

and we are going to find out if the Senator from New Jersey will not only object to providing relief to the victims of this abuse but will object to multiple other bills that are bipartisan bills supported by Members of this body, because he wants to play partisan politics instead. I hope he does not.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: S. 4569, the TAKE IT DOWN Act, Cruz-Klobuchar; Calendar No. 473, S. 275, the Rural Broadband Protection Act of 2024, Capito-Klobuchar; Calendar No. 474, S. 1570, the Bottles and Breastfeeding Equipment Screening Enhancement Act, Duckworth and Daines; Calendar No. 285, S. 1153, the National Manufacturing Advisory Council for the 21st Century Act, Peters and Rubio; Calendar No. 480, S. 3475, Strengthening the Commercial Driver's License Information System Act, Peters and Young; Calendar No. 479, S. 3277, the Marine Debris reauthorization, Sullivan and Whitehouse; Calendar No. 513, S. 4212, the American Music Tourism Act of 2024, Blackburn and Hickenlooper; and Calendar No. 485, S. 4107, the Think Differently Transportation Act, Duckworth and Capito; further, that S. 4569 be discharged from the Committee on Commerce; that the committee-reported amendments, where applicable, be agreed to; that the Cruz-Klobuchar amendment to S. 4569, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I object.

Madam President, the sharing of non-consensual intimate images online is harmful and unacceptable. It is a serious problem that is affecting too many Americans. Many times, it is impacting our young people, and we need to do more to ensure that digital platforms are not used to harass and harm.

We need ethical guardrails for emerging technologies including generative AI. This means laws that protect people from harassment and hold wrongdoers accountable, but do not have unintended criminal consequences.

I had hoped the junior Senator from Texas would work with me rather than using Senate procedure to create the false appearance of partisanship. He used personal attacks and half truths to politicize the serious issue of online sexual harassment. I have and will continue to work with my colleagues to combat the issue of online sexual harassment. I look forward to finding solutions to address the proliferation of nonconsensual intimate images online.

Online sexual harassment and so many other issues that impact Ameri-

cans, from public safety to reproductive care to failing power grids, are urgent and it is our duty to address them. However, taking to the Senate floor with veiled threats is not how we should operate in this deliberative body. We are here to work together and to find solutions together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BLOOMBERG FOUNDATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Three quick points, Madam President: No. 1, I rise, first, to thank the Bloomberg Foundation. I had made notes from which I was going to speak, but I lost them. So I am going to kind of wing it here.

Over the past couple of years, the Bloomberg Foundation has spent millions of dollars—I want to say the figure is \$30 to \$40 million—to try to help really smart kids from low-income families access some of our finest colleges in the country. And America does have the best system of higher education in the world, by the way. We have the best quality colleges.

What the Bloomberg Foundation was focusing on was that these were just really smart kids from low-income families who had great grades and great standardized test scores and great extracurricular activities, but many of them just didn't know about the opportunities that were out there in the world for them. The Bloomberg Foundation wasn't concentrating on race or gender or sexuality or a part of the country or any of those things. They were just looking to try to help really smart young women and young men in high school with great grades and great standardized test scores access some of the finest universities in the country. And they spent 40 million bucks doing it, working with some other groups.

Well, it didn't work out like they thought. They just didn't have as much success as they wanted to. But they learned from the experience.

What they learned was, in order to reach these young people, you can't just text them. You can't just call them. You can't send them an email—in part, because today, when all of us receive emails and text messages from people who we don't know, we automatically assume it is some kind of scam. So that is what Bloomberg and its contractors found—that people, including our young people, they are just very suspicious, and so they weren't able to reach that many kids. And those that they didn't reach—and by the way, the folks from Bloomberg contacting them would never meet the

kids. They wanted to reach as many kids as they could, so they were doing it digitally. They just found out it wasn't that effective. But they also learned that the way to reach these kids is to see them in person and, in part, go through the kids' high schools' guidance counselors and placement offices.

So I am hoping that Bloomberg is going to start again. I am not saying that Bloomberg had no success. They had success, but it just wasn't as much success as we all wanted. But, by God, they tried, and they deserve thanks.

This wasn't any taxpayer money; it was the money of the Bloomberg foundation. They tried, and they learned a lot from it, and I wanted to thank them for trying. I hope they won't give up, and I hope they will use what they learned to try to reach these young people again.

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE FOSTER

Madam President, No. 2, I want to repeat very briefly what I said last week. Katherine Foster is a member of our Cloakroom staff. Katherine is not here. She is in the back doing her job. Today is her last day, and I wanted to thank her again for her service. As I said last time, she has taken a very prestigious job in the private sector, and I wish her well, and I hope she makes bucket loads of money.

