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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God of mercy and light, we are in Your hands and rejoice because of the power of Your presence.

Lord, we are grateful that You have promised never to leave us. In the challenge of decision making, with its fluctuating intricacies, give each lawmaker a deeper appreciation for cultivating a conscience void of offense toward You and humanity.

Today, show mercy to the Members of this legislative body. Lord, let Your sovereign hand be over them, and Your Holy Spirit be with them, directing all their thoughts, words, and works for Your glory.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The President pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The President pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Nellie Liang, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The President pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The President pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The President pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

AMERICAN JOBS AND FAMILIES PLAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, every Senator, from every State, has witnessed the hollowing out of the middle class over the past few decades. Globalization and technology have changed the way that Americans work and compete. Productivity increased, but wages for the bottom 70 percent stagnated in this century, in this 20 years. Income equality spiked as wealth agglomerated to the top.

The financial crisis and the COVID pandemic heaped additional hardship on middle-class families that were already falling behind. The changes in the world—the swirling changes, economic and social—have made it harder to stay in the middle class and have made it harder to get to the middle class.

We Democrats feel an obligation to make it easier for those in the middle class to enjoy that middle-class life and stay there and for those struggling to get into the middle class to have those ladders so they can climb up to get there.

These are exciting and fundamental times to be here in the Senate. In short, we have a lot to do to restore the fundamental American promise of opportunity and economic mobility—the faith that, through hard work, any American can build a better life for themselves, their families, their children, and then pass even greater opportunity on to their children. That is the American dream. It has been fading, and that has allowed demagoguery and nastiness and divisiveness to become too great a part of our politics.

We want to restore that sunny optimism that Americans have always had, and that is why we are so intent on moving forward this month. The idea that Americans can build a better life for themselves and pass greater opportunity to their children is at the heart of this legislation.
of what Democrats are trying to achieve this year through the American Jobs and Families Plan, helping middle-class families stay in the middle class and breathe easier and helping poorer Americans climb that ladder to get there.

And nothing—nothing—will do more to advance that goal than the bill we are working on this year. The budget resolution agreed to by Democrats on the Budget Committee this week is the first step down a long road toward enacting a transformational change in our economy. It will allow us to pass the most significant legislation to expand support for American families since the era of the New Deal and the Great Society. If not quite Rooseveltian in scope, it is certainly near Rooseveltian. It is dramatic change to help average families do better.

The best way to understand the emerging legislation is in three broad categories: jobs, which will come through major infrastructure investments; families; and climate. We are going to create thousands upon thousands of good-paying jobs by investing in infrastructure and the training and apprenticeships that will help more Americans, including many of those who have been left out, get those jobs.

We are going to expand and strengthen the programs that support American families and introduce new ones, like paid family leave and a robust expansion of Medicaid to cover vision, dental, and hearing. I salute Senator Sanders for putting it on the map and now making it a real possibility to happen.

And we are going to act on climate in a bold and comprehensive way, to reduce emissions, make our infrastructure more resilient, and create the green jobs of the future to meet the President’s goals of an 80-percent reduction in dirty carbon that goes into energy production and a 50-percent overall reduction in the carbon we send to the atmosphere.

When Republicans held the majority in the Senate, unfortunately, their signature legislative achievement was a massive tax break for corporations and the wealthy. From one report I read, the top 1 percent got 83 percent of the benefits when the Republicans had power. What a difference when Democrats are in power. You know what the top 1 percent got in the ARP bill? Zero. Nada. Nothing. God bless them. They are doing great. They don’t need it.

Democrats, instead, are strengthening the backbone of the middle class, and that is what we are going to do in this joint and family plan. American workers, American families are going to benefit while we address the generational challenge of climate change.

And as I have said from the start, Madam President, as I have said from the start—the two tracks of infrastructure are going to move in tandem. We are making good progress on both tracks.

We in the Democratic caucus heard from the President yesterday on the budget resolution. The meeting was wonderful. The excitement was palpable. The opportunity to do so much good for so many American families was in the air in that meeting. It was exciting to see the bipartisan working groups had many meetings on the bipartisan infrastructure framework as well.

Today, I am announcing that I intend to file cloture on the vehicle for a bipartisian infrastructure bill on Monday of next week. Senators will have until Wednesday of next week before the initial vote on cloture on the motion to proceed.

Everyone has been having productive conversations, and it is important to keep the two-track process moving. All parties involved in the bipartisan infrastructure bill talks must now finalize their agreement so that the Senate can begin considering that legislation next week.

And I am setting the same deadline, next Wednesday, for the entire Senate Democratic caucus to agree to move forward on the budget resolution with reconciliation instructions. The time has come for make progress, and we will. We must.

CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Madam President, now on another issue, marijuana, 20 years ago, roughly 20 years ago, the United States decriminalized marijuana. Today that number is almost 70 percent. Even deep-rooted South Dakota voted to legalize the adult use of marijuana.

Americans’ perception of marijuana has, justifiably, changed, and it is time that Congress caught up and reformed our laws to reflect the popular wisdom and the science. So, yesterday, I joined with Senator Booker, who has been such a leader on this issue for so long, and Chuck Grassley, who has been active on this issue as well, our Finance chairman, to introduce the Cannabis Administration and Opportunity Act, which represents a monumental change because, at long last, it would take steps to right the wrongs of the failed War on Drugs. It would remove marijuana from the Federal list of controlled substances and expunge the criminal records of those with low-level marijuana offenses.

Many States are already moving toward legalization, including my home State of New York. The legislature did that in this past session. These States show the potential for new industries that can give opportunities to long-forgotten entrepreneurs. Our law would establish fair administration so small businesses and communities of color can get their fair shake in the marijuana business.

And we would deal with expungements—the expungement of a young person being arrested because they had a small amount of marijuana in their pocket but, because of the historic overcriminalization, they have a permanent, serious criminal record that prevents them, inhibits them from moving forward in their lives.

Now, I am the first majority leader to say it is time to end the Federal prohibition on marijuana, and as majority leader, I am going to push this issue forward and make it a priority for the Senate.

In short, the Cannabis Administration and Opportunity Act would help the Federal Government catch up with the overwhelming majority of the country who understands that we need to rethink our approach to marijuana and end—end—decades of overcriminalization.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

Madam President, on a final matter, the CTC. I have a little chart here. Over the past 20 years, the cost of raising children in America has become ludicrously expensive. Everything—from diapers to housing, to healthcare, to college tuition—has risen in price, some of it rather steeply and dramatically.

Wages, unfortunately, have not kept pace, putting strain—ever more strain—on American parents. The cost of childcare alone can be roughly equivalent to buying a new car every single year. That is a big burden for so many families.

The pandemic, of course, made life even harder on America’s families. So, in the American Rescue Plan, Democrats made sure that it included a dramatic expansion of the Federal child tax credit, to give families a little extra help during the once-in-a-century crisis.

And today—today—I am very proud to announce that tens of millions of Americans are going to see extra money land in their bank accounts, the first of monthly checks that will be disbursed through the expanded child tax credit. Let me say that again. Because of this law passed by Senate Democrats—sadly, not a single Republican voted for this much needed measure that will help the middle class and the poor—a vast majority of Americans, because of what we did, what we Senate Democrats did, will begin receiving a monthly check of $300 for each child under 6 years old, and they will also receive $300 every month for each child between 6 and 17.

Combined with the credits that apply next tax season, these payments total up to $3,600 for every child under 6 and $3,000 for every child 6 to 17. In short, it will amount to a substantial and potentially life-altering tax cut—tax cut—for American families.

If you are a middle-class mom or dad, this money will help defer the cost of groceries, rent, childcare, and maybe diapers, if you have an infant. Boy, they are expensive. I remember when my kids were little, compared to today, the cost. You can spend that money on something else if you need it, and it is especially welcome to those families that are going to go a long way to reducing the burdens that families face.

It also helps those kids in poverty. The expanded child tax credit will cut
telling the world they have had enough—had enough. They have had enough of a regime that has stolen their dreams for decades. They have had enough of its stranglehold on information and on prosperity. They have had enough of its intimidation and its repression.

The past week’s demonstration in the streets of Havana should represent a major turning point in the Cuban people’s movement toward liberation. The regime’s failed communist ideology has saddled generations of Cubans with a backward economy, inadequate services, and no means of justice or dissent. Now, some naive Americans on the left seem intent on once again running interference for the Cuban regime. They still buy the propaganda that Cuba is a socialist paradise—paradise—with a model healthcare and education system that we should actually emulate. But it is very simple and easy to sign up, and as long as your kids have a Social Security number, they can get it.

Republicans have for a very long time been the party of tax cuts, but when you read the fine print, it turns out that the Republican Party is the party of tax cuts for the wealthy and the well-connected. Democrats are sending this check to American parents for the child tax credit, $300 per month, courtesy of President Biden and Senate and congressional Democrats. Again, unfortunately, every Republican voted no.

And I want to give a lot of credit to Senator BENNET of Colorado and Senator BROWN of Ohio and Senator BOOKER of New Jersey and Senator WYDEN of Oregon and so many others who fought for this issue and helped make it a reality that today is going to happen.

So we say to the parents of America: Starting today, help—real help, significant help—is on the way, not just for the wealthy, as the Republicans like to communicate precisely that.

Democrats are sending this check to American parents for the child tax credit, $300 per month, courtesy of President Biden and Senate and congressional Democrats. Again, unfortunately, every Republican voted no.

And I want to give a lot of credit to Senator BENNET of Colorado and Senator BROWN of Ohio and Senator BOOKER of New Jersey and Senator WYDEN of Oregon and so many others who fought for this issue and helped make it a reality that today is going to happen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

CUBA

Mr. McCONNELLEsaid, Madam President, throughout my career, I have been proud to amplify the voices of freedom fighters around the world, brave men and women working to secure the blessings of liberty that we enjoy here in America. And I have repeatedly shone a floodlight on the oppressive regimes that stand in their way. I have championed the pro-democracy movement in Burma, the brave advocates for freedom in Hong Kong.

Right now, the incumbent for liberty are coming from very, very close to home. After enduring 60-plus years of socialist tyranny just 90 miles from American soil, the people of Cuba are
into a nearly 2-percent pay cut. And yet, in a spectacle that could only occur in Washington, Democrats picked the very same week to announce they want to tax, borrow, and spend yet another—listen to this—$1 trillion in the coming weeks. Yet anotherpackaging device as big—as the last one.

I am sure this is just what working Americans want to hear. They are already struggling to keep up with the soaring cost of gas, groceries, diapers, housing, automobiles—you name it. And now the Democrats’ big idea is to try and inflate their way out of inflation? Inflate their way out of inflation? That will be one wild ride for working Americans, middle-class families, and anybody with any savings.

For good measure, Democrats say they will probably pair this spending spree with a set of massive tax hikes, dumped right on top of our economic recovery.

Our colleagues need to take this summer and think very carefully about what they are discussing. It would be hard to imagine a proposal less suited to the conditions of our country at this point. Americans cannot afford another socialist borrowing, taxing, and spending spree that will kill jobs and raise costs for working families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I just heard the Republican leader refer to the American Rescue Plan as a grand socialist experiment. Remember that plan? That was President Biden’s response to the COVID–19 pandemic. How many Republicans voted for it? Not one. Not a House Member nor a Senate Member of the Republican Member supported it.

So what was in this socialist experiment? Well, the premiere piece was to make sure that every American could get the COVID–19 vaccine to every American. Obviously, some people think that is socialism. I think it is common sense. And the more and more Americans who are immunized, the more we escape the grasp of this pandemic; 99.5 percent of those who are admitted to the hospital today with serious COVID–19 symptoms are unvaccinated.

So this was socialism? I don’t think so. How about the aid we gave to small businesses to stay open or reopen? That was in the American Rescue Plan. That was Biden’s plan. There was not a single Republican vote for it.

Money to help businesses to reopen is socialism? Is that what the Senator from Kentucky is suggesting? Or how about the fact that today we are going to see across the United States of America help to families, middle-income families, working families, low-income families to raise their children?

So when Donald Trump went and check for $2,000 to every American family, that is just fine, but when the Democrats and Biden want to give money to families raising children, particularly those who are struggling to raise children, that is socialism? I think not. It is common sense.

If we really value families, we are going to invest in their future. And the money that is being sent starting today to these families will lift half of the children in the United States out of poverty for the first time. That is a dramatic achievement. It should be a bipartisan achievement. Sadly, it is a Democratic achievement because the Republicans boycotted the vote over and over.

There is one thing that the Senator from Kentucky fails to mention when he talks about the budget resolution—maybe two things are worth saying. First is this budget resolution, which we are going to bring to the floor next week, according to the leader, is going to do dramatic things across America in terms of pre-K education, 2 years of community college and the like. And in this circumstance, it is paid for. It is all paid for.

So to say it is inflationary is to suggest that it is not paid for as adding to the debt. Who pays for it? Those making over $400,000 a year in income and corporations. That is who pays for it. And then the result of it: The biggest tax cut in the history of the United States for middle-income and working families. That is the reality.

I am going to yield the floor. I see the Senator from South Dakota has come to the floor and I know he wanted to speak. We have a few minutes left. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, it didn’t take long. Just a year since “defund the police” became a rallying cry and city after city cutting money from police budgets, crime is surging.

At the beginning of June, the New York Times reported:

Homicide rates in large cities were up more than 30 percent on average last year, and up another 24 percent for the beginning of this year.

Homicides are up in New York City, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, Columbus; and the list goes on. And it isn’t only homicide rates that have risen. During the first 4 months of the year, Los Angeles saw a 73-percent increase in shootings.

As of the end of May, Portland, OR, which has been ravaged by violent riots over the past year, was on track to exceed 1,000 shootings this year, as compared to 389 in 2019.

A Washington Examiner piece from June reported:

Through the first 14 weeks of this year, New York City saw an 81 percent increase in shootings, the highest number of shootings during the same time period since 2002. Robberies, grand larcenies, felony assaults, and shootings have all increased in April and May compared to last year.

San Francisco has seen a surge in car break-ins, among other crimes, with the San Francisco Chronicle reporting in June that “last month, the Police Department’s Central District had a 53 percent increase in auto burglaries compared to the previous May.”

In Oakland, CA, carjackings are up almost 88 percent, shootings are up 70 percent, and homicides are up 90 percent.

