



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2023

No. 47

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, who is the same yesterday, today, and forever, we are transient creatures who long for a sense of permanence. Give us that permanence as we find in You our fixed and abiding center of faith.

Lord, we praise You because You are changeless, without any variableness in Your judgment and mercy. Strengthen our lawmakers for the challenges of our times. Keep them in the shadow of Your wings, and teach them to show mercy. Use Your powerful arm to rescue our Nation from the hands of all enemies of freedom. Let the tranquility of Your dominion increase until the Earth is filled with the knowledge of Your love.

We pray in Your glorious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING 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 legislative clerk read the nomination of Brent Neiman, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

RUSSIA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, earlier today, two Russian military aircraft conducted an unsafe intercept with an unmanned U.S. surveillance drone that was operating within international airspace over the Black Sea.

This intercept was so dangerous and so brazen that the U.S. Air Force was forced to crash their drone into international waters. It is another reckless act by President Putin and his military, and I want to tell Mr. Putin: Stop this behavior before you are the cause of an unintended escalation.

We have seen this behavior from the Russian military before, and it will not deter the United States from conducting operations over the Black Sea. These aggressive actions by Russian aircraft are risky and could lead—I repeat—to unintended escalation.

The United States has routinely flown over the Black Sea since before Putin's illegal and reckless invasion of Ukraine, and I am confident our military will continue to do so.

SILICON VALLEY BANK

Mr. President, now, over the weekend, as we all know, the U.S. banking system faced a significant threat after the collapse of Silicon Valley Bank. If the damage had spread across our financial system, the deposits and savings of tens of millions of families and small businesses could have been at serious risk.

Today, as we speak, thankfully, our banking system is stable thanks to the work of the Biden administration, the Federal Reserve, and the FDIC on Sunday. I thank the President, the Federal Reserve, and the FDIC for taking swift action to preserve confidence in the banking system, and the American people can rest assured that bank regulators have acted quickly and are doing everything they can to protect consumers.

In the days and weeks to come, Congress will look closely at what caused the run on Silicon Valley Bank and how we can prevent similar events in the future.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. President, now, later today, I will take the first procedural steps to take up legislation repealing the Iraq AUMFs of 1991 and 2002.

• This “buller” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S755

After a lot of hard work from Senators KAINE and YOUNG, as well as Chairman MENENDEZ and Ranking Member RISCH, this is the week the Senate will begin the process to end the legal authority that started the Iraq war two decades ago.

Every year we keep these AUMFs on the books, and every year we keep them on the books is another chance for future administrations to abuse or misuse them. War powers belong in the hands of Congress, and that means we have a responsibility to prevent future Presidents from exploiting these AUMFs to bumble us into a new Middle East conflict.

Americans are tired of endless wars in the Middle East, and we owe it to them and to our veterans and their families to repeal the Iraq war AUMF.

So thank you—thank you—to the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for their work, especially Chairman MENENDEZ and Ranking Member RISCH, and thank you again to Senators KAINE and YOUNG for their work spearheading this legislation.

The Iraq war has formally been over for more than 10 years. The reality on the ground has long since changed. So the laws on the books must change too. Repealing this AUMF will in no way hinder our national defense, and it represents a positive step forward in our relationship with the Iraqi Government.

I am pleased this effort has been thoroughly bipartisan. President Biden has voiced his support for the measure. The House passed a similar bill a few years ago with strong support from both Democrats and Republicans. Here in the Senate, the bill was reported out of committee with a 13-to-8 vote. So I thank my colleagues on both sides for allowing this bill to proceed.

AUKUS

Mr. President, now, on AUKUS, yesterday, in San Diego, President Biden joined his counterparts from the United Kingdom and Australia, and he announced the next steps in a historic arrangement known as AUKUS.

The President's announcement is a bold and generational investment to create a new fleet of nuclear-powered submarines to counter President Xi and the Chinese Communist Party's influence in the Pacific. And AUKUS, in general, will be a critical part of ensuring stability in the region. I applaud President Biden for recognizing the need to forge ahead on this multinational partnership.

During my recent codel overseas, our discussions with world leaders stressed the need for the United States to continue deepening our security arrangements with our longstanding partners. At the same time, I made it clear that we also must expand and grow relationships with countries like India, which will play a major role in shaping global security and stability in the 21st century.

And just like AUKUS serves as a bulwark in the Pacific, so will the quad

powers of the United States, Japan, Australia, and India, working together for democracy and stability in Asia.

The United States will only stay ahead of President Xi and the Chinese Communist Party if we can bring other democracies of the world to partner with us—from India, Australia, Japan, the UK, and so many others. And India and Australia can be very important partners in containing President Xi and the CCP.

So I remain committed to deepening our existing relationships and finding opportunities to build new ones, and I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis to advance them.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. President, now, on the President's Executive order on guns, today, in Monterrey Park, CA—where, sadly, unfortunately, tragically, a gunman murdered 11 people in January during Lunar New Year celebrations—President Biden will announce a new Executive order to strengthen background checks and other commonsense gun safety measures.

I commend President Biden for taking this much needed step to fight the scourge of gun violence in our country.

After gunmen massacred dozens of people in Buffalo and Uvalde last year, the Senate defied the NRA and passed a bipartisan, commonsense, and life-saving gun safety bill for the first time in decades. It was the first step Congress took since the Brady bill in 1994, which I was proud to author and lead passage of, which mandated Federal background checks on firearms.

Last year's bipartisan safety bill was a good, long-overdue step of progress, but we must do more. Gun violence remains a devastating sickness that festers deep within the heart of our Nation.

Democrats stand ready to keep working together to combat violence, and we hope a good number of our Republican colleagues will join us once again.

I hope my colleagues on the other side can free themselves from the vice grip of the NRA and the MAGA wing of the Republican Party and work with Democrats to pass more gun safety legislation in this Congress.

INSULIN

Mr. President, now, on insulin and the CBO, it is another important day for millions of Americans who rely on insulin. Following Eli Lilly's recent announcement that they are capping insulin costs at \$35 a month, Novo Nordisk announced today that they are following suit, slashing prices on some insulin products by as much as 75 percent.

It is good news that these enormous drug pharmaceutical companies are waking up to the injustice of price gouging of Americans who rely on insulin daily. There is no justification—none—for having insulin cost \$300 or \$500 or more a month. People who need that insulin for their health, for their safety, for their lives can't afford it

anymore, and this lowering of price is very important.

As we all know, we Senate Democrats took a major step in righting this wrong by capping insulin costs at \$35 a month for Americans on Medicare. It is my hope that both parties can build on this good work with commonsense bipartisan legislation to extend that \$35 cap to all Americans.

Lowering insulin costs is a good policy that everyone on both sides of the aisle should get behind. This is not a Democratic issue. This is not a Republican issue. It is something that affects people in every city, in every State and is an American issue.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Mr. President, finally, today, CBO released a letter confirming what most of us already knew: The Republican plan to balance the budget in 10 years and keep the Trump tax cuts is impossible—mathematically impossible—without making cuts to Social Security, Medicare, defense, and veterans' benefits.

To balance the budget in 10 years with no new revenues, while somehow leaving Medicare, Social Security, veterans' programs, and defense unscathed, Republicans would have to cut 86 percent from every other Federal program. That means nearly obliterating funds for Medicaid, for food and housing support, border security, healthcare, infrastructure.

This leaves Americans with a profound worry about their benefits, and it leaves Americans with some big questions down the road. If Republicans can't reach their goals without forcing severe cuts down Americans' throats, then what exactly are they planning to do?

To date, Republicans have refused to talk straight with the American people about budget cuts.

Speaker MCCARTHY, today is March 14. Show us your plan.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

MITCH MCCONNELL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it seems a little unusual to follow Senator SCHUMER because usually Senator MCCONNELL is next, and we certainly understand why he is not here today. He is in recovery from a fall that he experienced last week. We wish him the very best and hope he is back very soon.

BUDGET

Mr. President, there is an old saying that there aren't a lot of atheists in foxholes.

In my experience, there aren't a lot of unyielding, uncompromising, fiscally conservative, so-called budget hawks when a disaster hits. It gets personal. When tornadoes rip across your State or hurricanes devastate your community, when a cold snap takes down the electric grid in your State, when blazing heat sets off raging wildfires, when a freight train hauling

toxic chemicals derails and explodes into a raging fireball, you don't find a platoon of Ayn Rand-quoting ideologues that really come to the scene and want to be heard.

People want to see FEMA and other government Agencies on the scene helping as quickly as possible. They want to know that their government is there to help when it is needed.

When it gets right down to it, we Americans face a fundamental choice. Do we want a Federal Government that is there when we need a hand or do we want a government that will preach to us: Sorry. You are on your own, Mr. Taxpayer?

Do we want a government that is far-sighted enough to plant the American flag on new industries and inventions for the future or do we plan on leaving these transformative discoveries—the Moonshots of this century—to China?

President Biden told us last week where he stands on these basic questions when he proposed his budget to Congress. It is a plan that protects Social Security, strengthens Medicare, and adds 25 years of additional solvency to the Medicare Program.

The President's budget plan gives working families help with the basics—affordable, reliable healthcare coverage, including savings on prescription drugs, which the Democratic leader just noted when it came to insulin.

The President's budget invests in affordable housing and quality childcare. It invests in community colleges to educate skilled workers that our economy desperately needs and helps students land good-paying jobs and get a start on a 4-year degree.

The President's budget restores the enhanced child tax credit, which helped cut poverty among children in the United States in half when we included it during the pandemic. We are, in fact, the richest Nation on Earth, yet, shamefully, we have the highest child poverty rate among all advanced nations. If the superwealthy can claim tax breaks on their yachts, surely we can find affordable tax credits to help working families care for their kids.

President Reagan called another part of the Tax Code—the earned income tax credit—the best anti-poverty program ever invented. President Biden is proposing to make the earned income tax credit for childless workers permanent to lift millions of low-wage Americans out of poverty. Isn't that something that should be our aspiration in this country as a high priority? If you say you believe in the dignity of work, if you say you respect men and women who take the bus early in the morning, working maybe two or even three jobs to make ends meet, here is a chance to show our respect for work—support the earned income tax credit.

President Biden's budget includes continued funding for a Cancer Moonshot to end cancer as we know it. What family in America hasn't known the heartache personally or among friends or family members and frequently the

financial devastation of cancer? Not many.

I hope people not only embrace the administration's Cancer Moonshot but will continue the 5-percent real growth in medical research—including the National Institutes of Health—that this Senate has supported on a bipartisan basis for nearly a decade.

I went out to National Institutes of Health about 10 years ago, and I met with one of the greatest living Americans—and I say that without reservation—Dr. Francis Collins. He was the head of the NIH under Presidents of both political parties and did a remarkable job. Among other things, he was one of the key elements and contributors in mapping the human genome. That has just transformed a whole area of medical research.

I said to Dr. Collins when I went out to see him: I want to help the National Institutes of Health with medical research. I know there was a time when a bipartisan coalition doubled your budget.

That coalition should be remembered on the floor of the Senate. It was Arlen Specter, a Republican from Pennsylvania; Tom Harkin, a Democrat from Iowa; and John Porter, a Republican Congressman from the North Shore of the State of Illinois. The three of them got together and doubled the budget for the National Institutes of Health.

I said to Dr. Collins: I want to do something that helps you. What can I do?

He said: Work to give us 5 percent real growth every single year.

Do you know why?

He said: Our researchers aren't sure you are going to be there next year, Congress. They are not sure you are going to fund their projects. So they don't follow through to the end, as they should. They lose patience and end up in some other place. If you can give them a reliable budget each year for medical research, they will continue their research and find dramatic breakthroughs.

In the words of Dr. Collins, he said: We can light up the scoreboard if you will make that commitment.

I came back here and talked to a number of my colleagues. I talked to Roy Blunt—now retired—from the State of Missouri. I talked to PATTY MURRAY—of course still serving here and now chairing the Senate Appropriations Committee—from the State of Washington. I spoke to Lamar Alexander, a Republican from Tennessee. The four of us got together and put together a bipartisan team, and we achieved that goal of 5 percent real growth for 8 years. We went from \$30 billion at the NIH to \$40 billion at the NIH, and it makes a big difference. It made a big difference when the pandemic struck.

We are doing things now that really do improve the likelihood of finding cures for many diseases, and I want to continue with that. I am glad to report that President Biden's budget does just

that. That is the kind of commitment we need to make in the Senate on a bipartisan basis for at least another decade.

The President's plan also strengthens border security and the U.S. immigration system. There is no excuse why we have not rewritten our terrible immigration laws, our broken immigration system, in almost 30 years—30 years, since Ronald Reagan was President. That was the last time we ever agreed on any significant changes in immigration policy.

The world has changed dramatically. America has changed, and we still are laboring under the old laws, which do not meet today's needs. We need to do more. It is not enough to just appropriate money for border security; we need a plan that makes sense, that reflects our values as a nation of immigrants, which reflects the values we share when it comes to our future and recognizes the reality that many of these immigrants seeking to be part of the United States are going to make a significant difference not only in the lives of their families but in the lives of Americans all over.

These are people who have amazing energy and determination. I have yet to meet one of these new immigrants in my State of Illinois who is asking me where the welfare office is. They are asking me where they can go to work, and they are ready to roll up their sleeves and start working immediately. They are wonderful, ingenious, innovative, hard-charging people, and we need them in our future. It is time to wake up to the reality.

Having a system of orderly immigration in this country is the best thing to make sure we keep our labor pool strong and the best innovation available in entrepreneurial pursuits.

The President's budget also increases defense spending to ensure that we can deter any threats from China, Russia, Iran, or any other country that threatens us. It maintains our commitment to the brave fighters and people of Ukraine who are on the frontline of freedom in today's world.

I just read over the weekend where the Governor from the State of Florida really questioned whether we ought to be doing anything to help the people in Ukraine. I couldn't believe it when I read it, but I guess in politics, almost anything can happen.

To think that we would turn our backs now on these brave Ukrainians who for more than a year have fought off Vladimir Putin and his thugs invading their country in an unprovoked invasion is just, in my mind, mindless. If we can't stand up for the values of the Ukrainian people and stop this kind of ruthless, war-crime behavior by Vladimir Putin, shame on us. The United States needs to stand with the people of Ukraine, who are literally giving their lives on a daily basis for the future of their nation.

I might add, the President's budget honors Americans' commitment to our

military veterans, boosting investments in veterans' health and funding the PACT Act, which is going to allow those who were injured in service to our country by burn pits, for example, an opportunity to get the best quality medical care and to care for veterans sickened by service-connected exposure to toxic hazards.

This is important: According to the White House, if you earn less than \$400,000 a year, the President's budget won't raise your taxes one dollar. That bears repeating. If your family earns less than \$400,000 a year, your taxes under the President's budget will not go up one penny. He made that promise when he ran, and he has stuck with it.

The President pays for this plan by making the ultrawealthy, over \$400,000, and big corporations finally pay their fair share. When 55 of the largest corporations in America paid no taxes—zero—last year, that is not a conservative precept; that is a big con, and it is not fair.

Now, we know the President's plan is just an opening bid of what promises to be a long, complicated budget process. We will undoubtedly see alternative proposals from both sides of the aisle. That is the nature of negotiations and debate. But it does take two sides.

I have to join with the Democratic leader in the Senate to say: Speaker MCCARTHY, where is your plan? Where is your budget? You talk big, but you don't produce anything. We want to see it.

During the last administration, our Republican colleagues voted to add nearly \$8 trillion to the national debt. From the last administration was the single-largest increase in America's national debt than any other previous President. That is nearly one-quarter of all the debt accumulated since the beginning of this Nation. It happened in the last 4 years under the previous President. Most of the \$8 trillion in new debt was piled on before the pandemic. A lot of it was spent on tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America and the corporations they own.

Now they say they want to eliminate the deficit in a decade. As Senator SCHUMER said earlier, it just doesn't pass the laugh test, let alone the math test.

What is the plan to do that? Put it on paper. Put it on the table, and let's see it, Speaker MCCARTHY. Are you going to cut education? healthcare? medical research? aid for veterans? FEMA?

The President's plan is on the table. Republicans have a responsibility to come up with a credible, serious counteroffer, not just bumper sticker slogans.

EQUAL PAY DAY

Mr. President, on a related note, it was 60 years ago that John Kennedy, as President, signed the Equal Pay Act. The law was simple. Here is what it said: Women should not be paid less than men for the same work—simple. Yet, 60 years later, we are still not there—60 years.

