marshaled all of our vast resources and talent to rise to meet it. Then we grew the economy, after the war, from the middle class out, and we paid down the debt with rising wages.

This is a war too. Americans elected new leaders because they were tired of a President and a majority leader who refused to treat this war with the same urgency. People are tired of being told that we can't do it, that we can't afford it, and that we have done enough. Let's aim higher in this country. Let's deliver for the people we serve. Let's come together. Let's pass this. Let's make a real difference in Americans' lives.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my colleague Senator BROWN on an issue that should be close to all of our hearts, which is strengthening our VA so that it can provide more assistance, more help, and more support for our Nation's heroes.

I had the great opportunity last Sunday to spend time at the West Haven VA Hospital, where literally thousands of vaccines are being administered hour by hour to our veterans. Around 25 percent of the veterans of Connecticut eligible to receive it have had vaccinations administered to them. That 25 percent is way above the 10 percent of the entire population of our State, and it is a great beginning. Under the leadership of Al Montoya at the West Haven VA and his remarkable team, our Nation's heroes are receiving the vaccinations they need and deserve. More than 8,000 already—and the staff of the VA, 2,500—have received vaccinations. Not all want it, but the VA is reaching out to them—literally, person by person—to ask them to come and ensure them that this vaccine is safe and effective. Most assuredly, it is.

So the VA is moving forward, but much more needs to be done. A lot of that VA target population is among the most vulnerable by virtue of age, by virtue of preexisting conditions, by virtue of their service and exposure and comorbidity. That is why this plan, the American Rescue Plan, in its distributing COVID-19 vaccines to veterans, is so critically important. There are 9,000

VA patients who have died of coronavirus. Although 1 million nationwide of our veterans have received vaccinations, there are many, many more who have not. These vaccines are reaching the arms of veterans, but the VA system needs support and the investment to do its job.

Likewise, this pandemic has imposed mental health burdens on our veterans. The veterans who are shut in—likewise, the veterans who have no homes and veterans in all parts of the country—have been stressed and strained just like everyone else—in fact, maybe more so. Medical health services available through telemedicine are more important than ever, but they alone are not going to accomplish this purpose. Again, what we have seen in Connecticut through the CBOCs, what is accomplished from telemedicine, and what is provided through counseling all show additional investment will produce even better care for our veterans.

A lot of our veterans have debts. Some of them are medical debts. They need help. This American Rescue Plan provides assistance for them. I have been a longtime advocate of extending VA healthcare to more veterans. I am proud this plan would allow struggling veterans to get more healthcare at the VA, but relieving veterans from the burden of medical costs is not enough. We need to deliver stimulus payments, unemployment insurance, and aid to small businesses so that we can lift the broader economic pain brought on by COVID-19. Veterans are part of our general population, and those general programs are part of what we owe them.

All of these programs need more oversight and more vigorous scrutiny as we go forward in order to prevent the kind of waste or delay that we have seen sometimes in veterans' programs. That is why the funds for the VA would be directed, in part, to oversight by the VA Office of the Inspector General. Through oversight by the inspector general, in combination with rigorous congressional oversight, we can ensure that these dollars are being spent effectively and in accordance with congressional priorities in a way that best supports our veterans.

A broader plan is also necessary, a broader infrastructure plan that will, for example, reconstruct and rehabilitate the West Haven hospital. It dates from the 1950s. It has a new shell, but its structure is aging and aged, degrading and sometimes, in some ways, decrepit. The VA has done a great job of sustaining and maintaining it, but this reconstruction is absolutely necessary. A capital investment must be made as our VA facilities, our ports and airports, roads and bridges all are in need of vital repair and reconstruction. That is part of the broader plan that must be undertaken. Priority must be given to those VA facilities.

Just a few months ago, we suffered in Connecticut a tragic accident when

two workers at that VA hospital were killed while they were doing maintenance. It was unnecessary, avoidable, preventable, but it demonstrated the weaknesses and defects in the construction that remains in that hospital. It must be remediated and improved. The best way to do it is through a new building, not just a new exterior, not just cosmetic work but, truly, an infrastructure program that keeps faith with our veterans.

There is no excuse for delaying this COVID-19 rescue plan. Delay is unconscionable. Time is not on our side. We need decisive, bold, and big action to meet the needs that our veterans have and that all of the American people have in this time of unique, painful, and continuing crisis.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to make the case that we should invest \$10 billion in the prevention and defeat of COVID-19 in the foreign assistance portion of this budget resolution.

For so long as COVID-19 is anywhere, it can spread everywhere, directly threatening our national security, our economy, and the health and safety of the American people.

COVID-19 has devastated the world. To date, there have been nearly 103 million confirmed cases worldwide. More than 2 million people have died, including over 450,000 in the United States.

The lockdowns necessitated by the pandemic have triggered the worst recession since the Great Depression. We must join with our partners and allies around the globe to end this scourge once and for all.

Now, with so many Americans shattered by the death, disruption, and economic devastation unleashed by the coronavirus, I am sure more than a few would question why we should bother spending any resources in the global fight against COVID-19, let alone \$10 billion.

The simple answer is: COVID-19 knows no borders.

The pandemic didn't start here, but it came here. The world is in a race against COVID-19, and we cannot lose, for the longer we allow this virus to spread, the more it will mutate into new strains, and the more that it mutates into new strains, the greater the threat to the efficacy of our vaccines and our ability to rebuild our economy and restore our way of life.

This \$10 billion investment will ramp up American efforts to fight COVID-19 and stop new variants before they reach our shores and cost more American lives.

It will fund humanitarian assistance to respond to the suffering inflicted by COVID-19 and channel resources to international organizations charged with responding to these challenges and preventing further spread. And it will support the global race to develop new vaccines.

As Dr. Anthony Fauci publicly stated last month, we have to start work now preparing additional vaccines to deal with new and virulent strains of COVID-19.

This will require investment both at home and abroad.

In addition to our own efforts, we must invest in international research and development and support technology transfers so that vaccines capable of protecting us from future variants are produced and made available quickly around the world.

The package also includes funding for global health programs that strengthen health systems in developing countries. As we have learned firsthand, COVID-19 can overwhelm even the most robust of healthcare systems. For countries with poorer public health infrastructure, the challenge is exponentially harder. And the longer we allow COVID-19 to ravage health systems around the globe, the longer it will remain a threat to the United States.

The resolution will also help us protect two decades' worth of investments to combat the spread of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through the Global Fund. Specifically, the resolution ensures that lifesaving treatments for those three deadly diseases continues.

It also provides resources to support the Global Fund's newly developed COVID-19 response mechanism, allowing countries to better prevent, care for, and treat this disease.

It is hard to recapture the scale of the suffering unleashed by this pandemic, but here is what we know: The number of people facing faminelike conditions around the world has doubled, and child malnutrition and death rates are on the rise. Through this resolution, we will be able to address the pandemic's toll on the most vulnerable, including children and refugees, by funding organizations such as the World Food Programme and UNICEF.

It will also enable us to help confront dramatically increased rates of violence against women and girls, what the United Nations has called the "shadow pandemic" of gender-based violence. And it will provide urgently needed funding for the World Health Organization, which the Biden administration rejoined on the President's first day in office.

We cannot forfeit our seat at the table to other countries that do not share our values or our interests. We must engage, and we must lead.

Finally, the resolution will support ongoing State Department and USAID operations that protect Americans overseas and advance our diplomatic and economic interests around the

globe. We must begin to undo the damage to the State Department and USAID wrought by the Trump administration and ensure that both agencies have the resources to deal with the effects of COVID-19, including the impacts on our foreign service officers and their families, Embassy operations, and lost revenue due to disruption of services, even as we look to replenish and revive these critical instruments for our national security.

So I will end where I began: We cannot hermetically seal ourselves and believe that we can avoid any consequences from anyplace across the globe. Disease, including this one, knows no boundaries, knows no borders.

Unless and until COVID-19 is stamped out globally, American lives and livelihoods remain at risk. Simply put, our international efforts to stop the spread of COVID-19 abroad are directly linked to our national and economic security at home.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support continued relief, recovery, and prevention efforts by voting in support of the budget resolution.

I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague, the senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. CARDIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first, let me thank Chairman MENENDEZ, the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for his advocacy in getting into this budget resolution the \$10 billion for the global response to COVID-19.

I just want to underscore what Chairman MENENDEZ said from the beginning: This global response will not only save lives around the world, it will save lives here at home.

In 1 year, 450,000 Americans have lost their lives to COVID-19; 2.6 million worldwide. The United States has the distinction of having the largest number of fatalities and infections of any country in the world.

This is a challenge that requires the leadership of the United States of America. If we are going to beat COVID-19, America must be in the leadership to do this as quickly and as efficiently as possible.

So what does that require? It requires us to take the right steps at home, and the budget resolution before us gives us the resources to do that with the production and distribution—fair distribution—of vaccines and dealing with the needs for testing, dealing with the needs of those businesses and individuals who have been directly affected by COVID-19, all that is dealt with in this package, but we also need to work responsibly in the global community, and that is what this \$10 billion will allow us to do—to be leaders globally as well as what we do at home.