Unfortunately, I could go on all day. The crime surge is real, and it is frightening. I quoted a lot of statistics and percentages, but there are real people behind every one of those crimes—people whose lives have been cut short or ravaged by violence, people whose sense of safety has been destroyed.

It turns out that—surprise—defunding the police is a terrible idea. It is no coincidence at all that cities that have slashed their police budgets have seen huge increases in violence. Some of them are even recognizing the mistake they made and seeking to restore the funding that they cut. A Fox Business piece reports:

Cities like New York City, Oakland, Baltimore, Minneapolis, and Los Angeles are planning to reinstate tens of millions for the construction of new police precincts, increase police department budgets, among other plans to bankroll more efforts to confront the uptick in crime.

Unfortunately, the problem won’t necessarily be fixed that easily because “defund the police” rhetoric has not just resulted in smaller budgets; it has also resulted in police demoralization and left departments worried about deploying officers to do their jobs. It has resulted in a wave of police retirements and resignations.

The New York Times reports:

Thousands of police officers nationwide have headed for the exits in the past year. A survey of almost 200 police departments indicated that retirements were up 45 percent and resignations rose by 20 percent in the year from April 2020 to April 2021 when compared with the previous 12 months.

That is from the New York Times.

The city of Asheville, NC, has lost one-third of its police force—one-third, Mr. President. It is not surprising. It turns out that when you spend months vilifying police officers and demonizing them for doing their jobs, some of them no longer want to stay. This is perhaps the worst consequence of the “defund the police” movement.

Cutting police budgets is not a good idea, but resources and equipment can be built back up again, sometimes fairly quickly. It is a lot harder to replace good seasoned officers with years of experience protecting public safety. While it would be hard to replace them at any time, it is particularly hard today because it is difficult to imagine why anyone would want to become a police officer right now. Why would good men and women sign up for a job where they are regularly characterized as the worst kind of criminals? Why would they sign up knowing they may
be prevented from or punished for doing the job we ask them to do.

Violence against police officers—always a danger—is up. The sickening scene of protestors shouting “death to police” outside a hospital where two ambulances were parked is perhaps a harbinger of law enforcement officers fighting for their lives to be emblazoned on the minds of police officers nationwide. Again I ask, would anyone want to join the police under these conditions?

The defund the police movement is not only costing us many good officers today, it has depleted the pool of good officers for the future, and that is a travesty.

The unfortunate truth is, the Democrats bear a substantial amount of responsibility for the situation we find ourselves in because this is a party that either actively contributed to the “defund the police” rhetoric or implicitly endorsed it by largely staying silent, not to mention the less-than-censurable attitude the Democrats frequently displayed when it came to the violence and property destruction of last summer and the past year.

California Representative MAXINE WATERS said protestors in Minneapolis this April should “get more confrontational” should the verdict in this April should “get more aggravating.” Should the verdict in this April.

Our men and women in law enforcement a great debt—a debt we can’t even fully comprehend. These men and women go out and risk their lives every day of the week, every month of the year, to keep us safe. But they don’t just risk their lives; they also bear a heavy physical and emotional burden. Most of us go about our daily lives without having to confront much evil because our law enforcement officers go out every day to confront it for us. They confront violence so that we don’t have to, and they pay a price.

It is tough to have to see evil on a daily basis, to spend years rescuing children who are in trouble or supporting victims of violence or bringing rapists to justice, but it is a price most of them are glad to pay. They signed up to protect the innocent, to keep the public safe and evil at bay, and they are proud to do it. We owe them and their families our profound gratitude.

It is abhorrent that anti-police rhetoric has become such an accepted part of our national conversation and has been winked at or endorsed by so many Democratic leaders. We owe our police officers much better.

I hope the belated realization among some that police officers are essential to keeping our communities safe will spell the end of the “defund the police” movement. It is time to focus on protecting public safety and honoring men and women who spend every day working to protect us.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON LIANG NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Liang nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?
The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 246.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 195.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer Ann Abruzzo, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

The senior assistant legislative clerk will report the nomination. The clerk will report the nomination. The motion was agreed to.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 246, Jennifer Ann Abruzzo, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Luján, Jeff Merkley, Manchin, Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Patrick J. Leahy, Tammy Baldwin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, John Hickenlooper, Angus S. King, Jr., Tammy Duckworth, Patty Murray.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for cloture motions filed today, Thursday, July 15, be waived.

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

The senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, our Democratic colleagues have begun to lay out the groundwork for a partisan reconciliation bill totaling $3.5 trillion—what used to be an absolutely astonishing amount of money.

We don’t have many details about how that money could be spent, but based on everything we have heard from President Biden and our Democratic colleagues over recent months, there are some safe assumptions: Medicare expansion, Green New Deal-era climate initiatives, and a range of free programs that we know aren’t free at all—college, childcare; you name it.

To pay for these runaway spending habits, our Democratic colleagues will lean on job-killing tax increases and excessive borrowing from future generations. As a reminder, this is only one-half of the dual-track strategy they are pushing this month. The other half is more than $1 trillion worth of infrastructure.

And I would note that while there is strong bipartisan support for an infrastructure bill, that the Democratic leader is apparently intending to file cloture on a motion to proceed to a bill that hasn’t even been written yet, much less had a Congressional Budget Office score to see whether the pay-fors are meaningful or phony.

As I see it, our friends on the other side have made it even more difficult to convince our colleagues, let alone the American people, that this type of spending is necessary. After all, they have already developed a spotty record this year. At a time when our debts were piling up, they added up even more unnecessary spending.

Back in March, Democrats spent nearly $2 trillion without the support of a single Republican. They claimed $595 billion in the wake of the COVID-19 relief, even though less than 10 percent directly supported our pandemic response. The rest was a grab bag of irresponsible spending.

One case in point is the blue State bailout. Democrats spent $350 billion more in aid to State and local governments, many of which were not even facing any sort of budget shortfalls. Democrats said the jobs of everybody police officers to nurses would be jeopardized without this funding.

Republicans offered that this huge sum of funding wasn’t needed since many States were not operating in the red. Even liberal economists and non-partisan groups, like the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, agreed.

But as the old saying goes, time tells all. And it didn’t take much time for us to see how completely unnecessary this $595 billion is in the wake of COVID-19 Cali.

ifornian as an example. California has more than $100 billion budget surplus. That is with a capital “B.” Governor Newsom is using that money to dole out stimulus checks and provide medical coverage for undocumented immigrants.

New Jersey has had so much extra cash lying around that it has made its first full payment into the State’s pension system in more than 25 years. But they didn’t stop there. It exceeded that payment by more than half a billion dollars.

This was exactly the kind of reckless spending of supposed COVID-19 dollars borrowed against generations that we advocated against because we saw a tidal wave of funding going to States that were not even operating in the red.

A recent POLITICO article read:


The Wall Street Journal Editorial Board asked: “Didn’t States Say They Were Broke?” At a time when our spending already mirrored wartime expenses, Democrats handed States piles of cash to erase debts and add to rainy-day funds, not to provide for COVID-19 relief.
This money could have been used to invest in our roads and bridges, to have credible pay-fors for the bipartisan infrastructure bill that is currently being considered, or to increase broadband access in rural communities, or to support the response to the immigrant crisis on our southern border, or a number of other priorities.

But rather than repurposing the surplus funds from the first spending boondoggle, our Democratic colleagues are trying to double down on reckless spending. The irresponsible borrowing, more unnecessary spending, and more burdensome taxes. This multitrillion-dollar spending spree comes at a time that is already an unstable one for our economy.

Last month, inflation hit a 13-year high. And average prices are up 5.4 percent over the last year. Now, this is what happens when so much money starts chasing limited goods and services. The price of those goods and services is what helps to cause inflation. And consumers are the ones feeling the sting of rising prices for virtually everything they buy.

Fruits and vegetables are up 3.2 percent; electricity is up 3.6 percent; and dining out is up 4.2 percent, over a year ago. For families operating on a budget, unlike the Federal Government that can simply print money and borrow more money and impose that burden on future generations—for families operating on a budget, especially those who battled job losses and other tough financial circumstances during the pandemic, those dollars and those expenses add up awfully quick.

And those account for only a few of the price increases that families are facing. For example, if you want to purchase a washer or dryer for your home, you are going to be met with some pretty serious sticker shock. Prices are up 26 percent over last year.

For folks hitting the road for maybe a little time off during the summer-time or maybe even just commuting back and forth to work will have to budget quite a bit more for the gasoline necessary to get them there. They are paying 45 percent more at the pump than they did just 1 year ago.

And anyone heading to the used-car lot is bound for a big surprise. Over the last 12 months, used-car prices are up an eye-popping 45.2 percent. We know one of the reasons for maybe a little time off during the summer-time or maybe even just commuting back and forth to work will have to budget quite a bit more for the gasoline necessary to get them there. They are paying 45 percent more at the pump than they did just 1 year ago.

This is another reason why the House needs to take up the bipartisan U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, which passed the Senate last month. It can take less than a year to get a microprocessor to market. And if it is one thing to think that, we will get that product to market. And if you are a working family, particularly one coming off of layoffs or reduced hours as a result of the COVID-19 mitigation efforts, these are real. And you vote into the economics of these families.

As bad as inflation is, it is only one part of our economic woes. We are also seeing trouble getting people to go back to work. In February last year, before the pandemic hit, the unemployment rate was 3.5 percent. The economy was hitting on all cylinders. But within 2 months, unemployment went from 3.5 percent to 15 percent.

Since then, thanks to our investments in our own operational and our great scientists, we have made steady progress in getting workers back on the job. But, unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues have seen fit to incentivize men and women to remain on the sidelines of the labor market.

The partisan bill they passed earlier this year extended, bolstered unemployment benefits through the end of September, long after we expected our economy would have reopened.

It was literally true with the $300 Federal supplement to State unemployment benefits. People receiving unemployment benefits in my State, 80 percent of them got more from unemployment than they did from their former jobs.

That is simply the wrong kind of incentives to try to incentivize people not to work. We need to incentivize and facilitate people getting back to work so they can support their families.

So it is no wonder our economy is still struggling to rebound. A partisan go-it-alone strategy has not led to positive results for our country. It has driven up debt, deficits, borrowing, and spending. And for what?

The American people are spending more of their hard-earned money on everyday items. Workers are sitting on the sidelines of the labor markets. And one of the reasons for that is the Federal Reserve's low interest rate level than it was following World War II.

In the last election—contrary to, perhaps, the belief among some circles here in Washington—the voters did not give our Democratic colleagues a mandate. They didn't sign off on the far-left agenda or give a green light to spend trillions and trillions of dollars on unnecessary liberal programs.

If they wanted BERNIE SANDERS' multitrillion-dollar budget, they would have elected him President of the United States. But we know that did not happen.

Voters elected a 50-50 Senate, lessened the Democratic majority in the House, and took President Biden at his word that he promised to work across the aisle. This far left—hard left turn is not what the American people voted for.

Republicans will continue to fight this irresponsible spending boondoggle once again. And I hope, I hope some of our Democratic colleagues will stand with us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I see a very different country, apparently, from my colleague. And I respect Senator CORNYN.

I sat at this desk on March 6. We had been voting, as the Presiding Officer from Hawaii remembers. We had been voting all night. It was a Saturday at about 12:30. We had voted for about 11 hours. And we defeated by one vote an amendment where Senator GRASSLEY and my colleagues on the Finance Committee and the Senate Republicans tried to delete the child tax credit from the American Rescue Plan. We then took a second vote around noon on Saturday, after 11 or 12 hours of voting, where we passed the American Rescue Plan by one vote.

Two different times, the Republican Party, which always votes for tax cuts for the richest people in the country, always on party-line votes, always under the very discredited theory that the tax cuts will trickle down to workers and to the middle class and the rest of the country—they will always vote for a big tax cut for rich people, but they opposed twice—unanimously opposed, every single one opposed—the child tax credit.

(Mr. KING assumed the Chair.)

Today is the magic day. I remember saying to Senator CASEY, when we passed the American Rescue Plan, that this is the best day of my career in public service because we are going to reduce the child poverty rate by 50 percent.

This isn't a tax cut for rich people, so they can buy another home or another yacht or another vacation place. This is money in the pockets of working-class and middle-class and struggling people from Maine and Ohio and Texas and Iowa and all over the country.

So, today, people should start checking their bank accounts, looking at their phones, checking their tax accounts, looking in their mailbox. Starting today—today, Friday, Saturday, Monday—the great majority of American families will see this tax cut. They will see this $250 or $300 a month. They are going to start receiving it. There will be $250 if the child is 6 or over. There will be $250 6 to 17. If they are 5 or under, it will be $300 per month per child—on July 15, August 15, September 15, October, November, December.

Then, with the second half of the tax cut, they will get a lump sum starting next year when they file their taxes. Ninety-two percent of kids in my
State—92 percent of children under 18—are eligible for this. These are all numbers and these are all statistics, but here is what it means. I did a series of roundtables in Cleveland and Columbus and Dayton and Cincinnati and Toledo and Youngstown, and Fremont and Bryan and Defiance, OH. Here is what I heard. One woman said: You know, my son, for the first time in his life, I can send him for a week at summer camp because of this child tax credit.

A father said: I can buy the equipment for my daughter to play fastpitch softball now.

Another said: I am so anxious—I heard this many times—I am so anxious at the end of every month during the last week. How am I going to cobble together the money to pay my rent? And often I have to choose between buying enough food and paying my rent.

Others said: Now I can work more hours because I can afford daycare for my children.

A few said things like: You know, now, per child—my babies are 3 and 4 years old—I can put $100 a month aside for each of them so they can go to Lorain County College or Sinclair or Northwest State Community College or Ohio State University or Denison. They can get a start on saving money. Why wouldn’t we want to do that?

We talk about infrastructure around here, and I don’t think about that. We are building a foundation that families can launch their children to a better life. And providing families $250 or $300 a month—month after month after month—gives those families, give those kids an opportunity they never would have had. Why wouldn’t we think this is the best day this Congress has had in 25 years when we do that? It is pretty simple.

You know what I really like about this—and I know the Presiding Officer appreciates this, the President has his back for—Mannie in Maine; Senator Grassley in Iowa—we don’t make the decisions about what these parents should do. We provide them the dollars. They spend it best, whether it is a family in Dubuque or a family in Portland or whether it is a family in Mansfield or Cleveland. I don’t know what is best for them. We provide them the dollars. They make the decision of what is best for their child—summer camp, diapers, softball games, saving for college, just having enough resources to go out to a dinner down the street in Lima, OH. All those kinds of decisions, let the parents make.