Today is Equal Pay Day in America. Let me tell you what that means. This is the day when the average American woman will finally earn as much as the average man did last year. In other words, on average, it takes women 15½ months to earn as much as men do in America in 12 months.

The pay gap persists despite the law I told you about. Here is the reality: Women in America are still paid less than men even when they do exactly the same job. On average, a woman in America makes 82 cents for every dollar a man makes. This means that women who work full time year-round lose up to \$400,000 over the course of their working lives. When you include part-time and seasonal workers, women make only 77 cents for every dollar a man makes. The pay gap gets even wider for women of color, who lose up to \$1 million over the course of their working lives. And less pay during your working years means less retirement income, we all know.

Apologists offer all kinds of explanations and justifications, but the persistent pay gap among men and women is sexism, plain and simple. And it doesn't just hurt women; it hurts their families, who depend on them. Additionally, while men's wages rise throughout their lives, women's wages rise more slowly, and the gap widens if they have children.

President Biden's budget proposal contains a number of important measures that will help working families make ends meet. It includes affordable childcare—what a high priority that is for every working parent—and paid family and medical leave so that women, who are also primary caregivers in most families, don't have to stop working to care for a loved one.

But those measures, as necessary as they are, will not close the inexcusable pay gap for women. We need to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, closing loopholes in equal pay after finally giving women the tools they need to hold employers accountable if they break equal pay laws.

House and Senate Democrats reintroduced this essential legislation last week. I want to thank my colleague Senator PATTY MURRAY, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in particular for her leadership on this issue.

We are committed to passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, and we need Republicans to make it happen. If they believe in fairness, as I think we all do, if you care about the financial security of working families, stand with us, and let's finally pass this bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I often come to the floor of the Senate to talk about one particular item as I want to be able to walk through what we are going to do to be able to solve it.

Honestly, today, it is a little different for me. In some ways, I feel a lit-

tle bit like Will Rogers with his statement, the famous Oklahoman, who said that all I really know is what I learned from reading the newspapers, which is an alibi for my ignorance.

Today, I want to just be able to talk about random stories that I have read lately that are kind of in the "you can't make this stuff up" column. It has been frustrating for me.

Right now, 7 in 10 Americans feel like America is on the wrong track—7 in 10. I mean, I don't know why, but they just feel like something is not going right, like things are out of control. It has been frustrating to me to be able to go through so many news stories lately and to be able to say: If I put this in front of 7 in 10 or maybe 9 in 10 Americans, they would say, "Why are we doing this as a nation?"

Now, I understand a lot of the issues we face are complicated. Yet, quite frankly, some of these issues are not complicated; they are common sense; they become political only in this city. But for most of America, it is just not that complicated. Sometimes I just get frustrated with the language and the things that are coming out of not just the administration but with the things that are happening in our Federal Government right now that, I think, just need to be called out and for us to say: Let's as a Senate sit down and talk about some of these complicated issues. Instead of knee-jerk political reactions, let's try to solve some of these hard things because we are currently talking about it, and things are going sideways instead of things being solved.

Over the past 5 days, we have watched the collapse of the Silicon Valley Bank and Signature Bank—a big bank in San Francisco and a much smaller bank in New York. For both of them, we have now had the FDIC step in, and they are going to save every single person in the bank and make sure they are whole. Now, that is very different than cyclical. Most Americans know you are insured up to \$250,000, but the Biden administration stepped in and said: Oh, no. Everyone is going to be kept 100-percent whole.

The comment that has come out of it has been: Well, we are going to make sure no taxpayers have to be able to cover this bill. Then, if you listen closely, the very next statement is that it is going to come from an assessment on the banks instead.

Let me tell you what that means.

As one of the wealthiest banks in America, which has mostly millionaires who actually bank there—in fact, to show that, for 90 percent of the depositors in Silicon Valley Bank, their deposits exceed \$250,000—OK?—90 percent. That is not normal for a bank. For that bank in San Francisco, all of their depositors are going to be bailed out, and the way that they are going to be bailed out is they are going to put a special—what they are calling—assessment on banks across the country.

So let me tell you what is happening in the next few months.

Banks in Oklahoma, in rural towns, are about to pay a special fee to be able to bail out millionaires in San Francisco. Now, what Oklahoma banks and bankers had to do with that bank failure in San Francisco I have no idea, but the comments being made over and over again are that no taxpayer is going to be affected by this. I am sure my bankers will be glad to know that they don't pay taxes anymore, apparently, and I am sure every person who banks there will be interested to know when their bank fees go up and their interest rates go down so as to be able to cover what happened in San Francisco.

Listen, I don't want to see a contagion of banks either, but let's be honest. What is really happening is a backdoor tax increase on every single American. They are just not using the IRS to do it. They are using community banks to do it all over the country—to charge them a quick higher fee, which they know will mean a higher fee to the people who are members of their banks. That is how it is going to get covered rather than the typical way this would get covered—by actually taking that bank, actually doing an auction and auctioning it off to other banks to be able to take it in.

I look at that and say: You can't make this stuff up, in some ways, to be able to say no taxpayer is going to be affected, but quietly taxpayers across the country are going to be affected by this.

Mr. President, I was surprised when I saw the President's budget come out, when he said this is a new budget and a new way to be able to reduce deficits, when the budget proposal he had was \$6.8 trillion. That is the spending number—\$6.8 trillion. To put this in perspective, in just 2019—4 years ago—the total spending for the Federal Government was \$4.4 trillion. That was the last year before COVID—\$4.4 trillion. Now, post-COVID, the President's budget is \$6.8 trillion in new spending.

Mr. President, I visited with some folks on immigration recently, and it was interesting. In January, the numbers went down a little bit for illegal crossings, so the Department of Homeland Security immediately put out “numbers are down.” Even before the month was done, the numbers came out that the numbers were down in January. Now it is the middle of March, and we can't seem to get the numbers for February because the best guess-estimates we have is that they have skyrocketed back up again, so the DHS is no longer talking about it.

They have released a new proposal, though, to be able to expedite individuals on asylum, to be able to get through under asylum here, which is a good thing, by the way; but with their current structured proposal, they will do about 500 people a month through this new asylum process and procedures when we actually have 5,000 people a day illegally crossing. So their new proposed answer is how to expedite

hearings for 500 people a month when the problem is 5,000 people a day.

In addition to that, the Biden administration just released a new set of rules on what will constitute, as they say, “violent crimes.” These are individuals who are illegally present in the country who are due to be deported. They are trying to redefine what “violent crimes” mean and who is eligible for deportation in the country. Part of what they are redefining is, Who are sex offenders and how would you define a “sex offender” and who would be guilty of that?

Can I just tell you? I won't find very many Americans who would say: We only want part of the illegal sex offenders in the country. Yet the Biden administration is quickly trying to redefine what equals a sex offender and who actually has to be deported from that group.

Mr. President, I met with the Director of the FBI last week and had a conversation about a memo that the FBI put out just a month ago, saying that there is a threat of terrorism coming from traditional Catholics and that they need to have further investigation.

To their credit, the FBI pulled that back quickly after they released it, after the Director saw it, and the Director, unequivocally, distanced himself from it. But why did that ever start in the first place? Why was there an office in the FBI that considered traditional Catholics to be a threat to the country?

In the Federal workforce—it was interesting—just about a month ago, there was a big to-do. As a matter of fact, there were some here, even in this room, who made a big to-do about how the IRS is doing so much better. The literal statement was made: After we pass the Inflation Reduction Act, the IRS now has a much higher percentage of answered calls. And there was a celebration on the floor here.

Well, I have to tell you, that is a good thing to be able to answer more calls because there have been millions of unanswered calls from the IRS. So I went to check the data because so many people were saying the percentage of calls answered is much higher than what it was last year, thanks to the Inflation Reduction Act. I went and pulled the data on it to be able to look at it and to see what that was, just to be able to check the facts.

Here are the actual facts: Half as many people called the IRS last year as did the year before. In fact, the IRS actually answered 100,000 fewer calls than they did the year before. It is just that so many millions of people stopped calling them, knowing that they are not going to get an answer at all. The percentage looks better because fewer people were trying, but the actual number of answered calls actually went down. Literally, you can't make this stuff up. We need to stop celebrating better percentage when the real facts are fewer calls were actually answered by the IRS.

In the category of “you can't make this up,” the Office of Personnel Management, who runs the Federal hiring process—I just wrote a letter to them a few days ago because two of their leadership individuals and senior management team are now going to need to be fired because in their previous employment, they had credible accusations of harassment. This is the office that is designed to be able to oversee hiring in the Federal Government that failed to do background checks on senior management they were hiring.

In the category of “you can't make this stuff up” in the Inflation Reduction Act again, there was a lot of to-do about drug pricing and them saying we are now going to control drug pricing. Here is what also has occurred with that: Four drug manufacturers have now pulled new cancer drugs from the American market. Just in the last 6 months, four new cancer drugs have been pulled because they are saying they can't make it work with the new Inflation Reduction Act law.

If I want to stack on top of the Inflation Reduction Act, there was a huge section on green energy within the Inflation Reduction Act—which is really what the act really was, was a new Green New Deal bill. There was a huge section all about how we are going to do more energy production, more battery production for electric batteries. The future of green energy is going to be in America; and as the President said over and over again, it is going to be made in America.

In fact, I sat in on the President's State of the Union Address, and this is what the President said during the State of the Union Address. The President said:

Folks, I know I have been criticized for saying this, but I am not changing my view. We are going to make sure the supply chain for America begins in America. The supply chain begins in America.

So when we do these projects—and, again, I get criticized about this, but I make no excuses for it—we are going to buy American. We are going to buy American, folks. And it is totally—it is totally consistent with international trade rules. Buy American has been the law since 1933, but for too long, past administrations—Democrat and Republican—have fought to get around it but not anymore.

That is what the President said down the hall at the State of the Union Address.

What has happened in the last 3 weeks? The President's team has actually worked with Japan to create a false free-trade agreement because there is an exception in the Inflation Reduction Act that if you want to do green energy production, you have to do it in North America or you have to have a free-trade agreement. We don't have that FTA with Japan, so they are creating a type of FTA with Japan so Japan can sell us batteries. So much for “the previous administrations are the ones that tried to work around that.”

I would love to say it is isolated, but they just did the same thing with Germany, to create a workaround in the

Inflation Reduction Act's MADE in America Act so that the MADE in America Act and Produced in America Act will now also include Japan and their production, will now also include Germany and their production.

May I just say to you, one of the largest new North American battery manufacturers for EV just got moved to Canada, not the United States—so much for “past administrations have fought to get around it, but not anymore.” This administration is working around the MADE in America, Buy American Act right now for green energy. Where did they get their supplies and their critical minerals? It is not from the United States; it is from China.

In the energy environment—while I am still talking through that as well—the Willow Project has been talked about greatly with Alaska and saying that now ConocoPhillips is going to be able to produce off three platforms more oil coming from Alaska. That is good, by the way. We have a steady supply of oil that can come for a very long time from Alaska, and it has been blocked off over and over and over again, when the law states that property is set aside for energy production.

But in the process, the Biden administration not only allowed three platforms to start producing oil, but then they blocked off 3 million new acres from production—3 million.

There was recently, in the United Arab Emirates, a set of meetings in the Middle East dealing with the Abraham Accords. It is interesting, when I am traveling around that absolutely beautiful country and seeing the wealth that is there, I couldn't help but think, this is what Alaska would look like if the Federal Government would actually allow energy production there like there is energy production in the UAE. But our Nation won't allow it. Instead, we are still buying from other nations rather than allowing full production on our own. You can't make this stuff up.

If you talk to a developer right now, they will tell you it is very hard to develop new neighborhoods and new locations because they can't get transformers, those little boxes that sit on the edges of neighborhoods. Some of those are the transformers that are up high. Those transformers have a 99.55 percent efficiency—99.55 percent efficiency. I wish I had that layer of efficiency.

The Biden administration just put out new rules for those transformers—that are very hard to get right now because they are back-ordered—to add a 0.1 percent new energy efficiency requirement on them. Remember, they are already 99.55 percent efficient. They want them to be 99.65 percent efficient, so they are moving just that little decimal right there. To do that, it is going to slow down production of the transformers again—could be up to 16 months slower—and it will increase the cost by hundreds of millions of dollars.

So when your electricity bill goes up and they are not able to continue building an expansion, that is not the fault of your electric company; that is the fault of your Federal Government right now so they can brag about increasing production by 0.1 percent on something that is already 99.55 percent efficient.

Put this on top of the Biden administration's new exploration to be able to cut off gas stoves. They initially announced from two different Agencies that they are going to try to end gas stoves in America and then quickly pulled that back and only said: Oh, no, we are just going to study gas stoves in America, and we are going to look at trying to be able to shut those off in the future, but we are not going to do that right now leading up to the election because there are millions and millions of people who use gas stoves, which, by the way, have been studied for years across the country.

This is not an issue about particulars in the house; this is an issue about an administration that doesn't care about the cost to the consumer, as long as they can say they got their way.

It is the same exact issue on the EPA's heavy-duty electric vehicle emissions rule. That rule is rightly being addressed by my colleague from Nebraska, who is going after a very simple thing that the EPA is trying to be able to do in this Biden administration that will raise the cost of trucks up to \$8,000 per vehicle. Listen, there are a lot of long-haul folks who cannot afford \$8,000 per vehicle just to be able to follow a new Biden administration policy.

Listen, I put all these things together because as I read the news and as I go through the different things that I go through on a daily basis and be able to read through things, at some point, I look at it, and I think, Who says this makes sense? Where are these things coming from? If I pull any one of these out and put them in front of the vast majority of people in Oklahoma and ask, Is this the direction the country needs to go, they will say no.

This Senate needs to talk about the direction the Nation is going when you put controls around Agencies, that they just can't make up the rules based on their own preferences.

This is not just an issue for our consumers; this body had a wake-up call this weekend when we watched China broker a deal between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and the U.S. State Department was not at the table because our foreign policies are collapsing around the world. That is a threat to American national security. It is not just an absence of American policy making a difference, it is an absence of our American values. When China's values are on the move worldwide, that is not a safer world that we are living in. We need to shift the direction this is going. And it needs to be soon.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, almost 20 years ago, a family in Idaho purchased a lot in a residential area near Priest Lake.

They were looking to build a home. They obtained county building permits and started placing sand and gravel on their property to get it ready for the build. But shortly after the family began preparing their lot, the Environmental Protection Agency told them to stop. There was water on their building plot with no surface water connection to any body of water. But because of its proximity to Priest Lake, the EPA said that placing sand and gravel on the property violated the Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of pollutants, such as the rocks and sand used to prepare a building plot into navigable waters.

Navigable waters are ambiguously defined by the Clean Water Act as “waters of the United States.” That is more commonly known as WOTUS.

Normally, navigable waters are defined as waters that are deep; they are wide; and they are calm enough for boats or ships to go across. The surface water on the Idaho family's lot certainly doesn't fit that bill.

The Idaho family tried to challenge the EPA. They sought a hearing, but the EPA chose not to grant them one and, instead, continued to assert the Clean Water Act jurisdiction against their land. So Michael and Chantell Sackett sued.

They had been to the Supreme Court once, and they are back again this year. They still haven't been able to build on the property that they first acquired in 2004.

The Sackett v. EPA Supreme Court case centers on interpretation of the Clean Water Act. What counts as waters of the United States?

In 2015, the Obama administration published an unprecedented expansion of the definition of WOTUS, giving the Federal Government jurisdiction over a State resource—that is, Nebraska's water. It doesn't belong to the Federal Government.

I fought former President Obama's WOTUS rule since my very first term here in the U.S. Senate. The rule was the Federal Government at its worst. It encroached on families, on communities, and on businesses by its brazen intrusion into the precious water resource of my home State of Nebraska—and all the rest of our States as well.

The Trump administration rescinded Obama's WOTUS rule, but when President Biden took office, he reversed that. The President issued a new rule allowing EPA officials in Washington, DC, to make case-by-case determinations of what should be considered water of the United States. Privately owned land containing ponds, puddles, and even dry ditches can now be regulated by the Federal Government. This

needless power grab only places more people under restrictive regulations and rules.

The Federal Government should not have the power to regulate Nebraska's water; Nebraskans should. Nebraska has a special system of natural resource districts that empower locally elected community members to manage water resources based on river basin boundaries. Regular people living their lives at home know better than DC bureaucrats how to use and how to manage their State's natural resources.

That is why I have partnered with my colleague Senator CAPITO in introducing legislation to overturn President Biden's WOTUS rule. The Biden administration is determined to impose an overly restrictive rule right now, and that is before the Supreme Court has an opportunity to decide the Sackett case. We cannot let that happen.