President Biden has already taken the initial steps by rejoining the World Health Organization and joining the

COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access Facility so that 190 countries in the world can join together to make sure that everyone gets access to this vaccine, particularly in low- and middle-economic countries that otherwise would be challenged. Why? Because those are our values—humanitarian concerns globally, but it is also in our individual interest because if this virus is not contained in a country, it will get to the United States.

And as Chairman MENENDEZ said, the longer this virus goes globally, the more variants we are going to see and the tougher it is going to be for us to control the COVID-19 around the world and in the United States of America.

With 104 million infections globally, this is a global pandemic and requires a global response, and this budget resolution gives us the wherewithal in order to do that.

And as Senator MENENDEZ has pointed out, it is not only to deal with the direct eradication of the virus, which we have to do, but the consequences of the virus in world poverty and hunger and those issues that are important for the United States to lead the global community in dealing with the aftermath of this terrible virus.

So I just really wanted to come to the floor to underscore there are so many reasons to support this budget resolution, but the one that I just really wanted to underscore today is that we are not only dealing with the issues at home, we are being responsible citizens of the world, leading by example and leading by engagement, which will help the healthcare of the people in America and our national security.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, so as I understand it, some of the Senators will come in after I speak. I will talk 10 or 15 minutes, and then we will get on with the process of voting.

So, to the American people who may be watching, what is this all about? This is an effort by my Democratic colleagues, supported by President Biden, to pass \$1.9 trillion in COVID relief through a budget process that requires only 50 votes. It goes around the idea of bipartisanship.

And I would say this: I think all of us would like unity. I think President Biden said all the right things in his inauguration. The question is, Are we going to do more than talk about unity?

I can understand having reconciliation used for ObamaCare or for taxes. You all did that. We did that. There are big philosophical differences. But this is the one area that there was bipartisanship up until recently. This is the

one area where the Congress has been able to work together across party lines, and that is providing relief to the American people who have been long-suffering under the COVID pandemic.

So I find it odd that if our goal is unity, we start with an issue that has been unified up until now. That is what is a bit perplexing because it is not like the Republican Party can't work with the Democratic Party to help the American people when it comes to COVID relief.

We had a Republican President, a Democratic-controlled House, and a Republican Senate for the last year. We have appropriated \$4 trillion in COVID relief for the American people working together. So when there was divided government—a Republican President, a Democratic-controlled House, and a Republican-controlled Senate—we were able to achieve bipartisanship in large measure, dealing with a lot of money, because we saw the problem as something worthy of bipartisanship, necessary for bipartisanship, and COVID was affecting everybody, regardless of political persuasion.

Now we find ourselves early on in the Biden administration abandoning that model and going forward on a partisan effort to spend \$1.9 trillion with one party alone without, really, input from the other party.

On March 5, 2020, we approved an \$8 billion supplemental appropriation 96 to 1. In March, we were just beginning to understand the nature of the COVID problem. We shut the country down pretty much in March, and as things became more clear to us, we acted, I think, responsibly.

March 18, just a couple of weeks later, we approved, 98 to 8, a \$355 billion package to help families that were affected by COVID. March 25, just about a week later, we spent \$1.9 trillion in a COVID-relief package, which is a massive amount of money—one of the largest expenditures in the history of the country since World War II—96 to nothing.

So we are now talking about spending \$1.9 trillion in February of 2021, and there seems to be no ability here to negotiate a package that could get another 90-plus votes because my Democratic colleagues have chosen the reconciliation route.

April 21, 2020, by voice vote, we spent \$355 billion to add more money to the Paycheck Protection Act that Senator COLLINS and the Presiding Officer worked on to help businesses that had lost their customer base. September 30, we had \$8 billion, 84 to 10. December 21, 2020, we did an omnibus bill of \$1.4 trillion funding the government, and we had money for COVID in that package, about \$900 billion. That passed 92 to 6. That was Christmas.

Here is what I want you to understand. We have, up to now, been able to work together to help the American people who have been suffering from COVID. We have appropriated, as I have just described, over \$4 trillion,

and as of this moment, \$2.7 trillion has actually been allocated. So there is over \$1.3 trillion that we haven't spent yet. Of the \$900 billion we authorized to be spent, appropriated in December, only 20 percent of it has been spent.

So a lot of the money is yet to be spent, and now we are going to add \$1.9 trillion on top of what we have done before all the money has been spent or most of it has been spent. We created a Federal Reserve program for midsize and larger businesses that had a \$5.7 trillion cap on it, and we have done \$2.6 trillion.

So I think people on our side really believe that we should learn more about how the money we have already appropriated is being spent and that a \$15 minimum wage increase in a COVID package is a bad idea during a COVID economy, and that is what is in this package.

Most small businesses in South Carolina and throughout the country have been struggling to stay open due to lack of travel. And due to mandates at the State and local levels reducing the ability to have 100 percent occupancy in restaurants, tourism has really been hurt. The service sector has really been hurt. The food industry has really been hurt.

Can you imagine the combined effect of having the government reduce your ability to earn money by restricting your business model and at the same time adding a mandate to your business of maybe increasing your wages by 50 percent, maybe 100 percent?

So this one-two punch will take out what is left of small businesses in the tourism sector and the restaurant business because what we have had to do—some people say we have done too much in restricting the ability of small businesses to earn a living, and that is having an effect on their ability to generate income. Now we are combining an increase in cost of increasing wages for every business in the country to \$15 an hour over time. They can't absorb that.

A lot of us believe that is the wrong thing to do in a COVID economy. Maybe one day we can talk about a minimum wage increase when business can get back on its feet, but that is one of the reasons that you are going to find pretty much unified opposition on our side.

So I just want the American people to know, it is one thing to talk about unity, and it is another thing to seek it. And you picked the one issue that we have been able to find common ground. Why you did this, I don't know, but you have.

I appreciate President Biden sitting down with 10 Republicans who wanted to find an alternative. A lot of people believe that in this package the direct payments go to people who really are not going to spend the money because they haven't lost their jobs and are making over \$150,000 or \$200,000-plus as a couple and that we should target direct stimulus checks to people in the

lower income areas who have suffered the most.

So there is a lot of concern about the nature of the \$1.9 trillion package. Details do matter. But I will just say this: I can understand having a fight about healthcare and about taxes, but when it comes to COVID relief, we have been able, in the last year, to find bipartisanship for \$4 trillion. And now we are abandoning that quest, and we are going to try to create a process—my Democratic colleagues are—to deal us all out on our side and pass a \$1.9 trillion COVID package that I think in many ways misses the mark.

So to say that I am disappointed is an understatement. You have the right to do this. And during the campaign, we talked about what would happen if one party got in charge of everything. We predicted, on the Republican side, if you have a Democratic President, Democratic Senate, and a Democratic House, the liberal wish list is going to come roaring through the House and the Senate, trying to get on President Biden's desk.

To President Biden's credit, I think he ran a campaign that was more centrist, but now he has the chance, as President of the United States, to stand down this process and continue to talk with the Republicans. I think there are more than 10 who would like to find an alternative to a \$1.9 trillion package that we think misses the mark and is being appropriated when we haven't spent most of the money we have already appropriated.

So this is the choice you make. This is the debate we are going to have. It is going to be a long day. It will go into the night. Let's try to keep good cheer about it. I understand that we all love the country, but these kinds of debates are important, and the choices you make as a party—we will have to accept responsibility for the choices that we all make.

And I would just urge my Democratic colleagues, this is one area where I have been relatively proud of the Congress. We have spent an enormous amount of money in a bipartisan fashion. Some of the most conservative Members of the Senate have been voting on pretty large amounts of money because, I think, generally speaking, it has been necessary. But now the vaccine is being distributed. Anything we can do to get it out faster to more people, great. Most of the money we have appropriated hasn't been spent. I would just ask that we slow down a bit.

Whatever we spend in the future needs to be more targeted. And the last thing you want to do in a COVID economy is increase the cost of doing business at a time when most businesses are barely hanging on in certain sectors of the economy.

So I look forward to working with Senator SANDERS, trying to work through the amendments. This will be a long day, but, hopefully, it will be a fruitful day for the American people as you understand more about the differences that we have. And, eventually,

maybe we can find something in common.

If you asked me before the election: What are the two areas that bipartisanship would be easiest achieved, most likely to be achieved—infrastructure, because we all have roads and bridges and ports, and COVID. So I was wrong about the COVID part, and time will tell if it matters at all.

With that, I will yield to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the committee, Senator SANDERS.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me thank my colleague from South Carolina. And I look forward to working with him. He is going to be the ranking member of the Budget Committee. We have a lot of work to do, and I look forward to working with him.

As Senator GRAHAM indicated, in a few moments, at the end of my remarks, we are going to begin the vote-arama process, where Senators can offer amendments, with debate limited to 2 minutes—1 minute for the proponents and 1 minute for the opponents.

