

your children. Work should be rewarded in this country. When you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work on Workers Memorial Day and the other 364 days of the year.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise to voice my strong support for the confirmation of Ambassador Samantha Power to be the next Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development. I am confident that she brings the talent, skill, and experience required of this office and is the right person to lead this pivotal agency at a critical point in America's return to global leadership.

Ambassador Power has worn many different hats throughout her sterling career—advocate, academic, advisor, and diplomat. But that trajectory has been propelled in large part by her time as a journalist, where she saw the day-to-day experiences of those living in places struggling against the tides of war, famine, genocide, and disease. She witnessed, first-hand, the tireless efforts of USAID Foreign Service officers working in partnership with local stakeholders to uplift and empower communities around the world. And those early experiences seeing the work of USAID and the challenges the agency faces continue to guide her path.

Like Ambassador Power, I spent the early part of my career seeing global conflict up close. As a staffer working on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1988, I travelled to Iraq after Saddam Hussein used poison gas against the Kurdish people. It's a trip that Ambassador Power recounts in her first book, *A Problem from Hell*, which won her the Pulitzer Prize in 2003—and it's a trip that animates so much of the work I do in the United States Senate.

The world witnessed the horrific chemical weapons attacks on the Kurdish people in Halabja in March 1988 and later that year, together with my colleague, Peter Galbraith, I interviewed Kurdish survivors of other chemical attacks that followed. It was a heart-rending journey that stays with me to this day. But that experience, like Ambassador Power's experiences in Bosnia, East Timor, Darfur, West Africa, and elsewhere, instilled in me a sense of moral urgency that hasn't tired in the three decades since—and I know hasn't tired in Ambassador Power either.

I'm confident that she'll employ that sense of urgency in her new role as the Administrator of USAID, which bolsters peace and prosperity both in developing nations and here at home. The biggest threats that we face are interconnected and global—from climate change to cybersecurity to pandemics. As we've seen throughout the past year, viruses know no borders, and our ability to defeat COVID-19 depends

upon our willingness to partner with other nations to stop the spread and mount a successful recovery. And as we reassert American values at the core of our foreign policy, we will also need to combat the Chinese government's efforts to export its model of authoritarianism to governments in developing countries. USAID will be at forefront of these missions and others. In Ambassador Power's own words, "Development is critical to America's ability to tackle the toughest problems of our time—economic, humanitarian, and geopolitical."

Madam President, there is no doubt in my mind that Ambassador Samantha Power will serve our country well as the next Administrator of USAID. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of her confirmation.

VOTE ON THE POWER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

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

Mr. BROWN. 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 clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Are there any Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or change his or her vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Risch
Blunt	Inhofe	Romney
Booker	Johnson	Rosen
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Sasse
Capito	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cornyn	McConnell	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Crapo	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murray	Wicker
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	Young
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Boozman	Cassidy
Blackburn	Braun	Cotton

Cruz	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Daines	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Ernst	Lankford	Sullivan
Grassley	Lee	Thune
Hagerty	Lummis	Tillis
Hawley	Marshall	Tuberville
Hoeben	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—6

Cantwell	Paul	Shelby
Cramer	Rounds	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW"—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume legislative session.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, Leader CHUCK SCHUMER, Chairman TOM CARPER of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senator ANGUS KING, Senator EDWARD MARKEY and I are leading supporters and sponsors of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review, 85 Fed. Reg. 57,018, Sept. 14, 2020, also known as methane rescission rule. We submit these comments to provide the Senate with additional information regarding the intent in adopting this resolution.

The atmospheric buildup of greenhouse gases, such as methane, is changing the climate at a pace and in a way that endangers human health, society, our economy, and the natural environment. Specific public health impacts of anthropogenic climate change include respiratory harms associated with smoke inhalation from unprecedented climate-driven forest fires, heat stroke, and other health effects of increasingly frequent heat waves, and more widespread vector borne diseases. Other public welfare impacts include displacing U.S. communities by retreating snow and ice and rising sea levels, droughts that impact agricultural production and farming communities, and

changes in the frequency and intensity of heat waves, precipitation, and extreme weather events that have a disproportionate impact on our Nation most vulnerable.

A key chemical constituent of natural gas, methane is a leading contributing cause of climate change. It is 28 to 36 times more powerful than carbon dioxide in raising the Earth's surface temperature when measured over a 100-year time scale and about 84 times more powerful when measured over a 20-year timeframe.

Industrial sources emit greenhouse gases in great quantities, and methane emissions from all segments of the oil and gas industry are especially significant in their contribution to overall emissions levels and surface temperature rise.

