

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Cecilia Elena Rouse, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Ex.]

#### YEAS—94

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

#### NAYS—5

Cotton	Paul	Tuberville
Lummis	Scott (FL)	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Blackburn

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 94, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Cecilia Elena Rouse, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, a month after Janet Yellen made history as the first woman to serve as Secretary of the Treasury, today we are about to confirm another woman to step into a leading role in our economy, Cecilia Rouse.

When she came before the Banking and Housing Committee, Dr. Rouse's knowledge of our economy and her passion for service and her commitment to

the people who make this country work were obvious to all of us—to the Presiding Officer who is on the committee, to Republicans, to Democrats alike.

After a year when Black Americans have endured so many painful reminders of the yawning gap between the promise of our founding ideals, it is meaningful that our committee's first nomination—our first nomination committee hearing in the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee—consider the nomination of two outstanding Black women who will take leading roles in our economic recovery: Dr. Rouse, and my Congresswoman, my Congresswoman in Cleveland, MARCIA FUDGE.

This matters on so many levels. It is important for our future that little girls, including Black and Brown girls, see themselves in our leaders, from the Vice President to our economic leaders. It matters because of the perspectives and the life experiences these two women—these two Black women—bring to these jobs.

Dr. Rouse has family ties in my State, roots deep into the Mahoning Valley and Youngstown, and a real understanding of the people who make this country work—all people.

The Council of Economic Advisers will also play a key role both in helping our economy recover and in building a better economic system out of this pandemic. Dr. Rouse is exactly whom we need at the helm. She will help direct our Nation's economic policy to put Americans back to work at better jobs with higher wages.

Millions of Americans are still out of work. Those job losses have disproportionately fallen on low-wage workers, Black and Brown workers, and women. Three million women—three million women have been forced out of the paid labor force. At the same time, essential workers are risking their health to go to work, while corporations still refuse, in far too many cases, to pay them a living wage.

The minimum wage hasn't been raised in 14 years. Year after year—year after year, Republicans in this Senate and the White House profess to care about the working people in the heartland of this country, but they refuse to give them a raise while they funnel tax cuts to the CEOs.

My first speech in this body was in January 2007. Sitting in the chair that Senator SINEMA now sits in was Illinois freshman Democrat, Barack Obama. He was not even running for President at that point. Since we last raised the minimum wage, he was President 8 years and out of office for more than 4. That is how long. So while Republicans refuse to give raises, they funnel huge tax cuts to CEOs.

It is part of the same corporate elite mindset that treats American workers as expendable instead of treating them as essential to our country's success. And we have seen the results: The stock market goes up, corporate profits

or executive compensation explodes, and wages stagnate, and the middle class continues to shrink.

Building Back Better—that is what Joe Biden is about, building back. That is what Cecilia Rouse is all about. Building Back Better means taking on that system. It means creating an economy, creating an economy where hard work pays off for everyone, no matter who you are, what kind of work you do, with a growing middle class that everyone can aspire to; everyone has a chance to join.

This won't be the first time Dr. Rouse has helped us weather a crisis. She served on the Council of Economic Advisers in 2009, after the George Bush recession, during the Great Recession.

Dr. Rouse has spent her career focusing on workers and ensuring that this economy works for everyone. Her expertise, her leadership will guide this administration and Congress, as we get to work not only to recover from this pandemic but to build a better—just a better economy for the future.

For too long, American workers haven't had anyone on their side in the White House. That ends now. We saw it on Sunday night, with the strongest statement from a President of the United States in support of union organizing that we have seen in my lifetime. We see it in President Biden's choice of Dr. Rouse to help guide our economy and guide this rescue.

Cecilia Rouse understands we have the power to change how the economy works. It rewards work instead of rewarding wealth. We create more jobs at middle-class wages. We expand economic security and opportunity for everyone. And we create a better system that honors the dignity of all workers.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to roll.