The last time I checked—I may be a little behind the times on this—my Republican colleagues had filed over 550 amendments, which, theoretically, means that we will be here for days, but I think not. I have a feeling it will be a very long night, but I assume we will get out of here at some point.

Unfortunately, many of the amendments being offered have absolutely nothing to do with COVID relief, which, after all, is what this budget resolution is all about.

My Republican colleagues have filed amendments to make President Trump's tax breaks for the wealthiest people in our country and the most profitable corporations permanent, which would provide a massive windfall for the top 1 percent and the billionaire class who have already seen their wealth go up by over \$1 trillion during this pandemic. In my mind, it is not exactly the kind of policy that we need right now.

Republicans have filed amendments to exacerbate the xenophobia, the xenophobia which exists in this country, despite the fact that many undocumented workers are doing some of the most essential and dangerous work in our country. They are working in meatpacking plants; they are preparing our food and working on the frontlines, often with very low pay. We should not be attacking them. We should not be dividing this country up. We should be bringing our people together.

We have had 4 years of efforts to divide us up. Now is a time for unity.

Members of the Democratic caucus have made my life easy in this process because they have filed zero amendments. Republicans, 550 amendments; Democrats, 0. I think that speaks to the strong desire of our entire caucus to pass President Biden's \$1.9 trillion emergency COVID relief plan as soon as we possibly can.

The reason we have got to pass that plan as quickly as possible is that the

American people are suffering one crisis after another, and we have got to address those crises as quickly as we can.

Let me briefly—I know there is a lot of media talk about \$1.9 trillion, and this, that, and the other thing. Sometimes we forget to look at actually what is in the proposal. What are we trying to do? What are the problems that we are trying to address? So let me just, very briefly, touch on some of the provisions of this budget resolution.

First, and perhaps most importantly, it will enable us to aggressively crush the pandemic, which has already taken over 450,000 American lives. That is our top priority: crush the pandemic and allow people to get back to work as we reopen and strengthen the economy, and we get our kids back to school. That is an essential part of what this resolution is about.

This resolution will allow us to provide the funding to establish a national emergency program to produce the quantity of vaccines that we need. We don't have enough vaccines now. We need more. And then we need a process, which we don't have right now either, to get those vaccines into the arms of people as quickly as we possibly can.

At a time when so many of our people are hurting, have gone through the worst year in their lives as a result of this pandemic, this budget resolution will allow us to keep the promises we made to the American people and increase the \$600 in direct payments for working-class adults and their children to \$2,000. That means \$1,400 for every working-class adult and child in this country, an additional \$5,600 on top of the 600 bucks that we sent out a few weeks ago.

Do you know what that would mean to millions of families who are worried about whether they can pay the rent or put food on the table? They will understand that maybe, just maybe, we are one country, and the government and this Congress has heard their pain.

Passing this budget resolution will give us the tools we need to raise the minimum wage to a living wage of \$15 an hour and provide substantial help to struggling small businesses to help them cover the cost of these wage increases.

We do understand that restaurants and small businesses are hurting, and that is why we will provide billions of dollars to help them cover the cost of increasing the minimum wage.

But let us be clear, the minimum wage in this country has not been raised since the year 2007. It now stands at \$7.25 an hour. That is a starvation wage. That is an embarrassment, and that minimum wage must be increased so that we can give a pay raise to some 32 million workers.

Moreover, this pandemic has caused tens of millions of Americans to lose their jobs through no fault of their own. For 45 consecutive weeks, unemployment claims have been higher dur-

ing the worst week of the great recession in 2008.

The budget resolution that we are considering this week will provide the funding to provide 18 million Americans with \$400 a week in supplemental unemployment benefits until the end of September. So we are saying now to the millions and millions of unemployed workers in this country, who, through no fault of their own, have lost their jobs, we are there for you. We are going to extend unemployment benefits to September and add another \$400 on top of the benefits that you normally would receive.

One of the disgraces that we have allowed to go on for so many years, and not talk about it, is the fact that in this country—the richest country in the history of the world—we have one of the highest childhood poverty rates of any industrialized country. And they are all over America. You have got single moms and couples, people trying to take care of their kids, trying to pay for childcare, trying to do all of the things that good parents want to do, and they are unable to do it. This budget resolution will provide the resources necessary to provide childcare to 875,000 kids in America.

This resolution will expand the child tax credit from \$2,000 to \$3,000 and \$3,600 for kids under the age of 6, which we believe will cut the child poverty rate in America in half—something we should have done 20 years ago. That is what is in this resolution.

This budget resolution that we are debating today would provide \$350 billion to prevent mass layoffs of public sector workers in State and local governments. We have lost well over 1 million jobs—talking about teachers, firemen, cops, municipal workers. This resolution will give States and local governments the resources to not lay off workers, to bring those workers back so they could provide the services that their communities and States require.

We are the only major country on Earth not to guarantee healthcare to all people as a human right. And, right now, over 90 million Americans are either uninsured or underinsured. Imagine being uninsured in the midst of a terrible pandemic. That is the case for 90 million people.

This budget resolution will enable the Senate to substantially increase access to healthcare for many millions of Americans, including, very likely, a significant expansion of Medicaid.

This budget resolution will allow more Americans to receive the primary healthcare they need through community health centers. It will address the serious shortage of doctors and nurses in rural areas and inner cities by expanding the National Health Service Corps. And it will make sure our veterans receive the healthcare they have earned and deserve by increasing funding at the VA by some \$17 billion.

In addition, in the wealthiest country in the history of the world, I don't

think it is saying too much that people should not go hungry. I get emotionally wrought when, in my own State—and this is true in every State in this country—in my own city of Burlington, VT, hundreds of people line up in their cars to get emergency food packages. Many of them never, in a million years, would have thought that they would be in that position.

We are looking at the highest rate of hunger in America in decades. And if this country means anything, if this government means anything, we are not going to allow our fellow Americans to go hungry.

This budget resolution will provide nutrition assistance to tens of millions of hungry families with children, the disabled, and the elderly by providing billions of dollars for SNAP, WIC, and the pandemic nutrition assistance program.

One of the outstanding crises this country faces is the fear of many millions of our people of being evicted from their homes or their apartments. Today, over 14 million Americans owe an average of \$5,800 in back rent. We have a moratorium on eviction right now. But the day that moratorium ends, I fear that many, many people all over this country will face eviction. That is why this budget resolution will provide the funding for rent relief, utility assistance, and mortgage relief to millions of tenants and homeowners who are in danger of eviction or foreclosure.

In addition, this budget resolution allows us to address the terrible crisis of homelessness in America where, a few blocks away from here, in bitter cold weather, Americans are sleeping out in tents.

Not only is this \$1.9 trillion emergency COVID relief package the right thing to do from a moral perspective and a public policy perspective, it is exactly what the overwhelming majority of the American people want us to do. They understand that if we are one country and they are hurting, now is the time to come together and to address that pain.

So many of our people have given up on democracy. They have given up on their belief that government can work to help them. Now is the time to try to reaffirm people's faith in government.

People want us to go forward. According to a recent poll, over 70 percent of the American people support President Biden's \$1.9 trillion COVID-19 plan, 83 percent support boosting direct payments from \$600 to \$2,000, 64 percent support raising the Federal minimum wage to 15 bucks an hour, and 62 percent support additional unemployment benefits.

In other words, what we are doing is the right thing to do, and what we are doing is what the American people want us to do. So now is the time to reaffirm the faith of the American people that their government listens to them; that, in fact, we are a government of the people, by the people, and for the

people, as Lincoln talked about in the midst of the terrible Civil War.

So now we can show who we are, and that is, instead of listening to wealthy campaign contributors and all of the lobbyists who flood Capitol Hill, let us stand with working families today, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor who want us to stand with them. Let us pass this budget resolution, and let us then finish the job by passing a reconciliation bill so that we can get it to the President for his signature as soon as possible.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. 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. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up in the order listed: Wicker-Sinema No. 261, Tim Scott No. 53, Rubio-Scott No. 69, Blunt No. 48, Thune No. 52, Young No. 54; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 261

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 261 on behalf of Senator WICKER and myself and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Ms. SINEMA], for Mr. WICKER, proposes an amendment numbered 261.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to establishing a fund to provide grants to food service and drinking establishments affected by the COVID-19 pandemic)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A FUND TO PROVIDE GRANTS TO FOOD SERVICE AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS AFFECTED BY THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a fund to provide grants to food service and drinking establishments affected by the COVID-19 pandemic by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the def-

icit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I yield back all time on both sides.

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

Ms. SINEMA. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Baldwin	Grassley	Padilla
Barrasso	Hagerty	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blackburn	Hawley	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Risch
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson	Schatz
Capito	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lummis	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	Markey	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Ernst	Moran	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murphy	Wicker
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Graham	Ossoff	Young

NAYS—10

Braun	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Paul	Tuberville
Daines	Sasse	
Lankford	Scott (FL)	

The amendment (No. 261) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 1 minute.