To those who don't know, we have—by “we,” I mean the Republicans and the Democrats—what we call Cloakroom staff. These are people who work with us to make this place work. On any given day, the Democratic Cloakroom staff and the Republican Cloakroom staff are the nicest and the smartest people in this building, and they just do an incredible job. They work hard, and they have to be here at all kinds of ungodly hours, and they have to put up with back-sass from U.S. Senators. It is a very hard job. And that is true on both the Democratic side and the Republican side.

But, anyway, Katherine is one of that group, and she is leaving. We are sorry she is leaving, but we are happy that she is leaving because she is going to make more money than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. So we wish her well.

But I also wanted to use this opportunity to thank our entire teams on both the Democratic and the Republican side for their incredible work.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 8292

Madam President, No. 3, the House passed a bill dealing with the sanctity of taxpayer records.

In another life, I worked in State government. I worked for like, I don't know, 16 or 17 years—I don't remember because it went by in a flash—as State treasurer, which was an elected position. But before that, I was in an appointed position, a position appointed by the Governor. It was a political position called the secretary of the Department of Revenue, and that was a fancy title for “tax collector.” I was the State's tax collector for, I don't

know, 3½ years, until I left the position to go run for State treasurer.

One of the things I learned was the sanctity of people's income taxes. I mean, I am sure there are some documents that are more private—maybe our medical records—but they are not that much more private to us and precious to us than our tax records.

At the Louisiana Department of Revenue, which is where I worked, we had a hard-and-fast rule, and every employee knew it, and they respected it, by God. If you leaked somebody's tax returns, we would chase you like you stole Thanksgiving, and we would punish you. And we would not only fire you, but we would prosecute you if we had to. So, consequently, we had almost no leaks—none.

I wish I could say that for the IRS. Through the years, they have had a bunch of leaks. I don't want to overstate it, but they have. Not that long ago, back in 2019, they had a leak, and it actually came from a vendor that was working for the IRS.

By the way, the sanctity of those tax returns and whatnot and the importance to protect them also applies to contractors for the tax Agency.

But, anyway, one of the vendors for the Internal Revenue Service leaked 8,000 tax returns—8,000. Not 80, not 800—8,000 tax returns. And they gave these tax returns to a media organization. The person who leaked it—he didn't do it because he was trying to show tax fraud; he did it to try to embarrass the people. A lot of them were really wealthy, and he wanted to embarrass them just out of the meanness in his heart.

Some very famous people—I think Mr. Jeff Bezos was on the list. President Trump was on the list. But if you looked at this list, this list was as long as King Kong's arm. You could stack this list here and paint that ceiling—8,000. And it embarrassed a lot of people. It would have embarrassed you if your name was all over the Internet with your personal information and your home address and your signature. It was just wrong.

It took years for the IRS to track this down. We kept pushing them and raising fresh hell and saying: This is not right.

Well, I don't think they did it on their own; I think they got outside help. They finally caught this person. Do you know what his penalty was? He got 5 years, and they fined him \$5,000. I just don't think that is enough of a deterrent—I don't—when you add up all the misery that this one meathead caused to 8,000 people, none of whom were cheating on their taxes. He was just trying to embarrass them, and that is just wrong.

So the House passed a bill the other day that basically says the penalty is going to be increased. It is no longer going to be a minimum of 5; it is going to be 10 years. But also, instead of a \$5,000 fine, the maximum fine is going to be \$250,000.

And here is the thing. You can't—let me put it another way. Every document—every tax return that you release is a different count. In other words, this meathead that released 8,000, under the new law, that would be 8,000 counts against him. And that is the way it ought to be. It shouldn't be: Let's just lump them all together in one, and that is one count, and he pays 5,000 bucks, and he gets 5 years but he is probably out in 2. That is just not right, folks.

And what you allow is what will continue. And I don't hate anybody. I don't hate anybody. I don't know this meathead who did this, and in my heart, I don't hate him, but what he did was wrong. He just tried to embarrass and did embarrass 8,000 Americans who weren't doing anything wrong. They were paying their taxes, for God's sake. It is just wrong. It makes me want to throw up. It triggers my gag reflex.

So I hope we can pass the House bill. Like I say, I hadn't changed a word in the House bill. It is identical to what just passed the House. And I think—if I am wrong on this, Madam President, I will come back and correct the record—I think it passed the House unanimously.

Did it pass the House unanimously? Do we know, Josh? There were a couple of votes against.

This is Josh, who I work with. Smart as a whip.

It wasn't unanimous. I stand corrected. Josh, my brain, corrected me. But it was almost unanimous. And I would sure like to see this body do the same thing, and I just don't see this as a partisan issue.

Now, the reason I am talking so long is I think that my good friend Senator RON WYDEN wants to object to this. Now, I hope he doesn't. I don't know if I can say this, but I am going to say it anyway. I will buy him a pony if he doesn't object to this bill—a pony of his choice. That is not a bribe. I like RON WYDEN so much, I would buy him a pony of his choice anyway. But if he won't object to this bill, I will buy him a pony, OK, because this is a good, good piece of legislation.