In the past, I have cosponsored a bill targeting the flawed science used by the EPA to expand its definition of WOTUS. I have also helped to introduce legislation that would require Presidential administrations to consult with States and to consult with stakeholders before they impose these restrictions on our State-owned natural resources. This is essential. States understand the complex geological and hydrological factors that affect their own water resources. There is no way that the Federal Government can take all of that into account with its one-size-fits-all regulations.

I dealt with these issues during my time in the Nebraska Legislature, and I know that there are not benefits when the Federal Government tries to take control of State resources through these onerous regulations.

Leave water management to the experts. The States know their own water. The Federal Government needs to stay out of issues that are handled much better under State jurisdiction.

WOTUS is not the issue that everyone wants to talk about, but it is important to regular Americans in Nebraska, in Idaho, and in many other States, and those Americans—well, they are who we are here to represent.

WOTUS has a real, tangible impact on American lives. So let's come together. We can solve this problem that was created by the administration's rash and reckless regulating.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RYAN REDINGTON

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, colleagues who have been around for a

while know that it is usually about this time of the year that I come to the floor to talk about my favorite sporting event. I am not talking about March Madness. I am talking about Alaska's version of March Madness, which is the Iditarod, when teams of dogs led by pretty able athletes embark on a thousand-mile mushing adventure across the wilds of Alaska, beginning down in Anchorage, all the way up to Nome.

This year, it is not quite 1,000 miles. It is 998 miles, as they took the southern route, which they try to alternate during different years.

But it has been an adventure for the 33 teams that ventured out just last Sunday, and I am here to announce that literally 10 minutes ago—perhaps less than 10 minutes ago—the winner has just crossed the finish line under the burlled arch in Nome.

So Alaskans are excited. The Iditarod website has crashed because everybody was checking in to see if Ryan Redington had made it across, and I am here to announce that Ryan Redington is the winner of the 51st Iditarod race in Alaska. He and his team just, as I say, crossed. He has been in the lead for the past several days, but we are really, really quite excited about his win.

I am looking forward to being able to give a call myself to congratulate him, but I know that right now his family, his friends, and everyone who is there in Nome to greet them after this 8-day journey are really quite excited. So he is probably not going to be answering his phone just yet.

The Iditarod is really an extraordinary, extraordinary event. It is an experience like no other. And when they say it takes a village, it really takes a village. All of these little checkpoints along the way—some of them are communities; some of them are literally nothing more than a cabin. So it is an opportunity for the musher and their teams to be checking in, be checked out by the volunteer veterinarians who are along the way; refuel in the sense of feeding their dogs, resting their dogs, getting a little food for themselves, but then traveling on.

Think about what it means to drive a dog team for a thousand miles over this period of time and over terrain like this. Mr. President, you are from a northern State. You appreciate snow. We are not afraid of a little weather, but what these mushers and their teams have been through has been pretty amazing.

I was there at the ceremonial start last week. It was zero in Anchorage. It was a pretty great day to be a dog because it was nice and cool. Temperatures increased along the way. They encountered everything from drizzle to rain to mud, then to deep snow, then to freezing cold, then to gale winds—bumps along the way. It is a grueling test for all of these teams.

But as we look to what comes together to put on a race like this, it is

something that Alaskans take great pride in. This is fueled by volunteers, whether it is the Iditarod Air Force, whether it is the veterinarians who come to volunteer. There is going to be a mushers' banquet up in Nome, where people come from all over the country to come and volunteer to serve dinner and clean up after dinner.

I met a group a couple of years ago. They were from somewhere in Florida. I didn't know the name of the community. But they said that they took vacation every year to come to Alaska, to come to Nome, and their job was dinner rolls. They take a week vacation to go to Nome, AK, from Florida to be there, to be a part of this extraordinary, extraordinary event.

So let me tell you a little bit about Ryan Redington and this race that he has just finished. So we are still looking at the exact number of minutes, but he has been on the trail now for 8 days, 21 hours, and—again, trying to figure out what the minutes are. This is his first-ever victory.

Ryan is 40 years old, but Ryan has a stake in this race perhaps unlike any other young musher out there. He is a legacy musher, to put it in a sense. He was born and raised in Knik, AK. On his mom's side, his great-grandfather was an Inupiat who delivered the mail from Unalakleet to other villages by dogsled. That was how we utilized dog teams back then.

Ryan comes from a family of mushers. His brother and his sister-in-law have competed in sled dog races. His father and his uncle have both raced in the Iditarod. Not only did they compete, but they are in the Iditarod Hall of Fame. His daughter and son are taking up the tradition by taking on racing.

On his dad's side, it is his grandfather, Joe Redington, Sr., who is the founder. We call him the "Father of the Iditarod."

Joe Redington, Sr., has raced that race 20 times—almost 20 times. When he crossed the finish line for his last race in 1997, he was 80 years old—80 years old. Can you imagine being 80 years old and running 1,000 miles standing on the runners, running with your dogs? The Iditarod is not for the faint of heart, and so it is just an example here to say that mushing really runs in Ryan's blood.

In addition to competing in the Iditarod, he has competed in numerous races across Alaska and the lower 48. He is a prior champion of the Junior Iditarod. He was named Iditarod's "Most Improved Musher" back in 2017. He is the 2019 and 2021 champion of the Kobuk 440 in Kotzebue.

So, including this race, Ryan has finished the Iditarod now nine times—nine times. He came in seventh in 2021 and then last year had his third consecutive top-10 finish. He placed ninth. So this is a guy who has given his all—given his all—along with his incredible canine athletes, to be where he is today: No. 1.

We are just so excited and so thrilled for him, particularly given the family legacy surrounding the Iditarod. Ryan is the first Inupiaq Iditarod champion since 2011.

It is interesting, Mr. President. I don't want to jinx things, but if you look—this is our reader board that we have outside my office over in the Hart Building.

Every day this week, we have been kind of following the mushers up the trail so that people would know who is in the lead. And these are today's standings: Ryan, of course, in first. But he is followed by Pete Kaiser. Pete is from Bethel. Pete is Inupiaq. Richie Diehl. Richie is from Aniak, an Alaska Native. So if the places hold, it will be quite a strong and telling statement that our top three mushers would be Alaskan Natives.

Dog mushing has been a part of life and culture for Alaskan Native people long, long before the Iditarod. But it is an ongoing reminder—I think a really beautiful reminder—of how men and women and, really, incredible dogs can work together in some pretty extraordinary winter conditions, connecting communities, connecting people.

Ryan is an inspiration to so many of us, inspiring Alaskans and future generations of mushers, for how he cares for his team, for the character that he has shown as he has competed.

And so to Ryan, I am going to have an opportunity to speak with you directly, but you need to know that you represent the true spirit of Alaska. You make us all so very proud. And we certainly congratulate you as the 2023 Iditarod champion.

WILLOW PROJECT

Mr. President, as I am here on the floor today and speaking of great news for Alaskans, I cannot yield the floor without noting the significance of the news yesterday. Yesterday, a record decision was announced by the Biden administration announcing that the Willow Project, in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, has been approved and that ConocoPhillips, the producer, will be allowed to advance under what is now a modified alternative that will allow for three pads of drilling activity in the National Petroleum Reserve.

This is significant for Alaska from a jobs perspective. This is going to be about 2,500 jobs to a State that desperately needs that. This will be revenue and income to a State that desperately needs that. Our economy is still suffering in a post-pandemic world.

Our economy is still challenged in many, many ways. We are seeing a net outmigration unlike any State in the country. And it is because it is directly tied to the State of our economy. So we recognize that we are a resource-based State. So to be able to access resources not only for the benefit of Alaskans but for the benefit of the country, and, in fairness, for the benefit of our friends and allies who look to us—who look to us—and our resources to be able to help them as well.

I have been asked by many, "What is the Willow Project?" Well, the Willow Project is an oil project, yes. But Willow represents economic security; it represents energy security; and it represents national security.

It was a pretty incredible effort that came together to advance the cause of this. This was not one oil company that is standing off in the corner, saying: We want to be allowed to proceed here. It was an extraordinary coalition of Alaska Native leaders and individuals. It was an extraordinary coalition of labor leaders not only in the State; 100 percent of the labor unions in Alaska support advancing Willow backed by their national unions back here because they know that these will be good-paying jobs. These will be solid union jobs. These will be jobs for the future.

It was backed by a coalition of industry leaders, the university, unanimous—unanimous—resolutions out of both Houses of our State legislature. Think about that. We have a pretty broad spectrum across the political spectrum when it comes to our State legislature. So to know that from the southeast all the way to the north and the southwest that Alaskans came together, through their elected representatives, to affirm their support of this project advancing, it was really quite remarkable.

It was a united delegation—Senator SULLIVAN, Representative PELTOLA, and myself—coming together to lead this effort, working with our Governor. It was a coalition that was remarkable and remarked upon, and rightly so, because there are oftentimes so many matters that draw us apart. And there are—there are—opposing voices to this in Alaska. We understand that.

But I think it was so important that the voices of Alaskans—particularly those who live and work and raise their families in the North Slope—that those voices were heard. And what they heard from those who were from the North Slope region are that this is not only jobs in economic opportunity; these are resources that will help us with our quality of life, help us be able to resource and finance the search and rescue that goes on when somebody has gone missing on a hunting trip for their subsistence purposes, to help with the community supports, whether it is through the schools or public safety. The North Slope Borough is very unique in how they provide for all of their services for their residents in their eight communities across that huge borough that stretches all the way across the entire North Slope of the State.

And so, for them, this is significant and real in a meaningful way. It means everything to them in terms of health and wellness and life expectancy. As we have seen the benefits of the resources that come to these areas that flow from the oil, we have seen an absolute increase in life expectancy because of the quality of life that then can come

with decent housing, with decent healthcare, with access to food and resources.

What has been seen up north has been consequential. So this was an issue that when presented to the administration, when the Alaskan voices were allowed to be heard, the administration listened. And I thank them for that. I thank them for allowing those voices to be heard.

I also recognize that in addition to allowing Willow to advance, the administration is proposing to submit rule-making in a period of time, maybe within a matter of weeks, maybe a matter of months, that would provide for special protections—further special protections—within the NPRA.

There is much to be seen about what these protections will entail, whether it will allow for any level of activity, whether it be crossings in any way, pipeline or road, in any way. There is much to be learned. The administration has sent that signal that in order to advance the oil production opportunities within the Willow footprint—that vastly reduced footprint—that they want to add additional protections in several different areas.

We will evaluate that. We will take a look critically. There is a process that will follow. We understand that. But I think for today and where we are in recognizing the value that Willow will bring to Alaska, that Willow will bring to our country, it is important to applaud the actions of the administration and the President in advancing this.

At peak production, Willow is expected to bring online about 180,000 barrels of oil a day. That is significant. It is significant and putting it into context with where the United States has had to turn recently as we have looked to meet demand here in this country. The ask, the willingness to go to Venezuela, to lift sanctions, to ask for more production out of Venezuela—Venezuela will be providing us about 100,000 barrels a day.

Think about where we would be if Alaska's Willow opportunity were already online. We would not have had to go to Maduro. We would not have had to go to a country whose environmental track record is abysmal. We would not have to turn to those countries that not only have environmental degradation as they produce their resource but human rights issues that we don't want to see, we don't want to talk about. We just know that for this time we need your oil. We cannot export that environmental consequence.

We should be producing where we know we can do it safely, where it is under tight environmental conditions and restrictions and limitations, where the producers will adhere to the rules of the road, the rule of law, that there is a sensitivity to the environment around there as we operate up north.

They say that we have some of the tightest environmental conditions on how we access our resources out of the northern region than anywhere—anywhere not only in the country but in

the world. And there is a reason for that. It costs more. It adds to the cost. But there is a sensitivity to the land. And we appreciate that. As an Alaskan, I appreciate that and I expect that and I demand that of the companies. And if you are not willing to operate this way, then you shouldn't be coming to Alaska.

But companies that are willing to respect the fact that when the tundra is no longer frozen, there is no exploration activity. There is no work that proceeds in that way off of the tundra.

So in Alaska, our season, if you will, is 90 days. It is 90 days. And it is not 90 days in the good weather. It is between basically January and April—the coldest, darkest, harshest time that anyone could be up on the North Slope, much less being outside and working. But that is how we do it because that is when the ground is frozen. That is when we have that license to operate, if you will. And we respect that. And it is not when the companies decide we are done with this aspect of the program. When things start to warm up and start to thaw, that is when you are gone. And you are gone because the State regulators and the Federal regulators have said: Clock is up. You don't have extra additional days because spring is coming.

And so think about that. Any other business in the world, can you think about having just a 90-day window of operation? We do a fair amount of that in Alaska because, quite honestly, our seafood industry is certainly that way out in Bristol Bay. We do have a lot of seasonal activity. But think about what that means if you are trying to build a project and you have to stop—stop—after 90 days. Think about what it means to design a project around sensitive areas that may have wildlife or waterfowl that we need to be sensitive. Well, that is what we do. This project—this Willow Project—that was sent back for revision was to make sure that the impact on subsistence hunting, the impact on the animals was not going to be appreciable. And so there is a sensitivity. We get it. We get it.

The people who live up there are the first stewards of the land, and they get it. So when you have whaling captains who are standing shoulder to shoulder with the Alaska delegation out in front of the Capitol, standing there saying that we need Willow—we need Willow for our economy, we need Willow for our people, and we will make sure that the subsistence needs of those who live in the area are met. We will make sure that the environmental considerations are met. So we are ready. We are ready to proceed.

As I stand here, I am regretful that I think the next phase of this is not necessarily going to be movement towards gaining production; it is going to be movement towards the courts because that is just what seems to happen in every development project in my incredible State. But we are prepared for

that as well. We are prepared for that as well because this project is environmentally sound, it is just, it is fair, it is balanced, and it is time.

Again, I stand here appreciative that the administration has heard the voice of Alaskans. Now, let's get to work.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the years, I have heard President Biden share a favorite expression of his father's. He said his dad would tell you:

Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget and I'll tell you what you value.

Well, there is a lot of wisdom in that statement. A person's budget shows what they truly value, whether that is supporting those who are less fortunate, saving for the future, or achieving a certain type of lifestyle. The same is true for the Federal Government. It is easy for leaders to say they value a strong military or fiscal responsibility, but a budget shows whether they really mean it.

Last week, of course, President Biden released his budget for the next fiscal year, which gave us an unvarnished view of what he truly values. In countless ways, it stands in stark contrast to what he has told the American people.

The President spoke about the need to rein in out-of-control spending, but he proposed more than \$2 trillion in new spending.

Given the growing threats from China and Russia, he says he cares about a strong national defense, but he proposed a mere 3.2-percent increase in defense spending—far below the level of inflation. So it actually is a cut.

He has spoken about the importance of growing our economy, but he proposed additional job-killing tax hikes on Main Street businesses and other job creators.

He says he is concerned about energy costs but proposed \$37 billion in new energy taxes—taxes that will be paid ultimately by the consumer in increased costs.

Despite saying he cares about the border, President Biden made it absolutely clear he isn't serious about addressing the crisis at our southern border. For 2 years, law enforcement and border communities have struggled to keep up with the overwhelming number of migrants who are crossing every day. During President Biden's first 2 years in office, Customs and Border Protection encountered 4.7 million—4.7 million—migrants at the southern border. That is astonishing, a breathtaking figure.

Well, there is a clear need, an obvious need to strengthen our border security, and the President's budget request includes \$535 million for border security technology at and between the ports of entry. At ports, this could include advanced equipment to efficiently scan cargo and passenger vehicles.

Mexico is our second largest trading partner, and that binational trade is

important to both of our economies. But this same technology could be key to stopping illicit drugs, weapons, and currency from coming across the border.

Between the ports of entry, this funding could go toward sensors, cameras, and other surveillance tools that allow Border Patrol agents to monitor unpatrolled portions of the border and to spring into action when necessary.

Given the ongoing migration crisis and fentanyl epidemic which is killing 70,000 Americans every year, there could not be a more important time to invest in border security. While the President's request for \$535 million may sound like a lot of money—and it is a lot of money—when you compare it to other line items in his budget, it starts to look a whole lot smaller. For example, the White House wants to spend \$1 billion trying to address the "root causes" of migration in Central America and Haiti. That is nearly double the amount he wants to spend on border security technology.