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

SENATOR MURRAY'S 9,000TH VOTE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as the Senate proceeds today on its long string of rollcall votes, I rise at this moment to note that this vote is different than the rest.

One of our most beloved, effective Members has just cast her 9,000th rollcall vote in the course of her career.

Senator MURRAY, congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. SCHUMER. It is a history-making accomplishment from a truly history-making public servant.

Madam President, as the Senate proceeds today on its long string of rollcall votes, I rise at this moment to note that this one is different from the rest—because, with this vote, our

friend Senator MURRAY has now reached 9,000 rollcall votes over the course of her career, a history-making accomplishment from a truly history-making public servant.

Senator MURRAY was elected to this Chamber in 1992, the, “Year of the Woman.” She began her tenure alongside Senator FEINSTEIN, who will also hit this significant milestone later today, and two other women in a year that tripled the number of women who served in this chamber, from two to six.

Over the course of her career, she was the first woman to serve in a number of positions of Senate leadership, including chair of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee and chair of the Senate Budget Committee.

In her time, she has been a leading voice on the biggest issues, from healthcare, to the environment, to labor rights, pensions, standing up for families and workers everywhere, possessing the rare gift of explaining and presenting complex policy with extraordinary clarity.

As a close member of my leadership team, she has been a valued and trusted partner and a dear friend.

So let us take this moment to recognize Senator MURRAY, a public servant of extraordinary skill, and a Member we have all been honored to serve alongside for all these years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 53

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 53 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) proposes an amendment numbered 53.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ensuring the accurate reporting of COVID-19 related deaths of residents or staff at nursing homes)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE ACCURATE REPORTING OF COVID-19 RELATED DEATHS OF RESIDENTS OR STAFF AT NURSING HOMES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring States accurately report COVID-19 deaths, which may include conducting investigations and withholding funding from States who under-report, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Colleagues, as of last month, two out of every five COVID-related deaths in this country are either residents of nursing homes or the staff of nursing homes.

Inaccurate information affects life-and-death decisions for communities. Requiring States to provide accurate data is common sense for anyone who believes, as I do, that we should have a science-based, fact-driven response to this pandemic.

We should not offer more funding to States that have mismanaged and then covered up their pandemic response until they fix it. It simply makes no sense. That is why my colleagues should join me in supporting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I have great respect for my colleague from South Carolina. We are going to serve together on the Aging Committee, leading the committee.

I oppose this amendment for some basic reasons. No. 1 is he cited the number of deaths in long-term care facilities across the country. More than 150,000 people are dead in long-term care. The last administration didn’t even count those deaths until May of 2020, despite efforts by Members of this body to urge the administration to do that.

They never had a plan. They didn’t help the States. This is an effort, an ongoing effort, to blame States when the Federal Government dropped the ball when it came to long-term care.

I think we can do better than that. We should be helping nursing homes with the resources they need, like resources for cohorting where you can separate a resident with COVID-19 from those who don’t have it.

We should be providing money for strike teams in ways to help nursing homes. Let’s reduce the deaths instead of pointing fingers.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, how much time do I have left on my 60 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I look forward to working with Senator CASEY on the committee, and he is a person I have great respect for.

I would simply say that it is the responsibility of the Governors of these States to report accurate information. This is not a political debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 53

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

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

The amendment (No. 53) was rejected. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 69 and ask it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 69.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to prohibiting legislation that would increase taxes on small businesses during any period in which a national emergency has been declared with respect to a pandemic)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING TAX INCREASES ON SMALL BUSINESSES DURING A PANDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include preventing tax increases on small businesses during any period in which a national emergency has been declared with respect to a pandemic, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, this amendment simply says you can’t raise

taxes on small business during the pandemic, and I hope everyone can support it. I can't imagine anyone being against that idea.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

I recognize the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, there are no tax increases on small business in this. We support the Rubio amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do it by voice vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator want to yield back time?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes. We yield back time. We support a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall be dispensed with and we use voice votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Rubio amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 16 Leg.]
YEAS—100

Baldwin	Hagerty	Portman
Barrasso	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Hawley	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young
Graham	Paul	
Grassley	Peters	

The amendment (No. 69) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the subsequent votes be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask Senator PAUL, in front of everybody, to start wearing a mask on the Senate floor, like the entire staff does all the time—particularly the staff. And I appreciate now the Presiding Officer is wearing a mask, but I wish Senator PAUL would show respect to his colleagues to wear a mask while he is on the Senate floor walking around.

I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request from the Senator from Kentucky?

The objection is withdrawn.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

AMENDMENT NO. 48

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 48 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT] proposes an amendment numbered 48.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to prohibiting the provision of COVID-19 related kindergarten through grade 12 emergency relief to schools that do not reopen for in-person learning after the teachers of such schools are vaccinated against COVID-19)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING COVID-19 RELATED EMERGENCY RELIEF TO SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting schools, students, and their families, which may include limiting or prohibiting the provision of COVID-19 related kindergarten through grade 12 emergency relief to schools that do not reopen for in-person learning after the teachers of such schools are vaccinated, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I am offering an amendment today to reopen our Nation's schools once teachers are vaccinated and the potential for tying COVID funding to that reopening.

The evidence is clear, school closures are hurting students, prolonged remote learning puts kids where they are at high risk of falling behind, of failing classes, and of having mental health problems. And even a greater number of students with disabilities in under-

served areas are impacted by not going to school.

Science confirms schools can and should reopen safely. Just this week, the CDC Director said that vaccines aren't even a prerequisite to getting kids back to school. There shouldn't be any further delay. This amendment does include teachers vaccines as part of the criteria; but with vaccines, we should get back to in-person school. The case is strong. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the role of Federal funding to schools for COVID relief is to help support our schools in implementing public health protocols aligned with local public health guidance in order to safely reopen.

The President has made clear that he would like the vast majority of K-8 schools to reopen in the next 100 days, but any amendment offered today attaching extraneous conditions to those funds is simply a political show. If we withhold funds and schools cannot implement health safety protocols, then we are acting counter to actually getting students back into the classroom.

Making sure our Nation's educators receive a vaccine is an important step; however, vaccinations are just one piece of safely transitioning back. Safely reopening schools means providing schools the resources to implement public health protocols, physical distancing, consistent mask-wearing, ventilation, testing, and contact tracing. This amendment would prohibit schools from getting critical resources to implement those public health protocols, and, as a result, this amendment would make that much harder for schools to reopen for in-person instruction.

The best way for our schools to reopen as soon as possible is to give schools the resources they need. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, may I have additional time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 seconds.

Mr. BLUNT. Vote yes on this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 48

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

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 17 Leg.]
YEAS—50

Barrasso	Blunt	Braun
Blackburn	Boozman	Burr

Capito	Hoeven	Romney
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Cornyn	Johnson	Sasse
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Lummis	Sullivan
Daines	Marshall	Thune
Ernst	McConnell	Tillis
Fischer	Moran	Toomey
Graham	Murkowski	Tuberville
Grassley	Paul	Wicker
Hagerty	Portman	Young
Hawley	Risch	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

The amendment (No. 48) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 52, AS MODIFIED

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 52 be called up, as modified, and reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] proposes an amendment numbered 52, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the authority of States or other taxing jurisdictions to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States or taxing jurisdictions)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY OF STATES AND OTHER TAXING JURISDICTIONS TO TAX CERTAIN INCOME OF EMPLOYEES WORKING IN OTHER STATES OR TAXING JURISDICTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the authority of States or other taxing jurisdictions to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States or taxing jurisdictions by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, one significant thing we could do to provide genuine relief to Americans is to address the tax situation facing remote and mobile workers, like the medical

professionals who travel from other States to help during the COVID crisis who now may be facing a surprise big, fat tax bill.

Mobile workers generally have to file tax returns in multiple States, as tax rules often differ, and with COVID, many employers had their employees begin working from home, presenting a possible tax problem for workers who live in a different State than the one they work in.

This amendment would address these challenges. It would create a uniform standard for mobile workers, codify the prepandemic status quo for remote workers, and establish a special 90-day standard for healthcare workers and others who traveled to another State to help during the pandemic and to ensure that these workers don't face an unexpected tax bill.

I would ask that we adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend, the senior Senator from South Dakota, for working with me on this. We have been working on this for a full decade now. We worked together in the Ag Committee to deliver for America's farmers. I want to take the same approach here.

Healthcare workers, as my friend from South Dakota said, have been on the frontlines of this pandemic going on for a year now. Not only are they combating this virus in their own community; many of them have traveled across State lines, obviously, to do this.

A surprise tax bill is the last thing they need. We should make it easier for these mobile workers to support themselves and their family.