I don't want to do this behind his back. So I don't see RON here, but what I am going to do, Madam President—I am not trying to tell you how to do your job. You can do whatever you want. But I am going to make this motion, and I would ask if you would consider holding it until Senator WYDEN has a chance to get here because I don't want to do this behind his back.

I see the Parliamentarian is unhappy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognizing that fact, yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will buy her a pony too.

Let me go to plan B. What I will do is, I want to hit "pause" because I don't want to do this behind RON'S back. Let me hit "pause," and I will ask that we go into a quorum call.

When RON gets here, I will ask to be recognized so I can assert my motion, and RON can agree with my splendid bill, and then we will go pick out a pony.

So I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator will be recognized.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, my friend Senator WYDEN is here, so I would like to proceed. I am sorry he missed my speech. It would have given him goosebumps if he had been here to listen to it. But maybe you all can tell him about it, and I hope he will find it convincing.

In the meantime, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 8292, which is the bill I talked about passed by the House almost unanimously, which was received from the House.

They couldn't hear me? Let me start over. All right.

Madam President, I am sorry. I didn't have my mic on.

The Presiding Officer recognized my request that we suspend the quorum call?

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, Senator WYDEN is here. I thank him for coming out. I hope he heard my speech. I hope he was persuaded. I know him to be a reasonable man, so I took my best shot. So I am going to go ahead and make my motion now that he is here.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 8292. That is the bill I talked about that was passed almost unanimously by the House. That bill has been received from the House. 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. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I certainly have no sympathy for leakers, and I want to make a couple of points to make it clear why I am going to oppose this proposal.

First of all, the biggest leakers of taxpayer data are the big tax software companies. We never hear a peep from our colleagues on the other side about that. In fact, my Republican colleagues try, with every piece of legislation where there is a possible connection, to get rid of the IRS's new direct-file system that allows taxpayers to avoid the

big tax prep companies who overcharge them and give away their data.

My view is, it makes no sense to create an even larger double standard—a life sentence for nonviolent offenders. That seems disproportionate to the whole concept of potentially zero penalty for big corporations that leak all the time.

Second, let's talk about the system this proposal would protect. It is a system that allows the people at the very, very top to pay what they want, when they want to, and, often, sometimes nothing at all for years on end. Some of the wealthiest folks—the people at the very top—pay zero for years on end, including the ex-President.

So my view is the American people ought to have more information about the tax schemes the ultrawealthy are playing, not less.

I want to make it clear, again, I take a backseat to no one when it comes to protecting taxpayer data. But the tax games of the ultrawealthy are not a state secret that ought to be protected like the nuclear codes. The Congress ought to be doing more for tax transparency. I am happy to have that discussion.

Meanwhile, the Senate should not go out of its way to help the system that helps the ultrawealthy hide in the shadows and dodge paying their fair share.

For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I thank my friend RON for his point of view. I hope we can sit down and talk about this and perhaps work something out because this bill is not about changing the tax rate; it is just about everybody's tax return is their own business.

I also thank, Madam President, your courtesy and time and attention in this matter.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

LIEUTENANT OSVALDO ALBARATI STOPPING PRISON CONTRABAND ACT

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 5284, the Lieutenant Osvaldo Albarati Stopping Prison Contraband Act, introduced earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5284) to increase the penalty for prohibited provision of a phone in a correctional facility, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. OSSOFF. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

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

Mr. OSSOFF. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bill, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 5284) was passed as follows:

S. 5284

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 "Lieutenant Osvaldo Albarati Stopping Prison Contraband Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITED PROVISION OF A PHONE.

Section 1791(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) in the case of a violation of subsection (a)(1), imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(F) of this section;" and

(3) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by inserting "in the case of a violation of subsection (a)(2)," before "(d)(1)(F)".

SEC. 3. REVIEW OF POLICIES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall—

(1) conduct a review of the policies of the Bureau of Prisons pertaining to inmates who make, possess, obtain, or attempt to make or obtain a prohibited object, as defined in section 1791(d)(1) of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) update those policies as needed to improve protections for incarcerated individuals and staff.

Mr. OSSOFF. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Mr. OSSOFF. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the Perry nomination be withdrawn; further, that the Senate vote on confirmation of the Perry nomination at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 788.

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 legislative clerk read the nomination of Jonathan E. Hawley, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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 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. 788, Jonathan E. Hawley, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Ben Ray Lujan, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeanne Shaheen, Tim Kaine, Chris Van Hollen, Tina Smith, Christopher A. Coons, Margaret Wood Hassan, Richard Blumenthal, Tammy Duckworth, Tammy Baldwin, Martin Heinrich, Alex Padilla.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 620.

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 legislative clerk read the nomination of David Huitema, of Maryland, to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics for a term of five years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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.