Over the last few years, we have seen failed attempts to alleviate what are called the push factors—violence and poverty—that cause people to leave their home countries and come to the United States. But don't forget that these migrants are not just coming from Central America and Haiti; they are literally coming from all over the world. Best case scenario, it would take years, if ever, before these efforts would translate to even 1 inch of progress at the border.

I have said before what I learned at the Yuma Border Patrol Sector in southwestern Arizona when the Border Patrol chief said that in this sector alone, a sleepy little agricultural community, we have people coming across the border from 176 countries, speaking 200 languages. This is a global phenomenon not just isolated to Central America and Haiti.

Well, worst case scenario, the administration flushes \$1 billion down the drain while the border remains in a state of crisis.

The White House wants to spend even more money on the Department of Homeland Security's climate resilience program—climate resilience. A whopping \$4 billion is what they want for that. That is more than seven times higher than what the President has proposed for border security technology. Now, the mission of the Department of Homeland Security isn't to fight climate change; it is to safeguard the American people. It cannot achieve that mission with the meager budget proposed by President Biden and the lack of priorities.

You may think that climate resilience is an important matter, but it certainly doesn't rise to the level of the crisis we are experiencing today on the border, with an overwhelming number of migrants and illegal drugs that killed 108,000 Americans last year alone.

Of course, the funding level requested for technology is only part of the problem. The question isn't just how much do you want to spend but what do you need to spend it on?

As I mentioned, this is one pot of funding that would support two purposes: security at the border and security between the ports of entry. Both of those functions are essential to our security and our economy, but the White House didn't delineate how it would split that funding. Would it be divided 50-50? Would it be distributed based on need? How would the administration ensure that it was closing the highest priority security gaps first?

We have a responsibility to taxpayers to ensure that every dollar is maximized and serves the greatest purpose possible. A few years ago, Senator SINEMA, the Senator from Arizona, and I introduced something called the Southwest Border Security Technology Improvement Act to help understand the best way to do that.

It required the administration to assess technology needs at the border and issue a report within a year. Our bill was signed into law at the end of 2020, and the deadline for that final report was December 27, 2021. Well, 15 months has passed, and we still have no report. I have repeatedly asked for updates from the administration but received zero response.

In short, the administration has failed to provide an assessment that is necessary for Congress to determine what the technology gaps are at the border and what the priority should be. Instead, they just ask Congress for a \$535 million blank check. They have offered zero assurance that they plan to use those funds to increase operational control over the border. They haven't even assured us they know what those needs are. Once again, the administration isn't trying to solve the problem—just to create an illusion of effort.

But technology funding isn't the only problem with the President's budget; it also falls short when it comes to personnel.

I have been to the southern border more times than I can count—but I do count 10 times—since President Biden took office, and I have spoken with every law enforcement officer and local elected official, nonprofit, and small business owner I could find. When I ask them what is needed the most to combat this crisis, there is a recurring answer: We need more boots on the ground. We desperately need more Border Patrol agents on the frontline.

The administration wants to hire an additional 350 Border Patrol agents, which would be a great start, but the White House isn't taking any action to address underlying barriers to hiring those agents.

For years, the Agency struggled to meet its staffing goals, and one of the biggest obstacles is the polygraph requirement. Roughly half of new applicants fail the polygraph, which one officer described as “high-tech voodoo.”

Applicants have shared stories of aggressive and condescending examiners. They talk about being stereotyped based on their background and traveling to other States in hopes of having a different experience.

Still, failing a polygraph or receiving an “inconclusive” result disqualifies a potential agent. So it wouldn't matter if the White House called for 10,000 new Border Patrol agents in its budget; the Agency would not be able to fill those spots until the administration fixes the broken application process, and we have seen no indication of their plans to do so.

The White House is also calling for 460 processing assistants at Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. These would be the men and women who would help process the migrants. Based on my conversations with folks at the border, I can tell you these additions are desperately needed, but that is only one piece of the solution.

A huge part of the solution lies in deterrence. If people with frivolous asylum claims see they will quickly be removed from the United States, they aren't likely to attempt the journey to our border in the first place. That is why we just can't staff up on processing coordinators; we need more personnel to actually enforce the law and deliver consequences to those who break it.

The Biden administration has refused to do so time and time again, and the Biden budget only makes insignificant changes to staffing for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Removal Operations, as well as Fugitive Operations team members. These are the dedicated men and women who do the difficult but important job of removing people who have no legal right to enter the country. But right now, the system is so overwhelmed with migrants who will not be ultimately granted asylum. So what happens when their claim is denied? It is an important question to ask because I can assure you, ICE does not have the sufficient manpower to enforce the law given the scale of this crisis.

In short, the White House has proposed adding more personnel to process migrants and then release them, but it doesn't want to hire more people who will actually remove people who break our laws. Based on his own assessment strategy, President Biden does not value border security because his budget certainly does not reflect it. His budget is not a serious proposal to gain operational control of the border. It is more talk with no action.

Our country is experiencing an absolutely unprecedented migration crisis. The southern border has become an open highway instead of a secured checkpoint. The administration is essentially waving everyone through—from migrants with frivolous asylum claims to the drug runners who are carrying fentanyl that kills our fellow Americans. Based on President Biden's

budget, he appears content for it to stay that way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Massachusetts. SILICON VALLEY BANK AND SIGNATURE BANK

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on Friday, we experienced the second largest bank failure in our Nation's history. And make no mistake, this failure was the direct result of leaders in Washington weakening financial rules.

In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act to protect consumers and to ensure that big banks could never again take down the economy and destroy millions of lives.

Since then, Wall Street executives who hated the whole idea of the bill spent millions to keep it from becoming law and, after it passed, spent millions more to try to weaken it.

In 2018, the big banks won. With support from both parties, President Trump signed into law a law to roll back critical parts of Dodd-Frank. Now, I fought against these changes. On the eve of the Senate vote in 2018, I warned from right here on the Senate floor that “Washington is about to make it easier for the banks to run up risk, make it easier to put our constituents at risk, make it easier to put American families in danger, just so that the C.E.O.s of these banks can get a new corporate jet and add another floor to their new corporate headquarters.”

I wish I had been wrong, but last week, the FDIC was forced to rush in to take over two failing banks—Silicon Valley Bank and Signature Bank—and then take extraordinary actions to protect those banks' customers and prevent the contagion from spreading throughout the economy.

Both SVB and Signature Bank suffered from a toxic mix of poor risk management and weak supervision. If Congress and the Federal Reserve had not rolled back key provisions of Dodd-Frank, these banks would have been subject to stronger liquidity and capital requirements to help withstand financial shocks. They would have been required to conduct regular stress tests to expose their vulnerabilities and shore up their businesses. They would have had a more aggressive regulator standing at their shoulder, looking more closely at every part of the banks' business. But because those stringent requirements were taken out of Dodd-Frank, when an old-fashioned bank run hit SVB, the bank could not withstand the pressure.

Shortly after that, Signature Bank collapsed, and to fight back the risk of contagion and to protect the banking system, the Federal Government once again was called on to take extraordinary measures—the kind of measures that Dodd-Frank was originally supposed to protect us against.

These threats should never have been allowed to materialize, and now, we must prevent them from occurring

again by reversing the dangerous bank deregulation of the Trump era.

On Monday, President Biden called on Congress and regulators to reverse the Trump-era deregulation and “strengthen the rules on banks to make it less likely that this kind of bank failure will happen again.” The President is right, and that is why today, on the 5-year anniversary of having weakened Dodd-Frank, I am introducing legislation, along with 15 of my colleagues—including the Presiding Officer, including my colleague from Vermont—to reverse the mistakes that Congress and President Trump made 5 years ago when they rolled back a portion of Dodd-Frank.

This is what my legislation does:

First, it repeals section 401 of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. This will restore strong Fed oversight of some of the Nation’s largest banks, which together hold trillions of dollars in assets. Stronger oversight will help protect our economy from heightened risk. It is absolutely essential that we demand stronger, not weaker, oversight of these multibillion-dollar banks.

Second, my bill repeals section 402 of the 2018 law. That section slashed the capital requirements for large, systemically significant custody banks. Big banks cannot be trusted with lower capital requirements that degrade their ability to withstand financial shock.

Finally, my bill repeals section 403, which made it easier for giant banks—those much larger than SVB—to weaken liquidity requirements by adding municipal debt to the definition of “high-quality liquid assets,” particularly because such debt is actually not very liquid at all.

Now, there are a lot more changes we need to make to our banking laws. There are many other provisions in the 2018 law that I oppose. But today I remain focused on exactly the weakened rules that permitted banks like SVB and Signature to load up on risks, run up their profits, pay their executives giant bonuses, and eventually blow the banks to pieces.

I recognize legislation won’t fix everything. For 5 years, Jay Powell has overseen a deregulatory effort at the Federal Reserve Bank for banks like SVB. In 2021, I asked him if he could name a single—a single—regulation on banks that he thought should actually be strengthened instead of weakened, and he could not.

Preventing further crises will require a complete 180-degree turnaround from the Fed starting immediately. This bill will address the immediate issue in front of us—an explosion of risk in large financial institutions like SVB that have been inadequately supervised and regulated for the last 4 years—and it will show Americans across the country, in the wake of this disaster, that Congress is capable of acting quickly and decisively to make sure

that a serious problem doesn’t get worse—a lot worse.

The bank failures our Nation experienced this weekend were entirely avoidable if Congress and the Fed had done their jobs and kept strong oversight of big banks in place. Now, we must act quickly to prevent the next crisis by repealing the dangerous Trump-era provisions that made banks weaker.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. 27.

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 Jessica G. L. Clarke, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

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. 27, Jessica G. L. Clarke, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tina Smith, Christopher Murphy, Mazie Hirono, Tammy Baldwin, Margaret Wood Hassan, John W. Hickenlooper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Catherine Cortez Masto, Brian Schatz, Gary C. Peters, Alex Padilla, Michael F. Bennet.

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.

REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 25, S. 316.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 25, S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 25, S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

Charles E. Schumer, Tim Kaine, Robert Menendez, Amy Klobuchar, Ron Wyden, Christopher Murphy, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Mazie Hirono, Jeanne Shaheen, Christopher A. Coons, Richard J. Durbin, Cory A. Booker, Mark R. Warner, Jeff Merkley, Richard Blumenthal, Margaret Wood Hassan.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, March 14, be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I have just filed a cloture motion that would finally restore to Congress the power to declare war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask for consent to speak for up to 20 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, every year, I meet with local leaders and citizens in all 95 Tennessee counties, and with each visit, I am more and more encouraged by the changes I see. Low taxes, pro-business policies, and less invasive government have encouraged growth that my Democratic colleagues are not seeing back in their States. But still many areas of Tennessee are hurting, and those that

aren't are feeling the negative effects of inflation and broken supply chains.

What has happened over the past few years is proof that these Tennessee families and businesses are much better at spending their own money than the Federal Government is at spending taxpayer money. They have to be because if they were as reckless with their paychecks as the Biden administration is with taxpayer funds, they would have gone bankrupt a long time ago.

When they saw what the President put together in his latest budget request, they were not surprised, but they were incredibly discouraged at the idea of another year of Federal spending that leaves our southern border vulnerable and guarantees another year of unsustainable inflation.

Joe Biden and the Democrats have made it their mission to tax and spend this country into oblivion, but adding insult to injury is their commitment to ignoring the actual problems the American people are facing on a local level: inflation, drugs, crime, and continued supply chain problems.

During my recent visit with officials in Cannon County, they had a lot to say about how this failure to govern has affected their ability to follow through on even the most basic public works projects.

Like many distressed counties around the country, Cannon County received emergency funding during the pandemic. They put it toward short-term projects that, for this community, were really a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to grow.

But here is the problem: Over the past 2 years, my Democratic colleagues have spent so much money and driven inflation so high that any progress Cannon County leaders could have made with those projects has been completely washed out by the overall effects of inflation.

For Joe Biden and the Democrats, this is something that is easily brushed aside, but for the people of Cannon County, it means that something as essential as a water project is stalled indefinitely.

The topography of Cannon County makes it pretty hard to bring water in, but with this particular project, they would have been able to install a water line from neighboring Warren County and alleviate the pressure on their water supply. It wasn't a perfect solution, but it would have provided relief.

But, now, inflation and supply chain breakdowns have turned this project into a nightmare. Local leaders are questioning the construction estimates because they change or expire before their contractors can get their hands on the right materials. This means that by the time those materials come in, the county may not be able to pay for the work, and on and on it goes. There is no light at the end of the tunnel.

The White House can spin this all they want, but this is not how business

normally works. Joe Biden and the Democrats have embraced dysfunction at every turn and Tennesseans—they are the ones who are suffering.

Our wide-open southern border has come up in every single county meeting I have taken since Joe Biden took his oath of office, and, over the past few years, we have watched the situation become increasingly dire.

Every town is a border town, and every State is a border State, including Tennessee.

When I was in McMinnville, earlier this year, local leaders described to me in great detail how the Biden administration's refusal to secure the border has pushed local police to the breaking point. For a town that small, the people of McMinnville should not be suffering from so much crime. But the flow of drugs is out of control, and the law enforcement officials I spoke with can trace it from their neighborhoods to the closest cartel distribution hub in Atlanta and then down to the southern border.

They find fentanyl in just about every drug that they seize—deadly fentanyl. Overdoses caused by marijuana laced with fentanyl are common now, something that just a few years ago would have been rare if not unthinkable.

The rampant availability of drugs has caused a crisis among teens and young people, who are now using at such a rate that law enforcement has nowhere to house juvenile offenders. Fentanyl, the leading killer of Americans age 18 to 45. Fentanyl, the fastest growing killer of children under 18 fentanyl. Fentanyl that is flooding across our southern border—14,000 pounds apprehended last year by Border Patrol. That is enough to kill 3.3 billion people—3.3 billion people.

This is why every town is a border State. It is why every single local law enforcement official is saying: We need help. Secure that southern border.

When I have talked to them about what they need to get a grip on the fentanyl issue, they have told me the same thing that local officials are telling other Members of this body: Secure the border and make the resources available so that we can get a grip on this. They need to hire more law enforcement officers. They need to give them better pay and training, and they need to expand antidrug programming for younger children. As sad as that is, they are the ones who are being introduced to and affected by these drugs.

You could visit any county in the United States and probably hear very similar stories from local officials who have worked hard, kept their own spending in check, and who have done their best to plan for the future of their communities. They love their communities. They are worried about crime. They are worried about drugs. They want more choice and options for education. They want security in their local streets.

Officials in the White House and here on Capitol Hill know what their poli-

cies have done to these local leaders and to the American people. They also know that the President's budget request doesn't reflect what they need or even what they want.

They are asking for relief. They are not asking for new programs. They are not asking for pie in the sky. They are not wanting to see more bailouts. They don't need more mandates.

What they need is relief—relief that will address inflation, relief that will address supply chains, relief that will address the drugs and the crime that is flowing across that southern border.

These are issues they look at as root causes of rampant, out-of-control crime and out-of-control spending that has stalled growth in many communities.

They won't be able to do that until Joe Biden and the Democrats realign their priorities with those of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask that the scheduled vote occur immediately.

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

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

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. 62, Brent Neiman, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Jack Reed, Gary C. Peters, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Brian Schatz, Ben Ray, Luján, Elizabeth Warren, Christopher A. Coons, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, Michael F. Bennet.

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 Brent Neiman, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISC), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Bennet	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	Kaine	Shaheen
Booker	Kelly	Sinema
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Lujan	Tester
Carper	Markey	Tillis
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Collins	Merkley	Warner
Coons	Murkowski	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Welch
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Grassley	Reed	Young
Hassan	Rosen	
Heinrich	Sanders	

NAYS—40

Blackburn	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Hagerty	Ricketts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Britt	Hoehen	Rounds
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tuberville
Crapo	Manchin	Vance
Daines	Marshall	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Mullin	

NOT VOTING—8

Barrasso	Fetterman	Risch
Cruz	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Feinstein	Padilla	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

PRO ACT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, a little over a decade ago, Michigan lawmakers convened a session in the dark of the night. They put padlocks on the doors of the State Capitol so that they wouldn't have to listen to the protesters who had gathered outside.

They had come to Lansing to pass "right to work," a policy that weakened the power of unions all across Michigan. But today—today—my colleagues in the State legislature passed legislation in the State senate to repeal that law, and it now moves to the house next week.

They are stepping up. They are stepping up because they understand that we are living through a crucial moment. The richest Americans are only getting richer, while many working people are left behind, unable to reap the benefits of the wealth that they helped to create.