We are giving them that. If we care about family values, if we care about our families, give them a little more help. It will make a huge difference in their lives.

That is why it is so important. It starts today, then next month, and the month after for a year. We need to continue this. We need to make sure it is permanent. If we do that, it is going to launch a whole generation of kids and give them more opportunity. What is not to love about that?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, why is there such an increase in violent crimes in American cities?

In New York City, the murder rate is up 37 percent from 2 years ago; in Atlanta, 33 percent from 2019. In Portland, OR, murders have increased over 500 percent.

So everybody is asking: What is going on?

Well, if you were to ask President Biden, he would say the usual rhetoric about how we need more gun control. The White House recently put out a so-called strategy to reduce crimes.

What is the first thing that the President wants to do about this issue? Go after rogue gun dealers. Well, we all know gun dealers must follow the law, like doing background checks. We all agree on that. But I don’t think anyone truly believes that legal gun dealers are responsible for the sudden spike in violent crime, including our own Department of Justice.

Referring to the 2019 report, inmates who committed a gun crime most likely got their weapons from the black market—no background checks there. In fact, according to this report, only about 1 in 50 Federal inmates got a gun from a legal firearms dealer.

Speaking of which, if Democrats really want to protect Americans from illegal gun sales, they should support my bill, the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act, which would actually do that.

But getting back to the recent crime wave, the real problem is what everyone knows but many of my friends on the left dare not say. The real problem is the White House. In the last 14 months, police officers across the country have been vilified for doing their job, which has led to many of those same police leaving their job. In addition, liberal communities—and everybody knows most of our big cities of America are run by Democratic mayors—reduced the police forces and even reduced prosecutions. The result is that in San Francisco, for example, as you see on television, shoplifting appears to be a way of life.

Some police have pulled back from making sure that we are all safe because in too many cities, elected officials don’t have their backs.

Last year, Attorney General Barr enacted Operation Legend, which paired Federal law enforcement officers up with local police in nine cities where crimes were soaring. This led to the arrest of 6,000 violent criminals by the end of last year, including hundreds of murderers.

Now, does this White House have the will to support law enforcement so the police can make our streets safer? Does the President have their backs?

Recently, the President’s spokesperson said it was the Republicans who wanted to defund the police, not the Democrats. And that is just plain untrue and everybody knows it. What they were trying to say is that Republicans didn’t support the Democrats’ irresponsible spending bill back in March.

That is not defunding the police. That is just being fiscally responsible. It is not Republicans who say things like, “No more police—or militarization. It can’t be reformed,” or words like “defunding the police means defunding the police.”

Let me give you another example. This push to take resources away from law enforcement is alive and well in the House. A couple of weeks ago, the Senate passed three bills that would support police. The first one is the Protecting America’s First Responders Act. That bill makes sure seriously injured first responders and their widows and children get the benefits that they are entitled to.

The second bill, the COP’s Counseling Act, creates a zone of privacy for police counseling sessions for traumatic experiences and protect their privacy.

A third bill, the Jaime Zapata and Victor Avila Federal Officers Protective Act, makes it clear that killing a law enforcement officer overseas is a crime in the United States.

The Senate passed these bills because when it comes to law enforcement, we have their backs.

But right now, Democratic leadership in the House is preventing a vote on these bills. Why? Don’t know. They are bipartisan bills that should easily pass with resounding support. If you are with me on funding the police, I know you will support these bills. And if the President wants to reduce crime, he should tell our police: Go out there. Patrol our streets. We have your back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, Members of the Senate were all home last week for 2 weeks during their State work period. It was a good time to get back—to get back to reality, as I call it, because we all know here in Washington, people aren’t always operating in reality. If we were, we wouldn’t be seeing some of the policies that are coming out.

These State work periods are a great time to hear directly from the people we represent, and that is who we work for—what they care about and how they are affected by what is happening here in Washington. And we wouldn’t be seeing some of the policies that are coming out.

This is what folks back in Alabama were talking about. They were talking about small businesses that can’t find people to work because the government is paying more in unemployment benefits than folks make on the job. And that is understandable. We have to understand that, and we have to understand the problem and how we rectify
that problem. We need workers in the State of Alabama in the worst way, almost in every business and in manufacturing. They were talking about an economy that is hurting—really hurting—for hard-working Americans. They were talking about the real costs of rising inflation—rising prices on goods and services that the average family possesses.

While driving around, I fill my truck up with gas. The last time I paid was during the week I spent just a few months ago, and that affects every American in this country.

By the way, in June, consumer prices increased 5.4 percent. I got an earful from people about bread, eggs, and milk, all across the State of Alabama. I am sure that the people of Alabama are not alone in their concerns.

This didn’t happen by accident. This is the direct result of us up here spending way too much money, flooding the country with money that is out—I call it invisible money—out there just going into people’s pockets that either they are saving, putting in the stock market, or spending on goods.

This makes the timing of the President’s proposed tax increases the worst possible time. The President’s proposal is launching an all-out assault on the working Americans in this country, people who work hard for the money they put in their pocket to pay for the things that their family needs. Altogether, President Biden has called for 30—let me repeat that—30 different tax increases on the American people that total over $3 trillion.

This is the worst time—the worst time—that we could be pushing a new tax increase, especially during this pandemic, which we thought was coming to a close, but it looks like we are not even close to that. So this would be the worst time for us to be raising taxes. Businesses and families have worked very hard to make progress after a very, very tough year and a half, and it has been tough. Higher taxes would set most, if not all, back even further.

The President’s budget laid down a marker. It lays out straight the priorities of the administration. It spotlighted areas where the American public can expect a political emphasis. Well, with his budget, President Biden has telegraphed the types of tax increases that he intends to employ to pay for his progressive policies. We are sure to see a few of them in the new reconciliation package. I am not going to talk about all 30 proposals, but let’s take a look at some of the big tax increases that President Biden is going to propose.

President Biden wants to raise the corporate rate from 21 to 28 percent, which was lowered just a couple of years ago and put money in people’s pockets all across the country. Now we are going to raise it from 21 to 28 percent. That is not a tax on corporations; that is a tax on the people who work across this country, especially for these corporations.

If our Democratic colleagues get their way, Communist China will have a lower corporate tax rate than the United States. Let me repeat that. If our colleagues pass this tax, we will have a higher corporate tax rate than China. Take a moment to think about that.

The Biden budget targets certain industries that our Democratic colleagues don’t like, such as the oil and gas industry, which supports more than 10 million good-paying jobs in this country. It would raise nearly $150 billion in industry-specific tax increases. That is in addition to the already massive corporate tax increase.

Once again, the President is undoing the progress made over the last few years. The United States became fully—and I mean fully—energy independent for the first time in decades. As a net exporter, we exported oil and natural gas. What are we doing now? We are buying it. Since Biden has come into office, the U.S. has become increasingly dependent on Saudi Arabia, OPEC, and Russia for oil and gas.

Colleagues on the left want the government to subsidize expensive and inefficient energy, like wind and solar, so we can keep our good-paying jobs. We are all for natural energy, but you can’t do it all at one time. You cannot do it all at one time. Just look at the people with the Keystone Pipeline who are out of work. They were told they would have shovel-ready jobs if I hear from them every day. There are no jobs out there for them like they had when they worked on the Keystone Pipeline.

Many other preferred green energy sources require critical minerals that only China produces. In enforcing their Green New Deal policies on Americans, our Democratic colleagues are forcing us to be more dependent on China for key resources.

I want to say one thing about what is going on with China. They are getting ready to use a molten salt reactor that we invented years and years ago that we decided not to use. Now, they are starting to build it, and we are helping them. We are helping China to become energy independent off of coal in the future because of these nuclear reactors. We invented it and shut it down, and now, we are going to help China with the progress of putting these in all over their country.

All of that could potentially be a tax on regular working- and middle-class Americans since their energy bills will go sky high as a result of this all-out assault on our oil and gas. It makes no sense.

Not content with raising taxes at home, our President wants to implement a 21-percent global minimum tax on income that U.S. businesses earn overseas. Now, they are going to pay taxes overseas already, and we are going to turn around and tax them 21 percent more. Again, this is basically a double tax on the companies with international operations. Since they already have to pay taxes overseas, too, this tax would destroy American competitiveness. It would incentivize U.S. firms to headquarters overseas and move production offshore. We have got to rethink that. We have got to rethink it. Again, we are working for the American people, not for ourselves.

President Biden is also calling for a 15-percent global corporate minimum tax based on the misguided assumption that other world powers will play fair. We can’t count on anybody other than our allies. Everybody else is on their own. Even for the countries that do play fair, this international rate is lower than the 21-percent rate that companies headquartered in the United States would have to pay.

So what does that mean? It means inversions are going to spread like wildfire, and large business corporations are going to move their headquarters overseas. We cannot allow that to happen. We are going to lose jobs.

What is more, the President’s budget calls to increase the IRS’s budget by $8 billion over the next five years and add thousands of new agents. The President wants even more tax collectors to knock on your door and shake you down for all you are worth. I don’t know if you have ever been audited. I have been several times, and it ain’t a lot of fun. So what we are going to do is add even more people. If you get a tax refund, you are going to be audited. If you get some kind of refund, they are coming.

We are talking about the same Agency that aggressively targeted conservative groups and individuals during the Obama administration. Now that there is another Democrat in the White House, the IRS is up to its old tactics again. We cannot politicize the IRS again.

In just the past few months, the IRS has leaked the tax returns of American taxpayers to other groups. Now, to me, that really needs to be investigated. It has all gone done in the wrong way. For some reason, nobody is looking at this. Even more outrageously, news recently broke that a Christian organization based in Texas was denied tax-exempt status by the IRS. They were denied. Why? Because the IRS, for some reason, thinks the Bible is too closely associated with the Republican Party. That is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous. It is sad commentary on where our colleagues are coming.

We are talking about the same Agency that aggressively targeted conservative groups and individuals during the Obama administration. Now that there is another Democrat in the White House, the IRS is up to its old tactics again. We cannot politicize the IRS again.
 Sadly, there is more. The President's administration also has its sights on small business owners—this is huge in my State and in a lot of other small States in this country, especially in farming communities—family farmers, middle-class Americans who would like to pass on to their children what they have worked so hard to build. By ending the longstanding step-up in basis rule, the President would force anyone who inherits something to pay capital gains tax on that asset at the time of inheritance.

I want you to think about what that is going to do to millions of people, to millions of family members. This doesn't just apply to folks who inherit millions in wealth, and I know, as we all know, that is probably what this is aimed at; it would slam middle-class folks who inherit family farmland or a house or a small business.

I am going to say this: After campaigning for 2 years and in going through the State of Alabama and talking to our farmers, if we lose our family farms in this country to big corporations, we are going to be in huge trouble. This is exactly what this is going to do. If we tax them at the time of inheritance, we are going to have huge problems. Many would have to sell their businesses just to pay the taxes, and it would destroy American jobs in the process. We need to give incentives to small businesses, farmers, and the like to make sure they understand that they can grow and pass it down from generation to generation.

Opposition to this particular tax increase is bipartisan. Congressman DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, a Democrat and chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, wrote to President Biden:

Step-up in basis is a critical tool enabling family farming operations to continue from generation to generation. The potential for huge problems, many would have to sell their businesses just to pay the taxes, which would destroy American jobs in the process. We need to give incentives to small businesses, farmers, and the like to make sure they understand that they can grow and pass it down from generation to generation.

The American dream is about working hard so that your kids can have a better life than you did. That is why my parents worked so hard to give me and my brother and sister a chance. My dad made $15,000 a year, and we thought we were rich. We were actually poor, but they never let on to that. They worked hard to give us the opportunity to go to school, to get an education, and to try to make something of ourselves. I know that millions of members and fathers across the country feel the same way.

When you boil it down, the tax plan is really just a tax on the American dream. We cannot take away the American dream from the American people. That is why we lived off of. That is what we believe in.

So why do we need to raise taxes so badly? It is in order to, obviously, finance all of the money that, in the last year and a half or 2 years, we have pushed out onto the public and for what we are going to do in the future. We have to tax.

I keep hearing people say: Well, we are not going to raise taxes. Let me tell you that money doesn't grow on trees, so we had better find some way to understand that in the very near future or we are going to lose the future of our kids in this country. We can't let any of these tax proposals sneak into legislation that we are seeing. We can't let them do that. We can't let our policies overtake the things that will overcome our kids' future—and not just that of our kids, I used to say our kids and grandkids. Heck, it is us too. We are getting to the point now of no return, but we are looking at a package here in the next few weeks that is going to be $3.5 trillion, possibly even more. That is unfathomable. It is hard to understand. It is hard to conceive, and it is going to be going again after the pandemic. Let the American people do it. We don't need to do it in this building. That is not our obligation. Our obligation is to give the people of this country the opportunity to build a future that is prosperous, and to have heritage and prosperity are what have made this country great, and that is what we need to continue to do.

The root of the problem, I believe, is that a lot of people think that they can spend the hard-working people's money better than they can. They say: Trust us because Big Government knows best. Folks, Big Government is going to put us under—6 feet under. Governments have been making that argument to people for centuries. I would say this: In our growing up, look at the things that we as the government have taken control of, and you name me one thing that has been prosperous. I have thought long and hard about—a job because they can't work through the Federal Government, and it doesn't work. We have got to allow it to happen through small businesses and corporations.

Kings and Queens would demand more money from the people, but the monarchy felt that they were entitled to it. That was normal throughout the world until the United States was formed.

We formed this country because of Kings and Queens saying: We know how to spend the people's money. We try to put people to work through the Federal Government, and it doesn't work. We have got to allow it to happen through small businesses and corporations.

So the Founders wanted a country that was of and by and for the people, and that is why the United States of America was formed—because the people built this country, not government. Thankfully, they set up a system that allows us to voice our opposition to taxes through democratic means. When the government tries to raise taxes, the American people have the opportunity to let their voices be heard at the ballot box.

Just remember that when you earn, grow, and work hard to preserve your money, it is your money, not the government's.

Our President would do well to remember that he serves at the will of the American people and not the other way around.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week the Senate is going to consider Tiffany Cunningham's nomination to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

This is truly historic. Once confirmed, Ms. Cunningham will be the first—the very first—African-American judge to serve on the Federal Circuit.