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

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S.J. RES. 7

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the Minor Consent for Vaccinations Amendment Act of 2020 is a measure adopted by the District of Columbia that would allow for children 11 years old and older to consent on their own, without their parents' knowledge or acquiescence or consent, to being vaccinated. They could receive a vaccine, contrary to the wishes of their parents or without them even knowing.

Young children don't necessarily know their own medical histories, their families' medical histories, potential allergies, nor do they have the adult judgment that is sometimes needed to make an informed decision as to consent for a particular medical procedure or treatment or even vaccination, which is exactly why parents make healthcare decisions on behalf of their own children.

Parents play the most important role in caring for the health of their children. Moms and dads are at the heart of their children's education and care, and it is crucial that they be able to make decisions about what kind of healthcare is best for them and about the timing of it and certainly that they be not only able to make the decision but also that they be aware of it in the first place.

The DC legislation that I referenced a moment ago goes so far as to hide children's vaccinations from their own parents, even after it has occurred, in other words. This information is withheld from the parents. It requires doctors, nurses, insurance companies, and even public schools to conceal their children's vaccinations from their parents.

It would also fly in the face of parents who may have religious beliefs causing them to object to vaccinations or who have made the decision for their children to forgo, either on a long-term basis or for a particular period of time, certain vaccinations—like the HPV vaccine, for example.

Furthermore, it would pave the way for allowing children to consent to other types of medical treatment without parental knowledge down the road, other treatments in other contexts that might have long-lasting, significant impacts on their health.

Look, as a parent myself and as someone who, as a parent, believes in vaccinations, I think it is imperative to realize that regardless of how you, in particular, feel about vaccines, even if, like me, you support the idea of being vaccinated and having your children vaccinated, remember that there are those who don't share those views, and remember that separate and apart from their views, there are some people whose family histories and personal medical experience might reveal some tendency toward a reaction, an idiosyncratic reaction that could be harmful. In some circumstances the timing of a vaccination can also be important. These are all considerations that a parent ought to be able to make, and in every jurisdiction that respects the independence of parental rights, these ought to be decisions that are made by parents and certainly ought not be decisions made by children as young as 11 years old without their parents' consent or even their knowledge.

In light of these concerns, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 7 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the joint resolution 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. CARPER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I respect the views of my colleagues. I respect the views of this colleague especially, and he knows that. We don't always agree on everything or even, maybe, most things, but I think it is important we be able to find ways to disagree without being disagreeable.

I understand that the senior Senator from Utah is here today because he disagrees with a particular policy. That is certainly his right, his prerogative. He is welcome to register his views, as we all are.

For instance, we have heard our friend from Utah defend the principles of limited government and our system of federalism on this floor many times. I have heard him and other colleagues of ours argue with passion that the Federal Government should not be in the business of interfering in State or local matters.

Yet here we are, as our Republican colleagues try to tell a local government, once again, what it can and cannot do. The Senator from Utah has introduced a resolution that seeks to overturn a law passed by the duly elected council of the District of Columbia.

I am not here to debate the merits of this law. After all, I was not elected by the people living in the District of Columbia. In fact, no one, as far as I know, in this room was elected by the people of the District of Columbia.

But the reason that these Senators have the ability to try to overturn a law passed by the local DC government is that the over 700,000 individuals who call the District of Columbia home continue to be denied full representation in Congress—in fact, any representation here in the U.S. Senate.

Under current law, Congress reviews all legislation passed by the DC Council before it can become law. The District of Columbia is not allowed to even control its own budget. The Mayor of DC cannot even deploy the men and women of the National Guard in case of emergency, a right every other State executive can utilize. If this were the case for any other State or local government, there would rightfully be an outcry from the citizens of that State or local government.

I don't believe that our colleague from Utah would take kindly to me or any of us in this body telling the city council in, say, Salt Lake City—a city with just under 200,000 residents—what laws they could or could not pass, and he would be right. He would be right. Luckily, the people of Salt Lake City have a Senator who has come to Washington, speaks his mind on the Senate floor, and votes to advance the interests of not just Salt Lake City citizens but the rest of Utah as well. I think that is really, in its essence, all that the people of Washington, DC, are looking for.