This is important to a lot of my colleagues. Senator HASSAN, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator CORTEZ MASTO, and I just talked about it. I thank all of you for working to make this progress possible.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio, and I would ask that this amendment be adopted by voice.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 52, AS MODIFIED

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

The amendment (No. 52), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 54

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 54 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. YOUNG] proposes an amendment numbered 54.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to preventing legislation that would allow illegal immigrants to receive Economic Impact Payments or any other similar direct, tax-based temporary financial assistance)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOW ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS TO RECEIVE ECONOMIC IMPACT PAYMENTS OR ANY OTHER SIMILAR DIRECT, TAX-BASED, TEMPORARY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include provisions limiting or preventing illegal immigrants from receiving Economic Impact Payments or other similar direct, tax-based temporary financial assistance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today in support of my amendment to ensure that any new round of economic impact payments does not go to those in this country illegally.

It would establish a dangerous precedent if the Federal Government were to give a direct cash payment to those who have jumped the line and subverted our Nation's immigration system to enter the United States.

Now, I want to emphasize that this amendment is not a change. It is not a change from the way this body has approached EIPs during the last two rounds. Moreover, it does not affect the important fix that Congress implemented, with the leadership of Mr. RUBIO, in December to ensure mixed-status families are not negatively impacted.

This amendment would simply make certain that Democrats do not loosen the existing eligibility requirements moving forward if there is a new round of EIPs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me clarify something at the outset. Undocumented immigrants do not qualify for stimulus relief under current law or any proposal by the Biden administration. This amendment is unnecessary.

There are estimated to be 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States, 7½ million ITINS. These are men and women working in the United States, paying Federal taxes, living in this country.

We can save the debate for another day as to their entitlement for any financial relief, but let me hope that we do agree on one basic thing: Children who are legal citizens in the United States of America are entitled to help, regardless of the immigration status of their parents.

Unfortunately, Senator YOUNG's amendment, as written, would preclude these children of immigrant parents from this financial assistance. Whether you are for or against their parents receiving a payment, be fair to these American children, these legal citizens in the United States, and vote no on the Young amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, how much time do I have to respond?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five seconds.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, we have consulted with legal counsel. The gentleman from Illinois' statements, assertions are inaccurate. This would not impact mixed-status families.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote aye on this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 54

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DURBIN. Do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 18 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kelly	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Stabenow
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Tuberville
Fischer	Murkowski	Wicker
Graham	Paul	Young
Grassley	Peters	
Hagerty	Portman	

NAYS—42

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

The amendment (No. 54) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 775

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 775 and ask that it be reported by number.

I also ask for unanimous consent that the time be split between myself and the Senator from Maine.

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

The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) proposes an amendment numbered 775.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to targeting economic impact payments to Americans who are suffering from the effects of COVID-19, including provisions to ensure upper-income taxpayers are not eligible)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TARGETING ECONOMIC IMPACT PAYMENTS TO AMERICANS WHO ARE SUFFERING FROM THE EFFECTS OF COVID-19.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to targeting economic impact payments to Americans who are suffering from the effects of COVID-19, including provisions to ensure upper-income taxpayers are not eligible, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, American families in every corner of our country are struggling right now, and I don't think a single person on this floor would disagree that the decent, compassionate thing is for us to target relief to our neighbors struggling every day to get by, to the families who are struggling to pay rent and put food on the table. This \$1,400 will make a significant impact on their ability to get by. These families need our support right now.

Still, there are other families who have not missed a single paycheck as a result of this pandemic. It does not make sense to send a check to those individuals who are still working, earning a decent living over the wages that we talked about.

My bipartisan amendment would simply ensure those Americans who are truly struggling through no fault of their own—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty seconds.

Mr. MANCHIN. Are given the support they need during this difficult time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the question before us is quite simple: Do we want stimulus checks to go to households with family incomes of \$300,000 or do we want to target the assistance to struggling families who need the help and provide a boost for the economy?

I urge my colleagues to support the Manchin-Collins amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. I do not oppose this amendment. I don't think anybody here wants to see people making \$300,000 or \$400,000 get direct payments.

But let me be very clear, speaking for myself. I absolutely want to make certain that people who are making \$75,000 a year or less do get their payments and couples making \$150,000 a year or less do get their payments.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 775

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hagerty	Portman
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lujan	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lummis	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	Markey	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Warnock
Ernst	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murray	Wicker
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	Young

NAYS—1

Paul

The amendment (No. 775) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 553

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 553 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 553.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ensuring that State and local law enforcement are permitted to cooperate with Federal officials to enforce Federal law)

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ALLOWING STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT COOPERATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing Federal funding by any of the committees instructed in section 2002 for any State or political subdivision of a State that prohibits its local officials from cooperating with Federal officials to enforce Federal law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, this amendment would allow withholding of community development block grants and Economic Development Act funding from States and municipalities that prohibit local police from cooperating with Federal officials to enforce Federal law.

It is important to note it would not affect any security-related funds.

It is important because sanctuary cities, like San Francisco and Philadelphia, in my State, have radical policies that actually forbid the local police from cooperating with Federal immigration officials, even when the local police would like to cooperate.

These policies are dangerous. They cost us time and money. But most importantly, by far, is the tragic cost to human beings, people like Kate Steinle, killed by an illegal immigrant who opened fire on a San Francisco pier.

This shooter had been convicted of seven felonies, been deported five times. Why was he on the pier that night? Because San Francisco chose to release him rather than cooperate with Federal authorities that wanted to take him off the streets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, community policing is not a one-size-fits-all approach. The Congress and the administration should respect the judgment of local leaders when it comes to identifying public safety needs.

Hundreds of cities and counties have decided they don't want to be immigration police. Why? Because their resources are stretched thin, and doing so will deter people from reporting crime and cooperating with police investigation.

Instead of laying off this responsibility to local government, I have got a

radical idea: Why doesn't Congress do its own work and fix this broken immigration system once and for all, instead of blaming local police departments?

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 553

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Toomey amendment.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.
 The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 20 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

The amendment (No. 553) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the following amendments in the order listed and that the amendments be reported by number: Cardin No. 716; Barrasso No. 653; Sasse No. 192; Graham No. 687; Ernst No. 132; Collins No. 546; and Shaheen No. 834.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 716

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 716 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] proposes an amendment numbered 716.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to COVID-19 vaccine administration and a public awareness campaign)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COVID-19 VACCINE ADMINISTRATION AND A PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening and improving the process of distributing COVID-19 vaccines to States, which may include supporting States in implementing a transparent and consistent vaccine administration program and bolstering States' public awareness campaigns to increase awareness and knowledge of the safety and effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines (particularly among vulnerable communities, including ethnic minority populations), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that 30 seconds of my time be devoted to Senator PORTMAN.

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

Mr. CARDIN. I thank Senator PORTMAN and Senator MENENDEZ for cosponsoring this amendment. Each of our States has challenges in the adequacy and fairness of vaccine distribution systems. This amendment would provide that there would be State and Federal support to the States for implementing a transparent and consistent vaccine administration program and bolstering States' awareness campaigns to increase awareness and knowledge of the safety and effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines, particularly among vulnerable communities, including ethnic minority populations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I strongly support this amendment. The most important thing we can do right now is to get the vaccines distributed. One of the problems we have is that about 40 percent of Americans are still saying they are uncomfortable getting the vaccine. Part of that is because we haven't been able to get a proper public awareness campaign out there—not with politicians but with folks with white coats and people who are respected and trusted on this issue—to say it is necessary for us because these are safe and effective, and by getting these vaccines in place, we can turn things around.

I support the amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 716

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. THUNE. I yield back time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 21 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Baldwin	Hagerty	Portman
Barrasso	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Hawley	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young
Graham	Paul	
Grassley	Peters	

The amendment (No. 716) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 653

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 653 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRASSO] proposes an amendment numbered 653.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to supporting elementary and secondary schools in States with lost revenue due to the Federal moratorium on oil and natural gas leasing on public lands and offshore waters)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN STATES WITH LOST REVENUE DUE TO THE FEDERAL MORATORIUM ON OIL AND NATURAL GAS LEASING ON PUBLIC LANDS AND OFFSHORE WATERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting elementary and secondary schools in States with lost revenue due to the Federal moratorium on oil and natural gas leasing on public lands and offshore waters by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, my amendment addresses the serious impacts of the Biden administration moratorium on oil and natural gas leases and the impact on Federal lands and waters.

Wyoming and many States across the West have Federal land where there is oil and gas development. The revenue generated from the lease sales goes to States, which use it for essential services.

One of the many crushing consequences of the moratorium is eliminating hundreds of millions of dollars for K-12 education for students, funding all of these States. In 2019 alone, revenues from oil and gas contributed \$740 million to Wyoming's public schools.

This amendment creates a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect students and schools from this misguided moratorium by restoring these lost funds to the States.

I urge a "yes" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, my friend from Wyoming and I disagree on many things. We disagree on the impact of this policy in the immediate, and we disagree on the speed of the energy transition to a zero-carbon economy.

What we do not disagree about is that these communities we support—we support their schools, and throughout this transition we should support the people who have kept the lights on and made this country the greatest energy country on the face of the Earth.