She will not only bring diversity but an amazing set of credentials to the job. You see, the Federal Circuit is unique among Federal appeals courts. The jurisdiction of other appeals courts is based on geography—in other words, where the case arises. The Federal Circuit, on the other hand, has jurisdiction over particular legal issues, especially patent law.

This court plays a critical role in ensuring that our innovation economy can continue to flourish. It requires judges to understand the complicated law that governs this area and who understand the experiences of Americans from all walks of life. Ms. Cunningham is that person. She received her undergraduate degree in chemical engineering from MIT and her law degree from Harvard Law School. After graduating law school, she clerked for the Federal Circuit.

Ms. Cunningham boasts years of experience that will serve her well. For almost two decades, she worked as an intellectual property litigator in my home State of Illinois. In that role, Ms. Cunningham cultivated an in-depth understanding of every aspect of patent litigation, from the filing of the case, through discovery, trial, and appeal.

She has also represented clients across a number of the fields, including mechanical engineering, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, biotech, computer science, and the automobile industry. Ms. Cunningham's clients include high-tech and Fortune 500 companies.

Given her experience representing plaintiffs and defendants, she understands the importance of applying the law evenhandedly.

Ms. Cunningham's technical expertise, her deep knowledge of patent law, and 20 years of experience as an intellectual property litigator earned her a unanimous—unanimous—rating of "well qualified" from the American Bar Association.

She received broad bipartisan support in my committee, with five Republicans joining all Democrats in voting to advance her.

As a judge in the Federal Circuit, Ms. Cunningham will offer a perspective shaped by personal and professional experience that reflect the diversity of our Nation.
Given her years of experience working on issues germane to the Federal Circuit, she will be ready upon confirmation to hit the ground running.

Mr. President, at the end of her hearing, I said to her: “Why did you want to become a judge? Why would you go into public life? It looks like things are going pretty well for you as a lawyer.” She said: “It has always been my dream to serve on this bench.”

Well, I hope her dream comes true and the Senate helps her reach it. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of Ms. Cunningham’s nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the reading of the bill be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order for the reading of the bill is rescinded.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise again today to call for every Senator to have the opportunity to cast their vote on the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act.

It is time for us to look at this issue to move serious crimes like sexual assault and murder out of the chain of command and put them in the hands of well-trained military prosecutors who are independent, impartial, and highly trained uniformed prosecutors.

This is an issue that deserves urgency. I began calling for this full floor vote on May 21. Since then, it is an estimate that 2,912 servicemembers will have been raped or sexually assaulted during that time; more will have been victims of other serious crimes. Many will not even report these crimes because they have faith in the current system, where decisions about whether to prosecute are made by commanders and not trained lawyers. And yet this vote continues to be delayed and denied, week after week.

While I am glad to see that more of our colleagues have acknowledged that we must move sexual assault out of the chain of command, it is not enough. It doesn’t address the fundamental flaw in the military justice system, which is that commanders must act as judge and jury in highly complex crimes that they are not trained to do.

In fact, the training commanders get during that time; more will have been victims of other serious crimes. Many will not even report these crimes because they have faith in the current system, where decisions about whether to prosecute are made by commanders and not trained lawyers. And yet this vote continues to be delayed and denied, week after week.

Today, I would like to outline exactly which crimes this bill would move out of the chain of command. Opponents have tried to misrepresent these crimes the bill addresses. It does not, for example, deal with larceny under $1,000 or destruction of government property. Those crimes would stay with the chain of command.

The bill includes a finite list of crimes. I will read them all now: recruit maltreatment, nonconsensual distribution of visual images, murder, manslaughter, murder of a pregnant mother, child endangerment, sexual assault, obscene mailing, sexual assault of a child, voyeurism, major financial crimes, major fraud, robbery, bribery, graft, kidnapping, arson, extortion, aggravated sexual assault, maiming, domestic violence, stalking, perjury, obstruction of justice, and retaliation.

That is it. That is the list. Those are crimes that have punishment of more than 1 year associated with them.

I ask those who oppose this reform to tell me why they expect a commander with as little as a few hours of training to be prepared to try cases on obscene mailing or to be well versed on the elements of extortion. Tell me about the commander who understands the intricacies of using false documentation? We have the time and resources to investigate complex financial frauds. Tell me about what leaves our commanders prepared to act as judge and jury in a murder trial or a kidnapping case.

Our bill simply recognizes that these are serious crimes that require legal expertise to properly review and prosecute. By moving these crimes to independent military lawyers, this reform allows commanders to focus on what the military needs to do: preparing our troops to fight and win our Nation’s wars.

Additionally, the chairman has said that this bill would remove from the chain of command crimes that have been handled by the military chain of command effectively for years and years and years.”

But, actually, that is not the case. They haven’t been handled effectively. Just this week the Military Times reported on the case of Private Jonathan Lauture, who is alleged to have shot and killed Jason Lindsay in June 2019, when Lindsay entered Lauture’s home in an attempt to intervene in a situation of domestic violence.

His chain of command at Fort Bliss was aware of the killing, but they did not inform the Army’s criminal investigation division. Instead, they quickly reassigned him to Fort Steward, where he continued to assault his wife.

The Military Times reports:

Army investigators had no idea that the shooting had even occurred, much less the domestic violence. . . . Lauture’s Fort Bliss chain of command did not inform the CID of the shooting. Nobody did, until a domestic violence investigation in December 2019 by Fort Steward CID incidentally learned that Lauture had (allegedly) killed a man who was attempting to rescue his wife.

That is how the current system handles alleged murder and domestic violence. It is not only ineffective, it is actively concealing information and hampering justice. That is why the current system is unacceptable.

We have to reform the system. The Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act is supported by experts, by service members, and by a bipartisan filibuster-proof majority of Senators if we bring it to the floor.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

The undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 168, Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Margaret Wood Hassan, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Robert P. Casey, Jr.,Christopher Murphy, Ben Ray Lujan, Jack Reed, Chris Van Hollen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin
Blumenthal
Brown
Bennett
Booker
Cantwell

[2]
These new hurricanes and rain events and freezes impacted probably close to one-third, maybe 40 percent of my people. The worst part of it, but not the only part that was hit hard, was Southwest Louisiana. At last count, about 100,000 homes were damaged, flooded, or blown away.

They are still running the numbers. The damages are in the billions and billions and billions of dollars, and my people need help.

The purpose of my bill today is to offer us help for them. My bill today and Senator Cassidy’s bill today—as I said, I am here on behalf of Senator Cassidy, as well—would authorize $1.1 billion to help my people recover.

Now, I want to emphasize, some people, when they think of flooding and hurricanes, think of wealthy people with second homes, with multimillion-dollar dwellings on the beach. That is not what I am talking about. I am not putting down anybody who has a nice, expensive beach house, but that is not what we are talking about in Louisiana.

The people who were hit by these weather events, through no fault of their own, are just good, honest middle America up every day and go to work and obey the law. They pay their taxes. They try to do the right thing by their kids. Their biggest investment is their home, and many completely lost their home. Many of them had flood insurance, and many of them had homeowner’s insurance—and both. But it just didn’t cover their losses completely. So we are talking about middle America here, and I want to make that clear.

Now, Mr. President, I am sure you are thinking, because I know you well and you are a smart man: OK, if we are thinking, because I know you well about middle America here, and I want to digress too much, but, of years ago, the FCC—and those radio waves, by the way, belong to the American people. And when I say “heavy rain events,” I mean, that doesn’t sound very serious. I can assure you, it was. When you get 6, 8, 10, 12 inches of rain in a short period of time, you are going to flood. I don’t care if you are living on Pikes Peak. You are going to flood. The water has to go somewhere. And, of course, we were part of the bad, debilitating freeze, as well, that also hit Texas very hard.

My people are very resilient, and they are tough, but they are tired.

Most Americans, when they think of a natural disaster, at least in connection with Louisiana, think of Hurricane Katrina, and, certainly, it was a bad one. I was there. We never would have recovered without the help of the American people and we will never be able to thank the American people enough for putting forth their hard-earned tax dollars to help us recover.

Senator Cassidy’s bill and my bill would authorize the use of $1.1 billion of that $80 billion in cash to be used through community development block grants to help my people recover.

I can assure you that I wouldn’t be here to ask for this if my people didn’t desperately need it. They are hanging on. They are hanging on with every ounce of strength they have, but they are human. And, as I said, they are tough, but they are tired.

For that reason, on behalf of Senator Cassidy and myself, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2359, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have now crossed $28 trillion in debt. We borrow more than $2 million every minute. The deficit last year was over $3 trillion. The deficit this year will be over $3 trillion. There is a $1 trillion wish list out there for everybody. Everybody wants something.

Somebody says: Oh, there is money in the Treasury. Guess what. There is not. There is a big hole, a big black hole in the Treasury, 28 trillion dollars’ worth.

If we do have this one asset, and when we sell it, we should do it to pay down the deficit. We shouldn’t do it to expand government further.

So I object to this because we are $28 trillion in debt. We don’t have any money, and we should be fiscally conservative as we profess to be.

I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. CORTEZ MAZO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postcloture time on the Cunningham nomination be expired and that at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 19, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; further, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. CORTEZ MAZO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO EDITH RENFROW SMITH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the other day I read an article in the Chicago Sun Times about an incredible Chicaogan named Edith Renfrow Smith.

Yesterday, Edith celebrated her 107th birthday. Let me say that again—107th birthday. And learning about her life story, it occurred to me that it is really the story of America. Edith is the grandchild of two people who were born into slavery. When she was 23, she became the first Black woman to graduate from Grinnell College in Iowa.

Think about that. In just two generations, her family went from enduring bondage to earning a bachelor’s degree.

After she graduated, Edith traveled east to Chicago in search of job opportunities. She spent a few years working for the University of Chicago, and she even served as a secretary for the first Black Congressman to represent a district north of the Mason-Dixon Line: Oscar DePriest.

Eventually, Edith found her calling as a public school teacher. She devoted more than two decades of her life educating our city’s children. One of her colleagues described her as a “master teacher.”

As a resident of Hyde Park, where she raised a family with her husband Henry, Edith became close friends with Jazz legend Herbie Hancock. And in recent years, she has become something of a living legend herself. In 2019, her alma mater, Grinnell College, opened a new library named in Edith’s honor: the Edith Renfrow Smith ’37 Black Women’s Library.

Edith is a humble person. She doesn’t claim to know all the secrets to a long, happy life, like the one she has lived, but she does have a few suggestions.

She says, “You have to have respect for yourself.”

“Don’t let anyone disrespect you.”

“Listen to what people say to each other.”

That advice is worth keeping in mind as we work together in this Senate to solve the most pressing challenges facing America, like rebuilding our infrastructure. This body has a once-in-a-generation opportunity to transform our roadways and public transit systems, to secure a sustainable future for our children and grandchildren, and to bring broadband connectivity and clean drinking water to every community in America.

And while we have a lot of work ahead of us, I am confident that if we take Edith’s advice—if we listen to one another—we can make real progress for the American people.

Edith, thank you for sharing your inspiring story, and thank you for choosing Chicago as your home.

I wish you the best on your 107th birthday.

NATIONAL MOTH WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the 10th annual observance of National Moth Week, which will be celebrated this year from July 17 to 25.

What began as a plan for a statewide moth night in my home State of New Jersey evolved into a national week of recognition and quickly became an international citizen science project. In 2012, residents from East Brunswick, NJ, founded this initiative to promote the appreciation and conservation of moths and their important role in the ecosystem. Thousands of people in all 50 U.S. States and 100 countries have participated in observing and documenting moths during this week.

National Moth Week encourages people of all ages and abilities to shine a light on nighttime nature and record what they see. Moths are incredibly diverse members of the Lepidoptera order of insects, with estimates of 150,000 to more than 500,000 moth species. They support pollinators of crops and flowers and a food source for birds and other fauna. Enriching mothing events have been held at U.S. National Parks and Monuments; State, county, and local parks; museums, libraries, nature centers, and backyards.

This scientific event is an all-volunteer effort coordinated by the Friends of the East Brunswick Environmental Commission with the assistance of a team of entomologists, researchers, educators, and enthusiasts around the world. In addition, country coordinators in Asia, Africa, Europe, Central and South America, and Australia are helping to increase awareness, study and appreciation of moths, their incredible diversity, and ecological importance.

National Moth Week has brought people together from many different cultures and ethnicities for the purpose of observing and protecting an important natural resource and dispelling the negative conceptions some may have of moths. The hundreds of thousands of moths recorded during National Moth Week have been an invaluable resource for researchers and biologists. They contribute to our understanding of biodiversity, food chains, and ecosystem health.

The National Moth Week encourages people of all ages and abilities to shine a light on nighttime nature and record what they see. Moths are incredibly diverse members of the Lepidoptera order of insects, with estimates of 150,000 to more than 500,000 moth species. They support pollinators of crops and flowers and a food source for birds and other fauna. Enriching mothing events have been held at U.S. National Parks and Monuments; State, county, and local parks; museums, libraries, nature centers, and backyards.

This scientific event is an all-volunteer effort coordinated by the Friends of the East Brunswick Environmental Commission with the assistance of a team of entomologists, researchers, educators, and enthusiasts around the world. In addition, country coordinators in Asia, Africa, Europe, Central and South America, and Australia are helping to increase awareness, study and appreciation of moths, their incredible diversity, and ecological importance.