For me, the issue of DC statehood is not a Democratic or Republican issue;

it is a simple issue of basic fairness. For a Nation whose founding mantra—"no taxation without representation"—inspired the longest running experiment in democracy, we should all be concerned that today more than 700,000 tax-paying Americans, over two-thirds of whom are people of color, continue to be denied a vote here in this body.

Our Nation's Capital is home to more than just monuments and museums. It is a home to American families who go to work, to Americans who start businesses, to Americans who pay their taxes, to Americans who serve our country in times of war and peace, and to Americans who are still denied representation. Again, it is home to veterans and servicemembers who have signed up to protect our freedoms, who have risked their lives for our country and are still denied the ability to have a say in our Nation's future. It is home to the hundreds of Capitol Police officers who come to work every day in the Nation's Capital to keep us safe and are still denied a vote in the very institution they protect.

For generations, those who call the District of Columbia home have been denied the right to fully participate in our democracy, and that is why we are here today. That is why our Republican colleagues can call this vote to silence the decisions made by local leaders that DC residents have voted into office. That is why they can exercise this Federal overreach here today.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that my colleagues and I don't always agree on everything, but we do agree on quite a bit. But I strongly agree and want to associate myself with the words of Senator MIKE LEE in, I think it was 2018, just a couple of years ago. He said then:

We should allow each unique community to develop unique solutions according to the unique local preferences, and leave it at that.

Let me just repeat that.

We should allow each unique community to develop unique solutions according to unique local preferences, and leave it at that.

I could not agree more. I think it is incumbent upon all of us who care deeply for our democracy and the rights of all Americans to take up the cause of our fellow citizens in the District of Columbia and use our voices to call out this historic injustice and finally right this wrong.

With that, I stand opposed to Senator LEE's joint resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARPER. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I appreciate the thoughtful words of my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Delaware. I am grateful anytime someone is willing to recognize

that I have been a consistent champion of federalism and localism, self-rule.

He and I agree that those principles are important. My friend from Delaware, being a former Governor himself, understands the sovereignty of the States and the need to respect their judgment.

This is a different circumstance here than that. This would absolutely be inappropriate for us, in any other circumstance, to tell a State or any political subdivision of any State—a city, town, a county, any other subunit of one of our 50 sovereign States—it would be inappropriate for us to weigh in on a local policy issue like this. It is, in fact, part of our constitutional design that each State and each community within each State needs to be able to express itself and make its own decisions based on its own unique preferences.

Here is a very significant difference with respect to the District of Columbia. It has its own provision of the Constitution—in fact, its own clause in article I, section 8, known as the enclave clause. This provision, found in article I, section 8, clause 17, gives Congress exclusive legislative jurisdiction over what we now call the District of Columbia. It wasn't called that in 1787, when they wrote this. It hadn't yet been designed, created, but it described the area to be created out of land donated by one or more States, no more than 10 miles square that would serve as the seat of our national government.

There was an understanding the Founding Fathers had that the seat of government ought not be under the control of any single State, but rather it ought to be in a special status. To that end, the Founding Fathers put ultimate legislative jurisdiction in the hands of Congress, not in that district itself, not in the hands of the States that donated the land to create it, but in Congress.

Now, the DC Home Rule Act, of course, gives substantial authority to the DC City Council and Mayor. As it relates to this legislation, it gives the DC government 30 business days after the passage and enrollment of this legislation, and in that 30 business-day period, Congress has the ability to disapprove of that legislation, which would stop it from being implemented when it is set to take effect on March 18.

Let's remember what we are talking about here. We are talking about the most basic fundamental choice that a parent has relative to his or her child: the authority and the discretion to decide when, whether, how, and under what circumstances and what time certain medical procedures may be performed on the child. You might disagree with the medical judgment of a particular parent and at a particular moment, but I am not aware of any State that would make the decision on a statewide basis to take this choice away from parents and to say that a child as young as 11 years old could

make his or her own choice and not only deprive a child's parents from being able to make that decision but also be able to deprive that child's parents from ever even learning about it. These things are sometimes not without consequence.