So I would support this amendment because it is about supporting the schools in those communities.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 653

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 22 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Baldwin	Grassley	Portman
Barrasso	Hagerty	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Booker	Hirono	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sanders
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kennedy	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young
Graham	Peters	

NAYS—2

Lee Paul

The amendment (No. 653) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 192

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 192 and ask that it be reported by number, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SASSE], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 192.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to improving health care to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING HEALTH CARE TO PROHIBIT A HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONER FROM FAILING TO EXERCISE THE PROPER DEGREE OF CARE IN THE CASE OF A CHILD WHO SURVIVES AN ABORTION OR ATTEMPTED ABORTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving health care, which may include the creation of criminal and civil penalties for providers who fail to exercise the same degree of care for babies who survive an abortion or attempted abortion as would be provided to another child born at the same gestational age, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, we are doing a lot of red versus blue jersey stuff today. Until about 2 a.m., it is going to be mostly straight partisan votes. It would be good for us to find some common ground, and this amendment is an opportunity to do that.

This amendment, modeled on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, is an opportunity to come together and to defend babies. It is pretty simple, actually. Every baby, whether she is born in a state-of-the-art hospital with a NICU unit or whether she is born in an abortion clinic in a strip mall, every baby is born with dignity and is created in God's image, and she deserves care. This amendment is aimed at making sure that babies who survive abortions get the same degree of care that any other newborn would. There is nothing partisan about that. That is why my Democratic colleagues, JOE MANCHIN and BOB CASEY, both voted for this last year as legislation. We disagree on a bunch of stuff, but not this.

There is a lot of complicated debate in this Chamber, but this isn't actually one of them. Here is a chance for 100 Senators to come together and support every baby. Every baby deserves a fighting chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is already current law that all Federal protections for people apply to every infant born alive, including those born alive during the course of an abortion. Simply put, you cannot kill an infant, regardless of how they came into this world.

This is the law of the land thanks to the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which passed the House and Senate by a voice vote and was signed into law by President George Bush in 2002.

Does it work? In 2013, Dr. Kermit Gosnell, a physician in Pennsylvania, was found guilty on three counts of murdering babies born alive in his clinic after botched late-term abortions. He is currently serving three life terms in prison.

I would say to the Senator from Nebraska, of course we agree. People like Dr. Gosnell should pay a heavy price. But to put this into a budget resolution just doesn't fit, and I am afraid one page doesn't do justice to even the explanation that was given.

I raise a point of order that the pending amendment is not germane to the underlying resolution and therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. SASSE. Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and ap-

plicable budget resolutions for the purposes of Senate amendment No. 192, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 23 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Casey	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 687

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 687.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] proposes an amendment numbered 687.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to strengthening and protecting international agreements, joint declarations, or proclamations entered into by the United States and Mexico)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING AND PROTECTING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS, JOINT DECLARATIONS, OR PROCLAMATIONS ENTERED INTO BY THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening and protecting international agreements, joint declarations, or proclamations entered into by the United States and Mexico, which may include the Remain in Mexico program, which requires foreign nationals seeking assistance at the United States-Mexico border to wait in Mexico for the results, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the "Remain in Mexico" policy was put in place by the Trump administration after talks with Mexico about how to stem the flow of migrants from Central America who were seeking to come to the United States for economic reasons more times than not. Before the "Remain in Mexico" policy was adopted, migrants from the Northern Triangle countries traveled to the United States, seeking to turn themselves in and claim asylum whether they had valid claims or not. They would then be released into the United States and often did not return for their court dates.

If we end the "Remain in Mexico" policy for asylum seekers, it will lead to a run on our border and complicate efforts to reform the immigration system. Over 50,000 asylum seekers have been waiting in Mexico rather than in the United States, where they often disappear while waiting in the 1 million-person asylum case backlog. This was an important change that the Trump administration put in place, and it is a serious mistake to reverse it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment because my distinguished colleague and friend put it in a very narrow context.

The reality is that this amendment suggests that all agreements, proclamations, or declarations entered into between the United States and Mexico will be preserved. The problem is Congress does not have a clear picture of the international agreements, arrangements, and supporting documents that the Trump administration negotiated with Mexico. I requested those documents for almost 2 years as the ranking member on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Yet the Trump administration was afraid to put them up for congressional and public scrutiny.

Without knowing what they say or how low they may have stooped, I don't see how any Member can take an educated vote on this amendment to consent to that which Members don't even know exists.

I, therefore, oppose the amendment for those and other reasons.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment is not

germane to the underlying resolution and, therefore, violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of this amendment, Senate amendment No. 687, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, and the nays are 50.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 132

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 132 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Ms. ERNST], for herself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 132.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to prioritizing taking into custody aliens charged with a crime resulting in death or serious bodily injury)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING TAKING INTO CUSTODY ALIENS CHARGED WITH A VIOLENT CRIME.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for the Department of Homeland Security to establish and implement policies that prioritize the taking into custody of removable aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, this amendment reflects the intent of S. 80, Sarah's Law, which would amend the mandatory detention provisions of the INA to require the detention of anyone unlawfully present in the United States who is charged with a crime resulting in the death or serious bodily injury of another person.

It honors the life of a girl from Iowa, Sarah Root. Her life was tragically cut short by a drunk driver who was illegally here in the United States. Sarah's Law currently has 21 cosponsors.

One of the first things the Biden administration did was stop prioritizing violent aliens for deportation. This amendment reflects that DHS should not implement such policies.

I thank Senators TILLIS, MORAN, GRASSLEY, SASSE, INHOFE, HYDE-SMITH, LEE, RICK SCOTT, and HOEVEN for joining me in this effort, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment is opposed by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the Center for American Progress, America's Voice, SCIU, the National Immigrant Justice Center, and many, many other civil rights and immigration organizations. The reason they oppose it and why I oppose it is this amendment applies to people charged, not convicted. I am not a lawyer, but my understanding is that in this country, we believe that people are innocent until proven guilty.

What this amendment does is vilify immigrants. Many of them are working at essential and dangerous jobs right now, often for very low pay.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, this amendment is not germane to the budget resolution as required by law; therefore, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment

violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of Senate amendment No. 132, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Graham	Paul	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Feinstein	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, we had a vote a moment ago to have 10-minute votes. So far the vote are closer to 30 minutes than 10 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that the clerk time the votes to 10 minutes; that we not go beyond 10 minutes; that at the end of 10 minutes, we give an extra 1 minute of grace time; and that we close the vote after 11 minutes. (Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand

the Senator from Utah's sentiments, and I share them.

There is a physical need to call the roll, which takes an amount of time, which sometimes can be more than 10 minutes. If we reach a tie situation and have to call in the Vice President, it takes even longer.

The most effective thing I have seen in the Senate to deal with this issue is for Members to sit in their chairs and to vote as their names are called. We can bring the rollcalls to an end much more quickly. Now they are running around 30 minutes.

I am going to object to your suggestion, but I would suggest that when we reach the point where Members are sitting in their chairs, amendments are called, and we vote on them quickly, we can come to a conclusion in a much faster way.

Mr. ROMNEY. Would the gentleman agree, then, that we take as much time as it takes to read the names, and if it requires the Vice President to come here, we give her sufficient time to get here, but, otherwise, 10 minutes?

Mr. DURBIN. I think you are going to find that 10 minutes is not practical. I wish—I am for electronic voting, just to go way out on a limb, but I want to tell you—

Mr. ROMNEY. That is probably not practical tonight.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMNEY. Certainly.

Mr. SCHUMER. It would help speed things along if we could have a set amount. You keep handing us new sheets.

(Applause.)

And that is OK, but let's see the total amount of amendments, and then we can try to move the time as quickly as possible. OK?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, with due respect to the majority leader, I understand what he is suggesting. But the Senator from Utah has made a motion which has absolutely nothing to do with the number of votes that we are going to be taking tonight.

Look, 365 days a year, we are told, as individual Senators, to wait our turn; we will get to vote on whatever we want to vote on if and when we vote on them. This is the one time, with budget vote-arama, where anybody can ask for a vote on anything.

Now, I don't see anything wrong with the Senator from Utah's request that we limit the amount of time it takes to vote to the amount of time it takes to call the roll and then to add to that any additional time that might be taken up by waiting for the Vice President in the event of a tie.

So I would like to resuggest what the Senator from Utah has asked. That is, I ask unanimous consent that we so limit the amount of time we take to vote to the time it takes to call the roll, subject to the need to wait for

Vice President HARRIS to come and break any tie.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 546

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator MANCHIN, Senator CAPITO, Senator MORAN, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator KING, I call up amendment No. 546 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 546.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to strengthening the Provider Relief Fund, including a 20 percent set aside for rural hospitals)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING THE PROVIDER RELIEF FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening the Provider Relief Fund, which may include additional support for rural hospitals in order to preserve jobs and access to specialty services, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask that I be notified when I have 30 seconds remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to replenish and strengthen the Provider Relief Fund, which has been a lifeline for hospitals, nursing homes, and community health centers, as well as physician practices across the country, but especially so in rural America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 seconds.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, our rural hospitals have been particularly hard hit during this pandemic.