National Moth Week has brought people together from many different cultures and ethnicities for the purpose of observing and protecting an important natural resource and dispelling the negative conceptions some may have of moths. The hundreds of thousands of moths recorded during National Moth Week have been an invaluable resource for researchers and biologists. They contribute to our understanding of biodiversity, food chains, and ecosystem health.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the State of Idaho was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1258. A communication from the Deputy Administrator for Policy Support, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Baclulus velezensis strain RT393; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 10025–21–
OSGSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1331. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Bacillus subtilis strain RT1477: Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 10025-18-OSGSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1332. A communication from the Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol 070X6610; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1333. A communication from the Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Annual Appropriation Fund Symbol 070X6540; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1334. A communication from the Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Department of Agriculture, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1335. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, four (4) reports relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Department of Agriculture, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1336. A communication from the Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in United States Coast Guard Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol 070X6610; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1337. A communication from the Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Department of Homeland Security’s United States Citizenship and Immigration Services Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol 070X9040; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1338. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementing Executive Order 13892, Revocation of Certain Executive Order Prohibiting Federal Funds for Reparations for the Atrocities of Slavery, Segregation, and Apartheid” (RIN2501-AD93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 12, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1339. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that was declared in Executive Order 13411 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1341. A communication from the Acting First Vice President and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors Of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Canada; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1342. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations that was established in Executive Order 13581 on July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1343. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency as declared in Executive Order 13411 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1344. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Loans to Executive Officers, Directors, and Principal Shareholders of Member Banks” (RIN1700-AG10) (Docket No. R-1740) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1345. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Loans to Executive Officers, Directors, and Principal Shareholders of Member Banks” (RIN1700-AG10) (Docket No. R-1740) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1346. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf - Maximum Daily Civil Penalty Amounts for Violations of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act” (RIN1041-AA49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2021; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary:

- Emicke C. Lee, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.
- Veronica S. Rosman, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.
- David G. Estudillo, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.
- Lauren J. King, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.
- Tana Lin, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. S. 2351. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substances analogues that are imported or offered for import are to be regulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. HAS-SAN): S. 2352. A bill to require health insurance coverage for the treatment of infertility; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKET (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. MANCHIN): S. 2353. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require dispensers of certain opioids to affix on the container or package thereof a clear, conspicuous warning that the opioid can cause dependence, addiction, and overdose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURKER (for himself, Mr. MENDENHE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND): S. 2354. A bill to require certain practitioners authorized to prescribe controlled substances to complete continuing education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL: S. 2355. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to make a technical correction to the Restaurant Revitalization program to allow distilleries that are prohibited by State law from meeting certain sales requirements under the program to participate in the program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BERNSTE): S. 2356. A bill to provide funding to rehabilitate, retrofit, and remove the Nation’s dams to improve the health of the Nation’s rivers, improve public safety, and increase clean energy production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. SANCHE): S. 2357. A bill to fight homelessness in the United States by authorizing a grant program within the Health Resources and Services Administration for housing programs that offer comprehensive services and intensive case management for homeless individual and families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
S. 2368. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the provision of military housing to members of the Armed Forces and their families through private entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2369. A bill to provide access to reliable, clean, and drinkable water on Tribal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. OSSEFF, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. LUCAS):

S. 2370. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide rebates for the installation of zero-emission technologies in single-family homes and multifamily buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 2371. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to enhance the readiness of the Department of Defense to challenges relating to climate change and to improve the energy resilience of a certain military installation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2372. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conserva- tion need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2373. A bill to reestablish United States global leadership in nuclear energy, revitalize domestic nuclear supply chain infrastructure, support the licensing of advanced nuclear technologies, and improve the regulation of nuclear energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. COOPER of Florida), Mr. ROUND, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HEOVEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. Young, and Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2374. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, and Saeed Mohammad Raisi-Sadati, who was elected president of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the 2021 presidential election; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2375. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prevent employers from using non-compete agreements in employment contracts for certain non-exempt employees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2376. A bill to ensure the parental guardianship rights of cadets and midshipmen consistent with individual and familial responsi- bilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BLACKHURST, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. DAINES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. Cramer, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. Res. 305. A resolution supporting the people of Cuba in their demands for freedom and the fulfillment of basic needs and condemning the Communist regime in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MRKLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 394. A resolution designating July 2021 as “Pesticide Pollution Action Month”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOUCHAR):

S. Res. 306. A resolution recognizing the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States and the need for greater access to music education for African-American students and designating June 2021 as African-American Music Appreciation Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 336. A resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Jennifer Lopez v. Alberto M. Carvalho, et al; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 79. At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 79, a bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 212. At the request of Mr. CARPINELLI, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 450. At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 450, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 492. At the request of Mr. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUND) were added as co-sponsors of S. 492, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O’Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment
to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 854

At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 454, a bill to provide health care and benefits to veterans who were exposed to toxic substances while serving as members of the Armed Forces at Karshi Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. Cardin, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto) was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 861

At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 773

At the request of Mr. Thune, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Marshall) was added as a cosponsor of S. 773, a bill to enable certain hospitals that were participating in or applied for the drug discount program under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 877

At the request of Ms. Cantwell, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. Padilla) was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to provide lasting protection for inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. Sanders, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Booker) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to establish a Civilian Climate Corps to help communities respond to climate change and transition to a clean economy, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. Cardin, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. Murphy, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1312, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer and for other purposes.

S. 1404

At the request of Mr. Markley, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1404, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1406

At the request of Mr. Markley, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. Hyde-Smith) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1408, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 1453

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1453, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit product hopping, and for other purposes.

S. 1543

At the request of Ms. Hassan, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. Padilla) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1543, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to add best practices on student suicide awareness and prevention training and condition State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and tribal educational agencies receiving funds under section 520A of such Act to establish and implement a school-based student suicide awareness and prevention training policy.

S. 1544

At the request of Mr. Grassley, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Ms. Blackburn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1544, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 1588

At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1588, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or possession, of any live animal of any prohibited primate species.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. Rounds, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1596, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. 1672

At the request of Ms. Ernst, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Ms. Moran) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1672, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 2131

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Scott) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2131, a bill to require a review of the effects of FHA mortgage insurance policies, practices, and products on small-dollar mortgage lending, and for other purposes.

S. 2202

At the request of Mr. Moran, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. Lummis) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2202, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property.
At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2221, a bill to restrict executive agencies from acting in contravention of Executive Order 13950, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2232, a bill to direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to hold public hearings on proposed projects to restore and modernize National Laboratories, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2238, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2238, a bill to amend the Association of State Dam Safety Commissions Act to require the federal government to assess and provide information to states about the safety of existing and new dams.

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2238, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Parks, Jobs, and Equity Program to support job creation, economic revitalization and park development for communities impacted by COVID-19.

At the request of Ms. KLOUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2271, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to provide grants for eligible entities for activities designed to expand the sales and use of biofuels derived from agricultural feedstocks produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2279, a bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2301, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide capacity-building assistance to institutions of higher education to examine and address inequities in college student access and success, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2331, a bill to temporarily suspend the admissibility of certain persons traveling from countries that currently have a moderate or higher level of COVID-19 transmission and are not granted an exception.

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 21, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the use of slavery and involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BENNET): S. 2356. A bill to provide funding to rehabilitate, retrofit, and remove the dams of the Nation's rivers, improve public safety, and increase clean energy production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the “Twentieth-First Century Dams Act,” which I introduced today. I would like to thank Senators PADILLA, WYDEN, STABENOW, PETERS, GILLIBRAND, and BENNET, who have joined me in introducing the bill. This bill represents a remarkable and historic coalition of groups that are often at odds: environmentalists, the hydropower industry, and dam safety advocates have come together to advance this proposal to modernize our nation’s more than 90,000 dams. This breakthrough agreement is the result of a process launched three years ago and led by Stanford University's Woods Institute and Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance, with additional direction from the Energy Futures Initiative.

Our Nation's dams serve many important public purposes, including water supply, flood control, recreation, and, where appropriately mitigated, clean energy generation that will help slow climate change. But the dams also block off key habitat for fish, and can reduce flows needed for the health of rivers. As a result, conservationists have often sought proposals to upgrade older hydropower facilities, construct new water-powered energy-storage projects, undertaking lengthy regulatory disputes over environmental safeguards.

The historic coalition advocating for this bill has agreed to try a different approach by working together. They jointly support three principles for modernizing dams known as the “3 Rs”: rehabilitate, retrofit, and remove. First, rehabilitate: our bill increases investments in rehabilitating dams to improve their safety. Many of our nation’s dams were built more than 50 years ago to safety standards that are insufficient today, all the more so because climate change is increasing the extreme weather events, like super storms, that dams will have to withstand to avoid catastrophic failures.

Second, retrofit. Hydropower provides the United States with more than seven percent of its electricity and over 90% of its current electricity storage capacity. Both the private and Federal hydropower fleet generate electricity, and hydropower facilities can complement variable solar and wind power sources and provide long-duration energy storage, critical to decarbonizing the grid. DOE estimates that by maintaining and retrofitting existing powered dams, U.S. hydropower will produce 80% less carbon emissions by 5.1 billion metric tons by 2050 while supporting nearly 200,000 clean energy jobs. Retrofitting dams also includes measures to make them less ecologically damaging.

Third, remove. There are ample opportunities to remove unnecessary dams that no longer provide benefits to the population, have safety issues that cannot be mitigated in a cost-effective way, and/or have significant environmental impacts that cannot be addressed. Dam removals can improve public safety, restore the natural functions of rivers, help endangered fish species, create jobs, protect important environmental and cultural resources, and increase the climate resilience of U.S. rivers.

I would like to now talk about how the bill would advance each of the “3 Rs”: rehabilitations, retrofits, and removals. Rehabilitations of dams to improve their safety has long been a goal of mine. As Ranking Member of the Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, last year I funded for the first time the Army Corps of Engineers' loan program under the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, or WIFIA. This program focuses on dam safety, and will use $14 million in federal appropriations to back loans supporting approximately $1 billion in dam safety projects.

Dam safety has been underfunded at Federal, State, and local levels for many years. The 2007 Hurricane Katrina destroyed non-federal high hazard potential dams, which are at high risk of failure with probable loss of human life if they were to fail. The Association of State Dam Safety Officials has estimated that the total cost of rehabilitating these dams exceeds $20 billion.

The bill proposes a series of investments to meet this critical need:
FEMA’s grant program for non-Federal high hazard potential dams would be funded at $1 billion over 5 years, up from $10–12 million per year in recent years.

2) USDA’s Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Program would receive another $500 million for rehabilitating non-Federal dams over 5 years, up from just $10 million in the most recent appropriations bill.

3) The Army Corps’ WIFIA program, which I mentioned earlier, would be funded at $250 million over 5 years, a 250% increase over the most recent appropriations bill. This could support as much as $15 billion in loans for non-Federal dam safety projects.

4) The bill would also authorize funds to building existing state regulatory oversight capacity, mapping the potential consequences of dam failure, and modernizing the National Dam Safety Program.

Dam safety funding in the bill totals $2.405 billion over five years, plus $15 billion in lending capacity to rehabilitate dangerous non-Federal dams.

While public safety is paramount, it is also critical that we manage our dams as part of a comprehensive strategy to address climate change. As I mentioned before, hydropower facilities can “firm up” variable solar and wind power sources, critical to decarbonizing the grid, by both producing 24/7 electricity and providing substantial electricity storage capacity for variable resources.

The coalition proposal has a two-part strategy to advance the second “R” of retrofitting dams. First is investing in existing Federal dams, which make up roughly 50% of all U.S. hydropower generation. Federal dam investments are essential to maintain this energy resource.

The bill authorizes $11 billion over five years to improve the safety and renewable energy generation capacity, and reduce environmental impacts of federally owned dams across the United States. These investments are focused on the largest Federal dam-owning agencies, including:

1) $8 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers;
2) $2 billion for the Bureau of Reclamation;
3) $650 million for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and
4) $50 million for the Forest Service.

The bill also authorizes $200 million for the Department of Energy for research, development, and deployment to support innovative waterpower technologies, technologies to improve retrofitting and raising improving hydropower dams, and furthering the contribution of hydropower to grid resilience.

The coalition has also proposed establishing a 30% tax credit for investment at qualifying facilities in dam safety, including improvements to grid flexibility, and dam removals, with a direct pay alternative. Due to Senate rules regarding committee jurisdiction, it makes sense to move this tax credit provision separately. Senators CANTWELL and MURKOWSKI have introduced separate bipartisan legislation regarding this tax credit proposal, which they are actively discussing with the Senate Finance Committee.

Let me now turn to the third “R”—removal of unnecessary dams. Around the nation there are thousands of dams, in many cases built a century or more ago, which no longer provide significant benefits for society. In particular, dams block fish passage to critical habitats and otherwise harm river ecosystems.

A twenty-first century dam strategy would be wholly incomplete without provisions to remove these unnecessary dams. The bill creates an interagency council and a stakeholder advisory committee to help administer funding to remove dams where appropriate. Identifying candidates for dam removal will follow these guiding principles:

1) The dam owner must give consent;
2) The priority is to remove dams that pose a significant public safety hazard, or non-powered dams whose removal would provide significant ecological values;
3) Consideration of the extent to which the dam provides critical beneficial uses, the magnitude of public benefits from dam removal, and the cost-effectiveness and technical feasibility of dam removal. Because dam removal can be a difficult issue, I believe it is critical to establish the framework in this bill for identifying which dams are appropriate for removal. Within this framework, the bill authorizes $7.5 billion in funding over 5 years for multiple Federal agencies with dam removal authorities, including the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Forest Service, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

The broad goal of these provisions is to reconnect 10,000 river miles through the removal of 1,000 dams. In addition to ecological benefits that could transform the prospects for many endangered fish populations, these projects would also create over 100,000 jobs.

I want to again congratulate the hydropower industry, environmental community, and dam safety advocates that have come together in the coalition proposing this bill. This is an historic coalition. This proposal gives the Senate a remarkable opportunity to advance three critical goals:

1) Rehabilitating aging dams that pose public safety risks and need major investments to withstand the extreme flooding events that are coming with climate change;
2) Retrofitting our Federal and non-Federal dam fleets to increase clean energy generation and slow climate change impacts by raising dams’ environmental impacts; and
3) Removing unnecessary dams to open up critical habitat for endangered fish populations and restore the health of our precious rivers.

Our colleague, Representative ANNIE KUSTER (NH–02), has introduced this legislation in the House of Representatives together with Representatives DORIS MCCOLEY-ANDREW (AK–01), KIM SCHMITT, M.D. (WA–08), JULIA SANDERS (NY–26), JARED HUFFMAN (CA–02), DEBBIE DINGEL (MI–12), EMANUEL CLEAVER (MO–05), NANNETTE DIAZ BARRAGAN (CA–44), BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN (NJ–12), and SCOTT PETERS (CA–52). I look forward to working with my colleagues and Members to advance this important bill.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this legislation. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. SANCHEZ)

S. 2357. A bill to fight homelessness in the United States by authorizing a grant program within the Health Resources and Services Administration for housing programs that offer comprehensive services and intensive case management for individuals and families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the “Fighting Homelessness with Services and Support Act,” which would establish a new Federal grant program to increase support for comprehensive services paired with housing to address our Nation’s current homelessness crisis.