Labor unions are the best tool that we have to buck that trend. They expand and empower the middle class. They allow workers to negotiate for better wages and safer workplaces and the right to retire with dignity. But union membership is at an alltime low. Many employers intimidate workers who attempt to organize and retaliate against those who are able to come together. It is one reason that the gap between rich and poor continues to grow.

In order to keep building an economy that works for everyone, we need to

take a lesson from my home State of Michigan. We need to breathe new life into American unions, and we need to pass the PRO Act. This legislation will empower workers to exercise their right to organize. It will hold employers accountable for violating workers' rights. It will secure free, fair, and safe union elections, and it will preempt right-to-work laws across the country. Simply put, the PRO Act will make it easier for working people everywhere to join a union.

As a Michigander, the right to organize is a pillar of my State. Modern unions were born in Flint, MI, when autoworkers banded together in the winter of 1936 for better pay and working conditions. Their 44-day strike started a movement that formed the backbone of the American middle class.

But this is also very personal to me. My dad was a teacher and a member of the MEA. My father-in-law is a proud member of UAW Local 5960 as a retiree. My mother, a nurse's aide, worked tirelessly with the SEIU to organize her workplace. And when management tried to sway her to not support the union with a raise, she refused. She would not quit. She would not stop her fight until everyone got a better deal and everyone got a raise. And after the employees voted to unionize, they made her a union steward. She taught me the value of standing up and fighting for your rights, no matter what is in your way.

We have seen what is possible when we choose to stand up for working people. We enacted the bipartisan infrastructure deal, which will create good-paying union jobs all across our country and penalize companies that break the labor law. Just over 2 years ago, we passed the Butch Lewis Act and secured pensions for millions of American workers.

These victories have helped people all across our country, and we can build on that work by passing the PRO Act. It is a comprehensive, common-sense piece of legislation that we have to get across the finish line. The namesake of this bill is former AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka, a legend in the labor movement and a tireless advocate for working people.

Just before he died, he addressed a group of Alabama coal miners who were in the throes of a strike, and he told them: We are not going to give up. We are not going to give in. We will prevail. One day longer, one day stronger.

His words ring as true today as they did that night in Brookwood, AL. We are not giving in or giving up, and together we will prevail. I am proud to stand in solidarity with labor unions all across Michigan, as well as all across this country, as a cosponsor of the PRO Act, and I will continue to do everything in my power to see that it gets passed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 67, Michael Ratney, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; that the Senate vote on the nomination, without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Alan Ratney, of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PETERS. 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.

SUNSHINE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to commemorate Sunshine Week. Sunshine Week coincides each year with March 16, one of our Founding Fathers' birthdays: James Madison. Madison is widely known as the father of open government.

The sunshine I am talking about isn't the kind that helps the corn grow in Iowa. Sunshine Week is dedicated to promoting government accountability to the source from which all government derives its power: the people. Before joining the Supreme Court in 1916, Justice Louis Brandeis wrote: "Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants: electric light the most efficient policeman." As a longtime champion for an open, accessible government, I speak today in support of those enduring principles.

In great works of literature, readers often remember a novel's opening line even if they forget the rest. When one hears that line, it immediately calls to mind the entire book. Well the same is true of our Constitution, a document that both defines the powers of the

Federal Government and, at the same time, carefully limits those powers.

"We The People." These are not the opening words of a novel, but they are just as memorable as the best opening lines in literature. These solemn words form the opening line of our framework of our government, the Constitution.

This is not an accident. Our Founders and Framers made a conscious choice to open our sacred charter by calling to mind the source of all government powers, from local school boards to the deliberations of this Chamber: the people of our United States, as James Madison said, acting in their sovereign capacity. These are truths we must repeat often, so that we never forget them. The people in this framework are in control. To use the analogy of the sun, whatever promotes self-governance, spoken of in our Declaration of Independence, is sunshine. Whatever hinders the people in their right to govern their communities is darkness.

As the Federal Government has grown in size and scope, all too often bureaucrats prefer to live in the shadows of the bureaucracy. They forget that they are ultimately accountable to the people. Because of this, Congress has passed a series of laws requiring openness and accountability to citizens and taxpayers. Just like we need information from government agencies to decide how to cast many of our votes in Congress, so too do the American people need this information to fulfill their role, and to cast theirs.

This week is meant to draw attention to this need for openness, especially the Freedom of Information Act, which requires government Agencies to produce documents enlightening citizens as to what Agencies are doing. There is also the inherent constitutional power that Members of Congress have to conduct oversight and launch investigations.

Despite this framework of laws and the bedrock principles of our Constitution, Agencies day in and day out fight tooth and nail so they won't have to turn over records when people file Freedom of Information Act requests and even when Members of Congress make requests for information. The Freedom of Information Act is a key law for providing transparency in government. Exemptions that allow records to be withheld should only be used when necessary and not as an excuse to withhold potentially embarrassing information. Federal Agencies must also reverse the trend of ever-increasing FOIA backlogs.

For example, according to annual FOIA reports, the Department of Homeland Security saw its FOIA backlog double at the end of fiscal year 2022 from the previous fiscal year. They are not alone. The Justice Department, Defense Department, and State Department all saw increases in their FOIA backlogs from the prior year. Federal Agencies need to do better.

I continue to work for laws that strengthen the Freedom of Information

Act and other measures that will ensure the people's business is conducted in public, not in private. I am planning to reintroduce a bipartisan bill to ensure FOIA remains a useful public tool and to push back against recent case law that erodes greater transparency. This bill will restore pro-transparency principles and will make it crystal clear where Congress stands on the public's right to know what our government is doing.

To mark "Sunshine Week," I am also introducing the bipartisan Sunshine in the Courtroom Act, which would permit and encourage all Federal courts to welcome cameras into the courtroom. I am also cosponsoring, with Senator DURBIN, a companion bill which would require the U.S. Supreme Court to televise the arguments heard before them. I thank my Senate colleagues who are joining me as cosponsors on these important pieces of legislation.

I have supported the long overdue release of records on the assassination of President Kennedy. I support efforts and conduct oversight on a daily basis that bring information on our government's operation to the light of day. I have also long supported whistleblowers, who play a vital role in shining the light on waste, fraud, and abuse.

By reintroducing the SEC Whistleblower Reform Act, I am working to ensure whistleblowers who report possible violations of our Federal securities laws are fully protected, whether they take their concerns to the SEC or to someone in their company. My office has worked with whistleblowers and groups protecting their rights for decades. It is an essential part of our work. As Agencies all too often resist turning over the information we need to do our jobs, whistleblowers fill that gap with firsthand accounts of potential wrongdoing. To those whistleblowers: You are true patriots.

Corruption is a problem in our own government, but it is also a global problem. I support the rights of whistleblowers everywhere in their efforts to bring sunshine to corruption and aid people in their rightful quest to govern themselves.

Finally, I have been a long-time supporter of the False Claims Act. Since 1986, when I led the effort to update the False Claims Act, that law has helped the government recover \$72 billion in taxpayer money from fraud and likely saved billions more by deterring would be fraudsters. The False Claims Act is a tool by which we can—and must—hold fraudsters accountable.

That is why I also reintroduced the bipartisan Administrative False Claims Act again this Congress. That legislation raises the statutory ceiling on claims that can be handled with administrative procedures from \$150,000 to \$1 million, expands the number of Justice Department officials who can review these claims, and allows the government to recoup costs for inves-

tigating and prosecuting these frauds. The legislation makes pursuing fraudsters more efficient.

We need to take all possible steps to let the sunshine in. If we do, we will have a better and more accountable government that serves the people as it should.

NOMINATION OF ERIC M. GARCETTI

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last Congress, I spoke of my strong opposition to the nomination of Eric Garcetti to be Ambassador to the Republic of India. I opposed the nomination due to the serious and credible allegations that he enabled sexual harassment and racism to run rampant in the Los Angeles mayor's office. When the nomination expired, I had hoped President Biden would recognize his egregious mistake, believe the victims, and change course.

President Biden failed to do so. Indefensibly, at the same time the Biden administration decries sexual harassment and racism, it has now twice nominated an individual to represent our country abroad who has enabled those very same disgusting acts. Accordingly, I continue to oppose Garcetti's nomination and ask this question: What will it take for the Biden administration to believe the victims? That same question should be posed to every Member in the Senate that is considering voting for him.

During my career, I have prioritized protecting victims of sexual harassment and abuse. In 2005, I cosponsored the Violence Against Women Act. That bill provides vital aid to the Justice Department's Office on Violence Against Women and to law enforcement to protect victims of sexual harassment and abuse. Last Congress, I cosponsored bills introduced by Senator GILLIBRAND to protect and defend victims of sexual harassment and sexual misconduct. I cosponsored resolutions introduced by Senator FEINSTEIN to raise awareness of sexual assault. These include the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021, the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act of 2021, the Speak Out Act, the Campus Accountability and Safety Act, and a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

This Congress, I have sent several bipartisan letters to the Department of Justice seeking information regarding sexual misconduct by Bureau of Prisons personnel and inmates against staff. With Senators DURBIN and PADILLA, I met with the Bureau of Prisons Director to further investigate sexual misconduct and discuss reforms to enhance prevention, reporting, investigation, prosecution, and discipline of these matters.

With respect to Mayor Garcetti, I have made clear to my colleagues and

the American people that credible whistleblowers approached my office about concerning allegations that he was aware of and enabled his deputy chief of staff, Rick Jacobs, to sexually harass several employees within the mayor's office. These men and women alleged that Rick Jacobs engaged in inappropriate and degrading physical contact without their consent. They alleged that Rick Jacobs made crude sexual remarks and gestures towards staff and others. They alleged that he made blatantly racist remarks towards Asians and other minorities.

These allegations have also been publicly reported by many news outlets. Text messages made public by the Los Angeles Times indicate that these incidents were common knowledge among Garcetti's staff. A now infamous picture shows Jacobs inappropriately touching an individual next to him. In the picture, Mayor Garcetti is standing on the other side of Jacobs.

Mayor Garcetti said under oath during his nomination that "I want to say unequivocally that I never witnessed, nor was it brought to my attention, the behavior that's been alleged, and I also want to assure you if it had been, I would have immediately taken action to stop that."

How can that statement be true when there is a photo with Jacobs inappropriately touching an individual next to Garcetti? How can that statement be true when text messages exist from his own staff discussing the toxic work environment within the mayor's office?

In total, my office identified over 19 individuals who have either witnessed Jacobs' behavior or were the victims of it. So who are these brave and courageous individuals who made these allegations? Are they Republican operatives? No. They are his former communications director, senior staffers, junior staffers, businessmen, civic leaders, and a Los Angeles Police Department officer assigned to protect him. This isn't a political hit job. This is a bipartisan endeavor to stop an inadequate nominee.

To defend himself, Mayor Garcetti has pointed to a report which inconceivably purports to clear Jacobs of any wrongdoing. The report was conducted by a law firm hired and paid for by the city of Los Angeles. Mayor Garcetti and the city of Los Angeles would be liable if the report concluded sexual harassment occurred. The report was also delivered to the city of Los Angeles under attorney-client privilege, apparently in the hope that no one outside the city would ever see it.

The report failed to interview multiple firsthand witnesses. The interviews weren't taken under penalty of perjury. The report focused exclusively on allegations of sexual harassment made by the Los Angeles Police Department officer and failed to give due weight to other witnesses. For example, the report includes an interview with Jacobs in which he admits to

using racist language, kissing, hugging, and squeezing people's shoulders. The report also identifies the individual in the lewd photo I mentioned earlier. The report says that the individual stated that Jacob's actions weren't funny and embarrassed that person. That makes it clear nonconsensual physical contact occurred. It is evidence that sexual harassment occurred. And it literally occurred right next to Mayor Garcetti.

The last time I spoke about this matter was right after President Biden signed the Speak Out Act into law. I cosponsored that bill, which Senator GILLIBRAND led. The law enables survivors to speak out about workplace sexual assault and harassment.

So, on the one hand, the Biden administration says it supports victims. Yet, on the other hand, the Biden administration supports a nominee who enables misconduct that creates more victims. The Biden administration's positions are irreconcilable. They are the very definition of tone deafness. The Biden administration and all those who support this nomination have sent a message that victims will only be believed when politically convenient. The Biden administration has no credibility when it comes to protecting victims of sexual harassment. To my Senate colleagues, do you support victims of sexual harassment and racism or a man who enabled it for years, leaving many victims in his wake? You can't support both.

Mayor Garcetti's own staff have spoken out to stop this nomination at a risk to their careers. One of them is Naomi Seligman, who was Mayor Garcetti's former communications director and one of the many whistleblowers who worked with my office regarding this nomination. She said that Garcetti's vote out of the Foreign Relations Committee "on International Women's Day no less, shows a real disconnect between the rhetoric we hear from elected leaders who claim to support victims of workplace sexual harassment and the pass they give to party loyalists in the next breath. It's disheartening to say the least."

I agree. Mayor Garcetti is incompatible with the office that he seeks. I, again, strongly encourage my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to review the evidence found in my investigative report, as well as in the press. Most importantly, listen to the victims. The facts and the evidence compel me to vote no, and my colleagues must join me in doing the same.

NOMINATION OF JOSHUA D. JACOBS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request relating to the nomination of Joshua D. Jacobs, to be Under Secretary for Benefits at the Department of Veterans Affairs, PN195.

Mr. Jacobs, if confirmed, would lead the Veterans Benefits Administration

at VA. This VA component is at the heart of my many congressional oversight requests dating back 2 years, which the VA has failed to adequately respond to. The whistleblower allegations raised in my oversight inquiries that the VA Office of Inspector General—OIG—investigated have been vindicated, with the OIG issuing a report last year identifying potential conflicts of interest by the senior VA official at issue, Ms. Charmain Bogue. That official left Federal service and failed to cooperate further with OIG, as did the organization her husband worked for, Veterans Education Success, which had business before VA. This leaves questions open that VA has yet to resolve.

I raised other issues as well that the OIG did not investigate, but which VA needs to respond to. This includes allegations that VA failed to protect sensitive and confidential information about publicly traded companies. The OIG decided that this was more properly investigated by the Securities and Exchange Commission, but to my knowledge, they have not investigated the matter either. It falls upon VA to provide transparency on the issue.

I have also raised questions regarding FOIA records that show a senior VA official, Mr. Thomas Murphy, admitting to firing the person he suspected of being a whistleblower to my office in 2021. VA has not adequately responded to this apparently egregious violation of whistleblower-protections laws. I have raised serious additional questions as to what knowledge VA officials had of the underlying conflicts of interest at issue in my inquiry, how those conflicts were allowed to exist, why VA obstructed my investigation, and like issues.

To date, VA has failed to provide a full and complete response to any of the five oversight letters I have sent to them since April 2021. And today, I am sending two more, to the VA and OIG, raising allegations whistleblowers have brought to my office concerning potential contract irregularities and illustrating the VA's failure to answer the many outstanding questions I have raised in the past. There are at least 27 outstanding requests and questions raised in these letters that VA has inadequately addressed and, in many instances, not addressed at all. In instances where they have provided records, those have been heavily redacted with citations to FOIA exemptions, even though FOIA does not apply to Congress. In some instances, I have even had to rely upon third-party FOIA productions to provide information. It was only through a FOIA production, for example, that I learned that VA had begun drafting a response to me soon after my initial oversight letter, but never sent it. Instead, VA waited nearly 9 months to respond and even then declined to answer any of my questions other than requests for records, which it heavily redacted, and many of which it withheld in full. In

other words, the draft response that I would have never received but for FOIA included more information than what VA eventually sent me.

Because of my concerns with VA's obstruction and because the nomination relates to a position at the center of my oversight requests, I submitted questions for the record to Mr. Jacobs. Although I appreciate his response to my questions, I found a number of his answers unsatisfactory. For instance, he was provided with sufficient background in my questions with respect to my VA inquiry. I asked him, given the fact that he currently is exercising the powers of Under Secretary for Benefits, if he would commit to opening an investigation now into the serious questions I raised. He declined to respond, instead stating what he would do in certain hypothetical circumstances, even though the questions pertained to matters directly under his current purview. After I provided the names, dates, and specific allegations that need to be addressed but have failed to be for the past 2 years and after repeating many of those details in my questions to Mr. Jacobs, it was unacceptable for him to answer in hypotheticals. Many of his other responses were equally disappointing.

