

to vote, and it flies in the face of the practices of other democracies, like Germany, the United Kingdom, Norway, and France, which all require voters to verify their identities before casting their ballots.

Despite all of the revolutionary changes this bill proposes, the most disheartening thing might be that it was introduced to solve a problem that doesn't actually exist. More people voted in last year's elections than ever before, including a record 76 percent of voters in my State of Nebraska. In the middle of a pandemic, voters turned out in historic numbers to make their voices heard.

Defenders of this bill can't say that this turnout was an issue, so they have tried to scapegoat States like Georgia and Florida, which have recently passed new election laws. President Biden went as far as to call Georgia's bill "Jim Crow in the 21st century" before admitting that he was speaking about a very early draft, not the bill that actually became law.

Reality gets in the way of that narrative, too, as Georgia's bill is less restrictive than the laws of more liberal States like New York and Delaware. Reasonable people can disagree about the best way to conduct elections, but it is disingenuous to say that something is voter suppression or undemocratic just because you may not agree with it.

I hope we can agree that we all want to make sure that all American voters are able to make their voices heard in our elections. To see that in action, you only have to look at States like Nebraska. We have been a "no excuse" State for absentee and early voting for years, which means that anyone who has already provided an ID when registering to vote can vote by mail for any reason whatsoever. In fact, a bill that originally allowed for mail-in voting in Nebraska was the first bill I introduced and passed as a State legislator in 2005.

Many other States go out of their way to make it easy to vote, regardless of which party is in power and regardless of whether they are red States or blue States. That is the beauty of the American system. Each State can do as it sees fit and respond to events like the COVID-19 pandemic while still producing positive reforms. By keeping States free from Federal mandates, we are allowing them to innovate and introduce the changes that work best for them.

Washington, DC, isn't what makes America great. Our 50 States, each with its own history and its own needs, are what make this country so unique.

This bill jeopardizes that diversity, and it would do away with a system that works well and replace it with one that would be partisan, divisive, and, frankly, chaotic.

I think we would be making a terrible mistake if we pass S. 1 as it is currently written.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. 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. 123.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

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. 123, Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher A. Coons, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Baldwin, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Merkley.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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. 157.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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. 157, John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher A. Coons, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Merkley.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 475 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 475) to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 475) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 475

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 "Juneteenth National Independence Day Act".

SEC. 2. JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY AS A LEGAL PUBLIC HOLIDAY.

Section 6103(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to Memorial Day the following:

"Juneteenth National Independence Day, June 19."

JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 269, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 269) designating June 19, 2021, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which news of the end of slavery reached the slaves in the Southwestern States.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that 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. 269) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, thank you. That was the Juneteenth resolution, which we will talk about more tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ELECTIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the need for integrity in our elections.

As I stand here, you know, prices are rising at the pump, and prices are rising at the grocery store. Inflation is the highest it has been basically since the financial crisis 13 years ago.

The number of unfilled jobs is at a record high for our Nation. Small businesses, certainly in my home State in Wyoming and all across the country, have "help wanted" signs up; they can't find workers. Some are worried they may have to shut down forever.

We also have a crisis at the southern border. There is a lot happening in America today. Half a million illegal immigrants have crossed our border since Joe Biden took the oath of office to become President of the United States. Now, these are just the illegal immigrants whom we know about.

Since Joe Biden became President, we have seized over 3,200 pounds of fentanyl at our southern border. That is enough fentanyl to kill every man,

woman, and child living in America today. That is just one category of drugs, and these are the drugs that we know about. Just imagine what has come into the country that we don't know about.

Yet, despite the critics and the crisis—President Biden has created a crisis, and Democrats, certainly in this body, refuse to raise a finger to bring the crisis to an end. Instead, it seems that the Democrats are focused on only one thing and one thing alone, and that is seizing more power.