As we have seen with the growing diversity of our homeless populations—families with children, veterans, individuals with mental health conditions and struggling with addiction, people who simply could not keep up with increases in rent—our Nation’s homelessness crisis is not going to simply resolve itself on its own.

According to the most recent data available from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, there are more than 580,000 homeless individuals and families in the United States. More than 25 percent of this population is in California, with approximately 161,548 homeless people sleeping on the streets on any given night.

In a Nation as prosperous as ours, we can and we must do better, especially as we address this crisis in the aftermath of the coronavirus pandemic. Our city, County, State, and Federal governments must work hand-in-hand with the non-profit and private sectors to establish successful efforts to significantly address the issue of homelessness.

The good news is that we have seen a model that works: supportive housing, which helps meet homeless individuals and families where they are. This approach can help stabilize individual or family and change their life. Supportive services such as mental and physical health care, substance abuse
treatment, education and job training, and life skills such as financial literacy are critical components. Paired with intensive case management, supportive housing models make a difference.

One success story is the Downtown Women’s Center in Los Angeles. This shelter allows homeless and formerly homeless women to transform their lives through a combination of permanent, supportive housing and workforce development. This would not be possible without the Center’s partnerships with the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Department of Health, and other critical stakeholders. I’ve visited the Center and encourage my colleagues to do the same to see why this model works.

It is imperative that we support State and local efforts, as well as nonprofit service providers, as they work to get people into housing to both mitigate the spread of the coronavirus and address their long-term needs.

Without a doubt, it will take a significant investment to solve the current homelessness crisis. That is why I am introducing the “Fighting Homelessness with Services and Housing Act,” which would authorize a new Federal funding stream of $5 billion per year, subject to annual appropriations. Grantees must serve individuals or families who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless by providing housing paired with a comprehensive set of services and must provide a 25 percent match for any Federal funds received. Because each individual and every community is unique, the grant program created by this bill would be flexible in order to work in any region or for any homeless population.

This bill supports the great work already being done across the Country, allowing local governmental entities and non-profit organizations to expand their capacity and ensure a greater reach by putting Federal dollars where they will make the most effective impact.

This legislation is supported by a wide coalition of local governments, housing, health, and child welfare organizations, including the Mayors and CEOs for U.S. Housing Investment, National Alliance to End Homelessness, Corporation for Supportive Housing, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, National Low Income Housing Coalition, and the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting the bill and moving it through the Senate, especially as we continue to contend with the increase in homelessness amid the coronavirus pandemic.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2361. A bill to reauthorize the budget-neutral demonstration program for energy and water conservation at multifamily residential units, to establish a green retrofit program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am joining Senator COLLINS in introducing the Green Retrofit Act of 2021, which seeks to boost energy efficiency in multifamily residential homes across the Nation.

The legislation would accomplish this goal through two complimentary paths. First, the bill would authorize a public/private partnership program to make energy efficiency upgrades to properties currently receiving assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Second, it would direct the Secretary of HUD to create a program to distribute grants and loans for energy efficiency and home health upgrades in multifamily homes.

One of the most important investments we can make for our environment is more efficient energy use. Indeed, building a cleaner, more efficient energy system will increase America’s global competitiveness, support job growth, and save families and businesses money through reduced energy consumption—all while reducing our carbon footprint. Further, investments in efficiency can be undertaken quickly and provide immediate benefits.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, more than half of energy consumed in U.S. households is for two basic needs: heating and cooling. As our constituents in Maine and Rhode Island know all too well, these bills can get quite high during New England winters, and no one should be forced to choose between staying warm in the winter and buying groceries and medicine for their families. Improving the efficiency of building components such as heating, cooling, and lighting systems will help reduce energy bills, reduce health and safety risks, and improve the quality of life for residents.

Our legislation is supported nationally by the National Center for Healthy Housing, and in my state by the Rhode Island Office of Energy Resources and Rhode Island Housing. These state agencies have both made significant strides in clean energy and energy efficiency policy and I am glad this legislation will provide more resources to bolster their efforts.

With our economy still recovering from the pandemic, and the threat of climate change continuing to mount, it is more important than ever that we take steps to reduce costs for American families and decrease energy consumption.

I urge our colleagues to join us in supporting this commonsense legislation.

By Mr. DURBHN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2362. A bill to require rulemaking by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to address considerations in evaluating the need for public and individual disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

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

S. 2362

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fairness in Federal Disaster Declarations Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY ACTION REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this Act referred to as the “Administrator” and “FEMA”, respectively) shall amend the rules of the Administrator under section 206.48 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) NEW CRITERIA REQUIRED.—The amended rules issued under subsection (a) shall provide for the following:

(1) PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Such rules shall provide that, with respect to the evaluation of the need for public assistance:

(A) specific weighted valuations shall be assigned to each criterion, as follows—

(i) estimated cost of the assistance, 10 percent;

(ii) localized impacts, 40 percent;

(iii) insurance coverage in force, 10 percent;

(iv) hazard mitigation, 10 percent;

(v) recent multiple disasters, 10 percent;

(vi) programs of other Federal assistance, 10 percent; and

(vii) economic circumstances described in subparagraph (B), 10 percent; and

(B) FEMA shall consider the economic circumstances of—

(i) the local economy of the affected area, including factors such as the local assessable tax base and local sales tax, the median income as it compares to that of the State, and the property rate as it compared to that of the State; and

(ii) the economy of the State, including factors such as the unemployment rate of the State, as compared to the national unemployment rate.

(2) INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Such rules shall provide that, with respect to the evaluation of the severity, magnitude, and impact of the disaster and the evaluation of the need for assistance to individuals—

(A) specific weighted valuations shall be assigned to each criterion, as follows—

(i) concentration of damages, 20 percent;

(ii) trauma, 20 percent;

(iii) special populations, 20 percent;

(iv) voluntary agency assistance, 10 percent; and

(v) insurance, 20 percent;

(vi) average amount of individual assistance by State, 5 percent; and

(vii) economic considerations described in subparagraph (B), 5 percent; and

(B) FEMA shall consider the economic circumstances of the affected area, including factors such as the local assessable tax base and local sales tax, the median income as it compares to that of the State, and the property rate as it compared to that of the State.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amended rules issued under subsection (a) shall apply to
any disaster for which a Governor requested a major disaster declaration under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and was denied on or after January 1, 2012.

**SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS**

**SENATE RESOLUTION 303—SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF CUBA IN THEIR DEMANDS FOR FREE DOM AND THE FULFILLMENT OF BASIC NEEDS AND CONDEMNING THE COMMUNIST REGIME IN CUBA**

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MCNENLY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. DAINES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TULLIS, Mrs. CARRITO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MORA, Mr. HOVEN, Mr. BLUMENT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

**S. RES. 303**

Whereas, on July 11, 2021, thousands of people in Cuba raised their voices against socialism, tyranny, and oppression;

Whereas the Cuban people, tired of living under a brutal dictatorship, peaceably protested against the Communist regime throughout Cuba, from major cities such as Havana, Santiago, and Santa Clara to small towns and villages;

Whereas protesters have assembled at the headquarters of the Communist Party of Cuba chanting, “Cuba isn’t yours!” — “We are not afraid!” — “Freedom!” — and “Homeland and Life”;

Whereas those protests are only the latest in the Cuban people’s long struggle for freedom, which has included —

1. the Christian Liberation Movement, which has advocated for political change in Cuba since 1987;
2. the 1994 Maleconazo uprising in Havana, during which thousands of protesters rose up against the repressive policies of the Communist regime in Cuba;
3. the Varela Project, which, in 1998, proposed a law advocating for democratic political reforms within Cuba;
4. the Ladies in White movement, founded in 2003 by the wives and relatives of those imprisoned by the regime;
5. the San Isidro Movement, which was formed by artists, journalists, and academics in 2018 to protest the restrictions imposed by the Communist regime in Cuba on the Cuban people and their rights;

Whereas, since 1959, the Communist regime in Cuba has repressed political and economic freedoms, including by —

1. prohibiting Cubans from owning private property and using property stolen from Cuban-Americans, many of whom are now United States citizens;
2. forcing Cuban citizens to work at foreign firms to register with a state employment agency that confiscates the bulk of their earnings; and
3. preventing Cubans from traveling to Cuba to visit family or friends, and travelling as tourists;

And whereas, the Communist regime in Cuba has not acted to preserve the lives and well-being of the Cuban people during the COVID-19 pandemic and left Cubans in dire need of food, medicine, and other basic necessities; Whereas the Communist Party of Cuba has for years sought to silence those it considers its political opposition through acts of police harassment, forced detention, and torture, including —

1. dismissing and disparaging Oswaldo Paya, founder of the Cuban Christian Liberation Movement, and obstructing a credible investigation into the questionable circumstances of his death in a car crash in 2012;
2. imprisoning of dissidents, journalists, and human rights advocates during the “Black Spring” in Cuba in 2003;
3. imprisoning Daniel Lorrison and Jose Daniel Perez Garcia, founder of the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU);
4. arresting journalist Camila Acosta in March 2021 for sharing information on Facebook;
5. detaining Ivan Hernandez Carrillo, an independent labor union leader, multiple times;
6. imprisoning journalist Roberto Quiones Haces; and
7. detaining the leaders of the San Isidro Movement, including Luis Manuel Otero Alcantara, Esteban Lazaro Rodriguez Lopez, Maykel Osorno, and many others;

Whereas the Communist regime in Cuba has been responsible for numerous atrocities against those that stood up for the rights of the Cuban people, including the extrajudicial assassinations of innocent civilians and activists by firing squad and other brutal methods, such as during the Tugboat Massacre of 1994 and the shoot-down of the Brothers to the Rescue aircraft in 1996;

Whereas the Communist regime in Cuba is taking steps to silence protesters and their message by shutting down internet access throughout Cuba, including by seizing and assaulting photographer Ramon Espinosa;

Whereas the Communist regime in Cuba has already taken steps to violently suppress protests, including deploying heavily armed troops and tear gas to disperse protesters;

Whereas hundreds of Cubans have been wounded by that use of violence by the Communist regime in Cuba, and 67 individuals have been arrested by the regime;

Whereas Miguel Diaz-Canel has openly called for bloodshed to quell the protests by calling on “revolutionary” citizens to “battle[s] in the streets”;

Whereas the Communist regime in Cuba has for years resisted the efforts of the United States and its allies to bring freedom to Cuba, including by —

1. threatening the mass deportation of people in order to destabilize local government services in the United States;
2. harboring terrorists and fugitives from the United States wanted for committing violent crimes in the United States;
3. jamming the radio broadcasts of Radio and TV Marti, which provide critical information on the outside world to the Cuban people; and

Whereas, since 1959, the United States has stood steadfastly in support of the freedom of the Cuban people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate —

1. expresses support for the people of Cuba on their courageous efforts to advance freedom and democracy in Cuba;
2. calls on the military and security forces to respect the fundamental rights of the Cuban people to peacefully protest while raising their voices and demanding “Libertad”;
3. calls on the Communist regime in Cuba to immediately release all political prisoners and calls for the end of acts of repression and arbitrary imprisonment of members of the opposition, journalists, and human rights activists and of the San Isidro Movement;
4. calls on the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces to refrain from physical violence and any other acts of repression against the people of Cuba;
5. urges the European Union and Latin American and Caribbean allies to —
   A) express their solidarity with all the Cuban people;
   B) speak out against the repression of the freedom-loving people of Cuba;
   C) condemn acts of violence against the Cuban people by the military and security forces of Cuba; and
6. urges cooperation with the murderous and corrupt Communist regime in Cuba;
7. urges President Biden to coordinate an international effort to —
   A) calling a meeting of the United Nations Security Council;
   B) engaging the European Union and the collective action, both nationally and internationally, to condemn the oppression of the Cuban people by the Communist regime in Cuba; and
   C) leading the effort to impose bilateral sanctions on the regime and against those violating the human rights of the protesters; and
8. encourages President Biden and the Secretary of State to publicly condemn the violence, arbitrary arrests, persecution, threats, and intimidation against the people of Cuba.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 304—DESIGNATING JULY 2021 AS "PLASTIC POLLUTION AWARENESS MONTH"**

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WURTCHESTER) submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

**S. Res. 304**

Whereas plastic pollution represents a global threat that will require individual and collective action, both nationally and internationally, to address;

Whereas, since the 1950s, over 8,000,000,000 tons of plastic have been produced worldwide;

Whereas, in the United States —

1. just 9 percent of plastic waste is sorted for recycling; and
2. less than 5 percent of plastic waste is recycled into a similar quality product;

Whereas a recent study found that, despite the United States only accounting for 4 percent of the global population in 2016, in that same year the United States —

1. generated 17 percent of all plastic waste; and
2. ranked third among all countries contributing to coastal plastic pollution;

Whereas single-use plastics account for at least 40 percent of the plastic produced every year;

Whereas over 12,000,000 tons of plastic waste enter the ocean every year from land-based sources alone.

Whereas, if no action is taken, the flow of plastics into the ocean is expected to triple by 2040;

Whereas studies suggest that, every week, humans swallow the amount of plastic that is in a credit card;

Whereas taking action to reduce plastic use, recycle, and reuse make it more likely to lead to less plastic pollution;
Whereas, every July, people challenge themselves to reduce their plastic footprint through “Plastics Free July”;
Whereas, during the International Coastal Cleanup in 2020, nearly 45,000 people across the globe cleaned up over 10,000 tons of plastic from beaches;
Whereas switching to reusable items instead of single-use items can prevent waste, save water, and reduce litter; and
Whereas July 2021 is an appropriate month to designate as Plastic Pollution Action Month to encourage taking action, individually and as a country, to reduce plastic pollution: Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) designates July 2021 as “Plastic Pollution Action Month”;
(2) recognizes the dangers to human health and the environment posed by plastic pollution; and
(3) encourages all individuals in the United States to protect, conserve, maintain, and respect the environment by responsibly participating in activities to reduce plastic pollution in July 2021 and year-round.