My staff has also identified at least one document that seems to contradict Mr. Jacobs' claim that he did not play "any role" in VA's response to my inquiry. While I make no claim that Mr. Jacobs intentionally misled me in his responses, this document at least raises serious questions as to the accuracy of his blanket assertion. In the document, Mr. Jacobs reaches out to a senior VA legislative affairs official, multiple officials from VA's Office of General Counsel, and others, relaying information on a call he received about a matter related to my oversight, which he believed was the same issue that prompted my letters. This shows that he took at least one phone call on what he thought was the same matter and provided this information to those preparing a response to me. It is difficult to imagine that nobody ever responded to Mr. Jacobs, either by email or in-person conversations, in which he would have had additional conversations about VA's response. Accordingly, the email undercuts his assertion that he did not play "any role" in the matter. Moreover, VA's redaction-filled productions make it difficult to bring transparency.

Because of VA's lack of transparency on these critical issues and Mr. Jacobs' evasive answers on a number of my questions, I must therefore object to any consideration of this nominee. I am more than willing to discuss with the VA and Mr. Jacobs how they can remedy the deficiencies in their responses.

This hold is a reminder that executive agencies have an ongoing obligation to respond to congressional inquiries in a full and timely manner.

NATIONAL LIBERTY MEMORIAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have been glad to see that Lena Santos Ferguson is finally gaining recognition for her work to desegregate the Daughters of the American Revolution. In 1980, Mrs. Ferguson was turned away when she tried to join DAR. She was discriminated against even though she could trace her ancestry to Jonah Gay, who had supported the Revolution through the town committee of Friendship, ME.

According to the Washington Post, one of Ferguson's White sponsors was told that, if Mrs. Ferguson was admitted, the DC chapter "will probably fall apart." However, last month, the DAR renamed its Washington, DC, nursing scholarship as the "Daughters of the American Revolution—Lena Ferguson Scholarship," doubled its size, and announced the upcoming placement of a plaque in honor of her work.

It is a testament to the work of those such as Ferguson that the DAR has gone from threatening dissolution to naming a scholarship in her honor.

Ferguson represented a much larger group of under-recognized Black Revolutionary War patriots. In 1984, when Ferguson was finally allowed to join the DAR, the settlement agreement had an impact well beyond one woman's effort for recognition. It led to new research and the identification of over 5,000 of the estimated 10,000 Black Revolutionary War participants.

However, highlighting the contributions Black patriots made in the American Revolution does not end with DAR. That is why I worked with Senator MURPHY to pass into law the National Liberty Memorial Preservation Act. Our bipartisan bill allows the National Mall Liberty Fund D.C.—a group founded by Maurice Barboza, Ferguson's nephew—to continue its work getting a monument to Black patriots on or near the National Mall in Washington, DC.

Both this monument and the work of Mrs. Ferguson display the founding purpose of our Nation. Unlike almost every other country on Earth, Americans are not bound together by a common ethnicity or geographical ancestry. We are all Americans because we believe in the principles our country was founded upon. This is the common heritage of all Americans of all backgrounds. It is vital that we do not forget that bond and even more vital that we preserve the principles themselves and honor those of all backgrounds who fought for them.

The construction of the National Liberty Memorial by July 4, 2026—the 250th anniversary of our Nation's founding—would serve as another important reminder of that bond we share as Americans. I urge my fellow Americans to come together around that goal.

TRIBUTE TO BERNARD E. DOYLE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to acknowledge Bernard E. "Bernie" Doyle, who is retiring on 20 April 2023, after more than 40 years of combined military and Federal civil service to our country. After graduating from the George Washington University with a bachelor of arts degree in journalism and speech, Mr. Doyle received his Air Force officer commission in April 1979 as a public affairs officer. With unbounded ambition, Mr. Doyle was selected for the Air Force's Funded Legal Education Program and attended the University of Maryland Law School from 1981 to 1984. Upon his graduation from law school in October 1984, Mr. Doyle entered the second chapter of his military service as a judge advocate in the U.S. Air Force Judge Advocate General's Corps and never looked back.

Rising through military ranks and responsibilities through the years, Mr. Doyle was promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel and oversaw 11 attorneys in the Air Force Legal Service Agency's Employment Litigation Branch. He also personally conducted over 200 trials and appellate litigation in Federal employment discrimination cases and trial and appellate litigation before military courts martial and the appellate courts for the Air Force and the Armed Forces. Among the highlights of his military legal career was his experience defending the accused in three capital murder courts martial. With humility, he would share the profound impact that this experience had on his formative years as a military officer and an attorney in finding courage and compassion within the military justice system.

After his retirement from the Air Force in December 1998, Mr. Doyle continued his public service as an administrative judge with the Merit Systems Protection Board—MSPB—an appeals counsel in the MSPB's Office of the Appeals Counsel, and then as an assistant general counsel for the MSPB Office of the General Counsel. To no one's surprise, Mr. Doyle's managerial skills and legal acumen were quickly recognized by his leaders and peers, which led to his selection as the chief counsel to the vice chairman in a non-career Senior Executive Service position. During Mr. Doyle's 11-year tenure at MSPB, he worked extensively on MSPB precedential opinions and successfully defended MSPB final decisions before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Several of his cases, such as *Ward v. U.S. Postal Service*, *Kirkendall v. Army*, *Butterbaugh v. Department of Justice*, and *Becker v. Department of Veterans Affairs*, continue to serve as the guiding principles on due process rights for Federal employees and employment benefits and protections for veterans and military servicemembers.

Mr. Doyle joined the National Guard Bureau Office of the General Counsel as an associate general counsel in the Litigation and Employment Law Division in September 2014. His leadership and dedication to excellence was critical in managing and advocating for

the National Guard's interests in the most complex novel litigation against the National Guard. Specifically, he worked tirelessly with the Office of the Solicitor General on several cases concerning National Guard members' State and Federal military service, benefits, and employment protections before the U.S. Supreme Court. Mr. Doyle was also instrumental in drafting and implementing key reform legislation that improved the workplace conditions and benefits for 54,000 National Guard military technicians and civil service employees in the 54 States, Territories, and the District of Columbia. He also led the effort to overhaul the National Guard Discrimination Complaint Program, the first in the program's 21 years of existence, to ensure that the National Guard in the 54 States, Territories, and the District of Columbia maintains a workplace free of unlawful employment discrimination.

Mr. Doyle has dedicated his entire career to public service, improving the quality of employment conditions for Federal civilian employees and Air Force and National Guard servicemembers. He did so by changing minds person by person, by litigating case by case, and by providing technical assistance for statutory drafting line by line. Throughout his career, Mr. Doyle also mentored countless employment and labor relations military and civil service attorneys nationwide. For many attorneys, Mr. Doyle was often their first port of call when facing a complicated employment law case or when they just needed words of encouragement. Because of his legal advocacy and effect on those whom he influenced, Mr. Doyle's impact on labor and employment law will be felt for many years to come, as will his impact on the many, many lives he changed for the better.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CENTENNIAL OF THE CLEVELAND BRADLEY COUNTY LIBRARY

• Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is an honor to join my friends in Bradley County, TN, as they gather for the centennial celebration of their beloved library.

The Cleveland Bradley County Public Library is more than just a repository for books and historic documents. When a dedicated group of local leaders first opened its doors in 1923, they did so knowing that there were no taxpayer funds available to support their vision of the library as a hub for local life. Not to be deterred, the community came together. Organizations like the Kiwanis Club held fundraisers to "keep the lights on," and the Women's Club held annual "book showers" to keep the shelves full.

That dedication to the pursuit of knowledge and community continues to this day. I want to thank Bradley County Mayor Gary Davis, city of

Cleveland Mayor Kevin Brooks, and the library's many employees and patrons for supporting this unique and essential institution. I believe I speak for all Tennesseans when I say that I cannot wait to see what the next 100 years holds for you.●

REMEMBERING MABEL DESMOND

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, it would be hard to put into words what Mabel Desmond meant to me, to her family, to her community, or to the State of Maine.

To say that Mabel put service into every part of who she was is an understatement. I knew Mabel for her dedication to her constituents in Aroostook County and for relentlessly seeking what she felt would be in the greater good of the State. That same quality applied to her life as a mother, as a teacher, and as a friend. Her determination to make a difference echoed throughout her life in countless ways. She knew that one person striving to do the right things and being kind mattered.

Mabel's distinguished political career from 1994–2002 was during the same time I served as Maine's Governor. It was clear right away that she was a serious lawmaker; not one that would just go along with a plan, not one who made any assumptions, and not one that could be intimidated.

I grew to deeply admire her conviction over the years but never so much as when she was the lone voice on the education committee who would support the Maine Learning Technology Initiative "laptop" program, keeping the idea alive in the face of almost overwhelming opposition. This act of courage on an idea I was passionate about as Governor—and still so proud of today—has made an immense difference for now decades of Maine students. As a teacher, she "got it," and the respect which her colleagues in the legislature had for her was a key factor in the passage of the program. So many success stories of kids who were able to pursue their dreams, all because of Mabel's unshakable belief in a better future.

Mabel was my friend, someone I looked up to, someone who taught me the value of thoughtful decision making. I will be forever grateful to have known and worked with her and will miss her dearly.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations

which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 619. An act to require the Director of National Intelligence to declassify information relating to the origin of COVID-19, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 140. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'".

The message also announced that pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members to the House Communications Standards Commission: Mr. Morelle of New York, Mr. Sherman of California, and Ms. Underwood of Illinois.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 140. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 775. A bill to provide for increased transparency in generic drug applications; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 776. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Gila River system in the State of New Mexico as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, to provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal land in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 777. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2023, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 778. A bill to require the disclosure of information relating to the cost of programs, projects, or activities carried out using Federal funds; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 779. A bill to establish an AmeriCorps Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 780. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze certain legislation in order to prevent duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 781. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to revise the definition of the term "tipped employee", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 782. A bill to require applicable Federal agencies to take action on applications for Federal energy authorizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 783. A bill to require the Energy Information Administration to submit to Congress and make publicly available an annual report on Federal agency policies and regulations and Executive orders that have increased or may increase energy prices in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 784. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to complete an interagency report on the effects of special recreation permits on environmental justice communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RICKETTS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 785. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid

Vapor Pressure under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KING):

S. 786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 787. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to study and report on the operational preparedness of air carriers for preparing for changing weather and other events related to changing conditions and natural hazards; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. KING):

S. 788. A bill to amend the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013 to allow States to issue fully electronic stamps under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 789. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the United States Foreign Service and its contribution to United States diplomacy; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 790. A bill to align executive compensation with sustainable value creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 791. A bill to increase access to agency guidance documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 792. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 to provide certain Federal public benefits to citizens of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau who are lawfully residing in the United States if they are otherwise qualified, consistent with section 141 of the Compacts of Free Association; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 793. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 794. A bill to require a pilot program on the participation of non-asset-based third-party logistics providers in the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KING):

S. 795. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to improve education and risk

management assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 796. A bill to exempt discharges of fire retardant by Federal land management agencies, State governments, political subdivisions of States, and Tribal governments from the permitting requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 797. A bill to establish and implement a multi-year Legal Gold and Mining Partnership Strategy to reduce the negative environmental and social impacts of illicit gold mining in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 798. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make financial assistance to States under the Land and Water Conservation Fund available for water quality projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 799. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage for all physicians' services furnished by doctors of chiropractic within the scope of their license, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a higher rate of tax on bonuses and profits from sales of stock received by executives employed by failing banks that were closed and for which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been appointed as conservator or receiver; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 105. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 6 through March 10, 2023, as "National Social and Emotional Learning Week" to recognize the critical role social and emotional learning plays in supporting the academic success and overall well-being of students, educators, and families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 10

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to improve the workforce of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to amend title

38, United States Code, to improve certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for home and community based services for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 168

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 168, a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and require review of certain agricultural transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 176

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 176, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 252

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 252, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting the marketing of firearms to minors, and for other purposes.

S. 307

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 307, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish certain rules relating to unmanned aircraft systems and operations, and for other purposes.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 347

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 347, a bill to protect Americans from the threat posed by certain foreign adversaries using current or potential future social media companies that those foreign adversaries control to surveil Americans, gather sensitive data about Americans, or spread influence campaigns, propaganda, and censorship.

S. 416

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 416, a bill to designate the Russian-based mercenary Wagner Group as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes.

S. 444

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 444, a bill to require any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the World Health Assembly to be subject to Senate ratification.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to repeal changes made by health care reform laws to the Medicare exception to the prohibition on certain physician referrals for hospitals, and for other purposes.

S. 547

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 547, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 610

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 610, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 686, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to review and prohibit certain transactions between persons in the United States

and foreign adversaries, and for other purposes.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to suspend the entry of aliens in order to achieve operational control of the border, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit certain expenses associated with obtaining or maintaining recognized postsecondary credentials to be treated as qualified higher education expenses for purposes of 529 accounts.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 727, a bill to limit the price charged by manufacturers for insulin.

S. 750

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 750, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit health centers from providing abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 762

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 762, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require coverage of, and expand access to, home and community-based services under the Medicaid program, to award grants for the creation, recruitment, training and education, retention, and advancement of the direct care workforce and to award grants to support family caregivers, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 18, a joint resolution disapproving of the rule submitted by the Department of Homeland Security relating to "Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility".

S. CON. RES. 5

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution expressing support for the recognition of March 10, 2023, as "Abortion Provider Appreciation Day".

S. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 20, a resolution condemning the coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military's detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained, promoting accountability and justice for those killed by the Burmese military, and calling for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 103

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 103, a resolution recognizing Girl Scouts of the United States of America on its 111th birthday and celebrating its legacy of providing girls with a safe, inclusive space where they can explore their world, build meaningful relationships, and have access to experiences that prepare them for a life of leadership.

S. RES. 104

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 104, a resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 779. A bill to establish an AmeriCorps Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Madam President, service is a core American value. We take inspiration from those who have answered the call to serve, whether in defense of our Nation abroad or in strengthening our communities at home. Finding common cause through service is how we will overcome the major challenges of our time—addressing inequality, strengthening civil society and democratic institutions, and leaving a healthy, resilient planet to future generations. That is why I am proud to join Congressman JOHN LARSON of Connecticut in introducing the America's Call to Improving Opportunities Now, ACTION for National Service Act. Our legislation calls for a historic expansion of the number of service opportunities and an increased investment in those who serve.

The ACTION for National Service Act will honor our national value of service, while addressing the barriers that limit citizens' opportunities to

serve. Our legislation will set us on a path to 1 million national service positions within 10 years. It will increase the educational award so that an individual completing 2 full years of service will earn the equivalent of 4 years of the average in-state tuition at a public college or university. Indeed, those who are willing to serve should not be left to carry a heavy financial burden of student loan debt. The ACTION for National Service Act will also ease other financial barriers to service by increasing the living allowance and eliminating the tax liability for the education awards and living stipends. The bill calls for a robust outreach effort to ensure that all young people will know about the many opportunities to serve their country and their communities. It will mobilize a Civilian Climate Corps to address the urgent needs of hardest hit communities. Finally, the ACTION for National Service Act calls for elevating the Corporation for National and Community Service to a Cabinet-level Agency and establishes a National Service Foundation to leverage private sector resources to support national service activities.

Madam President, it is time that we reinvigorate the social contract we have with each other by elevating service as a national value. We must also make the commitment to invest in the education and professional development of those who are willing to sacrifice for our Nation. Developing the talents of our most committed citizens pays lifelong dividends. Our investment in the GI Bill not only honors our servicemembers but also enriches our Nation. Similarly, the education awards for those who have served through our national programs have economic impacts beyond the individuals who earn them. That is the new deal that the ACTION for National Service Act offers.

All AmeriCorps members take a pledge to get things done for Americans, to make communities safer, smarter and healthier, and to bring us together. It is a pledge we all should commit ourselves to.

I would like to thank Senators COONS, BALDWIN, BROWN, BLUMENTHAL, DUCKWORTH, and KLOBUCHAR for joining me as original cosponsors of the ACTION for National Service Act and the over 40 organizations, including Voices for National Service, States for Service Coalition, Habitat for Humanity International, YouthBuild, Service Year, City Year, and With Honor Action, that have endorsed this legislation. We urge our colleagues to join us in working for its passage so we can ensure that all who aspire to serve have the opportunity to do so.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KING):

S. 786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Madam 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. 786

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 "Personal Health Investment Today Act of 2023" or the "PHIT Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to promote health and prevent disease, particularly diseases related to being overweight or obese, by—

- (1) encouraging healthier lifestyles;
- (2) providing financial incentives to ease the financial burden of engaging in healthy behavior; and
- (3) increasing the ability of individuals and families to participate in physical fitness activities.