It is not possible to address the problem of rising global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations tEy achieving U.S. net greenhouse gas neutrality. The United States cannot become greenhouse gas neutral without reducing greenhouse gas emissions from all industrial sources, regardless of the relative size of any one emission source or the disparate locations of the points of emission.

Within this context, the methane rescission rule should be disapproved by Congress. The rule finalized regulatory actions and introduced legal interpretations that contravene the Clean Air Act and congressional intent for EPA to take strong action to regulate and abate greenhouse gas emissions, such as methane, from all sources.

S.J. Res. 14 renders the methane rescission rule's effect void and demonstrates Congress's disapproval of the new findings of fact and interpretations of law upon which this rule was based.

By adopting this resolution of disapproval, it is our view that Congress reaffirms that the Clean Air Act requires EPA to act to protect Americans from sources of climate pollution like methane, which endangers the public's health and welfare.

In rejecting the methane rescission rule's misguided legal interpretations, the resolution clarifies our intent that EPA should regulate methane and other pollution emissions from all oil and gas sources, including production, processing, transmission, and storage segments under the authority of section 111 of the Clean Air Act.

In addition, we intend that section 111 of the Clean Air Act obligates and provides EPA with the legal authority to regulate existing sources of methane emissions in all of these segments.

In addition, we do not intend that section 111 of Clean Air Act requires EPA to make a pollutant-specific significant contribution finding before regulating emissions of a new pollutant from a listed source category, although EPA could make such a finding if it chooses to do so on a case-by-case basis.

Disapproval of the methane rescission rule does not preclude future regu-

lation under section 111 of the Clean Air Act of methane, VOCs or other pollution from the oil and gas industry. This resolution nullifies a rule that strips away public health and welfare protections and deregulates the oil and gas industry. Any future rule that imposes regulatory requirements on the oil and gas industry, provides additional public health and welfare protections, or establishes or strengthens standards on sources of methane and other pollutant emissions would have the opposite intent and effect of the methane rescission rule and therefore cannot be construed as "substantially the same" as the methane rescission rule.

In fact, with the congressional adoption of this resolution, we encourage EPA to strengthen the standards we reinstate and aggressively regulate methane and other pollution emissions from new, modified, and existing sources throughout the production, processing, transmission, and storage segments of the oil and gas industry under section 111 of the Clean Air Act.

The welfare of our planet and of our communities depend on it.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today in support of the joint resolution of disapproval, which would reinstate critical regulations on methane emissions from the oil and gas industry.

Last summer, the Trump administration finalized a midnight rule that weakened and in some cases altogether eliminated requirements that oil and natural gas companies limit methane and volatile organic compound emissions from their operations. This action was taken despite methane's proven harmful impacts on air quality, health, and climate change.

Methane leaks from oil and gas wells are often accompanied by leaks of harmful carcinogens like benzene, resulting in health effects for the most vulnerable, including children and seniors. My home State of California is still dealing with the fallout of the Aliso Canyon gas leak—the worst gas leak in U.S. history—during which more than 100,000 metric tons of methane was emitted into the air. Many nearby residents reported having headaches, bloody noses, nausea, and rashes.

Methane also has more than 80 times the global warming potential of carbon dioxide and accounts for 10 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. According to one study, the Trump administration action will result in methane leaks equivalent to up to 592 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. This will have irreversible effects on our climate.

In California, we are already experiencing the destructive effects of climate change. California has seen recordbreaking and devastating droughts, floods, and wildfires. These disasters cannot be separated from global warming and the emissions of greenhouse gasses that cause it.

I am glad to see Congress taking action to reinstate necessary regulations

on methane emissions, and I look forward to taking additional action, along with my congressional colleagues, to combat climate change and ensure clean air for all Americans.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, as we approach the 100-day mark of this new Congress, the Senate is about to take its first major step in fighting climate change. In a moment, the Senate will vote on reinstating common-sense rules to reduce methane emissions. It will be the first time the Senate Democratic majority has used the Congressional Review Act, and it is no mistake that we have chosen to use the law first and foremost on the subject of climate change.

Under this Democratic majority, the Senate will be a place where we take decisive, ambitious, and effective action against climate change. Of course, reducing methane emissions is not the only thing we need to do to fight climate change, but it is a very significant and large first step.

Methane accounts for roughly a quarter of all the human-caused global warming that has transpired since the Industrial Revolution. Restoring these methane-reducing rules will be one of the most significant climate actions that the Senate has taken in more than a decade.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes and commend Senators HEINRICH, KING, and MARKEY for their great work on this issue.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Cardin

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

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—6

Cantwell	Paul	Shelby
Cramer	Rounds	Toomey

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) was passed, as follows:

S. J. RES 14

Resolved the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review" (85 Fed. Reg. 57018 (September 14, 2020)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The Senator from Delaware.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

DRINKING WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this week, the Senate has the opportunity to take a major step on an issue that affects all Americans: infrastructure.