With that, I would yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, 18 rural hospitals across America closed last year—three in my own State. Do any of you have any sympathy for people who live in rural America?

Twenty percent of the population in America is rural. We only got 6 percent

of the money that was associated that we sent out in the last CARES package, and that is 6 percent to rural hospitals.

We need to treat them fair. That is all we are asking for. A 20-percent set-aside is fair. Thank you, and I would appreciate your support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. Clearly, all across this country rural communities are suffering real healthcare crises in terms of a loss of hospitals that they desperately need.

So I would hope that this would be an issue that all of us will work together to rebuild healthcare in rural America and make sure that our communities have the hospitals that they need.

VOICE OF AMENDMENT NO. 546

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hagerty	Portman
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lummis	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	Markey	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Tuberville
Daines	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Ernst	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Fischer	Ossoff	Wicker
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Paul	Young

NAYS—1

Lee

The amendment (No. 546) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Chamber for a minute.

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

SENATOR FEINSTEIN'S 9,000TH VOTE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have another great accomplishment, one right after the other, because they both came together. Earlier today, we all congratulated our good friend Senator MURRAY for achieving a historic

milestone—9,000 rollcall votes. Well, we are pretty lucky because today we get to celebrate another 9,000-vote accomplishment by none other than the great senior Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN.

(Applause.)

Like Senator MURRAY, she was also elected during the Year of the Woman, and she helped blaze a trail that many would follow.

Throughout her career, and through many of those 9,000 votes, she has made her mark on some of the biggest issues of our time: the environment, healthcare, gun safety, and much, much more.

Alongside Senator Boxer, she was the first woman to come to the Senate from the State of California, the first Jewish woman to come to the Senate from any State, and she became the first woman ever to serve as chair of both the Rules Committee and Select Intelligence Committee.

One glass ceiling right after another in a storied and continually impactful career.

I congratulate Senator FEINSTEIN for today's accomplishment, and I thank her for her many years of friendship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 834

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I would like to call up amendment No. 834, as modified, and speak for 30 seconds and then turn the mic over to my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI, who is the cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mrs. SHAHEEN], for herself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 834, as modified.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to improving services and interventions relating to sexual assault, family violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and child abuse)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING SERVICES AND INTERVENTIONS RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT, FAMILY VIOLENCE, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, AND CHILD ABUSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving services and interventions for victims relating to sexual assault, family violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and child abuse, which may include funding for programs and grants authorized by the Violence Against Women Act and the Victims of Child Abuse Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, this amendment supports organizations serving survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and child abuse. As we know, because of COVID, those survivors and families have been hit particularly hard, and there has been very little money that has gone to support them. This amendment would say very strongly we need to do better.

Senator MURKOWSKI.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are ensuring with this amendment that there will be resources for survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and child abuse. Senator SHAHEEN has pointed out that our shelters are very, very much in need of our support.

We urge you all to protect the most vulnerable in their time of need. We ask for your support on this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 834

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Baldwin	Hagerty	Portman
Barrasso	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Hawley	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Cooms	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young
Graham	Paul	
Grassley	Peters	

The amendment (No. 834), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 833

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 833 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BRAUN] proposes an amendment numbered 833.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to prohibiting the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating rules or guidance that bans hydraulic fracturing in the United States)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY FROM PROMULGATING RULES OR GUIDANCE THAT BANS FRACKING IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and environmental laws and policies, which may include limiting or prohibiting the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or implementing a rule or guidance that bans fracking in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, my amendment helps ensure that the EPA cannot, through regulation or otherwise, ban fracking in the United States. This is an issue of energy independence, locking in our CO₂ emissions reduction provided by clean natural gas, and it gives us time to find the cleanest, least expensive options down the road.

Due to our American renaissance, the United States passed Russia as a leading energy supplier in 2011 and passed Saudi Arabia in 2018.

But fracking has been a boon to the economy as well. According to the Global Energy Institute, if fracking were banned in 2021, the U.S. economy would lose 19 million jobs in 4 years, local and State tax revenues would plummet, and gas prices would double. This is why President Biden promised: We will not ban fracking; we will protect and grow jobs.

Yet many in this body have called to ban fracking. The American people deserve to know who stands with energy security and American workers. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, unfortunately, I must rise in opposition to Braun amendment 833 this evening. On its face, this amendment would prohibit the EPA and the Council on Environmental Quality from issuing any regulation or guidance that would ban oil and gas fracking.

President Biden has stated repeatedly that he does not support a blanket ban on fracking. He has said that we should capture the methane that emanates from fracking, not ban the practice all together.

Let me give you his exact words. This is Joe Biden's words: "Let me be clear, and I know this always comes up, we're not going to ban fracking."

The amendment, as written, before us appears to go beyond just prohibiting EPA and the Council on Environmental Quality from issuing regs to ban oil and gas fracking. The effect here would actually go beyond that and prevent the Federal Government from regulating emissions of methane and air toxics that are related to fracking.

I encourage my colleagues to not vote for this hasty and unnecessary amendment. Methane is 85 times more dangerous than carbon dioxide. We should be controlling it, not allowing it to go up into the air.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 833

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

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 28 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Bennet	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Portman
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Romney
Braun	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Burr	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Casey	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Cramer	Lujan	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Booker	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Sinema
Cardin	Markey	Smith
Carper	Menendez	Stabenow
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warnock
Durbin	Ossoff	Warren
Feinstein	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Hirono	Rosen	

The amendment (No. 833) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order

to call up the following amendments in the order listed and that the amendments be reported by number and that the amendments alternate with a Democratic amendment when one is available to be called up: Grassley No. 91, Cortez Masto No. 853, Inhofe No. 786, Paul No. 1, Ernst No. 767, Daines No. 678, Johnson No. 542, Lee No. 821.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 91

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 91 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 91.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would allow for six-figure tax cuts for the top 1/10th of 1 percent of taxpayers)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that increases or eliminates the limitation on the State and local tax deduction if such increase or elimination would, as determined by the Joint Committee on Taxation, result in any taxpayer receiving a reduction in Federal income taxes which is equal to or greater than \$100,000.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, my amendment creates a point of order against repeal of the SALT tax deduction as part of the COVID package.

Any COVID relief package should be targeted at helping those in need, not the benefit of the top 1 percent. According to JCT, over half of the benefit from the repeal would go to those with incomes over \$1 million, and \$50,000 or lower wouldn't benefit at all.

According to an analysis of the Tax Policy Center, the top 1 percent would receive an average tax cut of \$144,000. No COVID relief package should include six-figure tax cuts to multi-millionaires when millions of middle-class Americans are struggling to make ends meet.

And for the benefit of my friends on the other side of the aisle, it is not progressive to give tax cuts to the top 1 percent of the people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have been advised that inclusion of this

amendment in the budget resolution would be corrosive to the privileged status of the resolution.

Since this amendment contains material inappropriate for inclusion in a budget resolution, its adoption could jeopardize the privilege of this resolution, which would completely halt our efforts to provide urgent, critical pandemic relief.

Additionally, this amendment is not germane to the budget resolution, as required by law. Accordingly, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for the purpose of Senate amendment 91, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 29 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Blunt	Hagerty	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeben	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Portman	

NAYS—51

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Paul	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 853

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 853.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) proposes an amendment numbered 853.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to expanded support to struggling Americans in relation to their employment in hospitality, including those in conventions, trade shows, entertainment, tourism, and travel)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING HOSPITALITY, CONVENTIONS, TRADE SHOWS, ENTERTAINMENT, TOURISM, AND TRAVEL AND THEIR WORKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting struggling Americans in relation to their employment in hospitality, including those in the convention, trade show, entertainment, tourism, and travel industries, which may include legislation that provides relief and recovery incentives, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, the coronavirus pandemic has devastated economies and industries at every single State across the country. In Nevada, our hospitality travel and tourism sectors have been especially hard-hit.

These businesses are economic engines for our communities, employing hundreds of thousands of workers and pumping billions of dollars into our economy each year, but they are facing incredible challenges right now due to COVID.

This amendment ensures that the Senate will prioritize support for the hospitality industry and its workers as it crafts legislation to provide coronavirus relief and recovery to communities across the United States.

Almost half of all job losses since the pandemic began have been in the travel, leisure, and hospitality industries, and the situation gets more dire every day we don't act.