SEC. 3. CERTAIN AMOUNTS PAID FOR PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, FITNESS, AND EXERCISE TREATED AS AMOUNTS PAID FOR MEDICAL CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 213(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting ", or", and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) for qualified sports and fitness expenses."

(b) QUALIFIED SPORTS AND FITNESS EXPENSES.—Subsection (d) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(12) QUALIFIED SPORTS AND FITNESS EXPENSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified sports and fitness expenses' means amounts paid exclusively for the sole purpose of participating in a physical activity including—

- "(i) for membership at a fitness facility,
- "(ii) for participation or instruction in physical exercise or physical activity, or
- "(iii) for equipment used in a program (including a self-directed program) of physical exercise or physical activity.

"(B) OVERALL DOLLAR LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount treated as qualified sports and fitness expenses with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year shall not exceed \$1,000 (\$2,000 in the case of a joint return or a head of household (as defined in section 2(b))).

"(C) FITNESS FACILITY.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), the term 'fitness facility' means a facility—

- "(i) which provides instruction in a program of physical exercise, offers facilities for the preservation, maintenance, encouragement, or development of physical fitness, or serves as the site of such a program of a State or local government,
- "(ii) which is not a private club owned and operated by its members,
- "(iii) which does not offer golf, hunting, sailing, or riding facilities,
- "(iv) the health or fitness component of which is not incidental to its overall function and purpose, and

“(v) which is fully compliant with the State of jurisdiction and Federal anti-discrimination laws.

“(D) TREATMENT OF EXERCISE VIDEOS, ETC.—Videos, books, and similar materials shall be treated as described in subparagraph (A)(ii) if the content of such materials constitutes instruction in a program of physical exercise or physical activity.

“(E) LIMITATIONS RELATED TO SPORTS AND FITNESS EQUIPMENT.—Amounts paid for equipment described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be treated as qualified sports and fitness expenses only—

“(i) if such equipment is utilized exclusively for participation in fitness, exercise, sport, or other physical activity,

“(ii) in the case of amounts paid for apparel or footwear, if such apparel or footwear is of a type that is necessary for, and is not used for any purpose other than, a specific physical activity, and

“(iii) in the case of amounts paid for any single item of sports equipment (other than exercise equipment), to the extent such amounts do not exceed \$250.

“(F) PROGRAMS WHICH INCLUDE COMPONENTS OTHER THAN PHYSICAL EXERCISE AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (6) shall apply in the case of any program that includes physical exercise or physical activity and also other components. For purposes of the preceding sentence, travel and accommodations shall be treated as a separate component.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 105—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF MARCH 6 THROUGH MARCH 10, 2023, AS “NATIONAL SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING WEEK” TO RECOGNIZE THE CRITICAL ROLE SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING PLAYS IN SUPPORTING THE ACADEMIC SUCCESS AND OVERALL WELL-BEING OF STUDENTS, EDUCATORS, AND FAMILIES

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 105

Whereas, according to research conducted by both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Harvard University, the COVID-19 pandemic heightened the urgency to provide greater assistance to students, educators, and families to address the mental health, behavioral, and other systemic challenges that impede the academic and developmental improvement and success of students;

Whereas decades of research demonstrate how social and emotional learning (referred to in this preamble as “SEL”) promotes academic achievement, mental wellness, healthy behaviors, and long-term success;

Whereas, according to a study by researchers at the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, Loyola University of Chicago, and the University of Illi-

nois at Chicago, SEL programs that addressed the 5 core competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making) increased academic performance by 11 percentile points, improved the ability of students to manage stress, and improved the attitudes of students about themselves, others, and school;

Whereas a study in the Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis found that, on average, for every dollar spent on the evidence-based SEL programs examined, there was an \$11 return on investment;

Whereas, according to a study published by the American Public Health Association, the development of social and emotional skills in kindergarten has been associated with improved outcomes for young adults later in life, resulting in reduced societal costs for public assistance, public housing, police involvement, and detention;

Whereas, in response to a Pew Research Center survey of parents of K-12 students, 66 percent of the parents said that schools teaching children to develop social and emotional skills was “very important” and another 27 percent of the parents said that such teaching was “somewhat important”;

Whereas EdWeek Research Center found that 83 percent of educators indicated that SEL is “somewhat” or “very” helpful for the academic learning of students;

Whereas research from Yale University, the University of Cantabria, Jagiellonian University, and Pennsylvania State University indicates that educators who demonstrate greater social and emotional competence are frequently more capable of protecting themselves from burnout; and

Whereas the week of March 6 through March 10, 2023, would be an appropriate period to designate as “National Social and Emotional Learning Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of “National Social and Emotional Learning Week”;

(2) recognizes the role that social and emotional learning plays in promoting academic achievement, mental and behavioral health, and future career success for students;

(3) expresses support for expanding access to social and emotional learning for each student and teacher; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to identify opportunities among Federal agencies to advance social and emotional learning to support students, parents, educators, and their communities.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Joshua David Jacobs, of Washington, to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs, vice Paul R. Lawrence, dated March 14, 2023.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I have one request for committee to meet during today’s session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 14, 2023, at 4:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2023

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 15; 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 morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Nieman nomination, postcloture; further, that all postcloture time be considered expired at 11:30 a.m. and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; that following the cloture vote on the Garcetti nomination, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings; and further, that if cloture has been invoked on the Garcetti nomination, all postcloture time be considered expired at 2:15 p.m. and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; and that if cloture is invoked on the Chaudhary nomination, all postcloture time be considered expired at 5:15 p.m.; and finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday’s session, the motions 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.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:34 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 15, 2023, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JULIE A. SU, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE MARTIN JOSEPH WALSH.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES W. BIERMAN, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KENNETH R. BLACKMON
REAR ADM. (LH) MARC S. LEDERER
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT C. NOWAKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JEFFREY A. JURGEMEYER
CAPT. RICHARD S. LOFGREN
CAPT. MICHAEL S. MATTIS
CAPT. RICHARD W. MEYER
CAPT. BRYON T. SMITH
CAPT. MICHAEL R. VANPOOTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN E. BYINGTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN A. ROBINSON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID E. LUDWA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PETER K. MUSCHINSKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARC F. WILLIAMS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MATTHEW J. CLEMENTZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SAMUEL T. KRAMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CARLA A. KIERNAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JOHN W. BROCK II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ROBERT M. MCTIGHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

EDWARD B. SAUTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JOAN E. SOMMERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624
AND 7064:

To be colonel

JOHN D. HORTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOEL N. BUFFARDI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND
7064:

To be colonel

SARAH D. ECCLESTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

NICHOLAS P. FIEBKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ANDREW J. DOYLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

WILLIAM T. GRIGGS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MEGAN L. MALOY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

KAITLYN M. HERNANDEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF
THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO
THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY I. ARCELAY
PHILIP F. BAKER, JR.
STEPHEN E. BRACK
GERALD D. BURRIS
MATTHEW J. COATES
THOMAS P. COMPITELLO
APRIL M. FRITCH
JASON M. HUNT
BRIAN E. LANGLOIS
CHARLES C. LEE
ROBERTO E. LOPEZ RODRIGUEZ
EDWIN MARTINEZ
GINA M. NICHOLS
ARNOLD RIVERASANCHEZ
EARL E. WEIGELT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SARA C. ADAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTINA G. NALLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF
THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO
THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

ANDREW ADAMCZYK
HENRY F. DONALDSON II
MATTHEW J. ELDER
SCOTT D. GOLDEN
JON W. GUTAUSKAS
LAURA A. THOMAS
HAVARD M. WHILES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ASHLEY S. LEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

TIMOTHY W. LINDEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

EBONY Q. STARR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SARAH A. DELAROSA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MARK T. SOPKIW, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JUSTIN T. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

REI T. ISRAEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ADAM L. FOX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JASON L. WORKMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

STEPHEN J. CUMBY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

STEPHEN M. ANDERSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ELISABET CRUMPLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY
APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE
UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION
605:

To be captain

KYLE A. ADUSKEVICH
JEREMIAH BLANCO
MEGHAN L. BODNAR
MICHAEL G. CHARNOTA
STEVEN J. COBOS
MICHAEL S. DALRYMPLE
HARRY C. EVANS III
JEFFREY C. FASSBENDER
SCOTT P. FENTRESS
TYLER W. FORREST
DARREN D. GERHARDT
BENJAMIN P. GRANT
DANIEL L. HEMMINGER
EREK A. KASSE
JAMES W. KAUBER
ROBERT D. LANE
RICHARD I. LAWLOR
CHARLES C. LITTON
LACY N. LODMELL
MATTHEW L. MARTIN
CARLOS F. MARTINEZ
ROBERT J. MCDOWELL, JR.
DANIEL J. MCNAB
NATHAN A. MURRAY
GARTH W. STORZ
JASON S. TARRANT
JOHN M. THORPE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY
APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE
UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION
605:

To be commander

BRAMWELL B. ARNOLD III
THOMAS D. GROARK
ARISTILE S. GUIDRY
ALFRED L. KELLER, JR.
DANIEL L. MARION
SARA A. NASH
STEVEN A. PERRY
NICHOLAS R. RADZIOW
DANNIE T. STIMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY
APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE
UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION
605:

To be lieutenant commander

JEFFERY R. BIERMANN
JEREMY R. BOTTOMLEY
JONATHAN J. BRANDT
THOMAS G. CATSIGRIS
GHEHTI D. C. CHRISTIAN
NATALIE E. CROW
NICHOLAS C. EVANS
SEAMUS K. FISH
MICHAEL J. FITZGIBBON
STEPHEN J. GEISS
NATHAN D. GLOWACKI
JACOB P. HEUSS

MATTHEW G. HOMEIER
HAROLD HUNTER
PETER O. HUNTLEY
EMILY E. HUTSON
COLE H. JOHNSON
SAMUEL E. JONES
HOWARD W. KELLETT, JR.
SPENCER A. KITTEN
TYLER A. L. LEDOUX
ZANE A. MACNAUGHTON
CLINTON R. MARTIN
ZACHARY S. MCCLURG
VANANH MCCORMICK
VANESSA L. MORROW
CULLEN A. MUNGER
REBECCA D. NAVARRE
JESSE R. PELLETIER
MATTHEW R. PERRY
NICHOLAS W. QUENGA
DANIEL SANCHEZ
ANTHONY M. STEVENSON
DAVID A. WAKEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES H. KNIGHT

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ROSS M. BOSTON
RYAN L. BUDGE
MORGAN L. CARTER
BRANDON K. KOOPMAN
ALEX S. LIU
JOHN R. MYERS
CODY A. NIEMIETZ
GARRETT V. SOILEAU
ROBERT F. WOJCICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JASON M. ADAMS
ANDREW D. ANDERSON
DANE M. BANNACH
RICHARD ARAM BROWN
KELLIE M. BROWNLEE
JOYCE A. BULSON
STEPHAN E. CUMMINGS
ANDREW C. DERMANOSKI
ERIN M. DUNAGAN
MATTHEW P. FLAHIVE
THOMAS P. GABRIELE
STACY H. GODSHALL
ALISON R. GONZALEZ
WILLIAM J. HASSEY
JUSTIN A. HODGE
RAMSEY MARTIN HORN
SUNG J. IN
JOHN G. KOLB
MICHAEL G. KRUK
SHAWN P. LEE
PATRICK W. LITTLE
MATHEW LUKACS
JONATHAN F. MCCALL
RYAN DAVID MCDANIEL
STEVIE MEDEIROS
NEIL A. MENZIE
EAMON R. MURRAY
JOHN D. PATRICK
NATHANIEL A. PEACE
CHRISTOPHER S. RITTER
JAMES E. ROBERTS
RAYMOND M. RUSCOE
WILLIAM D. SANDERS
JUSTIN EDWARD SORICE
ROBERT E. THOMPSON
STEPHEN A. TOTTH
NATHAN P. VOSTERS
JONATHAN L. WHITAKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER JOHN ALBAN
DANIEL JOSEPH ANAYA
FLYNT L. BAILEY
SEAN D. BARBER
GORDON L. BARNHILL
ERIC A. BASSETT
DAVID F. BOETTCHER
ANDREW J. BRINKER
ADAM B. BROWN
ALAN LINDSAY CALFEE
CHRISTOPHER N. CALLAS
IVONNE JANELLA CHARBONNEAU
MATTHEW T. CHARBONNEAU
ANTHONY F. CIAMILLO, JR.
ANDREW J. M. COMPTON
MATTHEW M. CONRAD
CHRISTOPHER A. COX
ALEX VICTOR CRAVEN
BOYCE H. DAUBY
EMMANUEL A. DELACRUZ
THEODORE J. DINKELMAN, JR.
KYLE J. DUFAUD

ADAM B. DUNK
ERIC J. EHN
GREGORY J. FERTIG
SEAN R. FISHER
MATTHEW J. GRIDLEY
SHAWN W. HACKETT
MEGAN L. HARKINS
SETH T. HORNER
MICHAEL A. HUFFMAN
BRYAN V. JACKSON
JARED M. JACOBSEN
JENNY WEIYUE JI
BRANDON L. KELLER
SCOTT J. KELLY
JONATHON D. KELSO
NATHAN T. KOPAY
ROBERT A. LAKE
MATTHEW T. LEINES
ANDREW J. MASSINO
ERIC J. MCLAUGHLIN
TIFFANY D. MURPHY
KEVIN M. NASTASI
SAMUEL Y. O
MICHAEL S. PEEPLES
NATASHA I. PEEPLES
MANUEL A. RAMIREZ, JR.
MARISSA C. REABE
AARON C. RHOADS
BRADLEY C. RIGG
JOSEPH B. ROBINSON
PAUL N. ROQUE
MRYAMN L. RUTH
RAQUEL V. SALIM
MELISSA A. SAWYER
ADAM M. SIEVERS
ALEXANDER L. SIMPSON
BRENDON P. SMERESKY
JOSEPH R. SPEAKMAN
DOUGLAS E. THORNTON
JOHN M. TURNER
KRISTIN L. VENTURA
BRANDON D. VOGT
JASON T. WIRTH
MARK J. WOJTOWICZ
SEAN ZABRISKIE
COSTANTINOS ZAGARIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRIDGET L. AJINGA
EARL R. ALEJANDRO
GREGORY L. ALLEN
JOSE L. ALMANZAR
MARISSA L. BANDUCCI
LUKE S. BASHAM
BRYAN G. BECKER
MELISSA BIERMA
CHRISTIAN J. BONNO
CHRISTOPHER S. BROWN
WILLIAM F. COSGROVE
MARK A. CRIMM
AMBER MELODY DAWSON
JUSTIN M. DAWSON
JEREMIAH A. DEIBLER
ZACHARY MICHAEL DOLLEY
CHRISTOPHER Y. FERRER
NEIL M. FOURNIE
JAMES D. FRANCIERE
MOSES K. GEORGE
VALENCIA SHERAE GORE
KENNETH P. GROSSELIN
JEREMY D. HAINES
THOMAS L. HARRIS
DEREK W. HAUN
BENJAMIN CHARLES HERRING
ANN L. HUGHES
ADAM P. JODICE
LAUREL A. JODICE
JUSTIN H. JONES
STEFAN P. KATZ
DAVID S. KIM
JACOB M. LYNES
MATTHEW CHARLES MANSHIP
IRAKLI MATCHAVARIANI
COLLIN M. MCSORLEY
DAVID R. MISHKIN
EVE C. OCONNOR
TYLER DAVID PAFFETT
ADAM J. POHL
JOSHUA R. PRINT
MICHAEL ALAN PROVENCHER
JOHN PATRICK QUINN
MARIA E. QUINN
RICHARD B. REHS
JUSTIN W. ROBERTS
RYAN W. SKILLING
ROBERT M. SMITH
BRIAN C. STEWART
BRADLEY DAVID TEMPIA
CLAY RAYMOND TOERNER
BRETT A. TUNING
ZACHARY S. VAN VALKENBURG
JOHN S. VINCENT
ERIC KENDRICK WAGNER
ERIK L. WALLACE
BRITTANY L. WIRTH
BRIAN K. YOAKAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JOHN W. ANDERSON