Senator DUCKWORTH, my friend and fellow Illinois Senator, is leading a bipartisan effort to finance critical water infrastructure improvements across the country.

The Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act authorizes \$35 billion in funding to improve access to safe drinking water, fortify our water infrastructure against extreme weather, lower the cost of utility bills, and rebuild aging water systems across America.

More than 40 percent of authorized funds will go to small, rural, and disadvantaged communities, many of which have not seen water infrastructure improvements in decades. And believe me, our water infrastructure is in desperate need of improvement.

My home State of Illinois has the most lead service lines of any State. Recent reports indicate that 8 in 10 Illinoisans live in a community where lead has been found in the drinking water in the last 6 years. Chicago alone has more than 380,000 lead service lines, the most of any city in the country. My hometown of Springfield has more than 10,000 lead service lines. These numbers are tragic and unacceptable. Every day, millions of my constituents risk exposure to lead, which can impair brain development in children and harm pregnant mothers. The people of Illinois, like many others across the country, sorely need these pipes replaced.

Thankfully, this bipartisan bill would begin to tackle the epidemic of lead in our Nation's drinking water. It would authorize \$100 million per year for lead service line removal and a further \$40 million per year for lead testing in schools. Just imagine what that kind of funding could do to protect vulnerable people and children in Chicago, Springfield, and across our country.

But unfortunately, lead is not the only water infrastructure problem facing our communities. A few weeks ago, I visited a small, rural town in Illinois called Centreville. Near my birthplace of East St. Louis, I have known this community all my life. Centreville's population is mostly elderly, Black, lifelong residents. They have faced chronic wastewater and storm water issues for decades. Ordinary rainfall can overflow the town's broken sewer systems and flood residents' basements and lawns with raw sewage. No one risks taking a sip of water from the tap.

I have heard from residents about the horror of stepping out of their front door in the morning to discover pools of sewage seeping up through the grass in their front yards. This is a tragic and dangerous situation and one that deserves significant Federal attention. And yet the problem has persisted for decades. Why?

Centreville is one of the poorest towns in Illinois and has struggled to attract financial help. The town cannot meet the cost-share requirements of grant programs or qualify for the loans it so desperately needs.

Well, the residents of Centreville have spoken up, they are fed up with officials looking the other way. They have every right to feel frustrated. They have every right to demand more of us. For decades our water policy has overlooked their needs and left them to fend for themselves. This cannot continue.

That is why I am glad this bill offers towns like Centreville a chance to fix their broken pumps, shore up their

drainage ditches, and begin addressing water issues that have been overlooked for far too long. The bill would waive many of the cost-share requirements for small, rural towns like Centreville, giving them a path to the funding they deserve. It also would give on-the-ground technical assistance to disadvantaged communities struggling with their water systems, and provide grants for repairing broken and outdated water infrastructure.

To help ensure that this expertise reaches places like Centreville, I offered an amendment to the bill to focus it even further. I want to thank the EPW Committee for including my amendment to require the EPA to prioritize distressed communities like Centreville, that have struggled to attract funds and face the cumulative burden of wastewater and storm water issues. Flooding, lead, drinking water access—none of these problems are new.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have spent years decrying the state of American infrastructure, and our water is no exception. Despite all the complaining, we have struggled to sit down together and actually address these issues. But for the first time in many years, we not only have a President willing to pursue bold and necessary infrastructure policy, but a majority in the Senate willing to work with him to get it done.

While President Biden's American Jobs Plan includes billions more in funding to replace the Nation's lead pipes, this bill is a good-faith, down payment on the President's plan, and importantly, it has bipartisan support. The Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act is the first step towards new, meaningful infrastructure policy.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill, so we can put a bipartisan down payment on the infrastructure every American needs.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY HAMBY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, our country recently took a long-overdue step toward honoring the courageous Americans who served in the First World War. Earlier this month and more than a century after the formal end of the war, the United States raised the flag over the newly constructed National World War I Memorial. I am immensely proud of this tribute in our Nation's Capital to the 4.7 million Americans who sacrificed to preserve our way of life. Today, I would like give special thanks to a remarkable Kentuckian who became a driving force bringing this memorial into existence. My longtime friend Terry Hamby, from Cadiz, is the chair of the World War I Centennial Commission. He deserves our sincere gratitude for his leadership and perseverance in giving every American the opportunity to honor our heroes.