Communities across this country have suffered as nearly \$500 billion in travel spending and an estimated \$64 billion in Federal, State, and local revenues have evaporated. Our communities cannot afford to see these industries decimated.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment to expand support for our struggling hospitality industry and provide relief for the workers in the industries hardest hit by this pandemic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 853

If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 853) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 786

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up amendment up No. 786 and ask it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) proposes an amendment numbered 786.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to maintaining the United States Embassy in Jerusalem, Israel)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAINTAINING THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM, ISRAEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the United States Embassy in Jerusalem, Israel, maintaining its current location and level of operations, which may include current funding levels and security, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I yield 15 seconds from our time to our friend, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. HAGERTY.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the senior Senator from Oklahoma as the lead cosponsor of this amendment in support of our shared objective, maintaining the U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem, the eternal and the indivisible capital of the Jewish State of Israel.

This Embassy is paving the way for peace throughout the region and should be preserved. Now our allies there know we will stand with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this amendment shouldn't be controversial to anyone. It has been our position in the United States for 25 years that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, and we should have our Embassy in Jerusalem.

This is not controversial. In 1995, the same amendment was 93 to 5. In 2017, it was 90 to 0.

With that, I retain the balance of my time.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 786

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator seek recognition in opposition?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 30 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Baldwin	Hagerty	Peters
Barrasso	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Hawley	Reed
Blackburn	Heinrich	Risch
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lujan	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lummis	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	Markey	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Warnock
Ernst	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young
Graham	Padilla	
Grassley	Paul	

NAYS—3

Carper Sanders Warren

The amendment (No. 786) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 1, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 1.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, every American family must balance its own family's budget, and voters wonder why Congress never balances its budget. The Democratic budget before us will add \$15 trillion of debt over the next decade. The Pennies Plan budget, which is consistent with the balanced budget amendment that most Republicans have voted for, balances the budget in just 5 years.

When I first introduced this budget a few years ago, all you had to do was cut one penny over 5 years, and the budget balanced, but as Congress has blown through the budget caps, it has

become much more difficult. Last year, it was two pennies—a 2-percent cut per year to balance in 5 years. Now it is a three-penny plan, and you have to have a 3-percent cut, but it is still foreseeable that we could balance our budget.

It is the right thing to do. It is good for America. It will make us a stronger country to leave for our kids and our grandkids, and I urge a “yes” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator seek recognition in opposition?

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 71, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 31 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Lummis	Toomey
Ernst	Marshall	Tuberville
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—71

Baldwin	Hawley	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Inhofe	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Sasse
Burr	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Capito	Klobuchar	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cotton	Merkley	Warner
Cramer	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Ossoff	Wicker
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Peters	Young
Hassan	Portman	

The amendment (No. 1) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 767

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 767 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Ms. ERNST] proposes an amendment numbered 767.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to prohibiting an increase in the Federal minimum wage during a global pandemic to \$15 per hour)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE DURING A GLOBAL PANDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the Federal minimum wage during a global pandemic, which may include prohibiting the rate from more than doubling to \$15 per hour, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, a \$15 Federal minimum wage would be devastating for our hardest hit small businesses at a time when they can least afford it. These small businesses, like restaurants and childcare centers, provide vital services for working families and are the lifeblood of our rural communities.

The CBO estimates that raising the Federal minimum wage to \$15 would result in 1.3 million jobs lost—this during the worst period of job loss since the Great Depression.

The cost of living in States like Iowa is very different than the cost of living in States like New York or California. We should not have a one-size-fits-all policy set by Washington politicians. We all support higher wages, but a \$15 Federal minimum wage would be counterproductive to this goal.

I thank my colleague Senator TIM SCOTT for working on this with me, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any Senator seeking recognition in opposition?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, at a time when half of our workers are living paycheck to paycheck, when millions of workers are earning starvation wages, and when Congress has not voted to raise the minimum wage since 2007, I will do everything that I can to make sure that a \$15-an-hour minimum wage is included in this reconciliation bill. But there appears to be some misunderstanding. As the author of the Raise the Wage Act, it was never my intention to increase the minimum wage to \$15 an hour immediately and during the pandemic. My legislation gradually increases the minimum wage to \$15 an hour over a 5-year period, and that is what I believe we have to do. We need to do it in the reconciliation bill, and we need to end the crisis of starvation wages in Iowa and around the United States.

So I will support this amendment because nobody is talking about doubling the Federal minimum wage during the pandemic. We are talking about gradually phasing it in over a 5-year period.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, do I have time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am sorry, the Senator from Iowa has no time remaining.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 767

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I would accept a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Ms. ERNST. We withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

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

The amendment (No. 767) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 678

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 678 and ask that it be reported by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 678.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the improvement of relations between the United States and Canada with regard to the Keystone XL Pipeline entering the United States in Phillips County, Montana)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving relations between the United States and Canada, increasing energy trade between the two nations, and reducing transportation emissions through the approval of the importation of oil from Canada to the United States through the Keystone XL Pipeline by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, despite President Biden’s call for unity, with the stroke of a pen, he killed the Keystone XL Pipeline and the thousands of jobs that come with it. He eliminated tens of millions of dollars of tax revenues for communities in Montana for education, for law enforcement, for infrastructure, as well as across the West. Hard-working Americans across our country, dozens of families in Montana have already been given the pink slip. They were told to go home. Their paycheck is gone. This isn’t because of a pandemic; this is because of President Biden.

I hope all of my colleagues join me today for the good of American energy and our blue-collar workers, or they can stand with the job-killing Green New Deal agenda. The choice is clear.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does a Senator seek recognition in opposition to the amendment?

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 678

If not, the question is on the amendment.

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 32 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeben	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	
Graham	Portman	

NAYS—48

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

The amendment (No. 678) was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

BUDGET RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT NO. 54

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I opposed amendment No. 54 proposed by Senator YOUNG because it could prevent more than 3.5 million American citizens with Social Security numbers, including 2 million children, from receiving vital relief if anyone else in their household lacks a Social Security number or uses an Individual Taxpayer Identification number to file their taxes. Before Congress passed an omnibus Covid relief package in December 2020, these mixed-status families were excluded from receiving economic impact payments, including their American citizen children. It is simply wrong and constitutionally suspect to discriminate against this group of American citizens.

AMENDMENT NO. 48

Mr. President, I opposed amendment No. 48 proposed by Senator BLUNT. Get-

ting our kids back in school is an urgent priority. Children, parents, and educators all struggle with remote learning, especially when far too many children don't have adequate access to the internet. But if we are to open safely and keep kids in school, we must follow evidence-based public health guidance from experts that protects all members of our school communities: students, parents, educators, and staff, alike. Vaccines for educators is a critical step, but schools must have the necessary guidance and resources to implement mitigation strategies to safely reopen, including funds for ventilation improvements, PPE, and robust testing and contact tracing. This amendment would be counterproductive—dangerously penalizing schools, disregarding State and local public health guidance, and blocking access to billions of dollars for our educators and students when they need it most.

The Biden administration has called for cross-agency collaboration to provide guidance and for Congress to provide an additional \$ 130 billion in emergency K-12 funding, so our schools can safely return to in-person learning. American families, children, and educators can't afford for us to waste any more time; it is time for Congress to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The senior Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 542

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Senator TUBERVILLE, I call up amendment No. 542 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], for himself and Mr. TUBERVILLE, proposes an amendment numbered 542.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting American taxpayers and the border, which may include prohibiting the cancellation of contracts for physical barriers and other border security measures for which funds already have been obligated and for which penalties will be incurred in the case of such cancellation and prohibiting the use of funds for payment of such penalties)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FROM THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH CANCELLING CONTRACTS RELATING TO BORDER SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting American taxpayers and the United States border, which may include prohibiting the cancellation of

contracts for physical barriers and other border security measures for which funds already have been obligated, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, in 2006, the Secure Fence Act was signed into law, authorizing 700 miles of double-layer fencing along the southwest border. It passed this Chamber on a vote of 80 to 19, with 26 Senate Democrats voting to secure the border. Among the Democratic Senators voting for it were then-Senators Obama, Biden, Clinton, and current Senators SCHUMER, FEINSTEIN, CARPER, and WYDEN.

In the end, only 36 miles of double fencing was actually constructed, which, in the end, combined with a very low bar for asylum claims and DACA, created the catalyst for a humanitarian crisis in 2014 of unaccompanied minors and family units coming in, with the crisis peaking in the summer of 2019. In reaction, President Trump enacted a number of policies, including construction of 700 miles of wall.

Now, we didn't construct all of it, but we contracted 700 miles, completed 450, and, as of today, 250 miles are contracted but not built.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration is now reversing all of these policies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have 2 minutes, don't I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was told 2.

Well, anyway, my amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON.—will prevent cancellation of those contracts, saving taxpayers the cancellation costs and securing the borders.

I urge support of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, we need to have a secure border with a strategic mix of personnel, technology, and barriers, and the Biden administration has initiated a comprehensive review of southern border security. But this amendment would force the last administration's misguided, simplistic border wall decisions on President Biden.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

Mr. PETERS. We are in the midst of an unprecedented pandemic and recession. The legislation before us must focus on families trying to put food on the table and struggling small businesses, not ensuring well-connected government contractors get rich.

The President's decision about our borders will be guided by what is best