Imagine, for example, a circumstance in which the parents are aware of some particular medical condition, a medical procedure that this child has recently had. Imagine circumstances in which a child's siblings or the child him or herself had previously reacted to a particular vaccination in a particular way or imagine a circumstance in which religious considerations come into play. Do we really want to deprive parents of the ability to make that decision?

I am not aware of any State legislature that would make that choice. I certainly hope they wouldn't. But regardless, and even though this would not be our choice, this would not be within our authority if it were not within the District of Columbia and, therefore, within our plenary legislative jurisdiction under the enclave clause to make this decision from Congress. It is our decision here because, at the end of the day, the DC government itself is acting on authority delegated to it by the Congress.

So whether you like it or not, whether you like, in the abstract, the idea of localism either as embodied in federalism or even more generally than that, you can't escape the fact that under our constitutional system, we are the lawmaker for DC, no less than any State's legislature is the legislative body for that State. If you choose not to decide here, you still have made a choice. You still have made a choice to approve of that legislative body stripping away critical protections, critical rights that parents have. We have made that decision not just because it sounds like the right thing to do, but anyone who has ever been a parent understands that it has to be the parent's choice. A parent has to be in a position of making these decisions and, at least, for crying out loud, be made aware of this. This takes away not only their authority or their rights but even their awareness of what has happened to their child.

So, yes, I understand the concerns of localism. They simply don't apply here.

Under our constitutional system, under the Constitution itself, the document to which we all have sworn an oath to uphold, protect, and defend, this is not a State decision.

To the extent it is a decision for the DC government, for the DC City Council, and Mayor, that is authority that we have delegated to the District, and it is authority that is ultimately ours. We are ultimately answerable to the people, to those who have elected us, to make sure that is exercised responsibly.

So if you don't like the fact that we are doing this—for that matter, if you don't like the policy of this, if you as a State lawmaker wouldn't be com-

fortable with this policy being adopted in your State—you have not only every right and every authority, but I believe you have a moral obligation to stand up to this piece of legislation. Do not let this kick in on March 18. This is wrong. It is not something we have to accept, and it is certainly not something that the Constitution even allows, much less compels.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from West Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO DONNA BOLEY

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I rise to speak on a couple of topics, but first, I want to take this opportunity to thank really an icon in our State, and that is West Virginia State Senate Pro Tempore Donna Boley. She is a good friend of mine, and she is now in her 10th term. She is the longest continuously serving member in our State's State senate. At one point in history, Donna Boley was the only Republican. She was the ranking member on every single committee and the lead Republican, as she was the only one in the early nineties.

I want to thank her for her service, for her service to our State, which began in 1985, and wish her all the best as she presides today—she is presiding today—over the West Virginia State Senate.

So, Donna, way to go. Really proud of you. You are a role model for every woman who is watching and certainly young girls as well.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, I also rise to join my colleagues to discuss the Democrats' so-called COVID-19 relief package.

Prior to this past round, Congress has been delivering much needed relief, as you know—five times since the beginning of this pandemic—with bipartisan support.

In this last month, my Republican colleagues and I put forth a targeted proposal, presented to President Biden in the Oval Office. He invited 10 of us over, and we had a great discussion. It wasn't just a plan, but it was a plan to work together, to be united and move forward in an area that we have had great bipartisan consensus.

Let's be clear. We don't disagree on the need for continued relief and resources, but it needs to be done in a targeted way. Throwing money randomly will not fix it, especially when some of these funds that are still being spent—that we speak of right now haven't been spent yet. And taking the opportunity to spend on favorite projects is not the intention of a COVID relief package.

In December of 2020—that wasn't that long ago, 2 months ago—we passed the most recent recovery efforts, which amounted to approximately \$900 billion in relief funds. President Biden's relief plan takes none of that into consideration. They don't take into full account a sufficient understanding that the impacts of that bill from just 2 months ago have yet to be felt. Instead, it force-feeds funds and radical