We are told Democrats are going to bring a bill to the floor next week on election takeover in America. Now, the majority leader already knows that this bill cannot pass the U.S. Senate. It will not pass because he doesn't even have the support for the votes in his own caucus, and that is because the bill is radical, it is extreme, it is dangerous, and it is scary. It is actually a Federal takeover of elections in America.

Under the Constitution, the times, places, and manner of holding elections is generally up to the States. This bill would flip the constitutional order and flip it upside down and put Congress and Washington in charge of elections, not each of our individual States. It would effectively repeal the election laws in all 50 States.

This Democratic takeover attempt is over 800 pages in length, over 800 pages of mandates. Every page of the bill has one thing in common: makes it easier to cheat. Makes it easier to cheat in elections.

For example, the bill would register people to vote automatically, whether they wanted to be registered or not. Automatic registration. Take everyone they have in databases throughout a State and sign them up.

Now, under this bill, anyone who interacted with a State government would then be registered to vote. Well, this includes a lot of people who aren't legally entitled to vote because they are not U.S. citizens. So these are obviously people who would not be eligible to vote. Doesn't matter to Democrats—register them anyway. Maybe it is just a coincidence that Democrats opened our border before pushing this election takeover, where everybody in a database in a State is registered to vote. Maybe it is not a coincidence.

The bill also endorses something called ballot harvesting. That is where paid political operatives can go door to door and collect hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of ballots—other people's ballots—and then they get to decide which ballots they are going to turn in. No supervision. No accountability. None. These activists could destroy, tamper, or lose ballots. These activists could do just that. No one would ever know.

Additionally, the bill would force taxpayers to pay for political campaigns. For every small political donation, taxpayers would pay and kick in an additional \$6—\$6 kicked in by the

taxpayers for every \$1 of small-dollar donations raised. Much of it is raised online. This is an invitation to money laundering. Activists could spread out donations to get free taxpayer money.

One of my colleagues in the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle looked at this and said: "Gee." Based on fundraising that he has done online, he would be entitled to a check from the government for \$30 million. Taxpayers don't want to put that kind of taxpayer dollar behind any candidate, whether they are Republican or Democrat.

Democrats sit here and they claim they want less money in politics. Yet every several years—every 2 years, they outspend the Republicans. Now they want taxpayers to add to the money they are spending. Well, political activists have plenty of money already. They don't need additional taxpayer dollars.

Finally, this bill would ban voter ID. That means when you go to vote and you ask for a ballot—this is what voter ID is. You go to vote, you ask for a ballot, and you have to show an identification card that proves you are who you say you are. Democrats have been trying to eliminate that one for a long, long time. Democrats claim that asking for identification is racist.

The idea that people can't get an ID is absurd. It is condescending. ID is required to check into a hotel. It is required to order a beer at a bar. It is required to buy a pack of cigarettes. It is required to get on an airplane—any airline in America. Voting is a lot more important than any of these things. It is the foundation of our entire system of government. We ought to make it safe, and we ought to make it secure.

During the committee process, Democrats had a chance to fix the bill. Senator HYDE-SMITH from Mississippi said that she would like to take a look at this bill and use the campaign funding instead to help rural hospitals, instead of this matching money of 6 to 1 to candidates. Oh, no. Democrats didn't want any part of that. They want the money.

Senator FISCHER and Senator HAGERTY said that we should delay the date the bill would go into effect. That would prevent a conflict of interest for the Democrats who vote for it, because, in a sense, the Democrats who vote for it would be getting the money themselves. Democrats said: No. No. We want the money.

Senator HYDE-SMITH and Senator CRUZ also tried to remove this ban on voter ID from the bill. Democrats said: Nope. People can show up, say whoever they want to say they are, and get a ballot.

Democrats deny the existence of voter fraud. They claim no irregularities ever happen—not in their elections. So then why are they trying to repeal or eliminate or take over every State voting law in the country?

Truth is, there is a problem with our elections today. Yet the Democratic