SENATE RESOLUTION 305—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THE MUSICAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEED FOR GREATER ACCESS TO MUSIC EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AND DESIGNATING JUNE 2021 AS AFRO-AMERICAN MUSIC APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FUSCONE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 305

Whereas spirituals, ragtime, blues, jazz, gospel, classical composition, and countless other categories of music have been created or enhanced by African Americans and are etched into the history and culture of the United States;
Whereas the first Africans transported to the United States came from a variety of ethnic groups with a long history of distinct and complex musical traditions; and musical instruments with them, and built new musical instruments in the United States;
Whereas spirituals were a direct response to the conditions of African slavery in the United States and expressed the longing of slaves for spiritual and bodily freedom, for safety from harm and evil, and for relief from the hardships of slavery;
Whereas jazz, arguably the most creative and complex music that the United States has produced, is the musical tradition of African Americans in New Orleans with the creative flexibility of blues music;
Whereas masterful trumpeters Louis Armstrong and Miles Davis achieved national and international recognition with the success of “West End Blues” by Louis Armstrong in the 1920s and “So What” by Miles Davis in the late 1950s;
Whereas Thomas Dorsey, the father of gospel music, used his composing talents to merge sacred and secular styles that created a reviving national and international gospel music;
Whereas jazz pianist and vocalist Nathaniel Adams Coles recorded more than 150 singles and sold more than 50,000,000 records;
Whereas the talent of Ella Fitzgerald, a winner of 13 Grammys, is epitomized by a rendition of “Summertime”, a bluesy record accompanied by melodic vocals;
Whereas Natalie Cole, the daughter of Nathaniel Adams Coles, achieved musical success in the late 1980s as a jazz/blues/bluegrass artist with the hits “This Will Be” and “Unforgettable”;
Whereas, in the 1940s, bebop evolved through jam sessions, which included trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie and the alto saxophonist Charlie Parker, which were held at clubs in Harlem, New York, such as Minton’s Playhouse;
Whereas earlier classical singers such as Elizabeth Taylor Greenfield, one of the first widely known African-American mezzo-sopranos, and other early African-American singing pioneers, including Nellie Mitchell Brown, Marie Selika Williams, Rachel Walker Turner, Marian Anderson, and Florence Egan-Bernberg, paved the way for the female African-American concert singers who have achieved great popularity during the last 50 years;
Whereas the term “rhythm and blues” originated in the late 1940s as a way to describe recordings marketed to African Americans and replaced the term “race music”;
Whereas lyrical themes in rhythm and blues often encapsulate the African-American experience of pain, the quest for freedom, joy, triumphs and failures, relationships, economic struggles, and political situations and were popularized by artists such as Ray Charles, Ruth Brown, Etta James, and Otis Redding;
Whereas soul music originated in the African-American community in the late 1950s and early 1960s, combines elements of African-American gospel music, rhythm and blues, and jazz, and was popularized by artists such as Aretha Franklin, James Brown, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, Bill Withers, and Jackie Wilson;
Whereas Motown, founded as a record label in 1959, evolved into a distinctive style known as the “Motown Sound”, a blend of pop and soul musical styles made popular by prominent Black artists such as Marvin Gaye, James Mason, and Mary Wells;
Whereas, in the early 1970s, the musical style of disco emerged and was popularized by programs such as Soul Train and by artists such as Donna Summer;
Whereas reggae is a genre of music that originated in Jamaica in the late 1960s and incorporates elements of rhythm and blues, jazz, mento, calypso, and African music, and was popularized by artists such as Bob Marley;
Whereas rock and roll was developed from African-American musical styles such as gospel and rhythm and blues and was popularized by artists such as Chuck Berry, Bo Diddley, Little Richard, and Jimi Hendrix;
Whereas rock, arguably the most complex and influential form of hip-hop culture, combines elements of the artistic musical tradition of African-American musical tradition with Caribbean calypso, dub, and dance hall reggae;
Whereas the development and popularity of old-style rap combined confident beats with wordplay and storytelling, highlighting the struggle of African-American youth growing up in underresourced neighborhoods;
Whereas contemporary rhythm and blues, which originated in the late 1970s and combines elements of pop, rhythm and blues, soul, funk, hip hop, gospel, and electronic dance music, was popularized by artists such as Whitney Houston and Aaliyah;
Whereas Prince Rogers Nelson, who was known by the stage name of Prince and was a wide vocal range, pioneered music that integrated a wide variety of styles, including funk, rock, contemporary rhythm and blues, new wave, soul, R&B, pop, and electronic dance music;
Whereas a recent study found that—
(1) nearly ½ of music ensemble students were White and middle class, and only 15 percent of those students were African-American; and
(2) only 7 percent of music teacher licensure candidates were African American; and
Whereas students of color face many barriers to accessing music education and training, especially students in large urban public schools: Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes—
(A) the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States;
(B) the wide array of talented and popular African-American composers, songwriters, and other early African-American pioneer artists and the obstacles that those artists overcame to gain recognition;
(C) the need for African-American students to have greater access to music education in schools across the United States; and
(D) Black History Month and African-American Music Appreciation Month as an important time—
(i) to celebrate the impact of the African-American musical heritage on the musical heritage of the United States; and
(ii) to encourage greater access to music education so that the next generation may continue to greatly contribute to the musical heritage of the United States; and
(2) designates June 2021 as “African-American Music Appreciation Month”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 306—TO AUTHORIZE REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF JENNIFER GRAPPLE v. ALBERTO M. CARVALHO, ET AL.

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 306

Whereas Senator Marco Rubio has been named as a defendant in the case of Jennifer Grapple v. Alberto M. Carvalho, et al., Case No. 21-cv-22016, currently pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida; 
Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend Members of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities; Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator Rubio in the case of Jennifer Grapple v. Alberto M. Carvalho, et al.
Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Republican leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, I send to the desk a resolution authorizing representation by the Senate Legal Counsel and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, this resolution concerns a lawsuit filed in Federal court in Florida that names a range of local, State, and Federal defendants, including Senator Rubio. Plaintiff’s sole allegation against Senator Rubio is that he did not act as Attorney General. Plaintiff’s request to introduce legislation that plaintiff urges him to present to Congress. Plaintiff’s claims against the Senator based on this allegation are subject to dismissal on jurisdictional grounds and for failure to state a claim. This resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator Rubio in order to seek dismissal of the claims against him.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate.

They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on executive business.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at the first vote, to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at the first vote, to conduct a hearing.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–955, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: The Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL); Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), At Large.

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSortium ACT OF 2021

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 73, S. 658.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

There being no objection, the Senate instructs the committee to consider the bill.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered a third time and passed and enrolled for a third reading, was read a third time and passed and enrolled for a third reading, was read a third time and passed and enrolled.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 658) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows: S. 658

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the “National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2021.”

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS

In this Act—

(1) the term “consortium” means a group primarily composed of nonprofit entities, including academic institutions that develop, update, and deliver cybersecurity training in support of homeland security;

(2) the terms “cybersecurity risk” and “incident” have the meanings given those terms in section 2299(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 659(a));

(3) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security; and

(4) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSortium

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may work with a consortium to support efforts to address cybersecurity risks and incidents.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO CONGress.—The Secretary may work with a consortium to assist the national cybersecurity and communications integration center of the Department established under section 2299 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 659) to—

(1) provide training to State and local first responders and officials specifically for preparing for and responding to cybersecurity risks and incidents, in accordance with applicable law;

(2) develop and update a curriculum utilizing existing programs and models in accordance with such section 2299, for State and local first responders and officials, related to cybersecurity risks and incidents;

(3) provide technical services to build and sustain capabilities in support of preparedness for and response to cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism, in accordance with such section 2299;

(4) conduct cross-sector cybersecurity training and simulation exercises for entities, including State and local governments, critical infrastructure owners and operators, and private industry, to encourage community-wide coordination in defending against and responding to cybersecurity risks and incidents, in accordance with section 2210(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 660(c));

(5) help States and communities develop cybersecurity information sharing programs, in accordance with section 2299 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 659), for the dissemination of homeland security information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents; and

(6) help incorporate cybersecurity risk and incident prevention and response into existing State and local emergency plans, including continuity of operations plans.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING SELECTION OF CONSORtium.—When the Secretary shall take into consideration the following:

(1) any prior experience conducting cybersecurity training and exercises for State and local entities;

(2) geographic diversity of the members of any such consortium so as to include different regions throughout the United States.

(d) METRICS.—If the Secretary works with a consortium under subsection (a), the Secretary shall measure the effectiveness of the activities undertaken by the consortium under this Act.

(e) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach to universities and colleges, including historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions, regarding opportunities to support efforts to address cybersecurity risks and incidents, by working with the Secretary under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize a consortium to direct any law enforcement agency in the exercise of the duties of the law enforcement agency.
AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF JENNIFER GRAPPELL V. ALBERTO M. CARVALHO, ET AL.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution of S. Res. 306, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 306) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Jennifer Grappell v. Alberto M. Carvalho, et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 306) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 19, 2021

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, July 19; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senators CRUZ and LEE.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Texas.

CUBA

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the protests we have seen erupt in Cuba over the past several days.

On Sunday, shouts of "libertad!"—freedom!—were heard in dozens of cities and towns all over Cuba as people took to the streets to protest the communist government that has had a stranglehold on that nation for 62 years.

This socialist regime has tortured, killed, silenced, denied freedom, and driven into exile generations of Cubans, forcing many, including my family, to flee or to be murdered. It has cut off Cuba from the rest of the world. It has destroyed its economy so that, today, Cubans stand in long lines for food, for medicine, for basic supplies. Therandid energy blackouts, and government officials can shut off their censored internet service on a whim—as they did on Sunday when the regime panicked about the protests.

This battle for freedom is personal to me. When Fulgencio Batista staged a coup in Cuba and became a brutal dictator in the 1950s, my father fought against his regime. My dad was imprisoned and tortured. His captors broke his nose and bashed in his front teeth so they were dancing from his mouth. My father's country had fought for and had been brutalized for trying to save—and in 1957, my father came to the United States. He went to Texas with $100 sewn into his underwear. He had nothing. He attended the University of Texas on a student visa and got a job washing dishes, making 50 cents an hour.

In the summer of 1969, soon after Castro had taken over Cuba, my father returned to visit his family, and he was horrified by what he saw. It quickly became evident that Castro was even worse than Batista had been. My father's sister, my tia Sonia, was still there, and she became part of the counterrevolution against Castro. Like her brother, my tia Sonia was thrown in prison, and she was tortured by Castro's goons.

In growing up, my cousin Bibi and I used to sit at the feet of my dad and my tia Sonia and hear stories about their fight for freedom about their stories about the batting in Cuba just like the heroic protesters on the streets are doing today. The freedom of America was the dream that allowed them to endure the brutality of Cuba. America was and is a beacon of hope for all of those who, like them, have endured oppression, and that is why we saw so many protesters in Cuba who were flying American flags on Sunday—because the American flag is a symbol of hope in Havana, in Hong Kong, and all over the globe. America must respond. Over the past few days, the world has seen that the American people stand squarely with the men and women of Cuba in their noble right for freedom.

Worryingly, however, the Biden administration has stopped short of strong, clear support for the brave protesters who are marching in the street, and it has been reluctant to issue clear and unequivocal condemnation for the communist dictatorship that oppresses those people. In statement after statement, as protesters have swept into the streets—literally risking their lives to stand for freedom—administration officials have issued lukewarm and guarded statements.

After being shamefully into finally taking stronger positions, President Biden finally put out a statement, saying that the protesters were exercising their First Amendment rights. But even that is wrong. In Cuba, they have no right to peaceful assembly because the Cuban dictatorship is out there arresting the protesters right now. It is out there beating the protesters right now. They are speaking with great courage, and the communist dictatorship is doing everything it can to silence what they are saying.

The Biden administration has also said the protests are about COVID-19 vaccines. That, unfortunately, doesn't even pass the laugh test. Just this week, the White House Press Secretary said the protests were about misadministration in Cuba, mismanagement. Well, the last I checked, the protesters in the streets weren't chanting: "Manage better!" They were chanting: "Libertad!"—freedom! They were chanting: "Down with the dictatorship!"

America has a unique role in the world—a role to provide leadership, a role to speak the truth—and at times of inflection, at times when people are risking their lives for freedom, the leadership of America matters.

Here is what President Biden needs to say to the Cuban people: To the Cuban people, you are right that you have a right to liberty; you have a right to speech; you have a right to worship; you have a right to live your lives and raise your children and be free of oppression and torture and murder.

President Biden needs to go on to say: The communist dictatorship that oppresses you is evil—period, full stop.

In my Senate office, I have a large painting of President Ronald Reagan when he was standing in front of the Brandenburg Gate. Above the gate, in the style of the graffiti that was on the Berlin Wall, are the words: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." American leadership matters, and it is heard in the darkest recesses.

Some years ago, I sat down with Natan Sharansky, the famed Soviet dissident. He and I sat down together in Jerusalem, and he told me, when he was in a gulag in the Soviet Union, that prisoners would pass notes from cell to cell: Did you hear what Reagan said? "Evil empire," "ash heap of history," "tear down this wall." Presidential silence is heard in Cuba, and Presidential clarity is heard in Cuba.
Here is what a close friend of the family said: Things are much more serious than what is reported on TV. This friend of the family described that she has no food, which is the same for almost everyone. Yesterday, she had a bowl of thin soup—nothing more. She was asking for help for the first time. There is no way to get money to Cuba. Banks are closed. Five protesters were killed in Santiago. Radio stations are being taken over by protesters. The internet is shut down so there is no further contact available. Matanzas, where my father was born, is a hotspot for COVID, and it sounds as though desperate times are generating desperate measures.

To the people of Cuba, I want you to know your message is being heard; your bravery is being seen; and it is worth it. This is potentially an inflection point, and America should stand up and speak boldly on the side of freedom.

There is a reason those protesters carry our flags. There is a reason they look to America as a beacon of hope and freedom across the globe.

To the people of Cuba, we stand with you. You have a right to be free, and your uprising, we are inspired by you. As to the evil thugs who are on the street, brutalizing you, they, too, will end up in the ash heap of history. The oppression in Cuba will fall, and we will, once again, see “una cuba libre” and “free Cuba” thanks to the courage and heroism of the Cubans in the street.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

BUDGET

Mr. LEE. Madam President, for far too long, the Federal Government has simply been spending and borrowing far more money than it should. It has been borrowing and spending money that it doesn’t have. Now, for individuals, for businesses, even for States and local governments, this kind of conduct is just not advisable, which it clearly is, but it is also impossible. I mean, sure, people can get away with it for a short period of time, but the laws of mathematics are very quickly able to catch up with them so that they can’t do it.