RYAN J. ANDERSON
JAIME M. BADUI
ALEXANDER C. BAST
JOHN E. BEARD
DAVID WILLIAM BEARGIE
BENJAMIN L. BEREZIN
RYAN ALLAN BERNDT
LOGAN W. BOLITHO
DEREK J. BULL
NATHAN SIMON BUTLER
CHARLES A. CARLEY
DAYLE L. CHANG
NICHOLAS S. CHIARATTI
KERI ANALEE CLARK
ALEC E. COOK
ELIZABETH R. COUCH
MICHAEL TARO DELACRUZ
BENJAMIN A. DEMARR
SIMON DUONG
DANIEL LEE EDWARDS
MICHAEL D. FOLEY
CHARLES J. GARLISI
ANTHONY J. GENTRY
GARRETT T. GILE
BRANT J. GRIMES
PAUL A. GROSSI
ALEXANDER S. HOESE
ALYSA M. HOESE
FRANK R. JACKSON
MATTHEW R. JOHNSON
THOMAS M. JOHNSTON
BRITTANY A. KARSTEN
PATRICK R. KENNEDY
WILLIAM J. KIM
CASEY R. KLEISINGER
DAVID M. KNIERIEM
STEPHEN JOSEPH KOEHLE
BRANDON C. LEE
JAMES J. LIU
DAVID J. LORE
JOSEPH JOHN MALEK
JORGE LUIS MARTINEZ
KARA L. METTY
JOHN T. METZGER
JOHN COREY MILAN
DHARYL GARCIA MONSALUD
JIN Y. MUN
JACOB W. MUSSELMAN
THOMAS H. NADOBNY
JACOB A. NICHOLSON
DAVID ANDRE PARKER
BENJAMIN F. PARMENTER II
JOHN A. PASIERBOWICZ
SHAUN CHRISTOPHER PERRY
KEVIN PLASCENCIA
PAIGE L. PLUEMER
TORY EMERSON ROBINSON
ROBERT D. RODGERS
DESI RUSSELL RODRIGUEZ
GREGORY C. SEYMOUR
JACOB W. SINGLETON
TRAVIS R. SMITH
JOSHUA S. STEDMAN
MARC A. STRANIERE
SPENCER LYNN SWEAT
NICHOLAS K. THOMPSON
ANTHONY J. TURNER
BENJAMIN T. VOWELL
BENJAMIN J. WALDON
JACK G. WALLER
TATSUKI L. WATTS
MONTI R. YOUNG
GEORGE ZEITLER
TONY H. ZILLI
ABBY ELIZABETH ZVEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTINA M. AKERS
JASON ROBERT ANDERSON
DANIEL JOSEPH AUSTIN
CHLOE ELIZABETH BABCOCK
STEVEN CRAIG BARTON
ANDREW R. BATHURST
WILLIAM A. BATTLE
BENJAMIN C. BLANEY
ROSS M. BOSTON
IAN M. BROTONOV
TERESA L. CAMERON
JOHN ALEXANDER CANAAN
CHRISTOPHER JAMES CARLISLE
GRACE CHO
ANDREW P. COLANTUONO
JUAN VICTOR CORREA III
KANIT DARARUTANA
JOSHUA L. DAVID
BRYAN M. DAVID
ANTHONY JAMES DESIMONE
JEREMY T. DIMMICK
CHRISTOPHER PAUL DONG
SEAN TIMOTHY DONOVAN
MARIO ISAAC ELIZONDO
JONATHAN D. ENG
CHRISTOPHER J. FONGERS
MIKAROBYN C. GARCIA
ALYSON R. GLEASON
JENNIFER LEE GLEASON
JONATHAN DAVID GREEN
MATTHEW A. HAASE
JESSE DEE HALE
ALEXANDER F. HARTENBURG
STEVEN G. HARTWICH
MICHAEL W. HARVEY
CHRISTOPHER A. HATZL

PATRICK A. HEUER
DEVIN SCOTT HIGHTOWER
ANTHONY WAYNE HOBBS, JR.
SCOTT AINSLIE HUBERT
BRANDON JOSEF HUFSTETLER
MICHAEL A. HUSAR
MICHAEL L. JONES, JR.
WILLIAM E. KENDALL
LAUREN LAREE LAURITZEN
HENRY N. LOEWENKAMP
KENNETH R. MACKENTHUN
FRANCES G. MACKINNON
JOHN JOSEPH CRUZ MAFNAS
ANDREW A. MARIN
GRANT CHRISTIAN MASTERS
ROBERT A. MATHEWS
YULONDA A. MCGEE
CHER RON L. MCLEMORE
KATHERINE DOROTHY L. MILLAR
DANNY K. MILLS
EMILY J. MOAK
DANIEL LEE MONTANO
MARTHA J. MOREO
MATTHEW JOHN MUNGO
DEVON PATRICK MURPHY
JOEL C. NAFZIGER
MICHAEL A. OBRANOVICH
BRYCE THOMAS ONEILL
CHRISTIAN A. ORTIZVALENTIN
TIMOTHY J. OSBORN
JOHNNY J. PAK
SAMANTHA D. PARR
TRAVIS RYAN PERRY
TYLER A. PERRY
JUSTINE N. PESCECELLO PARR
ANTHONY JAMES POMOZZI
MATTHEW J. REILLY
JASON W. ROGERS
ANDREA M. ROOF
RAMON BEAUMONT ROSARIO
TRAVIS JACOB SALTER
CHRISTOPHER AARON SARGENT
ASHLEY N. SAVOIE
RYAN C. SCHINDLER
JOSEPH H. SCHLUETER
JONATHAN J. SCHNEIDER
KYLE N. SCHROEDER
EMILY JO SCHULTZ
JAMIELYNNE SHEPHERD
CAMERON G. SIMON
PETER M. SPITTLER
WILLIAM DAVID SPROUT
KENNETH JAMES STEWART
JOHN BARENT STRYKER
BENJAMIN W. TILLMAN
KYLE KENNETH TINDELL
TYLER A. UNDERWOOD
ELLIE E. VLAHOS
SEAN R. WALLSTROM
ALFREIDA S. WARREN
SEAN P. WILFERD
RICHARD A. WOMBLE
MICHAEL K. YAM
KATHY E. YORKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES
SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CASSANDRA R. HIDALGO
ERIC J. PEREZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES
SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

EDWARD E. JONES

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE IN-
DICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E), IN-
CLUDING THOSE RESERVE OFFICERS WHO ARE TO BE AP-
POINTED AS PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS
PURSUANT TO TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2101:

To be lieutenant commander

ALAINA M. ACCUMANNO
BRIAN A. ACUNA
ANTOINE A. ADAMS
DAVID P. ALLEN
MIKAEL M. ALLERT
BO J. AMES
SARAH C. ANDERSON
SHANNON L. ANDREW
KETH G. ARNOLD
IAN J. ASHNER
RYAN R. BABB
SAMUEL G. BACON
ELIZABETH A. BAIRD
CHARLES C. BARRETT
JUSTIN J. BENCH
RACHEL O. BENEDETTO
KEVIN D. BERTO
ABIGAIL L. BISHOP
TYLER J. BITTNER
JOSEPH D. BLINSKY, JR.
LAUREN E. BLOCH
ROBERT T. BOBUK
JOSEPH Y. BODZEWSKI
ANDREW M. BOGDAN
GUYER S. BOGEN
ANDREW P. BOHUSLAV
MATTHEW J. BOLTON
THOMAS J. BONDURANT

MARK A. BONNER
BRIAN T. BONOMI
ERIC J. BONOMI
NATHAN M. BORDERS
DAVID M. BRINKMANN
NATHAN R. BROCK
BENJAMIN D. BROSTOWICZ
PATRICK K. BUCKLEY
MICHAEL A. CABALLERO
ABIGAIL J. CALDWELL
DEREK R. CAMPBELL
CATHERINE D. CANTU
NICHOLAS P. CAPUZZI
KATY C. CARAWAY
ALEJANDRO CARDENAS II
STEPHANIE M. CARDENAS
STUART B. CARLEY
HARRISON G. CARTER
DANIEL C. CHASE
MATTHEW A. CHILDS
PAUL M. CIVITA
ANDREW M. COLE
OLIVER O. COLE
KATE K. COMPAGNONI
MEGAN E. COOK FALCO
MICHAEL P. COOK, JR.
MASON D. COOK
JESSICA E. COOPER
NICOLE E. CORBETT
TRAVIS S. COULTER
KEVIN A. CURRY
JEDIDIAH T. DALEIDEN
MEGHAN K. DALEIDEN
STEVEN M. DANSEGLIO
BRADLEY J. DAVIS
REID A. DELEON
MATTHEW J. DELMASTRO
ADAM R. DERBY
GRANT A. DEVISSER
STEPHEN R. DICKS
JOHN M. DIERKER
WILLIAM S. DISE
ADAM C. DOLAN
ERIN M. DOUGHERTY
JUSTIN L. DOUGHERTY
JAMES E. DUNBAR
KEVIN M. DWYER, JR.
RONALD J. ELIOTT
AUSTIN S. ENGLISH
IAN J. ERICKSON
KRISTIN B. EUCHLER
DANIEL T. EVANS
JAMES S. FASOLI III
CARMINE A. FAUL, JR.
JAMES M. FERNESSEY
JOSHUA S. FISCHER
CHRISTOPHER R. FISHER
KARLIN C. FOOR
AUDRA K. FORTEZA
EDWIN J. FORTEZA
RYAN S. FOUST
ANDREW L. FOX
GLORIA R. FOX
MICHAEL J. FRANCIS
NICHOLAS M. FREDERICKSEN
ARTHUR E. FROOKS
EDWARD R. GAILOR
ANDREW G. GATHY
JOSHUA R. GILLBERT
DANIEL J. GILLIS
CASEY J. GILMORE
JOHN J. GIOVANNI III
SARA E. GLUCKLER
CARLOS M. GONZALEZ
TIA R. GRANDVILLE
KELLY E. GRILLS
LINDSAY A. GRIM
COLLIN R. GRUIN
MERRILL GUTOWSKI
ROBERT T. HAAS III
REBEKAH S. HAABA
BO A. HALE
ALEX R. HAMEL
JOHN M. HAMEL
BRADLEY R. HARBERT
SHANDA L. HARPER
RYAN P. HARRIGAN
KARL L. HARRIS
CASSANDRA N. HAWLEY
LAURA H. HIGBY
JOEL R. HILL
LAURA R. HILLS
BENJAMIN HINCHMAN V
BREANNA L. HITE
BRYAN T. HODDINOTT
FREDDY U. HOFSCHEIDER III
JUDITH A. HOOFMANS
NATASHA C. HOPE
ANDREW J. HORVATH
JOHN R. HOUK
ETHAN G. HUCK
JESSICA L. HULL
JAMES C. IRVIN
JARED D. ISCHE
EMILY A. IVASHENKO
CHRISTOPHER C. IZURIETA
TERRELL D. JACKSON
ANDREW J. JAEGER
ELLIS D. JAMES
STEPHANIE J. JOCIS
STEELE H. JOHNSON
XIMENA JOHNSON
DANIEL M. JONES
RYAN S. JUNOD
EDWARD K. KAAUA
ELLIOTT J. KAHL
KRISTIN D. KAM

GREGORY M. KENNERLEY
SCOTT W. KENNEY
JOSEPH W. KIDWELL
VINCENT M. KNAEBLE
KEVIN M. KNAUP
JAMES P. KNUDSEN
ARTEM KONOTOPSKIY
JOSEPH M. LACANLALÉ
VICTORIA E. LACEFIELD-RODRIGUEZ
JOSEPH S. LACORTE
TIMOTHY M. LAE
KATHRYN R. LAMPHERE
BRENT J.D. LANE
PETER M. LANG, JR.
KELCIE L. LAROCHE
PAUL J. LAROCHE
MARK S. LAURICELLA
CATHERINE M. LAWSON
PATRICK N. LEAVITT
CONOR C. LEE
CATHERINE R. LEKNES
JACOB G. LENZ
PATRICIA LIGGETT
PETER W. LINK
ERICA L. LINNEMANN
ERIN E. LOPEZ
MICHAEL J. LOPEZ
JESSICA D. LUKASIK
KELSEY M. LYFORD
MATTHEW F. LYNNE
JOHN V. MACK
JUSTIN P. MAIO
LESLIE A. MARCHALONIS
MATTHEW V. MARLER
JORDAN H. MARTIN
MICHAEL D. MASSARO
BLAKE A. MAURER
CHARRON L. MCCOMBS
WILLIAM G. MCCOWN
COLLEEN E. MCCUE
LAURA M. MCDONALD
TIARRA A. MCDONALD
DAHYOUNG MCGARRY
THOMAS M. MCGUIRE
MICHAEL T. MCHUGH
BENJAMIN MCINTYRECABLE
BENJAMIN J. MCKEATHEN
RYAN J. MIKLOSOVICH
GEDDY S. MILLER
RYAN P. MITCHELL
ANDREA A. MOLINA
ANTHONY J. MONTEFORTE
RODNEY O. MOORE
ANDREW J. MORAVEC
VIRGIL A. MORENO
ELTON K. MORRIS, JR.
ADAM C. MOSS
JAKE D. MUELLER
KEVIN MUSOROFITTI
KHIEM V.H.R. NAGY
BARTON S. NANNY
AMBER L. NAPRALLA
JACOB R. NAUM
ORLY NAUM
JUSTIN R. NEAL
JUSTIN D. NEASE
KEITH NICHOLSON
JOHN J. NOLAN IV
KELLI N. NORMOYLE
NICHOLAS C. OLMSTEAD
EDUARDO J. OROPEZA
THOMAS N. PALMEIRA
SHANE E. PALMIRA
CATHERINE M. PARIS
NICHOLAS M. PAVLIK
NOBERTO T. PEREZ
JOSEPH E. PETRY
DEREK J. PETTY
ROBERT W. PFAFF
NICHOLAS W. PHILLIPS
ROSS W. PHILLIPS
MICHAEL J. PIANTEDOSI
STEVEN R. PODMORE
NICHOLAS B. POWELL
MICHAEL B. POWER
SCOTT A. PRITZ
ANDREW D. QUANDT
ENRIQUE L. QUINONES
CHRISTINA L. RAMIREZ
JOHN C. RAMIREZ
RACHEL C. RAND
MATTHEW S. RANGER
MICHAEL A. RAUCH
ANDREW D. RAY
CHRISTOPHER P. REIMER
KILEY RELF
WILLIAM K. RICE
DERRICK P. ROCKEY
LYDIA F. ROETS
KATHLEEN A. ROMAS
ANNA L. RUTH
RACHEL L. RYCHTANEK
BRANDI R. SABLE
JONATHAN J. SALINAS
IAN D. W. SANKY
JORGE I. SANTIAGO
JONATHAN S. SAVUNDJIEFF
CARL W. SCHEMEL
CARTER T. SCHLANK
STEPHEN J. SCHMID
CATHERINE M. SCHMITZ
ANDREW P. SCHWALBENBERG
TONY J. SELEZNICK
EDWARD W. SELLA
LUKA S. SERDAR
CHELSEA M. SHEEHY
YUE H. SHEN

RACHEL A. SHVEDA
JEB S. SLICK
GARY S. SMEDLEY
KEVIN P. SMIT
MOLLY R. SMITH
LEIGH G. SOWERS
JEANPIERRE A. SPENCE
DREW M. STAFFORD
SCOTT R. STENDER
RONALD T. STEPHENS
CONNOR A. STEVENS
KEVAN STOECKLER
LORHEL E. STOKES
BOONE T. SWANBERG
COLLIN T. SYKES
RYAN A. SZABO
JILLIAN E. TALLEY
ANDREW P. TAYLOR
JON T. TAYLOR
LAURIN M. T. TEEGARDEN
ASHLY L. THOMAS
CHERI-ANN A. THOMPSON
STEPHEN H. THOMSEN

ALANA K. TIMULAK
NATHANIEL H. TOLL
EMILY M. TRUDEAU
JOSEPH R. TRUMP
JOHN P. TUBALADO
NATHAN C. TURNER
JONATHON F. UPTON
RYAN J. VANDEHEI
TYLER J. VIEIRA
JOSHUA S. VILLAFANE
MAXWELL E. WALKER
MICHELLE E. WALSH
JUSTIN R. WALTERS
ALEXA C. WARD
KAITLIN M. WARD
JASON R. WEEKS
THOMAS F. WHALEN
JULIANNA V. WHITE
FRANKLIN D. WILLIAMS
DAVID R. WOLINSKI
JOSHUA W. WOMBOLDT
DUANE D. WOOD, JR.
MICHAEL R. WORTMAN

HANNAH M. WYDERKO
TIMOTHY L. WYDERKO
ISAAC YATES
CAROL D. YIN
TAHNEE E. ZACCANO
GABRIELLA Z. ZAMBRANA
KRISTEN E. ZELMAN

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate March 14, 2023:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL ALAN RATNEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA.