

**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

bill would make these problems even worse.

A majority of the public says they don't want future elections to look like the last one—special situation, a pandemic. They don't want future elections to look like the last one. The American people want security, and they want integrity. We want to trust that our elections are fair.

That is why I have joined Senator SCOTT of Florida, Senator HYDE-SMITH, and Senator LUMMIS to introduce a bill specifically to give people more confidence in our elections. It is called the Save Democracy Act. Our bill bans vote harvesting. It bans automatic registration. It requires at least a Social Security number to register to vote.

Under our bill, States can't just send out ballots in the mail based on old information. People could still vote by mail, as they do in my home State of Wyoming; they would just need to request a ballot. They wouldn't get a ballot automatically in the mail; they would have to request a ballot so that we know their information is up-to-date. These are the kind of common-sense protections that our elections need. Our bill makes it actually harder to cheat, not easier. The Democrat's bill makes it easier to cheat.

At a time like this, when prices are too high, hiring is too low, the U.S. Senate has important work to do, the things that we hear about when we go home on weekends: What does it cost for gas? What does it cost for groceries? What does it cost to fill up your car?

The American people want us to work on these bread-and-butter issues that affect their daily lives. They don't want this partisan power grab that is going to be voted on in the Senate next week. They also don't want the Senate wasting time on bills that cannot pass.

It is time for the Democrats and the Democratic leader to focus on what the American people are asking us to focus on: bring down inflation, stop paying people more to not work than they would make if they were working, secure our southern border, and leave our elections alone. That is what I hear at home, and I know that many of the Members are hearing the exact same thing as we work here to focus on what should be the future of a better, more prosperous America, not a one-sided America, with a domination of elections based on a law to make it easier to cheat.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is no secret that this Senator has been a leader in promoting renewable energy sources. Iowa has done even more to lead the Nation in biofuels production. This leads to a cleaner environment and really increases America's energy independence.

Last week, Reuters reported the Biden administration is considering ways to allow U.S. oil refiners to not meet their biofuel blending requirements. This same administration has proposed hundreds of billions of dollars in subsidies for electric vehicles but failed to include any support for biofuels infrastructure, which play a vital role in our Nation's transportation sector as well as our efforts to reduce greenhouse gases.

Need I remind my colleagues, President Biden promised in his campaign to "promote and advance renewable energy, ethanol, and other biofuels to help rural America and our nation's farmers." President Biden is not keeping that promise.

Unfortunately, despite the administration's emphasis on the environment and climate, their recent actions contradict that and undermine their entire credibility. The biofuel industry has proven that ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions from motor fuel by almost half.

Almost every vehicle on the road can run on at least E10 ethanol. Many retailers are now selling more E15 ethanol and other higher blends like E85, if you have a vehicle that can use E85. Whether it is 10 percent, 15 percent, or 85 percent, it is cleaner than 100 percent petroleum.

According to the Energy Information Administration, by 2050, 81 percent of new vehicle sales will still be gas-powered or flex fuel.

In my introductory telephone conversation with EPA Administrator Regan, when he was nominated, he told me that biofuels are a major tool in the Biden administration's plan to combat climate change. I stressed to him at that time the importance of the biofuels industry to both agriculture and energy, and Iowa happens to be the No. 1 producer of ethanol.

No matter what the EPA or Big Oil says about the impact of its waivers to oil companies making billions in profits, farmers and biofuel producers know and feel the negative impact. Any attempt to exempt oil refiners from their biofuels obligation is a blatant bailout.

The law is simple: Blend biofuels or buy credits from those who do. By adding more biofuels to our energy mix, we can reduce emissions from dirty oil while keeping transportation costs low for working families.

Unfortunately, despite the administration's emphasis on environment, it seems like biofuels don't appear to be much of a priority and well short of what nominee at that time, now-EPA Director Regan said that it would be. Now it looks like labor unions have been co-opted by Big Oil, and we are doing their bidding in the White House.

President Biden is now faced with a decision. He can lower greenhouse gases with biofuels or he can side with Big Oil to destroy biofuel demand by illegally tampering with the renewable fuel standard, just as we had problems with previous administrations, both

Republican and Democratic—referring to what the Obama and Trump administrations did with the small refineries exemption.

Whether it is labor unions or Big Oil, I won't tire in standing up for home-grown clean biofuels. I did that whether we had Democratic or Republican administrations. I will continue to advocate for Iowans and the biofuels because it strengthens U.S. energy independence, makes for a cleaner environment, and creates jobs in rural America.

I encourage President Biden, EPA Administrator Regan, and my colleagues from across the aisle to keep it clean.

Does President Biden want to be known as "Big Oil" Biden? I don't think he does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. RES. 134

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, for more than 100 years, throughout times of change, tumult, and uncertainty, there has been a constant: the special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The UK has been one of our staunchest and most loyal allies. We have stood beside each other through two World Wars and the Cold War. In the 21st century, the United States and the United Kingdom have become even stronger friends and partners, both in the fight against global terrorism and for freedom, peace, and prosperity.

Now an opportunity lies before us to strengthen the relationship more than ever by securing a free-trade agreement between our two nations, which is the purpose of the resolution before us today. The trading relationship between our countries is already really strong. For hundreds of years, it has been a force for economic prosperity and security for us both.

In just 2019, the total trade in goods and services between our two countries totaled \$273 billion, and the United Kingdom was the seventh largest trading partner of the United States in goods. Figures from that same year show that U.S. trade with the United Kingdom resulted in a \$21.8 billion trade surplus.

The United States and the United Kingdom, in fact, share the single largest bilateral trade and investment relationship in the world. And now, with the UK's newfound ability to negotiate independent free-trade deals, we have the opportunity to grow that relationship even more.

A free-trade agreement would allow even more goods and services to flow even more easily between our two countries. It would allow for expanded commercial partnerships and greater investments in emerging industries. It would serve as an even greater engine of prosperity and economic liberty on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.