The Federal Government is unique in this regard. There is something about the size of the U.S. economy, coupled with the status of the U.S. dollar as the world’s reserve currency—a combination of factors—that has given the Federal Government this ability that is somewhat unique, you see, because it has access to essentially what amounts to a printing press in Washington, DC, that prints out more and more money with reckless abandon, more and more money in a way that would be impossible for any individual, any family, any business, or any nonprofit but also that most governments in the United States and the world could never dream of. Yet this government has been able to get away with it because of these unique factors and unique features that exist here. So the Federal Government just spends more money as if the laws of mathematics did not apply.

Now, in recent history, the Federal Government has been spending something in the range of about $4 trillion a year. Tragically—this is a massive sum of money, but, tragically, that has represented about $1 trillion a year more than there was to pay it. We have added to our debt at a rate of about $1 trillion a year.

This is stunning, especially when you consider the fact that we have been at the top of an economic cycle over the last few years. We have not been in a state of a recession and we were spending this money. Even with a booming economy, we weren’t able to bring our outlays down to match our revenue that was coming into the Federal Government. That means that more money was being spent and borrowed.

And then now the Democrats have announced a plan to spend another $3.5 trillion just this week. And on top of that, there is another trillion-dollar infrastructure package in the works. And later this year, there was a $1.9 trillion package that was passed. And so all of this is occurring in a year when we already have a staggering $28 trillion debt.

The reality is that the Federal Government does not itself feel the consequences of this; the people do. In other words, the Federal Government could get away with it because of this unique status that we have, the dollar being the world’s reserve currency, the size of the U.S. economy. It has gotten away with it without adverse consequences that the Federal Government and its officers themselves feel directly.

It does, however, produce consequences. They are felt by the people. Now, we have known for a long time that this was presenting something of a threat to future generations; something that we knew would really come to haunt our children and our grandchildren and their children after them. We have always known this. But at the rate when we have accelerated our massive deficit spending and the degree to which we have extended it, this is no longer just a problem for the future. This, you see, is affecting us right now. For a long time, I and others have talked about how it would affect our children and our grandchildren. And all this is still real—be a very real consequence. They will still have to face that debt. They will still have to pay it back. It will still be unpleasant, but not just in the future. They are caught up with us already.

The problem is no longer generations away. It has now reached its hand into our wallets, into our families, and into our day-to-day lives.

So what happens when too many dollars are produced out of thin air, when we just print more money? I mean, I don’t think there is an intermediate step there. Technically, it is borrowed money. The money that we don’t have isn’t just printed. It is—it is borrowed as the U.S. Treasury bills are sold. And we borrow that money knowing that we are going to have to pay it back later. But it has the effect of just printing more money.

When we just print more money, those dollars, which have now multiplied, they are still chasing, more or less, the same quantity of goods. And that means that the same quantity of goods with more dollars results in each of those goods being able to command a higher price—just inflation.

When you dump more money into the economy, it doesn’t make things easier for people; it just raises the cost.

Now, this hurts poor and middle-class Americans especially hard. It hurts especially hard those who are living on a fixed income, on a fixed wage or a fixed paycheck. And they cannot just go to the store and buy everything, they will have to pay a large amount of money that they can use to invest to make sure that, as price inflation occurs, maybe they can make some money off of it too. This hurts the poor and middle-class American families the most, you see, because they have still got the same amount of money to spend, but everything is more costly. This isn’t fair to them.

It is causing—our own government is causing—this increase in cost that hard-working families across Utah and throughout America are already feeling. Every day, it is getting harder to fill cupboards and refrigerators and bellies and gas tanks. Every day, it is getting more expensive to drive to work or to the doctor’s office or to see your family and friends.

From the price of housing to cars, to food, we are seeing the general level of inflation increasing at a higher rate than we have seen in many, many years.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics has produced data—the data for May that saw the biggest 12-month consumer price index increase in 13 years. This follows the April number, which was 2 percent higher than April of last year.

The data from May also showed that gasoline prices are up over 50 percent from last year; that used vehicles are, on average, costing 30 percent more over last year; and that food bought outside the home has seen a jump of 4 percent. Chicken prices are soaring. Boneless, skinless chicken breasts are...
trading at $2 a pound compared to the $1.30 a pound that it averaged over the last decade. Some packages of diapers that cost about $25 as recently as last year now cost around $40, and there are fewer diapers inside the package, further emphasizing the problem.

By the way, these higher prices disproportionately impact the poor and middle class, who don’t have the luxury of investing their income and don’t have the luxury of having that added buffer.

And we in Utah are feeling the pinch. According to a recent survey, 85 percent of Utahans are worried about inflation.

So what does this mean? Well, sadly, it means hard choices are in front of us; hard choices that we are going to have to face sooner than we might wish, but we will have to face them whether we want to or not.

The way we will have to say no to some hard things; things that—while not necessarily bad in and of themselves, things that might be good; things that others are incorrectly presenting as necessary and affordable when they are not. But we have to say no to kinds of the things that we can say yes to is what is necessary.

So what is truly necessary? Well, being able to buy groceries and put food on the table; being able to pay your rent or your mortgage; being able to turn on the heat or the air-conditioning in your home; being able to buy gasoline to drive to work, to the doctor, or to take your kids to school; being able to pay for school clothes and field-trip fees, not to mention baseball uniforms and soccer cleats.

And you can forget about that trip to see that relative you haven’t been able to embrace in 16 months.

These are all things that are necessary and they are all things that have one thing in common. They are all being jeopardized because of the government’s reckless spending and acting outside of its proper scope.

This, you see, creates a vicious cycle. It is a cycle that is all too convenient for many in government, who are making the decisions.

And who makes the decisions ultimately? Well, that is Congress—the Senate and the House of Representatives. You see, under our constitutional system, you can’t spend any money through the Treasury of the United States without Congress authorizing it, without Congress appropriating it. So we have to do all of this by law, and it ultimately comes down to us.

That dynamic I described earlier of an effective printing press that you know—well, it is a little more complicated than that. It is effectively a case that we just print more money, compound, in the fact that, culturally, within the Congress of the United States—among Republicans and Democrats alike, among Senators and Members of the House of Representa-

tives alike—we have grown too accustomed to a pattern, a dangerous pattern, that is good for the political class, maybe favorable in some ways for a small handful of elected politicians, but bad for everyone else.

You see, the way it works in this town, the way the news media tends to report on these things, you tend to get praised if you vote yes. There is always someone you can point to who benefits from the bill that gets passed from the moment it is introduced.

Very often does anyone get anything but criticism for voting against those things, even if, even though, even when by their very nature those things tend to impoverish, albeit in increments, increments that are sometimes difficult to observe at any given moment, to purchasing power of poor and middle-class Americans.

So what this means is, in many ways, we are all being jeopardized because of the government’s reckless spending and acting outside of its proper scope.

It is effectively a vicious circle. It is effectively a self-perpetuating cycle. Without Congress appropriating it, we will have to say no to some hard things. Things that are perhaps explainable in some cases through other mechanisms. Not everyone immediately connects inflation to out-of-control spending decisions by elected Senators and congressmen.

But we have ratcheted up the spending levels so much over the last year and a half. And, yes, this has been under the direction of Republicans and Democrats alike. We have turned that up so much, so quickly that people are feeling the effects more directly, more immediately, more unmistakably than ever before. And, yes, it is our fault because, yes, we have put our own political convenience ahead of the interests of the poor and middle-class Americans, and that is to our shame. That is to our shame especially if we don’t recognize that we are doing it and seek to correct it.

When it comes to voting on large spending packages, there is this trend of politicians voting yes and being praised, and politicians voting no and being criticized.

Look, it will be of little comfort to the poor and middle-class of this country who feel the buying power of their seemingly dwindling paycheck shrink each week just so that politicians can vote yes on large spending packages for a short-term amount of praise and political gain. At times I have been accused of being a reflexive no vote on things that some of my colleagues are willing to explain away or justify or defend wholeheartedly. But here is an important face to that I would like to make: I vote no not by reflex but through reason.

I vote no when I see how the consequences will affect those I represent in real, everyday life, not just the intended consequences of legislation that might indeed have a good goal and might indeed accomplish good things, but the unintended negative consequences also.

I vote no if it will mean saying yes to what really matters, what really counts for making everyday life better for Utahans and hardworking Americans across the country.

And I vote no so that Utahans can say yes to the things that they need, because if we don’t ever say no, we are hurting them. If we always say yes, we are putting them in a position of having to say no to the things that matter most to them and to their children and their families.

Look, this government’s reckless spending is notorious, but it is finally catching up with us. This problem exists because the Federal Government and the politicians in Washington, DC, work hand-in-hand with our central banks to spend endless trillions of dollars of money that we simply do not have.

This has been facilitated by so many who are so willing to call on it, even though it results in the dangerous accumulation of power and money in the hands of the few at the expense of the poor and middle class.

We are feeling the consequences of these things right here and right now. It is up to us to take action, to pump the brakes and steer our government back on a fiscally sustainable, and sane direction. The consequences will only get worse if we do not and if we do not do so very fast.

I yield the floor.
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Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4911–S4936

Measures Introduced: Twenty-seven bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2350–2376, and S. Res. 303–306. Pages S4924–25

Measures Passed:

National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act: Senate passed S. 658, to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with cybersecurity consortia for training. Page S4932


Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–595, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Senator Cantwell, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and Senator Blumenthal, At Large. Page S4932

Polite, Jr., Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice. A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit. Pages S4921–22

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. Pages S4921–22

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that all post-cloture time on the nomination be expired and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 19, 2021. Page S4922

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 72 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. EX. 264), J. Nellie Liang, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury. Pages S4911–15

By 91 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. EX. 265), Donald Michael Remy, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Pages S4915–16

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Abruzzo Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Jennifer Ann Abruzzo, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. Page S4916

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice. Page S4916

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

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. Page S4916

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. Page S4916

Cunningham Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit. Pages S4921–22

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 63 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. EX. 266), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. Pages S4921–22

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 72 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. EX. 264), J. Nellie Liang, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury. Pages S4911–15

By 91 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. EX. 265), Donald Michael Remy, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Pages S4915–16

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Chester John Culver, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.
Gabriel Camarillo, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Alan F. Estevez, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

Richard Trumka, Jr., of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2021.

Jeffry Lane Flake, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey.

Kent Doyle Logsdon, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova.

Atul Atmaram Gawande, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Alvin Harlyn Warren, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2023.

James A. Diossa, of Rhode Island, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring October 3, 2024.

Terrence Keith Wright, of Delaware, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring May 29, 2025.

Rahul Gupta, of West Virginia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

1 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration nomination in the rank of admiral.


Executive Communications: Pages S4935–36

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S4924

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S4925–27

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S4927–32

Additional Statements:

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Jennifer Lester Moffitt, of California, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, after the nominee testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

SEMIANNUAL MONETARY POLICY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, including S. 2323, to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish the Helping Obtain Prosperity for Everyone program, after receiving testimony from Jerome H. Powell, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

IMPLEMENTING SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCY


NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Robert Luis Santos, of Texas, to be Director of the Census, Department of Commerce, and Ed Gonzalez, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, who was introduced by Senator Warren, and Gwynne A. Wilcox, of New York, who was introduced by Senator Murray, and David M. Prouty, of Maryland, who was introduced by Senator Van Hollen, both to be a Member of the National
Labor Relations Board, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

**BUSINESS MEETING**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Eunice C. Lee, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Veronica S. Rossman, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, and David G. Estudillo, Lauren J. King, and Tana Lin, each to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

**BUILDING WEALTH AND FOSTERING INDEPENDENCE**

*Special Committee on Aging:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine building wealth and fostering independence, focusing on creating opportunities to save, after receiving testimony from Thomas Foley, National Disability Institute, Washington, D.C.; Josie Badger, #IWantToWork, New Castle, Pennsylvania; John Iacofano, Iacofano’s Catering, Mount Pleasant, South Carolina; and Rodney A. Brooks, Silver Spring, Maryland.

---

**House of Representatives**

**Chamber Action**

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m. on Friday, July 16, 2021.

**Committee Meetings**

**MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Full Committee held a markup on the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2022; and the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2022. The Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2022; and the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2022 were ordered reported, as amended.

**MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES**

*Committee on Education and Labor:* Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2119, the “Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act of 2021”; H.R. 3992, the “Protect Older Job Applicants Act”; H.R. 729, the “Strength in Diversity Act of 2021”; and H.R. 730, the “Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act of 2021”. H.R. 2119, H.R. 3992, H.R. 729, and H.R. 730 were ordered reported, as amended.

**MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES**


**AMERICA ON CDBG DISASTER RECOVERY:**

*Committee on Financial Services:* Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “America on CDBG Disaster Recovery: States, Cities, and Denials of Funding”. Testimony was heard
from Carol Haddock, Director, Houston Department of Public Works and Engineering, Texas; Judge Lina Hidalgo, County Judge, Harris County, Texas; Heather Lagrone, Deputy Director for Community Development and Revitalization, Texas General Land Office; Stephen Begg, Deputy Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 3524, the “Ensuring American Global Leadership and Engagement Act”. H.R. 3524 was ordered reported, as amended.

SECURING THE HOMELAND: REFORMING DHS TO MEET TODAY’S THREATS
Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Securing the Homeland: Reforming DHS to Meet Today’s Threats”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ARE TOXIC CHEMICALS FROM TIRES AND PLAYGROUND SURFACES KILLING ENDANGERED SALMON?
Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Are Toxic Chemicals from Tires and Playground Surfaces Killing Endangered Salmon?”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ADVANCING ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION THROUGH CLIMATE ACTION
Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Advancing Environmental Action Through Climate Action”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 16, 2021
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House
Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, business meeting on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY22; and markup on the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2022; and the Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2022, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.
Committee on Financial Services, Task Force on Artificial Intelligence, hearing entitled “I Am Who I Say I Am: Verifying Identity while Preserving Privacy in the Digital Age”, 12 p.m., Webex.
Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled “The Implications of Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee and Potential Legislative Responses”, 1 p.m., Zoom.
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “Fostering Equity in Energy Innovation”, 10 a.m., Zoom.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
3 p.m., Monday, July 19

Senate Chamber

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

At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Friday, July 16

House Chamber

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