



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 2022

No. 85

## Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 17, 2022)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our strong tower, continue to be our defender and guide. Lead our lawmakers in their work so that they will make Your priorities their priorities. Provide them with the patience, integrity, and compassion to become instruments of Your providence. Strengthen and protect them. Keep them safe from evil. Give them such courage and loyalty that they will passionately embrace Your precepts. Lord, infuse them with the spirit of wisdom, sympathy, and godliness as they grow in grace and in a deeper knowledge of Your providential love.

And, God, continue to sustain Ukraine.

We pray in Your powerful 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 (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, May 18, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,  
President pro tempore.

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

### 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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Barbara A. Leaf, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

#### CRIME

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Americans' concern about violent crime is the highest it has been in 6 years, and the statistics plainly show why that is. Between 2019 and 2020, the murder rate shot up by the largest 1-year increase in over a century, and the rate has kept on rising.

Nearly 60 percent more law enforcement officers were killed in 2021 compared to 2020. Cities all across America set alltime record highs for homicides last year. My hometown of Louisville, KY, was one of those cities. We also now average more than one carjacking every 48 hours.

Innocent citizens across America know this situation has literally spiraled out of control, but, unfortunately, the Biden administration and Senate Democrats continue to team up and find new ways to go soft on crime. The nomination and confirmation of Judge Jackson to the Supreme Court crowns a deliberate effort by Democrats to make the Federal judiciary literally softer on crime. They are specifically intentionally stuffing the Federal bench full of men and women whose starting perspective tilts toward sympathy for criminals rather than victims.

Even the New York Times had to admit this "concerted push by the Biden administration" to prefer nominees with "experience in criminal defense work" is "a sea change in the world of judicial nominations."

The Times continued:

The type of high-profile murder cases handled by some of Mr. Biden's nominees would have been considered disqualifying only a few years ago; now the president, who himself served briefly as a public defender early in his legal career, is actively seeking to name more jurists who have [that kind of] experience.

So, Mr. President, we are not arguing that public defenders ought to be excluded from the nomination process. Clearly, their work is important. Everyone deserves a lawyer, even the most heinous criminals. But the American people are not exactly clamoring for President Biden to dramatically tilt the entire judiciary toward the criminal-friendly perspective—least of all during this historic crime surge.

This week, with a long list of serious problems facing the country, the Democratic majority has decided to spend floor time on another judicial nominee with this one particular background, a second nominee who appeared during her committee hearing to be unfamiliar with a basic concept in trial law, and a third nominee whose

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2553

pro bono record includes helping sue the New York City government over policing and trying to reverse another person's robbery conviction. So I would urge Senators to oppose these controversial nominees.

I am proud to be one of many Republicans joining a new resolution from Senator CASSIDY begging this all-Democratic government to prioritize solutions for the violent crime wave. To start, the administration should stop this willful—willful—campaign to make the judiciary systemically softer on crime. Innocent Americans can't afford it.

#### UKRAINE

Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, the Ukraine people and their fight to repel Russian invaders from their sovereign territory has been inspiring. The world is watching Ukraine respond to gut-wrenching violence with bravery and with unity.

I encourage President Biden to do more to strengthen Ukraine and NATO's defenses well in advance so as to deter Putin and improve Ukraine's initial ability to resist aggression. Many Republicans shared my view that President Biden should have done more to help Ukraine more quickly.

Fortunately, as the Ukrainians have stood strong, President Biden has done more and more to help them in the fight. We are now investing to ensure Ukraine's forces are equipped to win and the arsenals of NATO allies who have joined in support can be replenished.

As I explained yesterday, American support for Ukraine is not mere altruism. The outcome of Ukraine's fight to preserve its sovereignty will have massive consequences for our own strategic interests, both in Europe and much farther afield.

So let's start with just that continent. Europe is home to some of America's longest-standing friendships and deepest trading partnerships. If Vladimir Putin's thuggish imperialism found success in Ukraine, America and our allies would certainly feel the effects. Prior to the current conflict in Ukraine, Putin's creeping expansionism, his interventions and manipulations of so-called frozen conflicts from Georgia and Crimea and Transnistria, only emboldened him. He must be stopped.

Beyond Europe's borders, Putin's fellow strongmen are watching all this to find out whether it is safe to follow his lead. In Beijing, President Xi's Communist Party is looking for a green light to apply the Russian model to their own wish list of sovereign territories to subjugate, starting, of course, with Taiwan. For their part, the Taiwanese people know they are in the crosshairs. As they demonstrated in solidarity with the people of Ukraine, the warning on the island in recent months has been "Today Ukraine. Tomorrow, Taiwan."

As Taiwan's Foreign Minister put it recently in the Washington Post,

"[T]he war in Ukraine has made it clear to the world how important it is for democracies to stand shoulder to shoulder against authoritarian aggression."

Fortunately, fellow democracies in the Indo-Pacific are doing exactly that. Earlier this month, Japan's Defense Minister acknowledged that China has been "carefully observing" both "Russia's aggression" and the reactions of the international community. And Prime Minister Kishida reaffirmed that we must "never tolerate a unilateral attempt to change the status quo by the use of force in the Indo Pacific."

From Kyiv to Taipei and to Tokyo, America's friends and partners see Russia's behavior for exactly what it is: a dangerous spark to be stamped out. Ukraine is succeeding in large part because it took its security seriously. Especially since the 2014 invasion, Ukraine reformed its military training, doctrine, and operations. They abandoned the outdated Soviet model for a more dynamic Western approach. With help from the West, Ukraine invested in its capabilities.

Other allies and partners should heed these lessons sooner rather than later. They should invest in their own defenses, seek interoperability with like-minded partners, and seize opportunities to train with top-tier militaries like our own. We must continue to help them do exactly that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

#### BUFFALO, NEW YORK, SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, I joined with President Biden, Senator GILLIBRAND, and New York officials on one of the most difficult and painful trips imaginable.

Visiting Buffalo 3 days after the worst mass shooting in its history was harrowing. I met a young boy, just 3 years old, who I learned lost his dad on Saturday because his dad was at Tops supermarket buying a birthday cake for the 3-year-old boy—a routine errand for a joyous occasion, something every parent looks forward to. In the blink of an eye, his life was unfairly and cruelly taken away simply because he was Black and in a supermarket.

It is tempting to think that this evil is beyond comprehension, but we know it is just not true. We know the shooter drew from the same wells of hate and White supremacy that inspired other shootings in El Paso, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Charleston, and other communities. By now, we know the shooter was inspired by a deranged conspiracy theory known as the "great replace-

ment." Indeed, in his online posts, he labeled the people he targeted as "replacers."

But the truth is that you don't need to visit the dark corners of the internet to see these White supremacist views anymore. You can find replacement theory on cable networks like FOX News, where Tucker Carlson used White replacement rhetoric on at least 400 episodes of his show. You can hear it at most Trump rallies every time the Republican standard-bearer vilifies undocumented immigrants and spreads the lie that they stole the 2020 election. Last night, the GOP in Pennsylvania nominated a hard-right disciple of the Big Lie as their candidate for Governor. You can also find many examples of replacement theory on Twitter. One House Member said in April that Tucker Carlson "is CORRECT about Replacement Theory as he explains what is happening to America."

The radical views of MAGA Republicans are taking over the GOP like a cancer. We saw it play out earlier this month in the wake of the Supreme Court's possible elimination of Roe, as they suggested national bans on abortion and championed restrictions without exceptions for rape or incest. Now we are seeing it here, as MAGA Republicans openly champion a repressive and conspiratorial view of who deserves to be called American.

To its credit, the Wall Street Journal Editorial Board wrote a few days ago that politicians have an "obligation" to condemn conspiracies like White replacement theory. But 4 days after the shooting in Buffalo, it is dangerous and disturbing to see that many on the right have pointedly refused to condemn replacement theory. This should be the easiest thing in the world to do, but many on the right, including too many in this Chamber, can't seem to bring themselves to say the obvious: that White replacement theory is evil and has no place in our politics, and any candidate or pundit who spreads it should be resoundingly condemned.

We are waiting to hear more of our colleagues condemn the MAGA right and condemn this horrible replacement theory. So far, there is just too much silence, even though a few have.

#### BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. President, on Ukraine, on a different matter, the Senate is moving forward on a number of high-priority items impacting our security, our economic prosperity, and our commitment to take care of veterans. So this is a busy week for the Senate once again.

Tomorrow, I expect the Senate will finish the critical task of approving another round of military, humanitarian, and economic aid for the people of Ukraine. This should already have been done and over with, but it is repugnant that one Member of the other side, the junior Senator from Kentucky, chose to make a show and obstruct Ukraine funding, knowing full well he couldn't actually stop its passage. For Senator PAUL to delay Ukraine funding for

purely political motives is to only strengthen Putin's hand. The majority—vast majority—of Democrats and Republicans want to see this legislation done, and get it done we will, as soon as tomorrow.

Off the floor, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will mark up the nomination of Bridget Brink to serve as U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine. Ms. Brink's nomination is terrific news at a critical moment for Ukraine and the United States. She is deeply experienced. She has already won bipartisan support in this Chamber, and she is very much needed as the United States seeks to strengthen our democratic ties to the war-torn nation. Ms. Brink's nomination will be a top priority to the Senate when she comes before the Chamber.

#### RESTAURANTS

Mr. President, on a different matter—the restaurants bill—tomorrow, the Senate is going to hold a vote on legislation to help our restaurants, gyms, minor league teams, and other small businesses that have been utterly devastated by the COVID pandemic.

This bill, championed by my colleagues Senator CARDIN, a Democrat, and Senator WICKER, a Republican—which I very strongly support—will help restaurants and other small businesses like gyms that were left out in earlier rounds of emergency aid. Every proposal included in this package is bipartisan.

Some have said: Well, COVID is over, and the restaurants are back. I see them sort of full.

That may be true for some restaurants, but for just about every restaurant, there is a shortage of labor, and many are only opening at limited times. Most of the restaurants I speak to are either closed certain days, don't serve lunches, or whatever, because they can't find labor.

Let's not forget that many of the restaurants, particularly the smaller ones, the nonchain ones, had to borrow during COVID, borrow large amounts of money. They need to repay that money, and they can't do it based on their limited incomes that are occurring right now. If they don't get the money to pay it back, the lenders are going to foreclose and close restaurants that are already back on the road to prospering and recovering. That makes no sense.

We must pass this legislation. I hope we will get a good number of our Republican colleagues to join Senator WICKER in supporting this. Two years into this crisis, the idea that restaurant owners have all recovered could not be further from the truth.

Restaurants are part of the fabric of every Main Street and every tight-knit neighborhood. It is where friends run into each other on the weekends, grab a drink after work, have lunch after church. The same can be applied to minor league teams and local gyms and businesses that support theaters. These are places where Americans have always come together.

I was proud to champion the \$28 billion restaurant relief in the American Rescue Plan, but these establishments, as I mentioned, still need our help. Tomorrow, there should be a strong bipartisan show of support to help these businesses.

#### VETERANS

Finally, there is another area that we will be voting on. There is an important announcement this morning for our Nation's veterans. Chairman TESTER and Ranking Member JERRY MORAN of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee will announce a bipartisan proposal on comprehensive legislation to help millions of our Nation's veterans who struggle with sickness because of exposure to toxins during their military service, including exposure to toxic burn pits and Agent Orange.

This has for years—for years—been a top priority of mine. I have worked closely with advocates like VSOs and Jon Stewart and John Feal to get this Senate to act on this long-neglected problem. I am happy to see burn pit legislation has taken an important step closer to passage.

I thank Senators TESTER and MORAN for their good work. I strongly support the agreement reached by TESTER and MORAN, and it is my intention to have this on the floor of the Senate the week that we return from the Memorial Day work period.

Our veterans—we will see them on Memorial Day—are very eager for this bill. I hope veterans throughout the country will let their Senators know how important this legislation is. Our veterans need it, they deserve it, and we have a moral obligation to take care of those who have sacrificed so much for us.

#### TRIBUTE TO SUZIE ORLOVE

Finally, Mr. President, today I want to bring special attention and praise to Suzie Orlove, my beloved and talented and deeply dedicated director of constituent service, who is retiring today after 37 amazing years in my office. Imagine that. She has worked in my office—first as a Congressman, then as Senator—for 37 years.

Suzie and I first met in the second grade in P.S. 19, Miss Ruth Moore's second grade class, and we have been friends ever since. Suzie stood out even in second grade for her compassion and her intellect.

Soon after I was elected to the House, Suzie came to work in my office and dedicated herself to making government work for everyday New Yorkers. She became a healthcare policy expert, navigating Medicaid, Medicare, and facing down often intransigent health insurance companies for constituents who often face life-and-death challenges. She became a maven navigating the bureaucracy of Social Security for our seniors and disabled. Year after year, Suzie oversaw the process of interviewing and nominating extraordinary young New Yorkers to our military academies.

The list of people she has helped is practically endless. All across New York, there are so many people who are grateful to Suzie Orlove for helping them in ways when they really needed help. She is amazing, as is the number of staffers she helped train to serve New Yorkers with diligence. She trained my staff—everyone who came in—but she also gave lots of advice to the staff of other of my colleagues, first in Congress and now in the Senate.

She is amazing—amazing.

Suzie Orlove, every day you came into work, you were dedicated to helping people—something that has always been a part of you. You were the strong glue in the office, teaching so many others who came and went how to help people, do casework, and do it with fierce dedication but a friendly smile as well.

All our office staff—past, present, and future—are grateful to Suzie for who she is and what she has done.

Suzie, thank you for your service. To quote the old song, "We're gonna miss you when you're gone."

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the majority leader reminds us of the tragedy that occurred in Buffalo over the weekend and how the shooter was somehow captivated by the notion of replacement theory—a theory which is so insane and so mean-spirited that it ignores what this country is all about.

A few minutes ago, over at what they call the House swamp, we held a press conference. Senator ALEX PADILLA of California, myself, Congresswoman ROSS, and Congressman BERA met with a group of young people. There were about 50 of them. Some were high school age; some were in college. They are the sons and daughters of people who came to the United States on H-1B visas. These are visas where people are allowed to come here for a period of years and work, and the visas can be renewed.

Children and families who accompany them are growing up in America, living in America, while the breadwinner goes off to work each day, but the clock is ticking. When the kids of these visa holders reach the age of 21, they are subject to self-deportation. In other words, they have no legal rights in America to remain.

The reason that they are in suspense for so long is that the green card backlog can be decades while the parents are waiting for permission to become legal in the United States on a permanent basis. So these young people live in uncertainty.

Senator PADILLA's bill is an effort—and I join with him in that bill—an effort to give them the opportunity to earn their way to citizenship, to become legal in America. Why would we give up this talent? These young people have grown up in America. They have

been successful in school. They have participated in community activities. They are ready to be part of America's future, I can tell.

One young woman got up there and told the story of how she came to California with her parents under similar circumstances. She now is completing her Ph.D. in biochemistry at Cornell University. She wants to go into cancer research. Is America better if we force her to leave this country at this point? She doesn't think so. She thinks she can make this a better nation and better world if she can stay in America.

The folks who are so dead set against immigration ought to just pause for a moment and meet the people we are talking about, the people who are coming into this country, taking the jobs which Americans don't want to take, doing things which Americans aspire to but don't achieve, and many other aspects of our life that are really enriched by their presence.

So I would urge my colleagues to support us in this bipartisan effort for this bill. But I would also urge them to step back and make it clear, the "replacement theory" is an insane approach to America. It ignores our history; it ignores our future; and it ignores the reality of our economy today.

#### E-CIGARETTES

Mr. President, my family, like many families in America, has been touched by tobacco-related disease and death. My father died of lung cancer when I was 14 years old—he was 53. Two packs of Camels a day, he got lung cancer and died at that age. I still remember it to this day, even though it happened over 60 years ago. I am not alone in that. There are so many families that can tell that story, sadly.

And because of it, I have really focused on stopping Big Tobacco from addicting more and more Americans and sentencing them to death, in many instances, because of their deadly products.

Over the years, I have had some success. It was over 25 years ago that I banned smoking on airplanes. Senator Frank Lautenberg picked up the bill over here on the Senate side, carried it successfully, and it was signed into law.

It changed—we didn't realize it at the time, it just changed America's attitude toward smoking. It was, indeed, a tipping point. But I have been watching Big Tobacco ever since. Their approach to building their market is very basic. They have to lure children into the addiction. Kids that are not mature enough to say no pick up the addiction of smoking and end up carrying it to their graves, if they are not careful.

And so we have, over the years, put warnings on cigarette packages, raised the price beyond the reach of children, and done everything that we could.

Well, these Big Tobacco interests are not discouraged. They found a new product that is wildly popular among

young people that creates a similar addiction. It's called e-cigarettes or vaping. Ask any of your kids in high school, ask the teachers in the schools and the principals, what is going on with vaping in your schools today? You will find it's wildly popular, and kids are taking it up. And many of them switch from the vaping products to tobacco products and, ultimately, at the expense of their health.

That is what has happened. So we basically said to the Food and Drug Administration: You have a responsibility to regulate this. They can't put their products on the shelves without you taking a look at it.

Well, let me tell you the story of what has happened. These companies have flooded the market with addictive vaping devices, companies like JUUL, which is partially owned by the tobacco companies, and they promoted their products to children.

For years, none of these devices were legally authorized, and, yet, they have poisoned the developing brains and bodies of our kids. Who was supposed to be the cop on the beat? The Food and Drug Administration in Washington, but they were nowhere to be found. After years and years of the FDA failing to regulate e-cigarettes—listen to this—a Federal district court stepped in and mandated that the Food and Drug Administration fulfill its statutory public health duty.

On Friday, the Food and Drug Administration submitted an update on its Agency's long overdue review of e-cigarette applications.

Listen to this. In it, the Food and Drug Administration admitted it will not finish reviewing e-cigarettes until July 2023, nearly two years past the Court's deadline of last September. This is a stunning disclosure.

This means that JUUL and other e-cigarettes that kids get hooked on in the nicotine contained in the product and which have not received an authorization from the FDA may continue to be sold with impunity for more than a year. Imagine the thousands of students who will become addicted to these products while the FDA dawdles.

What is most incredible to me is that this outcome is not inevitable. In fact, if it wanted to, the Food and Drug Administration, before the end of business today, could remove these products by regulation from the shelves of America.

That is right: Addictive e-cigarettes like JUUL are only on store shelves because the FDA has given tobacco companies a free pass to sell their vaping products.

This is just wrong. This is exactly the opposite of the intent of the law. With this decision, the FDA is complicit in endangering the health of America's kids. That is a powerful statement, but I stand by it.

The law is very clear, no tobacco product is supposed to be on store shelves unless its manufacturer proves to the FDA, prior to marketing, that it is appropriate for public health.

How in the world could you prove that a vaping cigarette, e-cigarette, is in some way appropriate for the protection of public health? It is just the opposite, and we all know it.

So today I am beginning by calling on the FDA to immediately halt its enforcement discretion and remove all unauthorized e-cigarettes from the market. Don't allow JUUL and the other tobacco companies one more day of addicting our children. Stop cowering before Big Tobacco's highly paid lawyers.

We have seen too many years of delay by the FDA to the point where the Court had to order them to finally exercise their obligations under the law, and we have seen too many kids hooked on e-cigarettes. If the Food and Drug Administration needs more time to review applications, protect our kids, and clear the market of big tobacco's poison while you are doing it—nothing less than the health and well-being of our children is on the line.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. 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.

#### AGRICULTURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, farming and ranching are industries that are particularly subject to the whims of the weather. Just one storm can wipe out an entire herd or crop, sometimes in a matter of minutes.

Last Thursday, several storms struck eastern South Dakota and farmers were hit hard. Fortunately, it was too early in the season to wipe out any crops, but farmers lost essential equipment and resources, feed, grain bins, outbuildings, and more.

My office will be doing everything it can to make sure those affected get the assistance they need to recover, and I know many are already planning to rebuild. Whether it is a natural disaster or an ordinary day, farmers and ranchers are always at the top of my mind here in the Senate. Agriculture is the lifeblood of our South Dakota economy, and I am committed to doing everything I can to ensure that our farmers and ranchers have the resources they need to help feed our country.

I am fortunate enough to be a longtime member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, which gives me an important platform in which to address the needs of South Dakota ag producers. Right now, a big focus of mine is the 2023 farm bill.

I have already held the first of a series of roundtables to hear from South Dakota farmers and ranchers about what they need out of the 2023 farm bill. And I have introduced the first of what will be a number of proposals

that I hope to get included in next year's legislation.

My Conservation Reserve Program Improvement Act, which I introduced in March, would make CRP grazing a more attractive option by providing cost-share payments for all CRP practices for the establishment of grazing infrastructure, including fencing and water distribution.

It would also increase the annual payment limit for CRP, which hasn't been changed since 1985, to help account for inflation and the increase in land value.

I am also working with colleagues from agriculture States on legislation based on my conversations with South Dakota farmers and ranchers. In fact, last week I joined Senator KLOBUCHAR to introduce the Agriculture Innovation Act.

Currently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture collects reams of data on conservation practices. The problem is that a lot of this data is often not analyzed and presented in a way that would be useful for farmers and ranchers.

The legislation Senator KLOBUCHAR and I have introduced would provide for better processing and development of the data that the USDA collects so that farmers and ranchers can evaluate the impact of conservation and other production practices on things like soil health, crop yields, and profitability.

Our bill would make it easier for farmers and ranchers to decide what conservation practices to adopt by, among other things, helping producers identify the ways adopting conservation practices can improve their bottom line.

And Senator KLOBUCHAR and I will be working to get this legislation included in the 2023 farm bill. In addition to farm bill priorities, I have been spending a lot of time focused on agriculture and trade. Our nation's farmers and ranchers already send their products around the globe. But with Russia's war in Ukraine and its devastating impact on Ukrainian agriculture, American ag producers are facing an added responsibility when it comes to feeding the world.

Unfortunately, for some time now I have been hearing reports of ocean carriers refusing to transport American agricultural products. This would be a difficult situation at any time as export markets around the world are critically important to American producers, but it is particularly painful at a time when inflation is soaring and the supply chain is under significant strain and when there is an increased need to get American agricultural products abroad—thanks to the war in Ukraine. And that is why I introduced legislation, the Ocean Shipping Reform Act, to address these kinds of shipping problems and create a more level playing field for American agricultural producers.

My bipartisan legislation would give the Federal Maritime Commission in-

creased authority to respond to unfair ocean carrier practices, whether that involves a refusal to carry certain cargo, like agricultural commodities, or discriminating against certain commodities for export.

It would also provide the FMC with tools to more quickly resolve attention and demurrage disputes, which would bring greater efficiency and transparency to a process that leaves many shippers frustrated, especially agriculture producers and other small businesses.

I was very pleased that the Senate passed my bill at the end of March, and I am working with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to advance this legislation so we can get it to the President's desk.

I also recently led a letter with 23 of my Senate Republican colleagues to the U.S. Trade Representative and the Secretary of Agriculture, urging them to prioritize increased access to foreign markets for American producers, including—and especially—American ag producers.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration has not made market access commitments a priority in its trade agenda, including the proposed Indo-Pacific economic framework. And the administration has failed to pursue any ambitious market-opening initiatives or comprehensive trade agreements.

Trade has played a large part in America's economic success for decades, and it is critical for American ag producers who depend on exporting their products. It is unacceptable that the administration has dropped the ball in pursuing increased market access for American producers.

I am also less than impressed by the President's failure to put forward a confirmable nominee for the post of Chief Agricultural Negotiator at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

And while the President has finally put forward a nominee for Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs at the Department of Agriculture, it has taken him far too long to fill this position, which plays a critical role in advocating for American producers when it comes to world trade.

I pressed the U.S. Trade Representative on the administration's failure to prioritize a meaningful trade and agricultural agenda during a recent Finance Committee hearing, and I will continue to maintain pressure on the administration to expand export opportunities for our Nation's workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses.

Our Nation depends on our farmers and ranchers, and I am profoundly grateful for all the determined men and women who have chosen and passed on this way of life. I am honored to represent South Dakota's farmers and ranchers here in the Senate, and I will continue to do everything I can to ensure that they have all the resources they need to continue to feed our Nation and the world.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, the conventional wisdom is that one of the adaptations that helped humans separate ourselves from all other species is this—the opposable thumb. The theory goes that the transformation of the thumb, able to operate by itself independently from the rest of our fingers, allowed humans to be able to manipulate objects with a level of precision and dexterity that was previously unseen in the animal kingdom, and this newly nimble hand allowed humans to, for instance, more easily catch fish and open fruit, pull out the seeds, this newfound bounty of fats and proteins. It vaulted the human brain into developmental overdrive.

But about 10 years ago, biologist David Carrier, a longtime student of the evolution of the human hand, proposed a different theory. What if the primary utility of the opposable thumb was not to do this, but instead this. The ability to tuck your thumb into the middle of your four fingers immediately gave humans a more effective fighting tool—important, since we lacked tusks or fangs or claws like other animals.

Maybe the development that mattered most to human development was the one that allowed us to become more effective fighters not just with predators but with ourselves because from the beginning, as a species, humans have been drawn to violence. In fact, there are few species, few mammals, that are more violent than humans.

There is a really interesting study of intraspecies violence, meaning when you conduct a violent act against another member of your species, and these researchers looked at over 1,000 mammals.

What is interesting is that 60 percent of mammals actually have zero intraspecies violence—bats and whales, they never attack each other. That tells you something, in and of itself; that it is not endemic to mammals to be violent.

But what the data showed is that right at the top of that list of those 1,000 species, when it came to the rates of intraspecies violence—humans.

Biologists trace our violence back to our earliest days. Without those tusks or fangs, humans could really only survive by grouping ourselves tightly together. We were quickly rewarded socially and materially for joining up in groups.

But with resources scarce in the early human world to survive, you had to find a group, and then you had to defend it—defend it against other humans who were competing with you for those same resources.

Intertribal violence was epidemic in this world in the early days of humans. In the bronze age, estimates suggest that one out of every three humans

died a violent death at the hands of another human.

Records suggest that in pre-Columbian America, as many as one out of four Native Americans died violently. The primary reason? Humans have an in-group bias. To survive in those early days, we needed to group ourselves tightly together and view with fear and skepticism members of other outside groups who were competitors for those scarce resources.

And centuries and centuries of human development have hardwired this in-group bias, this anxiety about out groups into our genetics.

One 2012 study determined that today, when an individual first meets a person who is perceived to be outside of one's defined social group, individuals demonstrate immediate, almost automatic instinct of anxiety and a surge of intention to act on that anxiety. It is not conscious; it is genetic.

And so if humans are hardwired to view out-group members as suspicious and to act on those suspicions, sometimes violently, then America was destined, by design, to be an abnormally violent place.

Now, why do I say that?

First, let's just be totally honest with ourselves. Our Nation was founded through the use of mass-scale violence. There are lots of people who are trying to erase these parts of our history as if there is some weakness in admitting the truth about our past. That is ridiculous. We should just tell the truth about our history, and the truth is that we exterminated Native Americans in order to gain control of this land. We enslaved millions of Africans and used daily epidemic levels of violence—beatings, whippings, lynchings—to keep these people enslaved. From the start, we were a nation bathed in violence, and we became a little immune, a little anesthetized to violence in those early days.

And our decision to build a melting pot of ethnicities and races and religions—it is our genius, right? It is our superpower as a nation. It is why we catapulted the rest of the world to economic and political dominance, but it also set us up as a nation with built-in rivalries, with easily defined groupings and easily exploited suspicions of those who aren't part of your group.

This combination—epidemic levels of violence in our early days that continued throughout our history and built-in tensions between easily defined groups—ensured that America would be a place with a higher tolerance for and a higher risk of violence.

OK. That is the end of the history lesson, but it is important to set this frame because this generation, our generation of Americans—we inherited this history. We can't do anything about that. We were born into and became citizens of a nation with a past—a past that does make us a little bit more prone to violence than other places.

The question really is simply this: What are we going to do? Do we ac-

knowledge this lean toward violence and take steps to mitigate it? That, of course, would be the commonsense approach.

Instead, we have done the opposite. Throughout American history, hateful, demagogic leaders have found political capital to be gained by playing upon people's instinct to fear others who aren't part of their group—again, so easy in a multicultural America. From Orval Faubus to Richard Nixon, to Donald Trump, there is an ugly tradition in American politics of leaders trying to drum up irrational fears of Blacks or immigrants or Muslims, gay people or Hispanics or Jews. Racism, xenophobia, homophobia—they have all been tools of leaders who seek to build followings by convincing people to organize around their fear or hatred of others.

The Buffalo shooter's manifesto is a tribute to this tradition, but he is not alone. The FBI's latest hate crimes report shows a dramatic spike in this country in crimes of bigotry and racism. Most alarming was a 40-percent increase in 2020 in hate crimes against Black Americans, foreshadowing the Buffalo attack.

And this shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone. The most visible political figure in America—Donald Trump—has spent the last decade relentlessly spreading the gospel of fear and anxiety and hate. His campaign rollout in 2015 was centered around hyping the threat to America from Mexican immigrants. His most significant campaign policy proposal was to ban all people from the country who practice a certain religion.

There is a straight line from this embrace of racism and fear to the increase in violence in this country. I know many of my Republican colleagues don't use the same terminology, the same language that Trump does, but they know the danger he poses to this Nation. They know that his movement is egging on violence, and they do nothing about it. They still accept him as the leader of the party, when they had a chance to get rid of him after January 6. Republicans go to Florida to kiss the ring. They appear on FOX shows that spread this message. They empower the message.

Knowing America's natural predilection toward violence, Republicans could have chosen to embrace leaders who seek to unite us, who would choose to push back against this tendency for Americans to be wary of each other. Instead, they did the opposite, and we are paying a price.

The other way that our Nation could have chosen to mitigate our violent instincts is to make sure that when American violence does occur, it does the least damage possible. This is commonly referred to in public health circles as harm reduction. If you can't completely and totally prevent the harm, then make sure that it is glancing rather than catastrophic.

Instead, America, once again, has adopted the opposite strategy—a strat-

egy of harm maximization. We are, as I have told you, a historically violent nation. We know this. And instead of trying to mitigate for this history, we choose to arm our citizenry to the teeth with the most dangerous, the most lethal weapons imaginable, to make sure that when conflict does occur, it ends up with as many people dying as possible. That is a choice that we have made.

The jumping-off point in the choice was in the mid-19th century, when Hartford, CT, inventor Samuel Colt built the first repeating revolver, allowing Americans to hide an incredibly lethal weapon in their coat pocket. All of a sudden, drunken street corner arguments, which used to result in a few awkward punches thrown, became deadly. And nearly every other country in the high-income world at this point, in the mid-1800s, saw this danger, and so they decided to regulate the handgun and the weapons that came after to make sure that those arguments stayed fist fights rather than shootouts.

But America took the other path. We let these weapons spread across the Nation. And then, as much more deadly guns were developed for the military, our Nation decided to go its own way again and let citizens own and operate these weapons too.

The result is, of course, a nation that is awash in guns, with no comparison—no comparison—in the high-income world. We have more guns in this country on our streets than human beings, than American citizens. So it is no wonder that in this Nation, everyday arguments seamlessly turn into gunfights, passing suicidal thoughts result in lives ended, and hateful racists can kill efficiently by the dozens.

I think about September 14, 2012, all the time. That is the day that a gunman, armed with an assault weapon and 30-round magazines, walked into Sandy Hook Elementary School and in less than 5 minutes, killed 20 kids and 6 educators. Think about that. The military weapons that this guy was able to own legally killed 26 people in under 5 minutes. The gun he used was so powerful that not a single child who was shot survived. Those bullets moved so fast, so lethally through their little bodies, it just tore them to shreds.

But on that same day in China, a similarly deranged young man entered a similarly nondescript school and attacked almost the identical number of people, but in that Chinese classroom, every single one of those 23 people who that man attacked survived. Why? Because in China the attacker had a knife, not a military-grade assault weapon.

Like I said, I wish this weren't true, but our Nation has, from the jump, been more violent than other countries. I can't, you can't, none of us can erase this history. And I come to the floor today to be honest about the parts of the American story that lead to these high levels of violence that we

can control and the parts that we can't control. It is up to us whether we want to spend every hour of every day trying to mitigate this predilection toward violence or whether we want to choose to exacerbate it.

Fueling the kind of racist, hateful, fear-your-neighbor demagoguery practiced by Donald Trump exacerbates American violence. Doing nothing year after year about the flow of illegal and high-powered weapons into our streets exacerbates American violence. These are choices we are making.

Kids living in fear that their classroom is the next one to get shot up, that is not inevitable; that is a choice. Black shoppers looking over their shoulder, wondering whether this is the day that they die, that doesn't have to be our reality; that is a choice.

We can look into the flames of American violence, this fire that has been burning since our inception, and we can choose to douse the fire or we can choose to continue to pour fuel on top of it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

(The remarks of Ms. STABENOW pertaining to the introduction of S. 4257 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will consider three outstanding nominees to the Federal district courts.

All three nominees are eminently qualified for the Federal bench and have the character and judicial temperament to serve with distinction. The nominees likewise represent important progress in ensuring that the Federal judiciary reflects the nation it serves.

First is Jennifer Rochon, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Today, Ms. Rochon serves as the first general counsel of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, a role she first assumed in 2013. She provides guidance, strategic insight, and legal counsel on a wide range of issues, and she also advises the Girl Scouts' board of directors on their fiduciary duties.

Prior to joining the organization, Ms. Rochon was a partner at Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP and a general commercial litigator, experience that will serve her well on the district court. Notably, she was also elected by Kramer Levin's partnership to be the first woman to serve on the firm's executive committee.

Over the course of her career, Ms. Rochon has advocated for gender equality and the advancement of women in the legal profession. She is yet another example of President Biden's commitment to a professionally diverse, exceptionally qualified judiciary, and I know she will serve the Southern District of New York well.

Ms. Rochon has the strong support of her home State Senators, Mr. SCHUMER and Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and she was unanimously rated "Well Qualified" by the American Bar Association.

Given the depth of her experience and her demonstrated prowess in the law, I am proud to support Ms. Rochon's nomination, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Our next nominee is Judge Trina Thompson. With 14 years as a trial litigator and over 21 years of service to the Alameda County Superior Court, Judge Thompson is unquestionably qualified to serve as a Federal district court judge.

She began her legal career as an assistant public defender at the Alameda County Public Defender's Office, where she tried over 35 cases as sole counsel over the course of 4 years. She then spent 10 years as a criminal defense solo practitioner, trying over 30 additional cases as sole counsel and another eight cases as cocounsel.

Back in 2000, the Alameda County Superior Court Judges appointed Judge Thompson to serve as a juvenile court commissioner on the Dependency and Delinquency Court. Just 2 years later, she was elected as an Alameda County Superior Court Judge, a role she continues to hold to this day.

Throughout her 22 years of judicial service, Judge Thompson has presided over 150 criminal jury trials, thousands of hearings, and hundreds of criminal and civil bench trials.

With her incredible depth of trial experience on and off the bench, it is no surprise that this Bay Area native, who earned both her A.B. and her J.D. from the University of California at Berkeley, has the strong support of her home State Senators, Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mr. PADILLA.

It is also no wonder that the American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Thompson as "Well Qualified."

The decades of trial litigation and judicial experience that Judge Thomas has accumulated will be an immense asset to the Northern District of California, which has a number of vacancies that urgently need to be filled by qualified judges.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her confirmation.

Finally, the Senate will vote on Judge Sunshine Sykes, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

Judge Sykes is an experienced litigator and jurist with a long record of unbiased decision-making. She attended Stanford University and Stanford Law School before beginning her legal career with a focus on civil litigation and juvenile dependency cases. She served as a staff attorney for California Indian Legal Services; worked for the juvenile defense panel in Murrieta, CA; and served as a deputy county counsel in Riverside County.

In 2013, Sykes was appointed to serve as a California Superior Court judge.

As a member of the Navajo Nation, she was the first Native American individual to sit on the Riverside Superior Court. During her time as a Superior Court judge, she has presided over more than 90 cases that have gone to verdict or judgment and over thousands of additional hearings.

Judge Sykes has the strong support of Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator PADILLA, and she was unanimously rated "Well Qualified" by the American Bar Association. If confirmed, she will be the first Native American article III judge to serve in California.

Her record on the bench is deeply impressive, and she will continue to administer justice in a thoughtful, evenhanded manner as a district court judge. I will vote to confirm her to the Central District of California. I hope my colleagues join me in doing the same.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer Louise Rochon, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

#### VOTE ON ROCHON NOMINATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rochon nomination?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Ex.]

#### YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hassan	Ossoff
Bennet	Heinrich	Padilla
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Sinema
Collins	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Graham	Murray	Wyden

#### NAYS—47

Barrasso	Capito	Cruz
Blackburn	Cassidy	Daines
Blunt	Cornyn	Ernst
Boozman	Cotton	Fischer
Braun	Cramer	Grassley
Burr	Crapo	Hagerty



Hawley	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Hoeben	Moran	Shelby
Hyde-Smith	Paul	Sullivan
Inhofe	Portman	Thune
Johnson	Risch	Tillis
Kennedy	Romney	Toomey
Lankford	Rounds	Tuberville
Lee	Rubio	Wicker
Lummis	Sasse	Young
Marshall	Scott (FL)	

## NOT VOTING—2

Rosen	Van Hollen
-------	------------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

## 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 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. 847, Barbara A. Leaf, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Martin Heinrich, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Dianne Feinstein, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Angus S. King, Jr., Bernard Sanders, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Michael F. Bennet, Christopher A. Coons.

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 Barbara A. Leaf, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Ex.]

## YEAS—54

Baldwin	Duckworth	Leahy
Bennet	Durbin	Lujan
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Manchin
Booker	Gillibrand	Markey
Brown	Hassan	McConnell
Cantwell	Heinrich	Menendez
Cardin	Hickenlooper	Merkley
Carpenter	Hirono	Murkowski
Casey	Kaine	Murphy
Collins	Kelly	Murray
Coons	King	Osoff
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Padilla

Paul	Schatz	Tester
Peters	Schumer	Warner
Portman	Shaheen	Warren
Reed	Sinema	Whitehouse
Romney	Smith	Wyden
Sanders	Stabenow	

## NAYS—43

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Rounds
Blunt	Grassley	Rubio
Boozman	Hagerty	Sasse
Braun	Hawley	Scott (FL)
Burr	Hoeben	Scott (SC)
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Shelby
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sullivan
Cornyn	Johnson	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Toomey
Cramer	Lankford	Tuberville
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	Lummis	Young
Daines	Marshall	
Ernst	Moran	

## NOT VOTING—3

Rosen	Tillis	Van Hollen
-------	--------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays 43.

The motion is agreed to.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:23 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KING).

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—(Continued)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

## JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, for many people—not just here in and around the Capitol but across the country—the past few weeks have been a wake-up call—a wake-up call to see the stakes of our fight for a fair judiciary.

From abortion rights to free speech to gun violence, Federal judges make countless decisions that impact our daily lives. We have been reminded of that in a very significant way. But our current Federal bench is not representative of the diversity of our country and our democracy. We have a lot of work to do to rebuild the judiciary in a way that deserves the faith of the American people, to build a judiciary that reflects and represents the diverse Nation that it serves.

I know we have talked about it before. We have been chipping away at it, not just through the Judiciary Committee but through a number of circuit court judges and district court judges across the country, including in California.

I am certainly proud of the significant step that we took recently with the confirmation of soon-to-be Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson. But for all the progress we have made this last year, we still have a lot of work to do, especially at the lower court level, where almost all Federal cases are heard. Many are decided there, and that is it.

That is why I continue to work closely with the Biden administration to recommend and support talented nomi-

nees for California's district courts—nominees who will bring a wide range of professional and lived experiences to the Federal bench.

So, today, I rise to highlight three outstanding nominees to California's district courts.

First, the Senate will soon vote on the confirmation of Judge Trina Thompson to become a judge for the Northern District of California.

Judge Thompson has deep roots serving the community of Alameda County. After earning her undergraduate degree and her JD from UC Berkeley, she began her legal career with the Alameda County Public Defender's Office; and, eventually, she built a successful solo practice in criminal defense.

Over the next decade, she handled dozens of criminal trials, and she continued to work with the county public defender's office to take on pro bono clients in the community. A legal trailblazer, Judge Thompson became the first Black woman to win election to serve as a judge in Alameda County. She has continuously demonstrated her sense of fairness, her commitment to justice, and her dedication to the rule of law. I know that Judge Thompson will continue to pave the road for equal justice on the Northern District bench.

I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Second, the Senate will also soon vote on Judge Sunshine Sykes' confirmation to become a judge for the Central District of California.

A member of the Coyote Pass Clan of the Navajo Nation, Judge Sykes is devoted to pursuing justice, especially for those who have too often been left behind by the legal system.

Judge Sykes earned her undergraduate degree and her JD from Stanford University. After law school, she chose to begin her legal career working for the California Indian Legal Services. There, she built a tremendous reputation as a skillful adviser and advocate for Tribes on a wide range of legal matters, from addressing domestic violence to developing Tribal courts and preserving cultural resources. She also developed an important expertise in juvenile dependency cases under the Indian Child Welfare Act.

Recognizing Judge Sykes' outstanding work, then Governor Jerry Brown appointed her to the California Superior Court in 2013. Over the past 9 years, she has presided over nearly 100 cases.

She will bring an impressive legal record, work ethic, and an appropriate sense of empathy to her judgeship in the central district.

If confirmed, Judge Sykes will also be the first Native American to ever serve on a Federal court in California. I will remind us that California is home to more federally recognized Native American Tribes than any State in the Nation.

I look forward to her distinguished service in the central district.

Finally, I would like to speak for a moment, as well, about Judge Sherilyn



Peace Garnett, who was confirmed last month to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

Judge Garnett brings an outstanding record as a lawyer, as a jurist, and a public servant committed to equal justice.

Judge Garnett earned her undergraduate degree from UC Riverside and her JD from Harvard Law School. After starting her career in private practice, Judge Garnett became an assistant U.S. attorney for the Central District of California. She spent 13 years serving that office, earning numerous awards and rising to a number of leadership positions.

Recognizing her hard work and record of excellence as a litigator, Governor Brown appointed Judge Garnett to the Los Angeles Superior Court in 2014.

For 8 years, she served with distinction as a superior court judge and a justice pro tem on the California Court of Appeal. She now brings this experience to the Federal bench as a judge for the central district.

Voices like hers—and the voices like that of Judge Thompson and Judge Sykes—have been left out of the judiciary for far too long. All three of these nominations of outstanding women, women of color, represent important progress. So I celebrate each of these jurists, and I thank them for their willingness to serve.

With each of their confirmations, we take another important step closer to the fair judiciary that this Nation deserves, toward the justice system that our democracy deserves.

Mr. President, I am so proud of the progress we have made in California. I look forward to working with you and our colleagues and with the Biden administration to continue this important work.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor our brave, hard-working men and women in law enforcement as we celebrate their service during National Police Week.

This week, thousands of law enforcement officers and their families will visit our Nation's Capitol to honor those who serve and those who have made the ultimate sacrifice to keep our community safe.

Over the past year, North Carolina has tragically lost three law enforcement officers in the line of duty. This doesn't include the numerous law enforcement officers who have also lost their lives over the last year due to other causes, including some due to COVID-19.

But I would like to take a moment to honor the three officers who lost their lives while protecting those they served.

Last October, we lost Ryan Hayworth of the Knightdale Police Department

after his patrol vehicle was hit by a drunk driver.

Officer Hayworth was only 23 years old, and he had already established a distinguished record of service. He was in the U.S. Army and the National Guard.

He answered the call again by becoming a police officer, following in the footsteps of his father, who was a longtime chief of the Zebulon Police Department, and his brother, who is a firefighter.

Last December, only 2 days before Christmas, in my home county of Mecklenburg, we grieved the loss of CMPD Officer Mia Danielle Figueroa-Goodwin.

Officer Figueroa-Goodwin, only 33, tragically was killed when a tractor trailer hit her patrol car as she was working to keep drivers safe following a previous crash.

Officer Figueroa-Goodwin had served CMPD for 6 years. She had a beautiful family, survived by her husband and three young children, including a four-month-old baby.

In January, we lost North Carolina State Trooper John Horton in a tragic accident with another patrol vehicle as the area was faced with icy and dangerous driving conditions. The accident also tragically took the life of another driver.

Trooper Horton had served for 15 years, and he is survived by his wife and 6 children.

The incredible sacrifice of our brave men and women in blue can take many forms. Last month, an act of incredible bravery by North Carolina State Patrol Trooper Cody Thao captivated North Carolinians. When a suspected drunk driver's car was barreling the wrong way down a highway exit ramp, Trooper Thao bravely put himself and his patrol car in the way to stop the driver from hurting or possibly killing others. Instead of speeding the wrong way on the highway, the suspect was stopped by Trooper Thao's split-second decision to angle his car and let the car hit his patrol car.

This act was filmed by Trooper Thao's dashboard camera, and his bravery has been broadcast literally to the world.

Trooper Thao's selfless decision undoubtedly saved lives and serves as a reminder of the danger our law enforcement community faces each and every day to keep us safe.

I am deeply encouraged by the outpouring of support from North Carolina communities for our brave, hard-working law enforcement officers. And I should say that I am happy to see the same across all States in the Nation.

But there are some folks who want to talk about anti-police policies. I don't think people back home in North Carolina or across the United States are buying it. I believe most people back home and across this beautiful country respect and support law enforcement.

The American people understand that law enforcement officers make our

communities safer and stronger. They understand that proposals to abolish and defund the police are out of touch with reality. The reality is that rhetorical attacks on law enforcement only serve to encourage physical attacks on law enforcement.

FBI Director Chris Wray raised the alarm just a few weeks ago when he told the American people that "Violence against law enforcement in this country is one of the biggest phenomenon that I think doesn't get enough attention." I agree with Director Wray.

While attacks on our brave men and women in blue may not get enough attention in the national press, our local communities recognize the tremendous sacrifice given by those who protect and serve.

We must stop the tide of violence against law enforcement in this country. That is why I am proud to have introduced the Protect and Serve Act. This commonsense legislation would make it a Federal crime to intentionally assault a law enforcement officer. This bill has also received bipartisan support in the past and, I believe, would make a strong statement to criminals that assaulting law enforcement is inexcusable.

With the Protect and Serve Act, criminals would be on notice that an assault on law enforcement is an assault on all Americans.

Each year, we take this week to celebrate those who serve and protect public safety.

These heroes deserve our gratitude 24/7, 365. I hope my colleagues will help me fight for the men and women in blue. They need us more than ever.

As I often say when I am back in the State of North Carolina, if you get an opportunity to see a law enforcement officer today, thank them for their sacrifice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### ISSUES FACING AMERICA

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, etched in marble above the chair you are sitting in is the Latin phrase "E Pluribus Unum," meaning "out of many, one."

Despite our differences, the union among our respective States as a single nation expressed by this motto has endured for nearly 250 years. The principles of liberty and equality upon which our Nation was conceived have not only survived but continued to flourish and expand from one generation to the next.

Many of us who are Members of this body would not have been eligible to cast a vote, much less serve in Congress, not so long ago. We stand here as real, live proof that the American experiment in self-determination has been a success unlike any other in history. This triumph has been made possible by the institutions established by our Founders to serve as guardrails to ensure liberty and maintain order while preventing tyranny.

Today more than ever, those institutions are under attack by the intrusion

of a woke counterculture that has taken over the Democratic Party. They condemn America as culpable rather than exceptional and embrace socialism, a system in which government controls everything.

Under the spell of these radical elements, the Democrats have unleashed a strange multiverse of madness in which reality no longer has meaning and the foundations upon which our Nation was built are being turned upside down and inside out or destroyed altogether.

The left tells us to trust the science and to believe all women—yet they can't even define what a woman is—and that criminals are victims and the law enforcement officers who risk their own lives every day to protect us are somehow the real perpetrators of injustice. Now they want Washington to be the arbiter of truth. That is right, folks. The Department of Homeland Security, which should be focused on securing our borders, is now trying to police what the Biden administration deems disinformation. It sounds like a novel idea, and by that, I mean George Orwell's novel "1984" in which the Ministry of Truth pushed state propaganda which was the exact opposite of truth.

This attempt to control what you can and cannot say is not only an attack on our First Amendment, which guarantees freedom of speech and the press, but an assault on truth itself. We don't need anyone in Washington—especially Joe Biden, who is factually challenged himself—telling us how to think or what to say. That may be how things are run in socialist countries like Russia and China but not in America, the land of the free.

The Senate itself is a prime target of this effort to undermine America's institutions by silencing opposing views. The Democrats are determined to end the Senate's long tradition of unlimited debate that has long guaranteed all voices can be heard. Senator SCHUMER once said that eliminating the filibuster would be "a doomsday for democracy." He then ignored his own apocalyptic warning by voting to nuke the filibuster for executive and judicial nominations. In doing so, the Democrats, minus JOE MANCHIN, threw away the only leverage the minority party in the Senate has to influence Presidential appointments, including life-long terms on the Court.

You would think they would have learned their lesson about how shortsighted that decision was, but they haven't. Now Senator SCHUMER is determined to do away with the legislative filibuster so he can push through the Democrats' radical plan to remake America by giving Washington control of how voters select their representatives and stacking the Supreme Court with liberal Justices who will legislate from the Bench rather than interpret the law through the lens of the Constitution.

Democrats have long been working to discredit and undermine the independence and legitimacy of the Supreme

Court. The Senate majority leader himself has publicly issued personal threats against specific Justices, warning that if they do not rule as he desired, they will "pay the price."

Earlier this month, for the first time ever, a draft opinion of a pending case before the Supreme Court was leaked to the media. Chief Justice John Roberts called the unprecedented breach of the Court's confidential deliberations a "betrayal of the confidences of the Court . . . intended to undermine the integrity of our operations."

Following the cues from the majority leader, radical activists are harassing Supreme Court Justices in an effort to intimidate and influence their verdict.

Folks, this madness has got to end. This woke crowd is living in an alternate universe that is devoid of reality where our Nation and those who founded it are now the enemy. It is all very strange because no serious study of history can look at the impact made by our great Nation, especially in the last century, and conclude that the world is not considerably better off as a result of the American Revolution.

America led the world to end fascism, defeat communism, and counter terrorism. At home, we expanded the right to vote and ended segregation. And there are countless brave men and women from all walks of life who have answered the call of our Nation, who are stationed around the globe at this very moment, ready to sacrifice all to defend freedom and stop tyranny.

Our system of self-government has lived up to and surpassed the promise of our Founders to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

All of this will be lost if we give in to the demands of the angry woke mob, which seeks to destroy the foundations that have long guided us and held us together as one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Utah.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the basic purpose and function of the U.S. Constitution is to protect the American people from the dangerous accumulation of power at the hands of the few. You see, that kind of protection is necessary to make us free. In that respect, it is the structure of our government, set forth in the Constitution, that truly makes us free. It is the bulwark against what would rob us of our freedom.

The Framers spent those hot summer days of 1787 in Philadelphia principally debating the structure and role of the Federal Government. Through the centuries of this great American experiment, it has been the structure of our government, not simply the Bill of Rights or other substantive provisions—it has been the structure that

has been the most effective protection from waves of oppression and the whims of dictatorship.

Tragically, under the auspices of CRT, unrestrained progressivism, and a false sense of national destiny, the modern left has embarked on a campaign of sorts to condemn the Founders, to tarnish the Constitution itself, and deface the structure and institutions that protect our liberty. Progressives have been astoundingly, shockingly, effective.

Unfortunately, this effort to seize power to enact a radical agenda, no matter the cost, is not a new tactic of the Democratic Party. President Franklin D. Roosevelt engaged in an institution-shaking campaign to pressure the Supreme Court to consent to and accept with constitutional infirmities his radical New Deal agenda.

He wanted to pack the Supreme Court by increasing the number of Justices to appoint his own political loyalists who would then do his bidding. His threats to the structural Constitution of the United States led to the infamous "switch in time that saved nine."

Now, Roosevelt's plan to pack the Supreme Court failed as a legislative matter. When it got to this body, when it reached the Senate floor, it didn't go anywhere, but it left a lasting mark, and it has not been a favorable one.

Legal scholars, historians, politicians, and people of every stripe and political persuasion have since then condemned this. For example, this Court-packing campaign has been called a "bad idea" just in the last few years by the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. It was likewise called "a bonehead idea" by then-Senator Joe Biden. And yet today many Democrats are returning to that rejected notion and, like a dog to its vomit, going back to a bad idea that was bad then and remains bad now.

The Supreme Court has consisted of nine Justices since 1869, over 150 years. It is a settled number that most Americans agree should stay. Not one person has argued that we need to increase the number of Justices because of a human resources problem or a workforce problem. No, it is not that; it is rather that they want to influence the outcome of decisions. They want to politicize the Court.

Tragically, the independence of the judiciary is thus being threatened, and it is being threatened, I would add, on several fronts. You have got misguided groups like Ruth Sent Us, along with others, that have attempted to pressure conservative Justices by protesting at those Justices' homes and places of worship.

When you show up to someone's home, the home of a public official, especially if that person is a judge or Justice, it is unlawful; 18 U.S.C. section 1507 plainly prohibits that because you are trying to influence them. You can't do that. It is unlawful. In fact, that is a Federal felony, a serious one in fact.

It is a serious offense because when you show up at the home of a public official like that, regardless of whatever else you might say or what the signs you are carrying might have printed on them, the lasting message, whether these words are spoken or not, is, "We know where you sleep." That is an implicit threat of physical violence.

On other fronts, you have got certain Members of Congress, including some Members of this body, who are willing to place the Court's independence at risk. You have got some Members of this body, including the senior Senator from Massachusetts, who went out and screamed with some of the same protesters in front of the Supreme Court and has written an op-ed for a local paper stating her intent and her desire to pack the Supreme Court, while pioneering the hashtag "ExpandTheCourt." I would venture that the Court is much more popular nationally than is her agenda.

But popular acclaim and the support of the constitutional structure of the United States is, of course, not the goal of the modern left. Their goal is power. Fittingly enough, the ambition of individuals is precisely what the Constitution is designed to restrain.

It is working as intended. James Madison wrote of the Constitution in Federalist 51:

If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and [then] in the next place, oblige it to control itself.

I pray that my colleagues supporting this dangerous effort will exercise the self-control of our constitutional form that our constitutional form of government requires. We have all sworn an oath to that, and that oath requires us to take into account the form and the role that it plays in protecting our freedom.

The current efforts to undermine and delegitimize the Court are multifaceted and have included the unprecedented treatment of Republican-nominated nominees to the Court, including the public high-tech condemnation of Clarence Thomas and the similarly unfounded attacks on Brett Kavanaugh, on Sam Alito, and on other Republican nominees to the Court; Senator SCHUMER's very public attempt to intimidate the Court by standing in front of the Supreme Court Building during oral arguments in a Louisiana abortion case, June Medical, shouting: "I want to tell you Gorsuch, I want to tell you Kavanaugh, you have released the whirlwind and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions."

The Constitution is a structure. It is a process and an organization. When Democrats threaten another branch of government for political ends, they threaten that structure itself. It is dangerous. It is wrong. And I pray for

the sake of our Nation that it never succeeds.

To that end, every Member of this body should be condemning these efforts and condemning the efforts of those described in the Axios article that ran today explaining that the Department of Homeland Security is now having to investigate serious credible threats of people wanting to burn down the Supreme Court of the United States, people wanting to assassinate Supreme Court Justices and law clerks.

We must all condemn them. And I hereby do so in the strongest terms I am capable of communicating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, in late 2016, soon after the Presidential election of that year, there was a significant portion of the political left that began referring to itself as "the resistance."

Apparently, these people were bent on fighting whatever the new President might try to do, only because of who the new President was. There were signs in yards. There were people who painted their garage door with "the resistance" on the garage door.

They weren't arguing against specific policies; they weren't making a rational effort to win support for their side; they were just trying to throw sand in the gears of the executive branch and interfere with how the government serves the people. One Senator on the floor of the Senate said: "The resistance starts here."

Now, they did it while trying to cloak themselves in maybe the compelling language of "the resistance," as if in their minds they were starring in the World War II movie "Casablanca," where the resistance was the heroes as they were all over World War II.

The damage "the resistance" was willing to do to the executive branch of our government was bad enough. On the floor of the Senate, at virtually every nominee the President nominated, the minority insisted on 30 hours of debate. We finally had to change that rule to 2 hours of debate, which those in the majority now know is a big enough challenge without 30 hours of debate. And I think the average time used was closer to 20 minutes, during that 30 hours, than 30 hours.

But 30 hours still had to be set aside. No other business could occur. People were nominated early on for Ambassadors to countries, for instance, that they eventually got to serve 1 year in because that "resistance" element appeared right here as well.

Then the group of political activists began to insist that we degrade the legislative branch as well, trying to change the Senate to get rid of the motion to proceed. And, frankly, ever since Democrats got control of the Senate, by the smallest margin possible, there has been a constant discussion of why we should change that rule.

Of course, many of us understand the so-called filibuster rule is what makes

the Senate. President Biden said, when he was a Senator:

[A]t its core, the filibuster is not about stopping a nominee or a bill, it is about compromise and moderation.

End the quote that he made at the time that I agree with now.

Many of the people who have been calling to end the filibuster changed their tune, not because something changed in America but because they are now in charge. And without the filibuster, we would see wild swings in policy when different parties would take control of the majority of the Senate, and we see that constantly in the House now. A lot of bills pass, and very few of them get to the President's desk. When the other party gets in control, they pass bills that reverse what the earlier majority passes, and, frankly, very few of them get to the President's desk either because the Senate has to take a little more time to think about what direction the country really wants to go in.

In the last 20 years or so, complete control has happened four times, alternating between Democrats and Republicans. That is a lot of time for the pendulum to swing and the potential for bad ideas to become law without something to make us think about that before we head in that direction.

At a time of razor-thin margins in the House and Senate, activists should be extra careful about getting rid of institutional guardrails. Their efforts have failed so far because there aren't enough Senators from both parties who are willing to make that change, but that doesn't mean they won't keep trying.

In fact, I am confident we will continue to hear that, and I am also confident their position will change as soon as they are in the minority and don't get what they want.

This brings us to the disappointing effort we have seen to damage the third branch of government: the judiciary. For more than a year, we have seen some people on the left try to apply political pressure on the Court to rule in a particular way.

The Senator from Utah just gave us an example of that. I am going to repeat it. It is probably worth repeating. In March of 2020, the Democratic leader of the Senate spoke to a crowd in front of the Supreme Court Building, and he said:

I want to tell you Gorsuch, I want to tell you Kavanaugh, you have released the whirlwind and you will pay the price.

Now, what would that possibly mean? If you are in the Supreme Court you have got a lifetime job, so the price clearly was not losing your job. What price was the Democratic leader suggesting and saying on the steps of the Supreme Court you would have to pay? And this is while the Court was inside hearing arguments on the case.

And the Leader added:

You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.

That kind of language has no place and really no legitimate purpose.

This is not the kind of language that we need to use.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have talked about introduced legislation to add new Justices to the Court to pack the Court.

Judges should rule based on the law, not on their partisan allegiance. That is not a new idea, but countries rarely manage to put it into practice.

The American judicial system became the envy of the world precisely because of its independence. Renowned historian of the American Revolution Gordon Wood has described it as the creation of judges who are “agents of the sovereign people somehow equal in authority with the legislators and executives.”

An independent judiciary is a critical element of the unique balance of power the Constitution created. Justices have frequently ruled against Presidents and parties that put them on the Court. Some of the most prominent, politically sensitive Supreme Court cases in history have involved Justices ruling against the parties that put them in power, including *United States v. Nixon* in 1974. And Harry Truman, who put his name on the desk that I am speaking from, would certainly have preferred not to lose the so-called steel seizure case of *Youngstown Sheet and Tube v. Sawyer*, but he accepted it without threatening any of the Justices, without plotting to increase the size of the Court, even though the vote against it by, for instance, Fred Vinson, the Chief Justice who had been his Secretary of the Treasury and lifelong—in terms of Senate service—friend and his nominee to be the Chief Justice, voted the other way.

The supporters of these changes are calling very loudly, but, just like the damage that they sought with their resistance of the executive branch, their efforts to break the Senate, they could do lasting, even permanent damage to the judiciary. Once the Court has been clearly politicized, it would be hard to ever bring it back.

I am concerned about the anti-institutional fervor we see going on today. I hope it does not produce the stated results and goals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous that Senator FISCHER and I be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each before the vote.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, when Democrats blew up the filibuster for nominees some 8 years ago, Republicans warned then that they would regret that move when the tables were turned. It seemed like such short-term thinking on the Democrats' part, but I have said before that progressive ideology has many Democrats convinced that they are, so to speak, on the side of history in the long run.

If you believe history is heading only in one direction and that direction is

your way, you don't worry about the pendulum swinging back. That explains why they broke from 200 years of precedent to filibuster conservative judges nominated by President George W. Bush and then expressed shock and outrage when their own precedent was used against them under President Obama. That ideology also explains why Democrats can passionately defend the filibuster one day as a vital protection for the minority and then just months later, after taking control of a 50–50 Senate thanks only to the Vice President's tie-breaking vote, call the filibuster racist.

The phrase “demography is destiny” as applied to politics today is another version of progressive ideology. The assumption with “demography is destiny” is that ethnic minorities who tend to vote Democrat are bound to vote that way forever, so they support an open-border policy, with a push for amnesty, even if it green-lights human trafficking and lets the lethal fentanyl pour into the bloodstreams of young Americans, driving down life expectancy in our country.

Progressive Democrats assume more Hispanic citizens means more votes for them and then, somehow, a permanent majority.

Let me remind you that Republicans thought that, after the elections of 1994 and 2010, that we would have a permanent majority. It didn't work out that way. Just like the Irish and Italians of the late 1800s and early 1900s, Hispanic citizens who have assimilated into the fabric of our Nation do not vote as a bloc.

So, just maybe, that is why the left seems increasingly desperate to stoke identity politics and racial division. Such thinking leads to counterproductive calls to, as an example, defund the police, followed by a desperate attempt to do a 180-degree turn when crime spikes and the very communities they sought to pander then end up suffering.

Remember how so many prominent Democrats felt compelled to defend and justify rioters they deemed to be on their side? Now Democrats insist not just on prosecuting January 6 rioters, as we should with all rioters, but on weaponizing that horrible day for political purposes.

They decry disinformation. They decry conspiracy theories on the right about the election while perpetuating conspiracy theories on the left. Remember the absurd claim that because the Postmaster General supported President Trump, absentee ballots wouldn't be delivered in the 2020 election? It caused a lot of unnecessary worry for many Iowans who vote absentee.

Democrats call for supporting our elections while at the same time tout false claims of systemic voter suppression, deeply undermining faith in our democracy.

Democrats do not seem to support America's democratic institutions for

those democratic institutions' own sake. But if the Democrats are convinced that they are not just right but on the right side of history, institutions are only worth preserving so long as they can be used to advance their own agenda. You cannot have respectful disagreement with someone on the wrong side of history. In fact, you demonize those people.

This kind of thinking pits neighbor against neighbor and drives wedges within our communities. This sense of division comes up in every one of my 99 county meetings in Iowa. I sense Iowans are fed up with this poison.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my concern about attempts to undermine American institutions.

There is a difference between constructive efforts to ensure public institutions are accountable and trying to cut down these foundational institutions at their core.

Recently, our country commemorated National Police Week, and it was an opportunity to show our gratitude and appreciation to the men and women who put their lives on the line to keep our people and our communities safe. Yet we continue to see those on the left trying to villainize all law enforcement in this country.

President Biden and Speaker PELOSI, scared about their party's dropping poll numbers, can keep trying to muffle their colleagues' destructive comments, but what the Democrats have already said has harmed our Nation's law enforcement.

We heard “defund the police” from many—too many—Democratic elected officials.

During a CNN interview in June 2021, a Massachusetts Congresswoman said:

I support a radical re-imagining of community safety and public safety, which means reallocating and not further investing in a carceral state.

A New York Congresswoman has called for the Federal Government to apply pressure to disrupt the system in reference to police departments.

Others have said time and time again that we must “completely re-imagine what policing looks like in our country.”

What affect is this antipolice rhetoric having on those who swear to serve and protect? Not surprisingly, we are seeing a drain on law enforcement agencies. Numbers of law enforcement officers rose from 2014 to 2020; however, over the past 2 years, retirements and resignations are climbing while recruitment numbers are down. Many of our law enforcement agencies are receiving far fewer applications.

This is something that I directly discussed with Sergeant Tony Conner, the president of the Omaha Police Officer's Association, when we met recently. Application numbers for some Nebraska law enforcement agencies are down 75

percent or more compared to just a few years ago.

Contributing to these challenges, police officers' jobs have also become increasingly dangerous. Last year, we saw surges in violence and aggression towards officers. Three hundred and forty-six police officers were shot in the line of duty, and 130 of them were targeted and shot in ambush-style attacks. In a recent CBS "60 Minutes" interview, FBI Director Christopher Wray said there had been a 59-percent increase in the murders of police officers, with 73—73—officers killed in 2021. That is a rate of about one officer killed every 5 days.

Without a doubt, Democrats' antipolice rhetoric has diminished morale and eroded public trust in law enforcement. Maybe that was the goal.

But dwindling application numbers to join the force also are contributing to rising crime all across this country. A report by the Council on Criminal Justice found that the national violent crime rate increased 44 percent from 2019 to 2021.

A recent Wall Street Journal editorial discussed efforts to address rising crime in one of our Nation's cities—Seattle. According to the editorial, Seattle city attorney Ann Davison's office found that 118 individuals were responsible for more than 2,400 crimes in Seattle over the past 5 years. Yet, her efforts to hold repeat offenders accountable are being stymied by some.

Because of a 2019 agreement signed by Davison's predecessor, certain classes of misdemeanors in that community go to the community court, and this court releases the accused after referring them to certain support services. The editorial states:

Seattle criminals get four tries in the Community Court before they flunk out. Each can encompass multiple charges. Repeat offenders see the lack of consequences as an invitation to commit more crimes.

Davison is currently trying to renegotiate that deeply flawed 2019 agreement, but despite the rise in crime in Seattle, these negotiations are at an impasse.

Problems like these aren't confined to the Emerald City. In L.A., Minneapolis, Chicago, Washington, DC, and other cities, liberal prosecutors often fail to hold violent criminals accountable.

The impact on public safety is clear. CNN reports the following about the increase in carjackings: In New York City, the number of carjackings has quadrupled in the last 4 years. In Chicago, more than 1,800 carjackings were reported in 2021. Here in the Nation's Capitol, Metropolitan Police confirmed that carjackings have tripled since 2019.

The administration's efforts to address the rise in this violent crime are weak. I am supporting a resolution led by the senior Senator from Louisiana that actually gets at what we should be doing. It demands that the President

work with Congress on a comprehensive strategy that encourages the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, as well as State and local law enforcement officers to counter the rise in violent crime by reinforcing strong criminal justice policies. The Senate should pass this.

Our law enforcement officers who wear the badge deserve our gratitude and our support. The sacrifices they make and the sacrifices their families make, keep us safe. We stand with our men and women in blue.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON LEAF NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Leaf nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Ex.]

#### YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Paul
Bennet	Hirono	Peters
Blumenthal	Kaine	Portman
Booker	Kelly	Reed
Brown	King	Romney
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cardin	Leahy	Schatz
Carper	Lujan	Schumer
Casey	Manchin	Shaheen
Collins	Markey	Sinema
Coons	McConnell	Smith
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Stabenow
Duckworth	Merkley	Tester
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Hassan	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Padilla	Wyden

#### NAYS—44

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Rounds
Blunt	Grassley	Rubio
Boozman	Hagerty	Sasse
Braun	Hawley	Scott (FL)
Burr	Hoeven	Scott (SC)
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Shelby
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sullivan
Cornyn	Johnson	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Tillis
Cramer	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Wicker
Daines	Marshall	Young
Ernst	Moran	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Rosen Van Hollen

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### 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. 687, Elizabeth Schoff Watson, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, John W. Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Alex Padilla, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Lujan, Catherine Cortez Masto, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tammy Duckworth, Mazie Hirono.

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 Elizabeth Schoff Watson, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 185 Ex.]

#### YEAS—50

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Padilla
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Burr	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lujan	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Ossoff	

#### NAYS—47

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Tuberville
Fischer	Murkowski	Wicker
Graham	Paul	Young
Grassley	Portman	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Markey Rosen Van Hollen

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth Schoff Watson, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

#### ABORTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this is a dark, enraging moment for our Nation. I have made that clear already, and so have so many of our Democratic colleagues. But I am speaking on the floor today because we cannot back down for a minute. We cannot lose sight of the terrifying reality that Republicans want to end the right to abortion, and they are within weeks of accomplishing that goal.

Very soon, the Supreme Court is set to overturn *Roe v. Wade* and fulfill Republicans' decades-long goal of controlling women's bodies and rolling back everyone's fundamental right to decide whether or not to start a family.

Let me say that again because it is shocking, and it is true. In a matter of weeks, women across the country will lose a constitutional right they have had for half a century. The steady march forward to secure women's rights that generations before us fought for will be reversed, and my daughter and granddaughters will have fewer rights than I did.

Women will be forced to carry pregnancies to term when it is not right for them, and Republicans will be responsible. This is the future that they have been fighting for. This is the America that they want, and they are not done yet.

Republicans are hell-bent on rolling back the clock. Last week, they blocked our bill to protect *Roe* and the right to abortion, but they are not going to stop at overturning *Roe* and shredding patients' rights to make decisions about their own bodies. In States across the country, Republican lawmakers are banning abortion without exceptions. They are targeting people who help a woman get an abortion, doctors who are providing essential healthcare, friends and family members who are just supporting a loved one, and even the drivers just doing their job and helping patients get to medical appointments.

Republicans are working around-the-clock to make it harder for women and families to control their own futures. They are coming after the birth control and IUDs that tens of millions rely on to plan a family on their own terms. They are coming after Plan B. They are even putting patients' ability to get the IVF care they need to help start a family at risk.

My Republican colleagues right here in the Senate have made clear that they have their sights set on something really extreme: They want a na-

tionwide ban on abortion. Republicans aren't content with some States banning abortion and creating health crises that spill across State lines; they want to eliminate the right of every woman in America to get an abortion in Washington State and everywhere else. It is not hypothetical, and it is not some far-off worry. It is appalling, and it is completely backward.

Republicans want to force us all with them into their time machine, but we are not going to let them. Democrats are fighting Republicans' increasingly extreme policies at every step of the way.

In the coming weeks, we are going to remind each and every American of the rights that Republicans want to rip away. We won't allow Republicans to run and hide from the reality of their extreme agenda. We are going to be on the floor each week highlighting how Republicans are doing everything they can to hit rewind on our rights, highlighting every protection and freedom that Republicans are ripping away from people across the country, and we are going to show the country how Republican policies hurt everyone. We are going to expose the Republicans' radical and unpopular views on everything from abortion to family planning to sex ed. We are going to make clear who is hurt most by their extremism.

This fight did not end when the Republicans blocked the Women's Health Protection Act last week—far from it. People across the country are fed up with Republicans' attacks on their rights. They are fired up, and they are fighting back, and so am I, and so are my Democratic colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4249

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, last week, President Biden tried to blame me for the current inflation crisis. In a speech where he couldn't even get my State right—I proudly represent Florida, in case he needs another reminder—he attacked me and tried to blame the record inflation he created on Republicans. I guess he has also forgotten that he is the President and that it is his policies that created this mess. And, by the way, Democrats are in control of the House and the Senate.

What is clear to the American people is that Joe Biden is to blame for the inflation that is hurting them more every day. Families I talk to in Florida are sick and tired of this President's failures. They are sick and tired of seeing an incoherent, confused man ramble on in the White House, with no plan but to blame everyone else but himself for the problems he created.

Last week, the Biden administration reported that the Consumer Price Index, our main measure of inflation, increased 8.3 percent year-over-year, and the latest Producer Price Index, released just a day later, showed wholesale inflation in April increased 11 per-

cent over the year. These price hikes hurt real families, and they are impacting every industry. We see it in the price of groceries, like milk, eggs, and meat. We see it in the price of gas at the pump and electricity for your home. We see it in the price of used cars and in the cost of transportation. Everything is going up, and some products, like baby formula, are nearly impossible to find.

It is causing families to make impossible choices. In March, a Census Bureau report found that over the last year, 24 percent of Americans reduced or went without basic items such as food and medicine as a way to afford their energy bills. In my home State, 26 percent of Floridians had to make this impossible choice.

Let's be clear. The financial pinch families are facing, the supply chain crisis families are facing, and the skyrocketing prices families are seeing are because of the radical spending agenda being pushed by President Biden and Democrats in Washington. Their reckless government spending has sent our economy into a downward spiral. Our debt has grown to over \$30 trillion, and Biden wants to push it up to \$45 trillion even as our GDP is contracting. Inflation has risen to the highest levels in over 40 years. It is wrecking our economy.

We need bold action to fix this mess and help families struggling to keep up.

I came to the floor to stop the insanity and introduce a budgetary point of order. My bill would stop any non-defense discretionary spending that would increase the deficit over the 10-year budget window when the average annual CPI inflation is 3 percent or higher. The Federal Reserve's target for inflation is 2 percent, so setting the bar for the point of order 50 percent above this target is totally reasonable.

My point of order would not even apply during time periods when inflation is at or slightly above the Federal Reserve's target. Of course, we need flexibility for emergencies, so my bill would allow this point of order to be waived if two-thirds of the Senate agree that deficit spending during times of elevated inflation is desperately needed. Further, my point of order would not apply to funding our armed services nor would it apply to any mandatory spending, such as Medicare or Social Security.

This is commonsense legislation. This bill would put in place the same scrutiny that families, especially poor families like mine when growing up, use in order to stay on budget. It is the same kind of careful examination that small business owners have to do to make sure they can pay their employees and make ends meet. The inflation we are seeing right now is unsustainable. It is time for action. I hope we will all come together to agree to this point of order.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed



to the immediate consideration of S. 4249, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, if the Senator from Florida's bill were to pass, it would make routine domestic spending bills nearly impossible to be passed in the U.S. Senate, freezing spending at current levels.

I worry that the Senator from Florida believes the false impression that inflation does not impact the millions of Americans who benefit from non-defense discretionary programs. These are people who have to go to work every single day and try to figure out if they are going to have enough money to put groceries on their table. This bill would make things worse for the American people, not better.

As an example, this year, the cost of the veterans medical care system is expected to grow by \$21 billion. We have all heard the patriotic speeches of how we stand behind our veterans when they answer the call, but I wonder how many VA hospitals and clinics in Florida would have to be closed if this proposal were to be approved. I know there are a lot all over the country that would have to be closed.

Natural gas costs have grown by 35 percent this year. Do any of us who may be from a State where the weather can get warm want to tell our constituents who rely on the LIHEAP program to cool their homes "No, you don't need air conditioning because the money is not going to be there"?

If Florida is struck by another hurricane this summer and the Senator from Florida's constituents look to FEMA for fuel, food, and water, will the Senator tell his constituents "Sorry. Inflation was too high. You are on your own. We can't respond to that emergency"?

In 2017, Members on the other side of the aisle lined up to vote for a \$1.9 trillion tax cut for the wealthy—a tax cut that I believe has contributed to the inflation we now see in the country. There is nothing in this request to roll back those tax cuts. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4250

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I disagree with my colleague's objection, but I think this issue is too important not to try to get something done today.

So, instead of enacting this point of order when the CPI reaches 3 percent, how about we raise it to 8 percent? Our current CPI level is at 8.3 percent. We see how bad things are right now. When the CPI gets close to where we currently are—inflation levels that we haven't seen since the 1980s—that is

when this point of order would take effect.

At 8 percent inflation, we have reached a crisis point. It only stands to reason for Congress to start looking closely at every bill that increases the deficit. Such deficit-increasing bills should only be passed by Congress when absolutely needed.

Again, this point of order could be waived in the Senate with a two-thirds majority. I think this is reasonable and that we owe it to American families to start holding Congress accountable for the reckless spending that we know fuels inflation. Hopefully, my colleagues can agree to pinning this point of order to inflation at 8 percent.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4250, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4251

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I was hoping we could arrive at a deal today, so let me try it one more time.

Eight percent inflation, I think, is really high. Remember that the Federal Reserve's target is 2 percent. I am just here to see if we can work something out and get something with which we can control excess spending. So I am going to try one more time. I want to give Democrats a chance in Congress to step up and fight for families all across America who are being devastated by raging inflation. There is no reason not to get this done.

My colleague objected to setting this point of order at 8 percent, but certainly no one can object to saying that, at 12 percent inflation, things need to change. Inflation over 12 percent would be an even bigger emergency. We haven't seen the CPI that high since Jimmy Carter.

Think about it this way: Things are really bad now, and 12 percent inflation would be a 50-percent increase over the already sky-high prices we are seeing today. Remember, we started at 3 percent. Now I am offering my colleague a point of order that can only be triggered at 12 percent.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4251, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object—and I will—I think back over the years to some of the debates.

I remember, during the Reagan administration, when we heard so many speeches from President Reagan and his supporters on how they had to balance the budget. He did this at a time when he doubled and tripled the national debt, all the time telling everybody how they were balancing the budget.

Then I heard the objections to President Clinton's budget, saying that it didn't do the wonderful things that the Reagan budget did even though, of course, it gave the United States the first surplus it had had in decades.

Every so often, reality catches up with rhetoric, and because of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I am clearly disappointed that we have had three opportunities to try to do something here that was going to try to stop the reckless spending that is causing this inflation.

I think all of us know that inflation is way too high. We also all know that reckless government spending is driving up the cost of inflation all across this country. I hope the Democrats in Washington will start figuring out how we can get inflation under control. It starts by living within our means. It starts by making sure that we live within our budget and that we stop wasting money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of the ways you try to save money is, again, not with rhetoric but with reality.

I would urge everybody to join with us on both sides of the aisle who are working to get our appropriations bills together so we can reflect the actual needs and go forward with that. Again, rhetoric is easy; reality is a tad more difficult.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INDO-PACIFIC REGION

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, with the President of the United States soon to be departing on his first Asia trip, I rise to speak today about U.S. policy in the Indo-Pacific, an area of the world that I know very well, having served as U.S. Ambassador to Japan prior to joining the U.S. Senate.

While U.S. foreign policy in recent months has focused largely on Eastern Europe, we cannot take our attention away from our Nation's greatest strategic adversary, namely, the Chinese Communist Party. Confronting communist China is the essential responsibility of our time, as the China challenge—and how the United States and



our allies respond to it—will determine whether freedom or autocracy defines the 21st century. That is why I am pleased to see President Joe Biden investing the time and energy to travel to South Korea and to Japan this weekend.

I can tell you just how critical I believe this trip is because I made a trip similar to this just last month. In April, I led the first congressional delegation to visit Japan since the pandemic began. I was joined by my colleagues Senator BEN CARDIN of Maryland and Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas.

During our 6 days in Japan, our bipartisan delegation met with the country's top leaders, including the Prime Minister, his Cabinet members, Parliamentarians, and top leaders from Japanese industry. I think it is fair to say that our delegation returned with a great sense of optimism—optimism about the opportunities that lie before our two nations to increase our cooperation diplomatically, militarily, economically, and technologically and, by so doing, strengthening our alliance.

While I certainly have policy disagreements with the current administration, I am hopeful that this is one area in which we can find common ground. The fates of our Nation and the world depend on it. This challenge, quite frankly, is just far too important to get wrong. So I am hopeful that President Biden will seize upon the opportunities presented to him in the Indo-Pacific region to confront the China challenge head-on and that this trip will provide him with a greater perspective to do so.

I am pleased to see this administration maintain a focus on the Indo-Pacific region, a focus that President Trump began and that I personally was proud to help lead from my diplomatic post in Tokyo. I also applaud President Biden for the actions that he has taken to engage the Quad at the leader level. Much more can be done.

In terms of strengthening our diplomatic cooperation, the United States should warmly welcome Japan's proactive leadership in response to recent international crises. Japan is the world's third largest economy and a major financial player on the world stage. Japan is a member of the G7.

In the days after Russia's unprovoked and unjustified invasion of Ukraine, the Government of Japan joined by imposing strong, multilateral sanctions against Vladimir Putin's war machine.

Japan's support on sanctions is as important as it is necessary. I saw this firsthand when, as U.S. Ambassador to Japan, I worked with then-Prime Minister Abe and his administration in complying fully with U.S. secondary sanctions to end Japan's purchases of Iranian oil in 2018. With Japan's help, we dramatically reduced Iran's revenue stream and its ability to fund terror at that time. We see Japan's importance

today with regard to multilateral sanctions against Russia.

Going forward, the United States must do its utmost to ensure that Japan always has a seat at the table on major international issues.

Indeed, I was very pleased to see Foreign Minister Hayashi become the first Japanese Cabinet member to attend a NATO ministerial when he traveled to Brussels last April. And I am even more pleased to learn that Prime Minister Kishida is considering attending the NATO Summit in Spain next month.

Here, I see an opportunity for the United States to engage further with Japan and NATO by exploring new ways to expand high-level diplomatic interactions and information sharing.

When I made the suggestion to Secretary of State Antony Blinken during a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing in early May, I was glad to see that my suggestion was well received.

The second opportunity that I see is in the area of improving defense and deterrence in the Indo-Pacific. The United States and Japan must further increase coordination on defense planning and procurement as Japan looks to significantly boost its spending on defense.

Japan has already begun the process of rewriting its national security strategy and its related national defense strategy. At the same time, leaders in Tokyo see growing support from the Japanese people to roughly double Japan's defense spending to 2 percent of GDP.

These developments come at a critical moment. Xi Jinping and the Chinese Communist Party have their eyes set on Taiwan, and they are surely learning lessons from Russia's invasion of Ukraine. At the same time, North Korean Dictator Kim Jong Un continues to develop nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles as he poses grave and gathering threats to the United States and to our allies in the region.

Our nations, therefore, must act with great urgency to strengthen defense and deterrence in the Indo-Pacific. In particular, the United States must encourage Japan to use their increased spending to field as rapidly as possible new defense capabilities that are mobile, lethal, and interoperable.

Japan must also significantly improve its cyber security capabilities and its ability to share intelligence and information with its allies. And it is critical that the American and Japanese militaries expand joint training exercises with one another.

I have had the honor of witnessing firsthand the success of our joint training exercises, and I encourage our nations to expand this invaluable training.

The third area where I see an opportunity is on energy security, an area in which we should be working together. This was the message that I heard last month in Japan as leaders expressed

concerns with America's current energy policies.

Several years ago, I worked hard to encourage Japan to make significant investments in LNG infrastructure to allow greater LNG imports from the United States in order to strengthen our two nations' energy security and our national security.

I hope President Biden's visit will underscore the significance of American strength as an energy exporter to enhance the security of our allies. But all members of the Quad must engage in the critical topic of energy security.

India is the world's biggest democracy and now has an opportunity to decrease its energy and military reliance on Russia, and Australia is a significant energy exporter.

When Secretary Blinken recently testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I pointed out to him that the Quad already has high-level working groups working on COVID-19 vaccines, infrastructure, critical and emerging technologies, space, cyber security, and environmental matters. But my argument to him was that adding a new working group in the Quad—one focused specifically on energy security—makes strong strategic sense, as energy security is inextricably linked to economic security and to our national security. Frankly, it is surprising to me that the Quad hasn't already made this issue a primary focus.

Secretary Blinken appeared to appreciate the suggestion, and I emphatically urge the administration to take this idea to heart and dedicate time and energy to discussing energy security in our Quad strategic grouping.

The fourth area of opportunity that I see is in technology. The United States and Japan already cooperate closely in this space. That was a point that I sought to underscore in many of our meetings with Japan's private sector leaders.

I see growing opportunities for our Quad partners to ensure our respective technology sectors continue to work together and to generate trusted alternatives in 5G, artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and in other strategic technologies.

When I served as U.S. Ambassador to Japan, I helped the United States and Japanese Governments coordinate closely to counter Huawei and China's other heavily subsidized companies and to clear them from the 5G markets of our representative economies. This was important because Chinese companies like Huawei pose grave and growing national security and espionage risks.

Our U.S.-Japan strategy prevented Huawei and other Chinese Communist Party-directed technology firms from obtaining the global scale that they sought in their effort to dominate international markets.

It also created openings for firms in the United States, Japan, and partner countries to pursue trusted 5G alternatives in supply chains, including software-defined networks and ORAN technologies.

With each passing year, the technology competition with China is only intensifying. It is, therefore, imperative that the U.S.-Japan alliance and the Quad increase coordination and innovation in response to technological competition.

The fifth opportunity is in economic leadership in the Indo-Pacific. When President Biden visits the region, I expect him to speak more about the Indo-Pacific economic framework. It is clear that many of our allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific are eager to see more U.S. economic leadership.

As a next step, the United States should take the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework's data provisions and turn them into a stand-alone, sector-specific free-trade agreement.

The executive branch should look closely at the U.S.-Japan Digital Trade Agreement of 2019 as a good starting point. This is the most comprehensive and high-standards agreement addressing digital trade barriers.

I was proud to help then-U.S. Trade Representative Bob Lighthizer negotiate this and other bilateral agreements with Japan. Our efforts brought about a more fair and reciprocal trading relationship between our two nations, helping not only our economies but also our workers.

The Biden administration has rightly maintained the Trump administration's tariffs on China as important leverage to uphold fair and reciprocal trade. This is a critical tool in our arsenal, and I hope the current administration continues to use it.

There certainly are other areas where the administration must hold the line against China. The administration could do more to hold communist China accountable for unleashing the COVID-19 pandemic upon the world. It also needs to press Beijing to stop the deadly flow of Chinese-origin fentanyl and fentanyl precursors from flowing across our southern border and killing more than 100,000 Americans a year through overdoses.

And we also know what is at stake when it comes to China's growing military threats against Taiwan. The last administration set a high standard on countering China, and I hope the current administration builds on that success.

I believe there is strong bipartisan consensus in Congress when it comes to the Indo-Pacific and when it comes to the rising opportunities that we see before us to further strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance and the Quad. So I urge President Biden to seize these growing opportunities that I have outlined when he travels to the Indo-Pacific. As the only former American Ambassador serving in this body and as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I stand ready to work with him as he does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Maryland.

#### SMALL BUSINESS COVID RELIEF ACT OF 2022

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time to review with my colleagues S. 4008, the Small Business COVID Relief Act of 2022—legislation that Senator SCHUMER has set up for action tomorrow.

I want to start by saying that this bill—and the underlining bill that it deals with, the Restaurant Revitalization Fund—was a bipartisan product in which Democrats and Republicans worked together to help an industry that was in desperate need, the restaurant industry. It provided relief for their revenue losses, and we were proud that we were able to get that passed.

The challenge was that after it was enacted, we provided \$28 billion for the restaurants under the Restaurant Revitalization Fund. In reality, that was not enough money to cover the demand, and we found that where close to 100,000 restaurants were able to qualify and receive funds under that program, 170,000 were shut down through no fault of their own.

So we went to work, Democrats and Republicans, in an effort to rectify that inequity and help an industry that was in desperate need.

We filed legislation in August of last year. And I am proud that it was bipartisan, joined by many of my Democratic colleagues and Republican colleagues. I want to single out Senator ROGER WICKER, who has been the real champion on making sure that we worked in a bipartisan manner. We were joined on the Republican side by Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator ERNST, Senator CASSIDY, Senator HYDE-SMITH, Senator COLLINS, and Senator BLUNT. And others have joined us during the process.

But I want to take you back a little bit before we filed that bill in August of last year. There was legislation filed that would replenish the funds at \$60 billion because we thought \$60 billion was going to be needed in order to complete the funding. I think Senator SINEMA led the effort in filing that legislation.

The difference between the bill that was filed for \$60 billion and the bill that we are going to be considering tomorrow is the bill tomorrow is \$48 billion less. We were able to reduce the amount of dollars that were needed in order to carry this out. Some restaurants have closed. We have tightened up the rules.

And we can not only do that for \$12 billion less than it was initially thought was going to be possible when we had bipartisan support last summer, but we are now able to expand it to other related industries—all of which have had bipartisan legislation in this body—to provide relief. These are industries that were shut down as a result of COVID-19. They had tremendous revenue losses and incurred tremendous debt in order to stay in business.

So we provided in this bill—for the same \$48 billion, we include help for our gyms. We include help for Minor

League Baseball, professional leagues. We provide money for music venues. We provide money for border businesses. We provide money for the bus industry. We were able to do all that, and we are still less money than the original bill that was filed last summer.

We did a couple more things in order to make sure this was done in a very fiscally conservative way. We were able to find some offsets. There were no offsets in those other bills. We found about \$5 billion of offsets that we put in this bill.

We did something else that was not in the original act. We required the SBA to bring in all the applications before they allocate any money. Now, we had them already in the restaurants. These are ones that qualified before. But in the other areas they will receive all the applications, and before they issue any checks, they have to make sure they have adequate resources. If they don't, there is a pro rata reduction so there is no further need for us to be concerned about replenishing the funds.

All those are improvements that were made on the original bipartisan legislation that was filed that is more considerate of the needs, less costly, and more efficient.

Now, we have other protections that are built into this legislation. A restaurant cannot double dip. They have to subtract the moneys that they received under the Paycheck Protection Program, either first or second round of funds, from what they would otherwise be qualified to receive. They have to have a revenue loss that they can document. So there are protections in the bill.

But I want to go to what is the major issue why we really need to make sure we get this done. Because of the way that this was administered, partly as a result of a court action, you had two restaurants side by side, identical in their needs, filing their applications on the same day. One was funded; one was not. The restaurant that was not funded, if it is still in business today, it is very likely that that restaurant owner is taking out loans in order to stay in business and is still trying to be competitive to that restaurant that is next door.

It is very possible that restaurant is having trouble getting help, as all restaurants are having trouble getting help, but cannot compete in salary with that restaurant that got the help and now has to compete and try to get workers, even though they didn't get the same financial assistance. So it is a matter of basic fairness.

I want to go one step further. We in the Congress tried to prioritize those restaurants in underserved communities and traditionally underserved small business owners. We set up a priority line for them to be able to get their help under the Restaurant Revitalization Fund. The court blocked

that line, and we now have small business owners who are literally discriminated against because they were veterans or in underserved communities.

So as a matter of fairness, we really need to get this done. The need is there. We all know how restaurants are operating at less than full capacity today. They are still hurting as a result of COVID-19. This is going back and helping them in regard to their first year of losses—something we should have done a long time ago but something that is desperately needed to get done. So I just really wanted to explain that to our colleagues, why we need to get this done. We finally have an opportunity.

Now, what are we going to be doing? We are going to be working on the motion to proceed. Now, this is not unprecedented. Let me remind my colleagues that the original bill that funded the restaurant fund was emergency funding. So it patterned itself after the relief we gave to the general small business community under the Paycheck Protection Program, which was also emergency funding.

The original bill, under the Paycheck Protection Program, was also underestimated by hundreds of billions of dollars. And we came back—Democrats and Republicans—in a bipartisan way and replenished that fund literally overnight—hundreds of billions of dollars—as emergency funding without offsets.

And now we are trying to finish what we started in regards to the restaurants. It should be—no question about it—emergency funding; but we are, again, trying to be as careful as possible, so we have even found some offsets in order to make this easier for our economy.

There are some who say they worry about what impact it is going to have on our economy. I think keeping small businesses open is pretty important for our economy. But we can tell you the Restaurant Association has informed us that a large part of these funds are going to be used to pay off debt that small business restaurants had to take out in order to stay afloat. So we are going to keep restaurants open. And they are going to be able to pay off their debt, and they are going to be able to add to our community. That is what is at stake here, and that is why we are so protective of making sure we try to get this done.

Now, this is a motion to proceed. I have listened to debate on this floor about how we have to have the Senate work. This is a bipartisan bill dealing with small business on a motion to proceed that will allow us to have the debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I don't understand any of my colleagues believing that this is appropriate to filibuster and not give us the 60 votes we need on a motion to proceed. There are a lot of my colleagues who are always talking about reforming the rules in this place. OK. I understand, when we are getting to an emotional issue, it

gets difficult for us to work together; but if we can't work together on a small business bill that was developed by bipartisan Members—Democrats and Republicans—that is consistent with what we have been doing in helping small businesses generally, and we now have an opportunity to bring it to the floor for a debate—it will be open to amendment. Those who say: Well, gee, are there other ways we can make this more affordable? Well, come forward.

We have been working on this for a year—close to a year. And, yes, that is why we have gotten good suggestions from Democrats and Republicans in order to try to make this work. But if you don't allow us to debate the bill on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I really don't understand that. If you profess that you want to see this place work and there is not a philosophical problem here of helping small businesses, why can't we move forward?

I don't even know why we need a cloture motion. We should be able to pass a motion to proceed on this bill and have a debate and go to amendments. And Senator WICKER and I have made it clear that we will act as traffic cops; we will try to figure out the best way to consider this bill in order to make it work for all.

Madam President, small businesses have a special way of filling our cities and towns that make them irreplaceable when they are gone. I think we all recognize that. They drive our local economies. They give our neighborhood character. They make us proud of where we come from and where we live. If we allow them to disappear through inaction, they will leave holes in our community that we cannot easily fill.

If we cannot pass one last round of aid, it will mean certain restaurant owners who have pending loans are going to close their doors forever. Those holes will exist in our community, and we will not be able to fill them.

I ask my colleagues—all of us understand the importance of small business. We understand they are the growth engines in our community and innovation engines in our community. We made a commitment to help them through COVID-19, and we have honored a large part of that commitment. This is the last chapter to complete that commitment, and I hope my colleagues will join us in allowing us to have this debate on the floor and support the help for our small businesses that are in desperate need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UKRAINE

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to lay out exactly why I intend to vote for the aid package to provide our Ukrainian allies with the weapons and support they need to fight Vladimir Putin's invasion.

First, it is important to understand why—thanks in large part to President

Joe Biden—we are in this dangerous situation to begin with. What is maddening about Russia's invasion of Ukraine is that it was utterly preventable. This did not have to happen, and it was caused by two specific mistakes by Biden and his administration. The first mistake was Biden's catastrophic surrender and withdrawal in Afghanistan. The second mistake was Biden's weakness and appeasement on display and his capitulation to Putin on the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline.

Putin didn't just wake up yesterday and decide he wanted to invade Ukraine. In 2014, Putin previously invaded Ukraine, but he stopped short of invading the entirety of the country. Why is that? The reason is simple: Russia's principal source of revenue is oil and gas, which is transported via pipelines that go directly through Ukraine. Putin knew that when the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline was complete, he could invade Ukraine and not have to worry about potentially destroying Ukrainian energy infrastructure because he would have in place an alternative pipeline to get his gas to market.

Last spring, President Biden formally waived the sanctions that Congress had put in place on Nord Stream 2, sanctions that I authored, bipartisan sanctions that passed this body twice and that President Trump signed into law twice. Last summer, President Biden surrendered to Putin, lifted the sanctions, allowed Putin to build the pipeline, and announced a deal with Germany to allow the pipeline to be completed. When he announced that deal, that capitulation, the governments of both Ukraine and Poland put out a joint statement saying: Mr. President, if you do this, Vladimir Putin will invade Ukraine.

In August, Biden surrendered in Afghanistan. In September, Nord Stream 2 was physically completed, and then Putin began building up his forces on Ukraine's border. Even then, our Ukrainian allies pleaded with us: Sanction Nord Stream 2 now so that Putin will know he can't turn it on later. The President, the Prime Minister, Parliament, and civil society of Ukraine all said so again and again and again.

I authored a new set of sanctions mandating immediate sanctions, which the Ukrainian Government formally called on the Senate to take it up and pass it. The Biden administration fought tooth and nail against those sanctions in January. I remember standing right here and saying: Mr. President, if you do this, we will see Russian tanks rolling toward the streets of Kyiv.

Sadly, 44 Democrats voted with President Biden against sanctions on Russia, against sanctions on Putin; and the appeasement from the White House and 44 Democrats led, within days, to the invasion of Ukraine.

That being said now, the difficult question is what should we do now that this war is unfolding and, specifically, whether it is in America's vital national security interests for Ukraine to

fight and defeat Putin's invasion. My conclusion is that, yes, it is.

There is no doubt, \$40 billion is a large number; and although much of that spending is important—in fact, some of it is acutely needed in the military conflict—I would have preferred a significantly smaller and more focused bill. But our Ukrainian allies right now are winning significant victories with the weapons and training that we provided them already, and it is in our national interest for them to keep doing so. They will not be able to fight Putin and have any chance of prevailing if we cut off military assistance.

So why is this in America's national security interest? The answer lies in some questions that my fellow Americans are rightly asking. They are asking: What would Russia's invasion of Ukraine mean for our problems here at home, including, for example, food and energy? They are asking: Is the cost of this bill really necessary? They are also asking: Isn't China our biggest long-term enemy?

These are all entirely legitimate questions. They are important to ask. They are the same questions I asked myself before deciding how to vote on this bill. Another question Americans are rightly asking is: Why aren't we doing anything about our problems here at home?

I emphatically agree that President Biden and congressional Democrats have failed on the issues here at home that Texans and Americans rightly care about and we should fix. Right now, we have a raging border crisis that President Biden won't do a damn thing about. We have skyrocketing inflation. We have gas prices at record highs. We have a baby formula shortage that has left parents all over the country scrambling to try to feed their babies. These are real problems that the Democrats caused and now refuse to even try to fix; and in multiple instances, such as the gas prices, these are problems that Democrats have deliberately made worse, inflicting pain on millions of Americans.

All of that can be true at home, and it doesn't mean the world has suddenly become safe and that our enemies do not mean us harm. At the same time that we need to secure our border and address the domestic crises, we also need to stand up and confront the very real threat posed by Russia and by China. We can't let the fact that Biden and the Democrats have created massive domestic and economic failures cause us to ignore threats to U.S. national security posed directly by Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

On the question "Why is what Russia does in Ukraine relevant for our national security," I want to answer this by making four points.

No. 1, what Putin is trying to do is to reassemble the Soviet Union and, beyond the Soviet Union, the Russian Empire from even earlier. If Putin succeeds in doing so, it would be disas-

trous for global stability and for American security.

The Cold War between America and the Soviet Union was incredibly costly and incredibly dangerous. We don't want to see Russia become the Soviet Union once again. When the Soviet Union was big and strong and mighty with a much bigger military, the lives of Americans and the lives of our allies were in much greater jeopardy.

It is overwhelmingly in America's interest to prevent Putin from reassembling the Soviet Union, because we do not want our enemies to become stronger and use that strength against us.

No. 2, Putin is trying to seize control of energy. If he is successful, it will be felt by Americans filling up their cars with gas or trying to heat their homes in the winter. We have already seen what Putin has done with Nord Stream 2, and he is not going to stop there. We don't want to see a world where Putin controls energy.

No. 3, the United States made a formal commitment to help Ukrainians defend themselves. Why is that? Well, after Ukraine successfully declared independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, the United States signed an agreement called the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances. Under the terms of the agreement, Ukraine gave up its nuclear weapons in exchange for explicit assurances that the United States would protect Ukraine's territorial sovereignty. Ukraine had the third largest nuclear arsenal on the face of the planet, and they voluntarily, willingly, gave it up. And we made a promise in exchange for that.

And No. 4, if we don't provide Ukrainians with weapons and they don't defeat Putin, Putin will be emboldened and may well eventually invade a NATO country that the United States has a treaty obligation to defend. That would be an incredibly serious escalation that nobody wants to see.

Some have further asked, "Why should America keep these commitments?" Why should we keep our commitment in the Budapest Memorandum? Why should we keep our treaty commitments to the NATO countries? And the answer is, because one of the ways we protect American national security is, when we make an agreement with a country, when we make a formal agreement, a treaty, we honor our commitments.

We want countries to know that America stands by our friends and that we stand by our word and that our treaties mean something.

If countries learned that under weak and feckless Presidents our formal binding documents aren't worth the paper they are written on, it undermines the ability of any President of the United States to negotiate agreements with our friends and allies to keep Americans safe.

Another question I have heard is, why so much money? Sure, it is impor-

tant to help Ukraine win, but why should we spend so much? Again, I would have preferred for this to be a smaller bill. But, in fact, enormous amounts of money are both justified and necessary. Of this \$40 billion, there is \$9 billion for replenishing our own stockpiles, American stockpiles which have been badly depleted in recent months as we sought to help our Ukrainian allies.

We are already beginning to see the risks and effects of depleted stockpiles. Just a few weeks ago, Taiwan's Ministry of Defense announced there would be dramatic delays in the delivery of some weapons, including howitzers and Stingers. Making sure we have the weapons we need to defend ourselves is incontrovertibly a good thing, and \$9 billion of this \$40 billion, I do not know a Senator in this body who could reasonably object to replenishing our own military stores and weaponry to keep America safe with America's military.

There is also \$10 billion in this bill for Ukrainian weapons and training, and altogether, \$24 billion in military funds in this bill. Ukrainian weapons and training—the very things they have been using to defend themselves and that if we don't replenish, will cause them to collapse.

The Ukrainian military right now is using tens of thousands of artillery rounds and ammunition every couple of days. Already last month, there was a growing concern that Ukrainian forces engaged in heavy ground combat against Russian units would quickly go through that amount of ammunition.

They have largely burned through the stockpiles of Russian-style ammunition they are familiar with and used in the opening weeks of the war. And last month, U.S. officials assessed that 40,000 rounds of artillery were only expected to last a few days. New efforts to resupply our Ukrainian allies are critical.

There is also about \$5 billion for food in this bill. Ukraine is rightly known as the bread basket of Europe. It is the sixth top exporter of wheat in the world, and there is a growing risk of global famine because of the disruption Russia's invasion is causing in Ukraine.

Devoting money now to stop countless people from starving to death in famine is a wise and prudent investment for American national interests.

Then there is \$9 billion in economic support funds for the Ukrainian government. Will a certain portion of that money be wasted? Absolutely. Will there be corruption? Almost certainly. If it were up to me, I would cut that amount from this bill. Might some of it end up funding a yacht for an oligarch? Very possibly. But unfortunately, this is what happens when Democrats have control of Congress and write the bill.

When you have a bill authored by a Democratic White House and a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, the result is you get waste and corruption and pork and fat and bloat in a bill.

So the question facing each of us Republicans is whether you are willing to cut off the missiles and cut off the bullets that we are sending to Ukraine and allow Putin to win simply because there is a portion of this bill that is waste and corruption that the Democrats have insisted on.

The reality is that a Putin victory in Ukraine will be much, much more expensive for American taxpayers in the long run than this bill. And let me underscore that point. If Putin wins, the consequences for America and American taxpayers will be hundreds of billions of dollars.

From a purely fiscally conservative view, ensuring that the Ukrainians have enough military equipment to defend themselves and to give Putin punishing defeats is overwhelmingly in our interest. And let me underscore as well: It is the Ukrainians doing the fighting. I do not want to see U.S. servicemen and women in harm's way. There is a reason I have vocally opposed a no-fly zone in Ukraine, because that would unreasonably increase the chances of an American pilot in an American jet engaging in combat with a Russian pilot in a Russian jet, and that escalation is not justified.

But ensuring the Ukrainians have the weapons to defend themselves is very much in our own national security interest.

And now I want to talk about a question that many Americans have not necessarily been asking but that is of staggering importance to our national security. And that is, "What does the war in Ukraine have to do with China?" The answer is, "An enormous amount."

Last summer, we watched the catastrophic withdrawal from Afghanistan unfold. We watched the surrender to the Taliban from Joe Biden. We watched the incompetence of this administration in abandoning Americans and leaving them behind, abandoning Bagram airfield before we evacuated.

When that happened, all across the globe, America's enemies looked to Washington and took a measure of the man in the oval office, and, tragically, they concluded that President Biden was weak and feckless and ineffective. And a weak American President is dangerous.

When the catastrophic withdrawal from Afghanistan happened, I said publicly that the chances of Putin invading Ukraine just rose tenfold. I also said, at the same time, the chances of China invading Taiwan just rose tenfold.

We have now seen the first of these two things happen, because Putin understood the disastrous surrender and withdrawal in Afghanistan to mean that President Biden was weak, and weakness is provocative.

If Putin wins in Ukraine, it will confirm to Xi in Communist China that he can confidently invade Taiwan and that America will be too weak and feckless to stand with our allies.

But if Ukraine defeats Putin with the help of American weapons and military aid, Xi will see aggression as a recipe for failure and that the United States has the strength of will to stand by its allies to ensure that they have what they need to defend themselves.

China is—mark my words—the most dangerous geopolitical adversary of the United States for the next 100 years. China has the military might of the Soviet Union with a much, much stronger economy and an economic engine.

China also carries out policies of murder and torture and genocide and slavery and lies and deception. A Chinese invasion of Taiwan would be catastrophic for American national security. Right now, today, over 90 percent of the world's most advanced semiconductor chips come from Taiwan. If China were to conquer Taiwan, it would give the Chinese Communist Party a stranglehold on the global supply of semiconductors.

After that, if Xi wanted to turn off the supply of semiconductors to Americans, he could do so instantly. It is simply irresponsible to allow that to happen, and it is impossible to overstate the catastrophe that would impose on Americans.

Overnight, it would be impossible to acquire or repair pretty much everything we rely on in modern life: Cars, planes, medical devices like pacemakers, clean water, refrigerators, all rely on semiconductors—of course, so do vehicles, boats, tanks, missiles that we rely upon for our national defense.

And even if China didn't turn off the supply of those chips, they would be able to control what went into them, including potentially planting spyware and espionage directly and immediately threatening American security.

And it goes without saying, the Chinese Communist Party would also immediately control the price of semiconductors and what they go into, which would drive up the cost of pretty much everything to Americans.

If you think \$40 billion is a lot of money, just wait and see the disaster if the Chinese communists lock up semiconductors on the world stage and use them to extract monopoly profits from Americans while simultaneously spying on us using those same semiconductors.

Just as we don't want to see a world in which Putin controls energy, we should not want to see a world in which Xi controls semiconductors.

I began this speech by talking about the consequences of failing to stop Nord Stream 2. I very much wish that these consequences had not come to pass, but the terrible reality is that President Biden failed in Afghanistan and failed again with Nord Stream 2, which played the decisive role in shaping the current crisis.

The reason we should help the Ukrainians defeat Putin by giving them weapons is the same reason we need to keep our thumb on China. And

it is not what some of my colleagues on the Republican side have said: It is not to defend democracy across the globe; it is not to defend international norms. That sort of empty nonsense is the sort of things John Kerry says.

The reason we should support our Ukrainian allies who are fighting and killing Russian soldiers is because it protects American national security, it keeps America safer, and it prevents our enemies from getting stronger, from threatening the safety and security of Americans, and from driving up the costs, the economic damage to Americans, by hundreds of billions or even trillions of dollars.

America needs to be strong—strong enough to stand up to Putin, strong enough to stand up to communist China, strong enough to defend the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I came to speak to the Senate about Police Week as we honor the law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Before I do that, we know that Putin was shocked by two things. He was shocked by the amazing resistance and the strength and the resiliency of the Ukrainian people and the effectiveness of their fight back. Putin really couldn't believe that happened.

The other thing that Putin was shocked by was the skill with which President Biden put together this international coalition of countries that were not part of this in the past, part of something—Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Finland—countries that now a couple of them want to be in NATO, and that really is the skill of the leadership of President Biden.

And I know, in spite of the Senator from Texas's comments—I know that most mainstream Republicans support what President Biden has done, support his work on putting together sanctions—first, providing aid for the Ukrainian people, the humanitarian aid, refugees going to Moldova, going to Poland, going to other parts of Eastern and Central and Southern Europe, and the skill with which he has gotten and the success with which he has gotten weapons to the Ukrainian people and the skills with which he put together sanctions.

The Presiding Officer, as a member of the Banking and Housing Committee, has been part of that with sanctions, and it has really made a difference in keeping these countries together at the fastest pace we could do it but keeping them together.

So most Republicans support what President Biden has done. But, you know, I am not saying that the Senator from Texas is part of this, but I have heard Congresswoman CHENEY, who is nothing if not a conservative Republican, daughter of a very conservative

Vice President, active in the Republican Party and Republican leadership—she talks about the Putin wing of the Republican Party.

Again, I am not saying that she includes the Senator from Texas in that category. I don't know if she does or she doesn't. I didn't hear her mention names, but I do know that she thinks that a number of Republicans are part of this Putin wing of the Republican Party, and it is despicable, but it is true, and it is disappointing to all of us.

And I would add, too, that the Senator from Texas, maybe he missed the news as he was talking about chips, computer chips, about semiconductors. Intel made a huge announcement that they are coming to Ohio. They are going to invest billions of dollars. They are going to hire 5,000 building tradespeople—5,000 tradespeople—over a 10-year period to build these fabs. Imagine the size of that. I have never seen anything like that.

So I am excited about what we are doing, and that is why it is so important what Senator WYDEN and I and others are doing on making sure that we pass the USICA—the Innovation and Competition Act. It is so important to our country. It is so important to workers. We are finally putting workers at the center of our economic policy, and that is a thrill.

And as President Biden said on the Senate floor, we are finally burying the term “Rust Belt.” We are burying it in Columbus with Intel. We are burying it in Northwest Ohio with solar manufacturing. We are burying it in Southwest Ohio with a new generation of jet fuel and jet engines. We are burying it in Cleveland with what we are doing with NASA. We are burying it in Youngstown with our manufacturing camps and all that we are doing for America Works.

Mr. CRUZ. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. Sure.

Mr. CRUZ. Just a moment ago, the Senator from Ohio made reference to the alleged existence of the so-called Putin wing of the Republican Party.

I would like to ask the Senator from Ohio, Is it accurate that the Senator from Ohio and 43 of his Democratic colleagues in January of this year voted against sanctioning Nord Stream 2, sanctioning Russia, sanctioning Putin, despite the fact that Ukraine begged the Senate to pass those sanctions and Putin invaded Ukraine just days after 44 Democrats sided with Russia and Putin?

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I take back my time.

I have heard no Democrat talk about—I have heard nobody talk about the Putin wing of the Democratic Party. No Democrat believes that.

I hear just down the hall 100 yards, Congresswoman CHENEY talk about the Putin wing of the Republican Party. I am not in intraparty fights; I am only pointing that out.

I want to get to this. We expect a vote soon after 6, and I want to get back to my remarks. I appreciate the engagement of Senator CRUZ on this issue

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Madam President, we honor during Police Week the law enforcement officials in our State who made the ultimate sacrifice.

This year, we will add to the National Law Enforcement Memorial the names of 10 Ohioans who laid down their lives last year: Officer Brandon Stalker, Deputy Donald Gilreath III, Natural Resources Officer Jason Lagore, Officer Scott Dawley, Deputy Sheriff Robert Craig Mills, Deputy Sheriff Boyd Blake, Corrections Lieutenant David Reynolds, Corrections Officer Joshua Kristek, Patrolman Sean VanDenberg, and Officer Shane Bartek. Each of these losses is a tragedy for a family, for a community, for all of law enforcement officials in this country.

We know in too many places right now the trust between law enforcement and the community is too often frayed or broken.

These Ohio lives are a reminder of the ideals we strive for—women and men who are true public servants in the best sense of the word, people who give themselves to their communities, and these Ohioans gave so much.

Let me mention each one briefly.

Officer Brandon Stalker, a 24-year-old father of two young children, devoted to his fiancée. His first partner, Officer Brent Kieffer, said he had a “constant smile and unfailing sense of humor.”

He added that “[e]very single day we went on patrol, Brandon was all about trying to serve the community. He truly wanted to make the community a better place.”

That comes from his patrol colleague.

Before joining the force, the Toledo native coached baseball at his former high school and was passionate about mentoring young players.

He gave his life last January protecting his community.

Officer Stalker, rest in peace.

Natural Resources Officer Jason Lagore was a Chillicothe native, devoted husband, and father of two sons. Those who knew him talked about his love of his job and commitment to helping people.

When he joined the Department of Natural Resources in 2005, he persuaded his bosses to let him bring in and train Ranger, his first K-9 partner.

Over the years, he grew the program, showing that department how successful K-9 teams could be. The department now has K-9 units all across the State. Lieutenant Hoffer watched his friend build the program from the ground up. He said of Officer Lagore:

He did it all himself, and we couldn't have had a better person. He was patient, a good all-around person, a good officer, and he knew what he was doing.

Last February, Officer Lagore and his K-9 partner Sarge were helping

with a search operation at Rocky Fork State Park in Highland County, southwest of Columbus, when he suffered a heart attack and fell into a lake. He was 36 years old.

Ohio Department of National Resources posthumously honored him with the Director's Award of Valor. Director Mertz said:

Because of his courage and bravery in the face of danger, there is no one more deserving of this honor.

Rest in peace, Officer Labore.

Officer Scott Dawley served his hometown of Nelsonville near Athens, a small tight-knit community. His death last August in a three-vehicle crash responding to a call was felt across town.

One lifelong resident said of Officer Dawley:

He loved his community, and the community loved him back. The outpouring of grief and support was overwhelming.

He had just gotten married in April, making a blended family of nine.

He was a devoted father. He coached his son's baseball team. His wife Marissa said one of her happiest memories was watching her 9-year-old daughter give Officer Dawley a makeover, complete with finger and toenail polish.

Officer Dawley, rest in peace.

Officer Shane Bartek was 25 years old when he was killed during a carjacking at a West Side apartment complex not too far from my house on New Year's Eve, just 28 months after he joined the Cleveland Division of Police.

His family said that from a young age, he always wanted to be an officer. His greatest aspiration was to become a detective.

His twin sister Summer talked about how Officer Bartek loved to participate in the annual “shop with a cop” event during the holiday season, allowing a child who has been touched by law enforcement to buy and give Christmas presents to that family.

One colleague said:

He would tell me how much he wanted to touch other people's lives so he could actually make an impact. And he did that.

Officer Bartek, rest in peace.

Last year, we also lost six officers to COVID-19: Deputy Gilreath, Deputy Sheriff Mills, Deputy Sheriff Blake, Corrections Lieutenant Reynolds, Corrections Officer Kristek, and Patrolman VanDenberg.

While many of us were still social distancing and working from home, police officers, like other essential workers—grocery store workers, nurses, technicians, food service people, all on the frontline of our community, all essential workers, even though many were not paid like it—risked their own health to keep our communities safe.

We can't begin to repay the debt we owe these officers and their families.

We can work to better support officers in the communities they swear an oath to protect.

It is why I am working with colleagues of both parties on legislation to support them as they do their jobs.

I joined my colleague Senator GRASSLEY to introduce the Fighting Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Act. It would increase mental health support for police, fire, emergency medical, and 9-1-1 personnel as they cope with the stress of responding to crisis situations.

These Ohioans deal with some of the most tense and life-threatening situations in our communities—car accidents, fires, family disputes, people in mental health crises.

So often our local police and fire departments don't have the resources to offer comprehensive mental health support. The Grassley-Brown bill will help us do that.

I also introduced the Expanding Health Care Options for Early Retirees Act, a bill that would allow retired police officers and other first responders to buy into Medicare beginning at age 50.

Police officers and other first responders wear their bodies out protecting our families and communities. They should have access to affordable healthcare when their service comes to an end.

This simple solution would ensure access to healthcare for police officers who are forced to retire but aren't yet eligible for Medicare.

I am working across the aisle with Senator THUNE and others to fix outdated IRS rules that prevent public safety officers from making tax-free withdrawals from retirement accounts to cover healthcare premiums.

We need to make sure police and fire can retire with dignity. Part of dignity of work is retiring with dignity. At the very least, that means they should be able to afford the healthcare they need.

This Police Week, let's offer more than empty words. Let's honor the memories of these women, these men who laid down their lives in service of their communities by getting their fellow officers the tools they need, the training they need to do their jobs and to build trust with the communities they are sworn to protect.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote be called immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VOTE ON WATSON NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Watson nomination?

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 186 Ex.]

#### YEAS—50

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Padilla
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Burr	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lujan	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Markey	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Ossoff	

#### NAYS—45

Barrasso	Hagerty	Portman
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeben	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Sasse
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tillis
Ernst	McConnell	Toomey
Fischer	Moran	Tuberville
Graham	Murkowski	Wicker
Grassley	Paul	Young

#### NOT VOTING—5

Cramer	Rosen	Van Hollen
Menendez	Sullivan	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Thompson nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Trina L. Thompson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

#### VOTE ON THOMPSON NOMINATION

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted "No."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 187 Ex.]

#### YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hassan	Ossoff
Bennet	Heinrich	Padilla
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Sinema
Collins	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Graham	Murray	Wyden

#### NAYS—44

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Tuberville
Fischer	Paul	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	

#### NOT VOTING—5

Blunt	Rosen	Young
Cramer	Van Hollen	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The clerk will report the Sykes nomination.

The senior assistant executive clerk read the nomination of Sunshine Suzanne Sykes, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

#### VOTE ON SYKES NOMINATION

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.



The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Ex.]

#### YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hassan	Ossoff
Bennet	Heinrich	Padilla
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Sinema
Collins	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Graham	Murray	Wyden

#### NAYS—45

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Tuberville
Fischer	Paul	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Young

#### NOT VOTING—4

Blunt	Rosen
Cramer	Van Hollen

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Lowman nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Joseph Lowman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

#### VOTE ON LOWMAN NOMINATION

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

Mr. BENNET. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. SUL-LIVAN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Ex.]

#### YEAS—94

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

#### NAYS—1

Hawley
NOT VOTING—5

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oklahoma.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, in tracking through what is happening on our southern border, it is interesting I still have folks that catch me and say, "I don't see anything about it in the news anymore, so what is happening?"

So I try to periodically come here to the floor to be able to describe what is happening. Interestingly enough, just yesterday, the leadership of CBP did their news release that they normally do to kind of outline what is happening at the border.

In their news release they released out:

CBP works to secure and manage our borders while building a fair and orderly [im]migration system.

This is what they put out yesterday—while we build an orderly and fair migration system.

Interestingly enough, this was a picture taken the day before their press release. This was taken in the Eagle Pass area of Texas in the Rio Grande Valley, and, yes, that line you see are people coming across the river in Eagle Pass.

Now, you don't catch everything because you can't see how much farther it goes this way and how much farther it goes that way.

This was the day before CBP released this statement: We work to secure and manage our borders while building a fair and orderly migration system.

Earlier in the report, the very first page of the news release, CBP leadership said:

After many months of planning, we are executing a comprehensive strategy to safely, orderly, and humanely manage our borders. CBP is surging personnel and resources to the border, increasing processing capacity, securing more air and ground transportation, and increasing medical supplies, food, water and other resources to ensure a humane environment for those being processed, screened, and vetted.

By the way, just south and west of this, just the day before this was taken, Border Patrol picked up two child sex predators, four MS-13 gang members, and an 18th Street gang member—just right before this, just the day before this was released.

This is our frustration with the administration right now. Because the media has turned away and decided they are not going to look at this, that they are not going to pay attention to it, everyone seems to think everything has just gotten fine.

What is really happening on our southern border, again, from current statistics right now, they are only able to handle 44 percent of the flow coming across the border. At 44 percent of the flow, right now, they are releasing thousands of people directly into the country with a notice to report saying: "Turn yourself in to an ICE facility anywhere in the country, and they will process you there," because they can't handle the backlog of the thousands of people coming across.

What are we talking about, thousands of people? Well, remember last year when the cameras were all focused on the southern border? Last year, there were 6,500 migrants coming across a day at this time, and all the cameras were focused on the southern border because it was such a massive influx of people because 6,500 migrants were crossing a day. Right now, 7,800 migrants are crossing a day—7,800 a day.

Last month, the CBP released that almost a quarter million people illegally crossed our southern border in 1 month. That beat the old record of the month before when there was just under that by a couple thousand people—a quarter million people a month illegally crossing the border.

Now, to their credit, about half of those are turned away under what is

called title 42 authority because of the pandemic. Those single adults, half of them are turned back, but the interesting thing is the administration says on May 23—yes, next week—on May 23, they want to end title 42 authority, and so they are not turning anyone away at the border—so literally all quarter million cross into the country and no one gets turned away. When that happens, DHS's own numbers have estimated that when that occurs, they estimate that they will see a million people surge through the border in 6 weeks—6 weeks.

So what is happening on interior enforcement? Well, at the border right now, they are allowing a quarter million people to cross the border, turning half of them away, but their plan is, next week, they are going to stop turning anyone away. Everyone is going to cross in.

How many people are being deported? Criminal aliens, individuals that have a final order of removal from a court, how is that going? Well, currently, under this administration, we have a record low number of deportations that are happening. While we have 7,800 people a day illegally crossing the border, ICE is now deporting 203 people a day from the Nation.

So let me run those numbers past you again: 7,800 people a day illegally crossing the border, 203 people being turned around due to ICE custody and releasing them back into their country where they came from.

Now, these aren't folks just from Central America. In fact, now about half of the people coming are not from Mexico or Central America. They are coming from all over the world. Last year, we had people from every single country on the planet illegally cross the border in the 2 million people that crossed the border. They came from every single country in the world—yes, including Iran and North Korea, all of it.

But this administration is now working towards next week saying we are going to lift title 42 authority, and we are not going to turn anyone around.

Currently, what is happening? When individuals come across the border, they are given notification. They will request for asylum, all they have to say is, "I have credible fear." They will say, "What city would you like to go to in the entire U.S.? You can go to any city you want to go to." They pick their city, they are given a piece of paper, and on that piece of paper, they are told here is your court date 8 years in the future—8 years in the future. And they go anywhere they want to in the country for the next 8 years.

And they are told to keep that piece of paper with them. If they are ever pulled over, they can pull it out and show: I am awaiting my court date. I am here for the next 8 years.

Now, let me ask you a simple question: If I have to go through the legal process to be able to get a visa or a work visa and go through all of that

process and fill out paperwork, or—and I will be here just temporarily for a season, or I can illegally cross the border and I will be here for the next 8 years, which would you pick?

This administration is literally incentivizing this and encouraging more people to illegally cross the border. Is there a way to be able to handle this? Yes, there is. Some of it is overly simplistic, I understand. Let's start with finish building the wall system because there are gaps in the fence and everyone heads towards those gaps in the fence.

I am not the only one saying that. The career professionals at Border Patrol are saying that is one of the prime things that they need.

Do they say that is the only thing they need? No. There is a lot more they need, but they are saying that is a really important element that they need is that fencing. That slows people down; that funnels people towards gaps. Build a wall system.

No. 2, don't lift title 42, keep it in place. I am not the only one saying that. I had an ambassador from a Central American country contact me this week and say: We are asking the White House not to lift title 42 authority because, in Central America, we are facing thousands of people migrating through our country from all over the world that are headed to the United States, and it is causing economic turmoil in their country. And their fear is, if President Biden lifts title 42 authority, it is going to make a bad situation in their country even worse.

And while President Biden talks about root causes in Central America, Central America is telling the United States: Enforce your border; stop incentivizing people to illegally travel to your border; that is one of the root causes of migration.

Finish building the wall system. Don't lift title 42 authority. Have cooperative agreements with other countries. This has been done by multiple Presidents before to be able to have engagement with other countries so that they enforce their border. And I don't mean just say to them: Go enforce your border. Help them. If they don't enforce their southern border and their southern border and their southern border, it all piles up here, and right now, the Biden administration is just letting them all in.

Asylum hearings: Individuals that request asylum are legally bound to actually have asylum. There is lots of changes that need to happen in asylum laws, but let me just say this simply. This administration right now with current asylum laws could do last in, first up for hearings. Instead of handing people a piece of paper and say, You are here for the next 8 years until the next asylum hearing if you cross the border illegally right now, they say, you have to stay right here at the border for the next 2 weeks; your hearing is in 2 weeks, and it is in that courtroom right over there here at the border.

They go through the legal process to be able to request asylum. When they do not qualify, they are returned. That sends an entirely different signal—because what the Border Patrol tells me now is, when individuals cross the border, get a piece of paper that says you are going to be here for the next 8 years, they quickly pull out their cell phone, snap a picture of it, text their family back home and say: I paid this cartel member, I crossed at this spot, I said these words, and I got this piece of paper; come join me. And the next person comes, and the next person comes.

If what happens instead when they cross the border is they get there and their hearing is in 2 weeks and then they find out they don't qualify for asylum and they are returned, they instead text their family members and say: Don't come. The border is closed.

Nothing has changed at that point other than the enforcement. That can be done right now.

Fourth, Federal courts have required the Biden administration to put what is called MPP or what some people call "Remain in Mexico" back in place. So the Biden administration, following the court order, has spent millions of dollars standing up facilities, putting up courtrooms, and they are putting almost no one through them, so they can tell the Federal court they are doing it.

What do I mean by that? I mean 7,800 people crossing a day illegally, the Biden administration is putting about 2,000 people a month through the MPP process simply so they can say they followed the court order, but they are not.

So 7,800 people a day and they are doing 2,000 a month through MPP. That is decorative; that is not border enforcement. It is why I tell people the Biden administration is getting in illegal immigration exactly what they designed the system to do: to have more people come.

Finally, deport people that a court has ruled they should be deported—this does not mean this is following the law.

We have literally thousands of people in the United States that a Federal court has ruled a final order of removal on individuals and said: You are not legal in this country, and you have gone through all of the process; you need to be removed. Currently, ICE is not removing them. Again, sending the signal to everyone that wants to come here illegally that if you pay the cartels, you get across. You stay for 8 years, and then after 8 years, no one is looking for you.

That is why we had 2 million people last year illegally crossing the border. That is why we had a quarter million people last month illegally cross the border, because this administration just keeps saying, I don't want to be mean. We are going to open this up.

We are not asking for something crazy. We are just asking for the law to be enforced.

What is mean? What is inhumane? I will tell you what is inhumane. In February of this year, Reuters did a story on a young girl named Amelia. Amelia borrowed \$10,000 to pay the smugglers from Guatemala to be able to cross into the United States in Arizona. She borrowed \$10,000 from the human traffickers.

She got across the border. She was referred to the HHS Office of Refugee Resettlements, unaccompanied minors, after crossing. That is right, Amelia is under 18. So HHS processed her through, moved her into the location that she had as a piece of paper to say this is the location I need to go. She traveled to that location and got to that spot, and HHS said: Our duty is done.

When Reuters found her, she was working on a poultry processing farm in rural Alabama with her sister Rosa. When they asked her why she wasn't in school, she responded: School isn't for me; I have debt—because she is working in a poultry processing facility in Alabama to pay off the cartel's \$10,000—she and her sister both.

She also, by the way, paid \$1,500 to get a false Social Security card and a false ID, and she is working to pay off that debt as well.

While the administration continues to call this humane and leadership of CBP calls this orderly this week, I don't think it is humane or orderly for us to open up our borders to individuals being trafficked into our own country to pay cartels \$10,000 a person that then they come into this country and work their debt off in labor camps for the cartel.

By the way, for Amelia and for her sister Rosa, this story can be repeated all over again with multiple individuals who pay off their debt to the cartels by trafficking in illicit materials because the cartel will say: If you took the loan out from us, you pay us back our way.

That is what we are facilitating in America, and all we are asking the Biden administration to do is enforce the law. That is what it means to be President of the United States.

I yield the floor.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 896.

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 Dara Lindenbaum, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2027.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 896, Dara Lindenbaum, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2027.

Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Robert Menendez, Christopher A. Coons, Michael F. Bennet, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Elizabeth Warren, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tammy Duckworth, Debbie Stabenow, Edward J. Markey.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 857.

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 Evelyn Padin, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 857, Evelyn Padin, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Charles E. Schumer, Cory A. Booker, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, John W. Hickenlooper, Gary C. Peters, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester, Richard

J. Durbin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Mazie Hirono, Amy Klobuchar, Maria Cantwell.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 915.

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 Charlotte N. Sweeney, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 915, Charlotte N. Sweeney, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Jacky Rosen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 801.

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 Nina Morrison,

of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 801, Nina Morrison, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Brian Schatz, Alex Padilla, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tammy Duckworth, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Gary C. Peters, Elizabeth Warren, Jacky Rosen, Ben Ray Lujan, Cory A. Booker, Christopher A. Coons.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 806.

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 Sandra L. Thompson, of Maryland, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

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. 806, Sandra L. Thompson, of Maryland, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

Charles E. Schumer, Sherrod Brown, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Jacky Rosen, Chris Van Hollen, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Christopher Murphy, Jeff Merkley, Thomas R. Carper, Patty Murray, Christopher A. Coons, Catherine Cortez Masto, Rich-

ard Blumenthal, Patrick J. Leahy, Mazie Hirono.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 651.

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 Henry Christopher Frey, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 651, Henry Christopher Frey, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 670.

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 Lisa M. Gomez, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 670, Lisa M. Gomez, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 652.

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 Chavonda J. Jacobs-Young, of Georgia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 652, Chavonda J. Jacobs-Young, of Georgia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics.

Charles E. Schumer, Cory A. Booker, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, John W. Hickenlooper, Gary C. Peters, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester, Richard J. Durbin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Mazie K. Hirono, Amy Klobuchar, Maria Cantwell.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 669.

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 Amy Loyd, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 669, Amy Loyd, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 792.

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 Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 792, Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Jacky Rosen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 675.

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 Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring April 10, 2027 (Reappointment).

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 675, Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring April 10, 2027 (Reappointment).

Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Robert Menendez, Christopher A. Coons, Michael F. Bennet, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Elizabeth Warren, Tim Kaine, Tammy Duckworth, Debbie Stabenow, Edward J. Markey.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 728.

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 Samuel R. Bagenstos, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 728, Samuel R. Bagenstos, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell, Debbie Stabenow, Jacky Rosen, Raphael G. Warnock, Chris Van Hollen, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Robert Menendez, Jeff Merkley, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Alex Padilla.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 856.

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 Robert Steven Huie, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 856, Robert Steven Huie, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Jacky Rosen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 772.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Shalanda H. Baker, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Department of Energy.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 772, Shalanda H. Baker, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Department of Energy.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Jacky Rosen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, May 18, be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 461, Marsha Stephens Bloom Bernicat, to be Director General of the Foreign Service; that there be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form, on the nomination; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 885, 541, 771, 926; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of William Brodsky, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 2023; Chester John Culver, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation; Carol Annette Petsonk, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation; and Bridget A. Brink, of Michigan, 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 Ukraine, all en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

#### CONFIRMATION OF BRIDGET A. BRINK

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Madam President, we have just confirmed Bridget

A. Brink, of Michigan, to become the Ambassador to Ukraine. This was very important. I am so glad we could finally do this by unanimous consent.

As we all know, the relationships between the United States and Ukraine are so vital, and to have no Ambassador really hinders our relationship in ways that nobody would want to see.

To have an Ambassador there at this crucial link, as the United States continues to help the Ukrainian people resist brutal and vicious attacks by Russia, is a wonderful thing, a good thing, and will help advance the cause of peace, security, and freedom.

So I am very glad that we did this, and I congratulate Bridget A. Brink. I have every confidence that she will be an outstanding Ambassador and help Ukraine overcome the attacks by Putin.

#### RECOGNIZING WOMEN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES FOR NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 612.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 612) recognizing women-owned small businesses for National Small Business Week.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 612) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 3, 2022, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 643, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 643) designating the week of May 15 through May 21, 2022, as "National Police Week".

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

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

motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 643) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I misspoke. The Executive Calendar number is 541, not 451.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The number will be corrected.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

#### UNITY PARK

• Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I would like to congratulate and honor the city of Greenville in South Carolina for their opening of Unity Park on May 19, 2022.

Harlan Kelsey, a nationally known landscape artist commissioned by the Municipal League of Greenville, published recommendations for improvements to Greenville more than a century ago in 1907. His recommendations identified what is now the site for Unity Park. The transformative 60-acre park will help bring people together to celebrate the diversity of the Greenville community.

The park comes after 22 months of construction, nearly \$13 million in private donations, and countless hours of community engagement. With this addition, the city has committed to bringing more affordable housing to nine acres near the park, created a location to celebrate the community, built a place to continue highlighting the rich history of Greenville, and is transforming one of our State's designated Opportunity Zones: Unity Park will feature playgrounds and splashpads, a welcome center, numerous trails and bridges, and an observation tower.

I commend the city of Greenville on the park's opening and their commitment to growth, success, and community. •

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:26 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, an-

nounced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 1760. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs planned to be built in Oahu, Hawaii, as the "Daniel Kahikina Akaka Department of Veterans Affairs Community-Based Outpatient Clinic".

S. 2514. An act to rename the Provo Veterans Center in Orem, Utah, as the "Col. Gail S. Halvorsen 'Candy Bomber' Veterans Center".

S. 2520. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for engagements with State, local, Tribal and territorial governments, and for other purposes.

S. 2687. An act to provide the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs testimonial subpoena authority, and for other purposes.

S. 3527. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transfer the name of property of the Department of Veterans Affairs designated by law to other property of the Department.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5754. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of veterans to electronically submit complaints about the delivery of health care services by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 6376. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for a certain work-study allowance paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who pursue programs of rehabilitation, education, or training on at least a half-time basis, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6604. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the method by which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines the effects of a closure or disapproval of an educational institution on individuals who do not transfer credits from such institution.

H.R. 6868. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for financial assistance to fund certain cybersecurity and infrastructure security education and training programs and initiatives, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6871. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6873. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office for Bombing Prevention to address terrorist explosive threats, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7153. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a plan to modernize the information technology systems of the Veterans Benefits Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7375. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to update the payment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs to allow for electronic fund transfer of educational assistance, administered by the Secretary, to a foreign institution of higher education.

H.R. 7500. An act to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2022, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1095(b)(1)(C)-(D) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2022, the Minority Leader appoints the following member to the

Commission on the National Defense Strategy of the United States: Mr. John (Jack) M. Keane of McLean, Virginia.

At 3:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7309. An act to reauthorize the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 5754. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of veterans to electronically submit complaints about the delivery of health care services by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6376. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for a certain work-study allowance paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who pursue programs of rehabilitation, education, or training on at least a half-time basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6604. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the method by which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines the effects of a closure or disapproval of an educational institution on individuals who do not transfer credits from such institution; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6868. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for financial assistance to fund certain cybersecurity and infrastructure security education and training programs and initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6871. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6873. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office for Bombing Prevention to address terrorist explosive threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 7153. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a plan to modernize the information technology systems of the Veterans Benefits Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7309. An act to reauthorize the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 7375. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to update the payment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs to allow for electronic fund transfer of educational assistance, administered by the Secretary, to a foreign institution of higher education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, under the authority of S.



Res. 116, 112 Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary: Carlos Felipe Uriarte, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Stephen Elliott Boyd.

### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4169. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-4170. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Medicare Beneficiary Ombudsman (MBO) Fiscal Year 2017-2019"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4171. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2023 Inflation Adjustment for HSAs and HRAs" (Rev. Proc. 2022-24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4172. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Simplified procedures for certain bona fide residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to claim the child tax credit under section 24" (Rev. Proc. 2022-23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4173. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of intent to provide assistance to Ukraine, including for self-defense and border security operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4174. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Antarctic Krill Meal" (Docket No. FDA-2018-C-1007) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4175. A communication from the Supervisory Workforce Analyst, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Senior Community Service Employment Program Conforming Changes to the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020—Updated Guidance on Priority of Service, Durational Limits and State Plan Submissions" (RIN1205-AC04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4176. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from September 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4177. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Rulemaking—Criminal Referrals" (RIN2137-AF58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4178. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Gathering Pipelines: Extension of Reporting Requirements, Regulation of Large, High-Pressure Lines, and Other Related Amendments: Response to a Petition for Reconsideration; Technical Corrections; Issuance of Limited Enforcement Discretion" (RIN2137-AF38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4179. A communication from the Program Analyst, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alaska Drive Test Order and Request for Comment" (WC Docket No. 16-271) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4180. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Area R-4102A and R-4102B; Fort Devens, MA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0074)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4181. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Area R-7001C and Establishment of Restricted Areas, R-7001D, R-7002A, R-7002B, and R-7002C; Guernsey, WY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2020-1053)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4182. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-7, V-9, and V-11; Eastern United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1048)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4183. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Removal of VOR Federal Airways V-18, V-115, V-222, V-241, V-245, V-311, V-321, V-325, V-333, V-415, V-417, and V-463 in the Southeastern United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1031)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4184. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q-15; Western United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0676)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4185. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Jeffrey, NH" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0123)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4186. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment, Establishment, and Revocation of Multiple Air Traffic Services (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Borger, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0821)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4187. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Weatherford, OK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0043)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4188. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Worthington, MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0128)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4189. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; La Porte, IN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1141)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4190. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Emmetsburg, IA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0043)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4191. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Marshall, MI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0129)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4192. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class B Airspace Description; Atlanta, GA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0057)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4193. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Jefferson, IA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0164)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4194. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hugoton, KS" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0163)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4195. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ashtabula, OH" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0130)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4196. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Gulf Shores, AL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0048)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4197. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Joplin, MO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0131)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4198. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes; Amendment 39-22043" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0511)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4199. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-22042" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0512)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4200. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Scheibe-Aircraft-GmbH Gliders; Amendment 39-22037" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0506)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4201. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39-22015" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0685)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4202. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39-22017" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2021-1173)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4203. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22012" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0084)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Report to accompany S. 115, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the travel and tourism industry in the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-110).

Report to accompany S. 116, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to study the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on injuries and deaths associated with consumer products, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-111).

Report to accompany S. 1880, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to submit to Congress a report on unfair or deceptive acts or practices targeted at Indian Tribes or members of Indian Tribes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-112).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Bernadette M. Meehan, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile.

Nominee: Bernadette Michelle Meehan.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Chili.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Bernadette Meehan: \$500, 10/02/2020, Biden for President; \$500, 10/02/2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$28.47, 09/30/2020, Biden for President; \$28.47, 09/30/2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Mike Espy for Senate); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue

(Earmarked for Montanans for Bullock); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Dr. Alan Gross for Senate); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Hickenlooper for Colorado); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for MJ for Texas); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Sara Gideon for Maine); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Jon Ossoff for Senate); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Peters for Michigan); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Doug Jones for U.S. Senate); \$7.14, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Cal for North Carolina); \$7.15, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Warnock for Georgia); \$7.15, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Jaime Harrison for U.S. Senate); \$7.15, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Theresa Greenfield for Iowa); \$7.15, 09/20/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Bollier for Kansas); \$25, 08/28/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Mark Kelly for Senate); \$25, 08/28/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Sara Gideon for Maine); \$25, 08/28/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for McGrath for U.S. Senate); \$25, 08/28/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Jaime Harrison for Senate); \$500, 08/07/2020, Biden for President; \$500, 08/07/2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$2, 07/02/2020, Act Blue, \$25, 07/02/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Spanberger for Congress); \$2, 07/02/2020, Act Blue; \$50.00, 07/02/2020, Act Blue (Earmarked for Friends of Desiree Tims); \$500, 06/29/2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 06/29/2020, Biden for President; \$500, 06/12/2020, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$500, 06/12/2020, Andy Kim for Congress; \$250, 04/30/2020, Biden for President; \$100, 08/15/2017, Act Blue (Earmarked for Andy Kim for Congress); \$100, 07/03/2017, Act Blue (Earmarked for Andy Kim for Congress); \$1,000, 06/07/2017, Ed Meier for Congress.

Evan Medeiros \$500, 10/21/2020, Andy Kim for Congress; \$1,000, 10/14/2020, Biden for President; \$1,000, 10/14/2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 07/20/2020, Andy Kim for Congress, \$1,000, 06/29/2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$700, 06/29/2020, Biden for President; \$300, 06/29/2020, Biden for President; \$2,500, 03/04/2020, Biden for President; \$500, 03/22/2018, Andy Kim for Congress; \$500, 08/17/2017, Andy Kim for Congress.

Bruce I. Turner, of Colorado, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament.

Nominee: Bruce I. Turner.

Post: Conference on Disarmament.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

For Bruce Turner: None.

For Veronique Turner: None.

Constance J. Milstein, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malta.

Nominee: Constance J. Milstein.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Malta.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Constance J. Milstein: \$2,800, 02/19/2020, Biden for President; \$2,800, 02/19/2020, Biden for President; \$2,800, 05/21/2020, Friends of Mark Warner; \$2,800, 05/21/2020, Friends of Mark Warner; \$2,800, 05/21/2020, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$2,800, 05/21/2020, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$2,800, 05/21/2020, Shaheen for

Senate; \$2,800, 05/21/2020, Shaheen for Senate; \$2,800, 06/24/2020, Peters for Michigan; \$2,800, 06/24/2020, Peters for Michigan; \$2,800, 06/24/2020, Bollier for Kansas; \$2,800, 06/24/2020, Bollier for Kansas; \$2,800, 06/24/2020, Dr. Al Gross for U.S. Senate; \$2,800, 06/24/2020, Dr. Al Gross for U.S. Senate; \$2,800, 06/24/2020, Cal for NC; \$2,800, 07/17/2020, The Markey Committee; \$725,000, 08/24/2020, Biden Victory Fund (this contribution was allocated to the participants in this joint fundraising committee in the amounts noted below); \$10,000, West Virginia Democratic Party; \$35,500, Democratic National Committee; \$10,000, New Hampshire Democratic Party; \$10,000, State Democratic Executive Committee of Alabama; \$10,000, North Carolina Democratic Party—Federal; \$10,000, Pennsylvania Democratic Party; \$10,000, Colorado Democratic Party; \$10,000, Democratic Party of South Carolina; \$10,000, Arizona Democratic Party; \$10,000, Indiana Democratic Congressional Victory Committee; \$10,000, Maine Democratic Party; \$10,000, Minnesota Democratic-Farmer Labor Party; \$10,000, Democratic Party of New Mexico; \$10,000, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$10,000, Montana Democratic Party; \$10,000, Ohio Democratic Party; \$10,000, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; \$10,000, Nebraska Democratic Party; \$10,000, Kansas Democratic Party; \$10,000, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; \$10,000, Texas Democratic Party; \$106,500, Democratic National Committee (Convention Account); \$106,500, Democratic National Committee (Recount/Legal Account); \$106,500, Democratic National Committee (Headquarters/Buildings Account); \$10,000, Nevada State Democratic Party; \$10,000, Democratic State Central Committee of LA; \$10,000, Democratic State Central Committee of Maryland; \$10,000, Democratic State Committee (Delaware); \$10,000, Idaho State Democratic Party; \$10,000, North Dakota Democratic-Nonpartisan League Party; \$10,000, Tennessee Democratic Party; \$10,000, Mississippi Democratic Party; \$10,000, New York State Democratic Committee; \$10,000, Massachusetts Democratic State Committee; \$10,000, Georgia Federal Elections Committee; \$10,000, Missouri Democratic State Committee; \$10,000, New Jersey Democratic State Committee; \$10,000, Alaska Democratic Party; \$10,000, Michigan Democratic State Central Committee; \$10,000, Vermont Democratic Party; \$10,000, Kentucky Democratic Party; \$2,800, 09/01/2020, Montanans for Bullock; \$2,800, 09/01/2020, Montanans for Bullock; \$2,800, 09/30/2020, Jon Ossoff for Senate; \$2,800, 09/30/2020, Jon Ossoff for Senate; \$2,800, 10/06/2020, Mike Espy for Senate Campaign Committee; \$2,800, 10/07/2020, Hickenlooper for Colorado; \$2,800, 10/07/2020, Jaime Harrison for US Senate; \$2,800, 10/07/2020, Mark Kelly for Senate; \$2,800, 10/07/2020, Amy McGrath for Senate, Inc.; \$2,800, 10/07/2020, Sara Gideon for Maine; \$2,800, 10/07/2020, Warnock for Georgia; \$2,800, 10/08/2020, Theresa Greenfield for Iowa; \$35,500, 10/20/2020, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; \$2,800, 10/21/2020, Cory Booker for Senate; \$5,000, 10/21/2020, Blue Hen Federal PAC; \$2,900, 02/24/2021, Jana Lynne Sanchez for Congress; \$2,900, 02/24/2021, Jana Lynne Sanchez for Congress.

Said Nabil Abu-Kaud: None.

Jane Hartley, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Nominee: Jane Dorothy Hartley.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these

persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:  
Jane Hartley:  
Recipient, Joint Fund Recipients, Date, and Amount:

Gillibrand for Senate: 3/5/2018, \$2,700; 3/5/2018, \$2,700.

Friends of Maria: 3/5/2018, \$2,700.

Murphy Victory Committee: 3/8/2018, \$1,000; Friends of Chris Murphy, 3/6/2018, \$1,000.

Michigan Wisconsin Victory Fund: 3/26/2018, \$2,000; Tammy Baldwin for Senate, 3/26/2018, \$1,000; Stabenow for US Senate, 3/26/2018, \$1,000.

Moulton for Congress: 3/29/2018, \$2,700.

Rufus Gifford for Congress: 4/10/2018, \$2,700; House Victory Project: 4/23/2018, \$54,000;

Gina Ortiz Jones for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$2,700; Angie Craig for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Susie Lee for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Tom Malinowski for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Elissa Slotkin for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Kirkpatrick for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Susan Wild for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$2,700; Debbie for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Elaine for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Jason Crow for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400; Mikie Sherrill for Congress, 4/23/2018, \$5,400.

Murphy Victory Committee: 5/2/2018, \$4,400; Friends of Chris Murphy, 5/2/2018, \$4,400.

Beto for Texas: 5/10/2018, \$1,000.

Bredesen for Senate: 5/22/2018, \$2,700.

St. Clair for Congress: 6/1/2018, \$2,700.

Menendez Victory Fund: 8/11/2018, \$2,700; Menendez for Senate, 8/12/2018, \$2,700.

House Victory Project: 8/13/2018, \$27,000; Elizabeth Pannill Fletcher for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; McCready for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Cindy Axne for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Delgado for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Spanberger for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Katie Hill for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Josh Harder for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Amy McGrath for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Katie Porter for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700; Mike Levin for Congress, 8/13/2018, \$2,700.

Donna Shalala for Congress: 9/19/2018, \$2,700.

House Victory Project: 9/26/2018, \$9,600; Dr Kim Schrier for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960; Paul Davis for Kansas, 9/26/2018, \$960; Radinovich for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960; Sharice for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960; Andy Kim for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960; Friends of Dan Feehan, 9/26/2018, \$960; Betsy Dirksen Londrigan for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960; Colin Allred for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960; Haley Stevens for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960; Eastman for Congress, 9/26/2018, \$960.

2018 Senate Impact: 9/27/2018, \$10,800; Rosen for Nevada, 9/27/2018, \$2,700; Donnelly for Indiana, 9/27/2018, \$2,700; Bill Nelson for US Senate, 9/27/2018, \$2,700; Sinema for Arizona, 10/14/2018, \$2,700.

House Victory Project: 9/27/2018, \$17,400; Dr Kim Schrier for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Paul Davis for Kansas, 9/26/2018, \$1,740; Sharice for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Andy Kim for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Radinovich for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Friends of Dan Feehan, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Betsy Dirksen Londrigan for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Colin Allred for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Haley Stevens for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740; Eastman for Congress, 9/27/2018, \$1,740.

MJ for Texas: 10/23/2018, \$2,700.

New Democrat Coalition PAC: 10/24/2018, \$5,000.

House Majority PAC: 11/1/2018, \$10,000.

Peters for Michigan: 2/6/2019, \$2,500.

Doug Jones for Senate Committee: 2/15/2019, \$2,700.

Biden for President: 4/29/2019, \$2,800.

Bennet for America: 5/3/2019, \$2,800.

Hickenlooper 2020: 5/13/2019, \$2,800.

Win the Era PAC: 5/13/2019, \$2,800.

Amy for America: 5/20/2019, \$2,800.

Beto for America: 5/20/2019, \$2,800.

Gillibrand 2020: 6/10/2019, \$2,800.

Seth Moulton for America Inc.: 6/17/2019, \$2,800.

Kamala Harris for the People: 6/25/2019, \$2,800.

Mike Johnston for US Senate: 6/27/2019, \$2,800.

MJ for Texas: 6/28/2019, \$2,800.

Kamala Harris for the People: 6/28/2019, \$500.

Kamala Harris for the People: 6/30/2019, \$500.

Hickenlooper for Colorado, 8/23/2019, \$2,800.

Cory 2020: 9/5/2019, \$2,800.

DCCC: 9/6/2019, \$5,000.

Kennedy for Massachusetts: 9/30/2019, \$2,800.

The Top 4 2020 Committee: 9/30/2019, \$22,400; Peters for Michigan, 9/30/2019, \$3,100; Tina Smith for Minnesota, 9/30/2019, \$5,600; Shaheen for Senate, 9/30/2019, \$5,600; Doug Jones for Senate Committee, 9/30/2019, \$2,700.

The Top 4 2020 Committee—Refund: \$(5,400).

2020 Senate Impact: 11/26/2019, \$22,400; Cal for NC, 11/26/2019, \$5,600; Theresa Greenfield for Iowa, 11/26/2019, \$5,600; MJ for Texas, 11/26/2019, \$5,600; Mark Kelly for Senate, 11/26/2019, \$5,600.

House Victory Project 2020: 12/20/2019, \$28,000; Joe Cunningham for Congress, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Committee to Elect Jared Golden, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Kendra Horn for Congress, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Xochitl for New Mexico, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Lauren Underwood for Congress, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Andy Kim for Congress, 2/20/2019, \$2,800; Friends of Lucy McBath, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Brindisi for Congress, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Max Rose for Congress, 12/20/2019, \$2,800; Friends of Ben McAdams, 12/20/2019, \$2,800.

Josh Gottheimer for Congress: 1/3/2020, \$2,800.

DCCC: 1/21/2020, \$35,500.

Josh Gottheimer for Congress: 2/4/2020, \$2,800.

2020 Senate Impact: 3/3/2020, \$16,800; Sara Gideon for Maine, 3/3/2020, \$5,600; Bollier for Kansas, 3/3/2020, \$5,600; Hickenlooper for Colorado, 3/3/2020, \$5,600; Hickenlooper—Refund, 3/31/2020, \$(2,800).

House Victory Project: 3/16/2020, \$28,000; Harley Rouda for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Elaine for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Elizabeth Pannill Fletcher for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Finkenauer for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Cartwright for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Cindy Axne for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Delgado for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Elissa Slotkin for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Spanberger for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800; Tom Malinowski for Congress, 3/16/2020, \$2,800.

Joe Kennedy III: 3/18/2020, \$2,800.

Kennedy for Massachusetts—Refund: 9/30/2020, \$(2,800).

Democrat Party of Wisconsin: 4/9/2020, \$10,000.

Montanans for Bullock: 6/2/2020, \$2,800.

Booker Victory Fund: 6/2/2020, \$2,800. Cory Booker for Senate, 6/21/2020, \$2,800.

Donna Shalala for Congress: 6/11/2020, \$2,800.

Donna Shalala for Congress: 6/11/2020, \$2,800.

Biden Victory Fund: 6/12/2020, \$41,100; Biden for President, 6/12/2020, \$2,800; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, 6/12/2020, \$35,500; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, 6/12/2020, \$2,800.

Jaime Harrison for US Senate: 6/15/2020, \$1,000.

2020 Senate Impact: 6/23/2020, \$8,400; Montanans for Bullock, 6/25/2020, \$2,800; Warnock for Georgia, 6/25/2020, \$2,800; Warnock for Georgia, 6/25/2020, \$2,800.

People for Government PAC, 7/8/2020, \$5,000; Peters for Michigan: 7/22/2020, \$2,800.  
Peters for Michigan—Refund: 8/10/2020, \$2,800.

Peters Victory 2020: 8/3/2020, \$2,800; Michigan Democratic State Central Committee, 8/19/2020, \$2,800.

House Victory Project 2020: 8/7/2020, \$33,600; Sri for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Amy Kennedy for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Peterson for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; TJ Cox for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Carolyn for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Rita Hart for Iowa, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Friends of Dana Balter, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Candace for 24, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Kate for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Gina Ortiz Jones for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Eastman for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800; Betsy Dirksen Londrigan for Congress, 8/7/2020, \$2,800.

New Leadership PAC: 8/12/2020, \$10,000.  
Goroff for Congress: 8/31/2020, \$1,500.  
Menendez Victory Fund: 9/14/2020, \$2,800; Menendez for Senate, 9/14/2020, \$2,800.

House Victory Project 2020: 9/21/2020, \$22,400; Cohn for Congress 2020, 9/21/2020, \$2,800; Hiral for Congress, 9/21/2020, \$2,800; Hoosiers for Hale, 9/21/2020, \$2,800; Scholten for Congress, 9/21/2020, \$2,800; Wendy Davis for Congress, 9/21/2020, \$2,800; Jackie Gordon for Congress, 9/21/2020, \$2,800; Friends of Dan Feehan, 9/21/2020, \$2,800; Debbie for Congress, 9/21/2020, \$2,800.

Susan Wild for Congress: 9/29/2020, \$2,800.  
Common Sense 2020—III: 11/17/2020, \$2,800; Jon Ossoff for Senate, 11/24/2020, \$2,800.  
Wyden for Senate: 3/16/2021, \$2,900.  
Wyden for Senate: 3/16/2021, \$2,900.  
Friends of Schumer: 3/24/2021, \$2,900.  
Friends of Schumer: 3/24/2021, \$2,900.  
Bennet Wyden Victory Fund: 3/26/2021, \$2,900; Bennet for Colorado, 3/31/2021, \$2,900.  
Bennet Wyden Victory Fund: 4/30/2021, \$2,900; Bennet for Colorado, 4/30/2021, \$2,900.  
Ro for Congress: 6/25/2021, \$2,900.  
Ralph Schlosstein:  
Recipient, Joint Fund Recipients, Date, and Amount:  
Friends of Dan Feehan: 1/25/2018, \$2,700.  
St. Clair for Congress: 6/8/2018, \$2,700.  
Donna Shalala for Congress: 9/30/2018, \$2,700.

2018 Senate Impact: 10/4/2018, \$10,800; Rosen for Nevada, 10/4/2018, \$2,700; Donnelly for Indiana, 10/4/2018, \$2,700; Bill Nelson for US Senate, 10/4/2018, \$2,700; Sinema for Arizona, 10/14/2018, \$2,700.  
MJ for Texas: 10/23/2018, \$2,700.  
Cory 2020: 3/31/2019, \$2,800.  
Bennet for America: 5/3/2019, \$2,800.  
Bennet for America: 5/3/2019, \$2,800.  
Bennet for America—Refund: 4/17/2020, (\$2,800).

Biden for President: 5/13/2019, \$2,800.  
Amy for America: 5/21/2019, \$2,800.  
Beto for America: 5/29/2019, \$2,800.  
Kamala Harris for the People: 6/14/2019, \$2,800.

Win the Era PAC: 8/5/2019, \$2,800.  
Hickenlooper for Colorado: 8/23/2019, \$2,800.  
Service First Women's Victory Fund: 9/9/2019, \$5,000; Mikie Sherrill for Congress, 9/9/2019, \$1,000; Elissa Slotkin for Congress, 9/9/2019, \$1,000; Chrissy Houlahan for Congress, 9/9/2019, \$1,000; Spanberger for Congress, 9/9/2019, \$1,000; Elaine for Congress, 9/30/2019, \$1,000.

Kennedy for Massachusetts: 9/30/2019, \$2,800.  
Kennedy for Massachusetts: 9/30/2019, \$2,800.  
Kennedy for Massachusetts—Refund: 9/30/2020, (\$2,800).

Hiral for Congress: 9/9/2019, \$2,800.

2020 Senate Impact: 12/17/2019, \$20,000; Theresa Greenfield for Iowa, 12/17/2019, \$2,800; Theresa Greenfield for Iowa, 12/17/2019, \$2,200; MJ for Texas, 12/17/2019, \$2,200; MJ for Texas, 12/17/2019, \$2,800; Cal for NC, 12/17/2019, \$2,200; Cal for NC, 12/17/2019, \$2,800; Mark Kelly for Senate, 12/20/2019, \$2,200; Mark Kelly for Senate, 12/20/2019, \$2,800.

2020 Senate Impact: 2/25/2020, \$15,000; Hickenlooper for Colorado, 2/25/2020, \$2,200; Hickenlooper for Colorado, 2/25/2020, \$2,800; Hickenlooper for Colorado—Refund, 3/31/2020, (\$2,200); Sara Gideon for Maine, 2/25/2020, \$2,200; Sara Gideon For Maine, 2/25/2020, \$2,800; Bollier for Kansas, 2/25/2020, \$2,800; Bollier For Kansas, 2/25/2020, \$2,200.  
Friends of Suraj Patel: 6/8/2020, \$1,000.  
Biden Action Fund: 8/10/2020, \$50,000; Biden for President, 8/10/2020, \$2,800; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, 8/10/2020, \$11,700; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, 8/10/2020, \$35,500.  
New Leadership PAC: 8/14/2020, \$10,000.  
Shaheen for Senate: 10/1/2020, \$2,800.  
Shalala Victory Fund: 10/8/2020, \$2,800; Donna Shalala for Congress, 10/9/2020, \$2,800.  
Wyden for Senate, 3/16/2021, \$2,800.  
Wyden for Senate, 3/17/2021, \$100.  
Friends of Schumer, 3/25/2021, \$2,900.  
Friends of Schumer, 3/25/2021, \$2,900.

Alexander Mark Laskaris, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be an Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

Nominee: Alexander M. Laskaris.  
Post: Ambassador, Republic of Chad.  
(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)  
Contributions, amount, date, and donee:  
None.

Alan M. Leventhal, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Denmark.

Nominee: Alan M. Leventhal.  
Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Denmark.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)  
Contributions, amount, date, and donee:  
Self:

Recipient, Joint Fund Recipients, amount, and date:

The Chicago Committee: \$11,100, 2/08/2018.  
Helena Moreno for Council: \$1,000, 3/12/2018.  
Committee to Elect Royce Duplessis: \$500, 3/12/2018.

Committee to Elect David Pearlman: \$500, 4/03/2018.

Montanans for Tester: \$2,500, 5/01/2018.  
Crowley Leadership Fund: Crowley for Congress, Jobs, Opportunities and Education PAC (JOE-PAC), \$5,000, 5/01/2018; \$400, 5/24/2018; \$4,600 5/24/2018.

Refund—Crowley for Congress: (\$2,700), 9/11/2018.

Michael A. Sullivan Committee: \$1,000, 6/4/2018.

Richmond for Congress: \$2,700, 6/21/2018.  
Byron Rushing Committee: \$1,000, 8/13/2018.  
A New Direction PAC: \$5,000, 8/22/2018.

Gumbo PAC: \$7,500, 12/7/2018.  
Massachusetts State Democratic Party: \$10,000, 2/6/2019.

Committee to Elect Richard Nangle: \$1,000, 3/20/2019.

Richmond for Congress: \$2,800, 3/21/2019.  
A New Direction PAC: \$5,000, 5/09/2019.

The Wu Committee: \$1,000, 5/30/2019.  
Biden for President: \$2,800, 6/05/2019.

Action New Orleans: \$12,500, 8/14/2019.  
Gumbo PAC: \$5,000, 8/19/2019.

Joe Giarrusso Campaign: \$2,500, 9/16/2019.  
John Bel Edwards Campaign LLC: \$5,000, 10/16/2019.

Committee to Elect Marty Walsh: \$1,000, 10/21/2019.

Victory for Louisiana/LA Democrats: \$25,000, 10/22/2019.

Shaheen Committee: \$600, 12/03/2019.

Shaheen Victory Fund: New Hampshire Democratic Party, \$10,000, 12/03/2019; \$5,000, 12/20/2019.

Jake Auchincloss for Congress: \$2,800, 12/05/2019.

Committee to Re-Elect Latoya Cantrell: \$5,000, 12/05/2019.

The Governor JBE Transtion Transition Fund LLC: \$5,000, 12/09/2019.

Unite the Country: \$250,000, 12/18/2019.

Madame President PAC: \$10,000, 2/03/2020.

Committee to Elect House Democrats: \$10,000, 2/03/2020.

Maggie for NH: \$5,000, 2/03/2020.

Unite the Country: \$50,000, 2/28/2020.

Committee to Elect Marty J. Walsh: \$1,000, 3/05/2020.

Biden for President: \$2,800, 3/25/2020.

Committee to Re-Elect Claire Cronin: \$1,000, 5/07/2020.

Kennedy for Massachusetts: \$2,800, 3/31/2020.

Shaheen Victory Fund 2020: New Hampshire Democratic Party, \$5,000, 5/26/2020; \$5,000, 6/13/2020.

The Committee to Elect Sara Lewis Judge: \$1,000, 6/22/2020.

Biden Action Fund: DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee—Headquarters Account, DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee—Recount, DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee—Convention Account, DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, \$250,000, 6/23/2020; \$106,500, 8/17/2020; \$106,500, 8/17/2020; \$1,500, 8/17/2020; \$35,500, 8/17/2020.  
Common Good Virginia: \$100,000, 6/24/2020.  
Cal for NC: \$2,800, 6/18/2020.

Dr. Al Gross for U.S. Senate: \$2,800, 6/18/2020.

Sally Kerans: \$250, 6/22/2020.

Alan Khazei: \$2,800, 6/29/2020.

Khazei for Congress: \$2,800, 7/21/2020.

Refund—Alan Khazei: (\$2,800), 11/11/2020.

Olin Parker: \$1,000, 9/1/2020.

Ethan Ashley: \$1,000, 9/1/2020.

Carlos Zervigon: \$1,000, 9/1/2020.

Nolan Marshall: \$1,000, 9/1/2020.

Katie Boudouin: \$1,000, 9/1/2020.

John Brown: \$1,000, 9/1/2020.

Leslie Ellison: \$1,000, 9/1/2020.

Alan Gross: \$2,800, 9/09/2020.

Committee to Elect Terri F. Love: \$2,500, 9/09/2020.

New Hampshire Coordinated Campaign: \$5,000, 9/15/2020.

PT Fund: \$5,000, 9/15/2020.

Jake Auchincloss for Congress: \$2,800, 9/18/2020.

Jason Rogers Williams: \$2,500, 10/10/2020.

Finkenauer Victory Fund: Finkenauer for Congress, \$2,800, 10/16/2020; \$2,800, 10/16/2020.

Disouza Re-Election Committee: \$1,000, 10/28/2020.

Leslie Ellison: \$1,000, 11/10/2020.

Ethan Ashley: \$1,000, 11/10/2020.

Katherine Boudouin: \$1,000, 11/10/2020.

Carlos Zervigon: \$1,000, 11/10/2020.

Nolan Marshall, Jr.: \$1,000, 11/10/2020.

Jon Ossoff for Senate: \$2,800, 11/10/2020.

Warnock for Georgia: \$2,800, 11/10/2020.

Common Good Virginia: \$10,000, 11/24/2020.

PIC2021, Inc: \$100,00, 12/07/2020.

William Peduto: \$2,800, 12/22/2020.

Troy Carter for Congress: \$2,800, 1/29/2021.

Friends of Schumer: \$5,800, 3/9/2021.

Keisha Lance Bottoms for Mayor: \$4,300, 3/22/2021.

Refund—Keisha Lance Bottoms for Mayor: (\$1,500), 6/29/2021.

Warnock Victory Fund: Warnock for Georgia, \$2,900, 4/20/2021; \$2,900, 4/20/2021.

Jake Auchincloss: \$2,900, 6/02/2021.

Environmental Voter Project: \$1,000, 7/13/2021.

Joseph I. Giarrusso III: \$2,500, 8/10/2021.  
 Jay Banks: \$1,000, 8/18/2021.  
 Kristin Gisleson Palmer: \$1,000, 8/25/2021.  
 Michelle Wu: \$1,000, 10/25/2021.  
 Jean Paul Morrell: \$2,500, 10/26/2021.  
 Committee to Elect Jay A. Banks: \$4,000, 12/23/2021.  
 Spouse:  
 Recipient, Joint Fund Recipients, date, and amount:  
 The Chicago Committee: 2/8/2018, \$11,100.  
 Hilena Moreno: 3/12/2018, \$1,000.  
 Royce Duplessis: 3/12/2018, \$500.  
 Bill Cassidy for U.S. Senate: 3/26/2018, \$1,000.  
 David Pearlman: 3/31/20, \$500.  
 Richard Nangle: 4/9/2018, \$500.  
 Joshua Zakim: 4/18/2018, \$1,000.  
 Gumbo PAC: 12/7/2018, \$7,500.  
 Judge Chase Finance Committee: 1/19/2019, \$1,000.  
 The Markey Committee: 2/8/2019, \$5,400.  
 Kamala Harris for the People: 4/8/2019, \$2,800.  
 Biden for President: 6/5/2019, \$2,800.  
 Joe Giarrusso Campaign: 9/16/2019, \$2,500.  
 John Bel Edwards Campaign: 10/21/2019, \$5,000.  
 Shaheen for Senate: 12/4/2019, \$2,800.  
 Shaheen for Senate: 12/4/2019, \$2,200.  
 Jake Auchincloss for Congress: 12/5/2019, \$2,800.  
 Campaign to Re-Elect Latoya Cantrell: 12/11/2019, \$5,000.  
 Shaheen Victory Fund 2020—Redesignated from Spouse: New Direction PAC, 1/15/2020, \$5,000.  
 The Committee to Elect Mayor Walsh: 3/5/202, \$1,000.  
 Claire Cronin: 5/29/2020, \$1,000.  
 Shaheen Victory Fund 2020: New Hampshire Democratic Party, Shaheen for Senate, 6/13/2020, \$5,000; 6/13/2020, \$4,400; \$600.  
 Becky Grossman for Congress: 6/17/2020, \$1,000.  
 Jake Auchincloss for Congress: 9/18/2020, \$2,800.  
 Dr. Al Gross for U.S. Senate: 9/21/2020, \$2,800.  
 Pinkenauer Victory Fund: 10/16/2020, \$2,800.  
 Pinkenauer for Congress: 10/16/2020, \$2,800.  
 Jon Ossoff for Senate: 12/17/2020, \$2,800.  
 Warnock for Georgia: 12/7/2020, \$2,800.  
 William Peduto: 12/22/2020, \$2,800.  
 Troy Carter for Congress: 1/29/2021, \$2,800.  
 Warnock Victory Fund: Warnock for Georgia, 4/20/2021, \$2,900; 4/27/2021, \$2,900.  
 Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms: 4/22/2021 \$4,300.  
 Jake Auchincloss for Congress: 6/2/2021, \$2,900.  
 Kim Janey: 6/21/2021, \$1,000.  
 Elect Joseph Giarrusso: 8/10/2021, \$2,500.  
 Michelle Wu for Mayor: 10/25/2021, \$1,000.  
 Jean Paul Morrell: 10/26/2021, \$2,500.  
 Bridget A. Brink, of Michigan, 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 Ukraine.  
 (Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)  
 Nominee: Bridget A. Brink.  
 Post: Ukraine.  
 (The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)  
 Contribution, amount, date, and donee:  
 None, N/A, N/A, Bridget A. Brink.  
 None, N/A, N/A, Nicholas B. Higgins.

## 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. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4239. A bill to establish a democracy advancement and innovation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 4240. A bill to amend section 2441 of title 18, United States Code, to broaden the scope of individuals subject to prosecution for war crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4241. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to require investment advisers for passively-managed funds to arrange for pass-through voting of proxies for certain securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 4242. A bill to provide for the preservation and storage of uranium-233 to foster development of thorium molten-salt reactors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 4243. A bill to establish the Department of Homeland Security Trade and Economic Security Council and the position of Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 4244. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the manufacture, processing, use, and distribution in commerce of commercial asbestos and mixtures and articles containing commercial asbestos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4245. A bill to impose a moratorium on large agribusiness, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 4246. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a pilot program to provide grants related to advance air mobility infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 4247. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to establish university centers to encourage certain economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 4248. A bill to enhance pipeline safety and oil spill preparedness and response, particularly in the Great Lakes Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 4249. A bill to create a point of order against legislation making nondefense dis-

cretionary appropriations that would increase the deficit during a period of high inflation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 4250. A bill to create a point of order against legislation making nondefense discretionary appropriations that would increase the deficit during a period of high inflation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 4251. A bill to create a point of order against legislation making nondefense discretionary appropriations that would increase the deficit during a period of high inflation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4252. A bill to terminate duties and other restrictions on the importation of infant formula, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4253. A bill to prohibit the mass cancellation of student loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4254. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to clarify a provision relating to certain contents of registrations under that Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4255. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4256. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent food shortages, including shortages of infant formula and certain medical foods; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 4257. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to establish requirements for infant formula cost containment contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr.



LEAHY, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COONS, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. REED, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KAINE, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. KELLY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER);

S. Res. 643. A resolution designating the week of May 15 through May 21, 2022, as “National Police Week”; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 241

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 241, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to promote international press freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 1596

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1596, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. 1784

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1784, a bill to amend the Fairness to Contact Lens Consumers Act to modernize verification of contact lens prescriptions, and for other purposes.

S. 2278

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2278, a bill to improve agency rule-making, and for other purposes.

S. 2553

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2553, a bill to amend title

28, United States Code, to protect employees of the Federal judiciary from discrimination, and for other purposes.

S. 2607

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2607, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the former hostages of the Iran Hostage Crisis of 1979–1981, highlighting their resilience throughout the unprecedented ordeal that they lived through and the national unity it produced, marking 4 decades since their 444 days in captivity, and recognizing their sacrifice to the United States.

S. 3029

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3029, a bill to amend section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 to remove immunity for providers of interactive computer services for certain claims, and for other purposes.

S. 3417

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3417, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 3678

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3678, a bill to authorize the National Detector Dog Training Center, and for other purposes.

S. 3719

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3719, a bill to establish the Southwestern Power Administration Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 3747

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3747, a bill to prohibit an employer from terminating the coverage of an employee under a group health plan while the employee is engaged in a lawful strike, and for other purposes.

S. 4003

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4003, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises.

S. 4131

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4131, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the trade

or business expense deduction for the reimbursement of employee costs of child gender transition procedure or travel to obtain an abortion.

S. 4190

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4190, a bill to provide for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to Ukraine for military, economic, and humanitarian aid.

S. 4192

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4192, a bill amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end the tax subsidy for employer efforts to influence their workers' exercise of their rights around labor organizations and engaging in collective action.

S. 4228

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4228, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to immediately resume oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes.

S. 4229

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4229, a bill to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 39

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 39, a concurrent resolution honoring the 1,000,000 individuals who have died from COVID-19 in the United States.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 4246. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a pilot program to provide grants related to advance air mobility infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Advanced Aviation Infrastructure Modernization Act, which I introduced today.

Next-generation propulsion aircraft, including electric vertical takeoff and landing aircraft, are poised to revolutionize how people and cargo move within and between cities, suburban, and rural areas. These advanced air mobility technologies also present the potential to transform how we link historically underserved communities and

deploy a new type of transportation that does not require physical roads or rails.

As localities, regions, and States consider how to integrate the advent of these technologies and the opportunities to relieve traffic congestion and improve mobility options, a modest Federal investment can help communities ensure that cutting-edge, clean, quiet aviation technologies can be best integrated into existing and future transportation networks.

That is why I am proud to introduce this bill to help States and localities keep pace with this growing sector. It would establish a pilot program to help State, local, and Tribal governments to prepare for anticipated advanced air mobility operations and ensure communities can take advantage of the potential benefits of the safe integration of these technologies in our Nation's airspace.

I want to thank Senator MORAN for coleading this bill with me, and I hope our colleagues will join us in support of this bill that will help communities prepare for the development and deployment of advanced air mobility technologies and related infrastructure.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 4247. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to establish university centers to encourage certain economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the University Centers for Growth, Development, and Prosperity Act, which I introduced today.

The U.S. Economic Development Administration created the University Center Program to allow institutions of higher education and consortia to establish and maintain university centers, with the understanding that our higher education institutions play a critical role in our Nation's economic growth.

University centers are Federal partnerships that leverage the assets of higher learning institutions to strengthen regional economic growth by promoting innovation, entrepreneurship, and job creation. They encourage economic development in economically distressed regions, which helps spur job growth, high-skilled regional talent pools, and business expansion.

Despite EDA's important work, many communities across the country have yet to benefit from the Agency's programs, including smaller communities, communities of color, and rural areas experiencing higher rates of poverty.

The current University Center Program is not specifically authorized by Congress and is instead part of EDA's Technical Assistance Program.

That is why I am proud to introduce legislation that would codify and ex-

pand the University Center Program, leverage more resources for minority-serving institutions, and support a greater diversity of innovation and entrepreneurship in their communities. California has thriving institutions, including Chico State and Fresno State, that will be able to scale their impact with new resources. By prioritizing the establishment of new university centers at colleges and universities that serve significant populations of underserved students, we can strengthen regional economies and help close the racial wealth gap.

Specifically, the bill establishes an EDA University Center Program to help universities collaborate with economic development districts, trade adjustment assistance centers, and other economic development technical assistance and service providers to develop and implement comprehensive economic development strategies and other economic development planning at the local, regional, and State levels, with a focus on innovation, entrepreneurship, and workforce development.

It also prioritizes the participation of minority-serving institutions as part of the University Center Program. Minority-serving institutions provide incredible opportunities for so many low-income and first-generation students. I am proud that my State of California is home to 174 Hispanic-serving institutions and 51 emerging Hispanic-serving institutions the highest amount in the country.

As a Senator representing one of the most diverse States in the country, I am proud to work with my colleagues to ensure that we work to improve the equity of EDA programming and help increase the participation of minority-serving institutions.

I want to thank Congressman PETE AGUILAR for introducing this bill with me, and I hope our colleagues will join us in support of this effort.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4255. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. 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. 4255

*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 "Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2022".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(2) the term "domestic terrorism" has the meaning given the term in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code;

(3) the term "Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee" means the committee within the Department of Justice tasked with assessing and sharing information about ongoing domestic terrorism threats;

(4) the term "hate crime incident" means an act described in section 241, 245, 247, or 249 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631);

(5) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(6) the term "uniformed services" has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

#### SEC. 3. OFFICES TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF OFFICES TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, INVESTIGATE, AND PROSECUTE DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) DOMESTIC TERRORISM UNIT.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Unit in the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, which shall be responsible for monitoring and analyzing domestic terrorism activity.

(2) DOMESTIC TERRORISM OFFICE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Office in the Counterterrorism Section of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice—

(A) which shall be responsible for investigating and prosecuting incidents of domestic terrorism;

(B) which shall be headed by the Domestic Terrorism Counsel; and

(C) which shall coordinate with the Civil Rights Division on domestic terrorism matters that may also be hate crime incidents.

(3) DOMESTIC TERRORISM SECTION OF THE FBI.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Section within the Counterterrorism Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall be responsible for investigating domestic terrorism activity.

(4) STAFFING.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each ensure that each office authorized under this section in their respective agencies shall—

(A) have an adequate number of employees to perform the required duties;

(B) have not less than one employee dedicated to ensuring compliance with civil rights and civil liberties laws and regulations; and

(C) require that all employees undergo annual anti-bias training.

(5) SUNSET.—The offices authorized under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) JOINT REPORT ON DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) BIENNIAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and each 6 months thereafter for the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit a joint report authored by the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and



(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the domestic terrorism threat posed by White supremacists and neo-Nazis, including White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and the uniformed services; and

(B)(i) in the first report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that have occurred in the United States since April 19, 1995, including any White-supremacist-related incidents or attempted incidents; and

(ii) in each subsequent report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that occurred in the United States during the preceding 6 months, including any White-supremacist-related incidents or attempted incidents;

(C) a quantitative analysis of domestic terrorism for the preceding 6 months, including—

(i) the number of—

(I) domestic terrorism related assessments initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of assessments from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism;

(II) domestic terrorism-related preliminary investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of preliminary investigations from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and how many preliminary investigations resulted from assessments;

(III) domestic terrorism-related full investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of full investigations from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and how many full investigations resulted from preliminary investigations and assessments;

(IV) domestic terrorism-related incidents, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, the number of deaths and injuries resulting from each incident, and a detailed explanation of each incident;

(V) Federal domestic terrorism-related arrests, including the number of arrests from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each arrest;

(VI) Federal domestic terrorism-related indictments, including the number of indictments from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each indictment;

(VII) Federal domestic terrorism-related prosecutions, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each prosecution;

(VIII) Federal domestic terrorism-related convictions, including the number of convictions from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each conviction; and

(IX) Federal domestic terrorism-related weapons recoveries, including the number of each type of weapon and the number of weapons from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism; and

(i) an explanation of each individual case that progressed through more than 1 of the stages described under clause (i)—

(I) including the specific classification or subcategory for each case; and

(II) not including personally identifiable information not otherwise releasable to the public; and

(D) certification that each of the assessments and investigations described under subparagraph (C) are in compliance with all applicable civil rights and civil liberties laws and regulations.

(3) HATE CRIMES.—In compiling a joint report under this subsection, the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall, in consultation with the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, review each Federal hate crime charge and conviction during the preceding 6 months to determine whether the incident also constitutes a domestic terrorism-related incident.

(4) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public websites of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(5) NONDUPLICATION.—If two or more provisions of this subsection or any other law impose requirements on an agency to report or analyze information on domestic terrorism that are substantially similar, the agency may produce one report that complies with each such requirement as fully as possible.

(c) DOMESTIC TERRORISM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee, which shall meet on a regular basis, and not less regularly than 4 times each year, to coordinate with United States Attorneys and other key public safety officials across the country to promote information sharing and ensure an effective, responsive, and organized joint effort to combat domestic terrorism.

(d) FOCUS ON GREATEST THREATS.—The domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall focus their limited resources on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the number of domestic terrorism-related incidents from each category and subclassification in the joint report for the preceding 6 months required under subsection (b).

#### SEC. 4. TRAINING TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) REQUIRED TRAINING AND RESOURCES.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall review the anti-terrorism training and resource programs of their respective agencies that are provided to Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, including the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Program that is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice, and ensure that such programs include training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies in understanding, detecting, deterring, and investigating acts of domestic terrorism and White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of law enforcement and cor-

rections agencies. The Attorney General shall make training available to Department prosecutors and to Assistant United States Attorneys on countering and prosecuting domestic terrorism. The domestic-terrorism training shall focus on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the quantitative analysis in the joint report required under section 3(b).

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Any individual who provides domestic terrorism training required under this section shall have—

(1) expertise in domestic terrorism; and

(2) relevant academic, law enforcement, or other community-based experience in matters related to domestic terrorism.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and twice each year thereafter, the Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each submit a biannual report to the committees of Congress described in section 3(b)(1) on the domestic terrorism training implemented by their respective agencies under this section, which shall include copies of all training materials used and the names and qualifications of the individuals who provide the training.

(2) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary;

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of each report, be posted on the public website of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(C) include the number of Federal incidents, investigations, arrests, indictments, prosecutions, and convictions with respect to a false report of domestic terrorism or hate crime incident.

#### SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall establish an interagency task force to analyze and combat White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of the uniformed services and Federal law enforcement agencies.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the interagency task force is established under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall submit a joint report on the findings of the task force and the response of the Attorney General, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense to such findings, to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(C) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) submitted in unclassified form, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public website of

the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

**SEC. 6. FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR ADDRESSING HATE CRIME INCIDENTS WITH A NEXUS TO DOMESTIC TERRORISM.**

(a) **COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE.**—The Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice, authorized under section 1001(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000g), may offer the support of the Service to communities where the Department of Justice has brought charges in a hate crime incident that has a nexus to domestic terrorism.

(b) **FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.**—Section 249 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.**—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall assign a special agent or hate crimes liaison to each field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate hate crimes incidents with a nexus to domestic terrorism (as such term is defined in section 2 of the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2022).”.

**SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, may be construed to authorize the infringement or violation of any right protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States or an applicable provision of Federal law.

**SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 4257. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to establish requirements for infant formula cost containment contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I remember being a new mom and then a new grandma, and all you want to do is hold your baby close and savor every single moment. Instead, parents across the country right now are in a panic—forced to search high and low to find baby formula, the safe baby formula that they need, any safe baby formula.

Almost half of all of our babies born in the United States receive their baby formula through a really important program called WIC—the Women, Infants, and Children program—that we are so proud of, and it is something that has made sure that safe baby formula and healthy food is available for pregnant moms and for babies throughout the first years of a baby's life. So, as all of this has happened now with this emergency—and it is a huge emer-

gency, a huge crisis—there are no options here when children—you know, when babies need to eat. When babies are born, they need safe baby formula.

This has been an “all hands on deck” moment for all of us. That is why, as chair of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee—and I am so proud the Presiding Officer is a member of our committee, is a very valued member of our committee—I am joined with our ranking member, JOHN BOOZMAN, to introduce legislation today to make sure that the USDA can be as flexible as possible in getting our moms and dads and, most importantly, babies the critical baby formula that they need right now.

We are doing this in conjunction with the House, which also has bipartisan legislation. It is my understanding that they will be voting on that soon, and I am hopeful that we can do the same thing. This should be something that brings us all together as quickly as possible.

As an example, the reason we need the bill dealing with WIC—and there is a lot and so much positive that comes from this program. But right now, we make sure that there are safety standards, high-quality safety standards, and that we negotiate, through a competitive process, the best price for moms and babies, but we now need to have flexibility so when a family—for instance, maybe, in Traverse City, MI, or in Lansing or in Detroit—goes to a grocery store and there is only one brand on the shelf and it is not the brand under the WIC contract, that they can buy it. If that is the only thing available, they need to be able to use their WIC support to be able to purchase that.

That is something that our USDA Secretary has jumped into gear to be able to make that happen, but we have got to make sure that that can continue, or we have got to make sure if a parent, again, goes to the store and there are different sizes of formula cans or different prescriptions that normally would not fit under the WIC contract, that they can waive those because we have to be able to get whatever is safe baby formula to families as quickly as possible.

These may sound like small things, but they are the difference right now between whether or not our families on WIC are able to actually get the formula that they need.

In order to make sure that that continues, we have introduced legislation that will guarantee that the flexibilities the USDA needs will continue beyond the public health pandemic flexibilities that they are currently operating under. They have short-term flexibilities because of the public health pandemic. We want to make sure this is permanent and that whether it is a recall, a safety recall, a supply chain breakdown—whatever it is—that, with all hands on deck, the USDA has the capacity—the authority, the tools—to be able to move forward and

make sure that they can respond as quickly as possible.

We also want to guarantee that formula manufacturers that want to compete for these WIC contracts have a plan in place to respond to any kind of shortage so we don't have this situation happen again. There is just no excuse, frankly, for what happened here.

I want to thank Secretary Vilsack and the USDA for moving quickly once they were notified about the Abbott plant shutdown.

I am deeply concerned that they were not given a heads-up earlier. The FDA was working for months, evidently—for a few months—with Abbott around concerns as it related to the safety standards and so on at the plant, and the USDA needed to know sooner so that they could prepare sooner. They understand how serious this is, what an emergency it is. So, when they found out, they went immediately into gear to make sure that our moms and babies, if at all possible, in any way possible, could get what they need. That has to be a top priority, not just for the moms and babies on WIC; all moms, all parents, all babies need to make sure that it is an “all hands on deck” and that we are moving as fast as possible.

That is why I also want to thank President Biden and the FDA for working with other baby formula manufacturers to increase supplies.

Supplies are going up. I am very anxious to see more manufacturers of baby formula. I think we, as in every area, it seems, of our economy, have too much consolidation—that is certainly true here—and we need more competition, and we need more baby formula manufacturers competing for our contracts. We need to have a contract that gives the best price to WIC's moms and dads and babies, but we need to make sure that we have as many large and small companies that are competing for that to be able to make sure that we have the formula available and that we are getting the very best price.

I also want to thank them for carefully and thoughtfully opening up imports from the European Union. We certainly have other countries that have the same very high safety standards that we do. We have got to make sure that anything that comes in is of the very highest safety standard.

We know that, right now, we have got to make sure that baby formula is on the shelf. Children—babies—need this every day, not “let's wait a month or 2 months.” This is like today that this needs to be happening. Again, there needs to be a sense of urgency to do whatever we can related to this issue and look at all aspects of it to make sure that this does not happen again, if at all possible. This should not be happening again.

Within our WIC bill, we are focused on what we can do to support the USDA to have the maximum flexibilities to support moms and babies and on what we can do to make sure the manufacturers are prepared if something

like this were to happen—some short-age—down the road. We need to make sure that we are looking at every aspect of this and acting now, as fast as possible, and then preparing for the future.

I want to thank, again, Senator BOOZMAN and welcome all of our Members on both sides of the aisle to join us in what, I hope, will be legislation that moves very, very quickly.

The Access to Baby Formula Act is something that every single Member of the U.S. Senate should be supporting so that we can move this legislation out as quickly as possible, working with the House, and getting this done.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 643—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 15 THROUGH MAY 21, 2022, AS “NATIONAL POLICE WEEK”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COONS, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. REED, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KAINE, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. KELLY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 643

Whereas Federal, State, local, and Tribal police officers, sheriffs, and other law enforcement officers across the United States serve with valor, dignity, and integrity;

Whereas law enforcement officers are charged with—

- (1) pursuing justice for all individuals; and
- (2) performing the duties of a law enforcement officer with fidelity to the constitutional and civil rights of the public the officers serve;

Whereas law enforcement officers swear an oath to uphold the public trust even though, through the performance of the duties of a law enforcement officer, the officers may become targets for senseless acts of violence;

Whereas law enforcement officers have bravely continued to meet the call of duty to

ensure the security of their neighborhoods and communities at the risk of their own personal safety in the time of a viral pandemic;

Whereas the resolve to service is clearly demonstrated by law enforcement officers across the country who have tragically fallen ill or passed away due to complications of COVID-19 contracted in the line of duty;

Whereas, in 1962, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy signed Public Law 87-726 (referred to in this preamble as the “Joint Resolution”), which authorizes the President to proclaim May 15 of every year as “Peace Officers Memorial Day” in honor of the Federal, State, and local officers who have been killed, disabled, or otherwise injured in the line of duty;

Whereas the Joint Resolution also authorizes the President to designate the week in which Peace Officers Memorial Day falls as “National Police Week”;

Whereas the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, dedicated on October 15, 1991, is the national monument to honor those law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty;

Whereas Peace Officers Memorial Day, 2022, honors the 576 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty during 2021, including—

- (1) Edgardo Acosta-Feliciano;
- (2) Darrell D. Adams;
- (3) Tracey A. Adams;
- (4) Troy A. Adkins;
- (5) Alexey B. Aguilar;
- (6) Thomas J. Albanese;
- (7) Daniel I. Alfin;
- (8) Sylvia L. Allen;
- (9) Jon D. Anderson;
- (10) Honorato Antones;
- (11) Jose L. Anzora;
- (12) Kevin D. Apple;
- (13) Brandon W. Ard;
- (14) Stephen C. Arnold;
- (15) Derek S. Asdot;
- (16) Roland Asebedo;
- (17) Kareem A. Atkins;
- (18) Christopher J. Bachelor;
- (19) Jeffrey S. Bain;
- (20) Charlie L. Banks, Jr.;
- (21) Thomas P. Barnes;
- (22) Eugene K. Baron, Jr.;
- (23) Martin Barrios;
- (24) Phillip D. Barron, Jr.;
- (25) Shane H. Bartek;
- (26) Joshua Bartlett;
- (27) Wagner L. Bassett, Jr.;
- (28) Thomas A. Beard;
- (29) Justin W. Bedwell;
- (30) Gordon D. Beesley;
- (31) Timothy L. Beggs;
- (32) Julio Beltran;
- (33) Theodore L. Benda;
- (34) Luca P. Benedetti;
- (35) Hugh B. Bennett;
- (36) Dennis K. Bennett;
- (37) Sherman O. Benys, Jr.;
- (38) Gordon W. Best;
- (39) Ryan A. Bialke;
- (40) Derrick A. Bishop;
- (41) Joseph E. Boberg;
- (42) John M. Borges;
- (43) John W. Bost III;
- (44) Andrew R. Bouchard;
- (45) Michael A. Boutte Sr.;
- (46) Nicholas A. Boutwell;
- (47) John M. Bowe;
- (48) Randolph Boyd, Jr.;
- (49) Dennis E. Boykin;
- (50) Donald C. Brackett;
- (51) Chad O. Brackman;
- (52) Ronald E. Bradley;
- (53) Lakeisha M. Brantley;
- (54) Tommy G. Breedlove;
- (55) Nathalie Brill;
- (56) Jeremy A. Brinton;
- (57) Lyndon T. Britt;
- (58) Christopher Broadhead;
- (59) Anthony N. Brognano;
- (60) Thomas A. Brooks;
- (61) Bryan R. Brown;
- (62) Jeremy R. Brown;
- (63) R. Paul Brown, II;
- (64) Tony L. Bruce;
- (65) John R. Bullard, Jr.;
- (66) S. Allen Burdic;
- (67) John R. Burright;
- (68) Joseph W. Burson;
- (69) Thomas L. Burtzloff;
- (70) Austin S. Bush;
- (71) Vincent R. Butler;
- (72) Sean G. Byler;
- (73) Thomas A. Byrne;
- (74) Shawn R. Caine;
- (75) Frederick H. Cameron, Jr.;
- (76) Phillip J. Campas;
- (77) Gregory B. Campbell;
- (78) Lewis F. Cante;
- (79) Armando Cantu, Jr.;
- (80) Roberto C. Cantu;
- (81) Joseph T. Cappello, III;
- (82) Alicia D. Carter;
- (83) Michael P. Cassidy;
- (84) Freddie J. Castro;
- (85) Ervin Castro-Dominguez;
- (86) Francesco L. Celico;
- (87) Esther Charley;
- (88) Leonardo M. Chavez;
- (89) Yandy Chirino;
- (90) David A. Christensen;
- (91) Harry R. Cieszynski, Jr.;
- (92) Joseph A. Cisneros;
- (93) Douglas L. Clark;
- (94) Sony Clerge;
- (95) Robert C. Cloninger;
- (96) Whitney N. Cloud;
- (97) Leonard D. Cocco, Jr.;
- (98) Christopher R. Cockburn;
- (99) Thomas S. Collora;
- (100) Terence P. Connelly;
- (101) Yokemia L. Conyers;
- (102) Tara L. Cook;
- (103) Jon A. Cooke;
- (104) Reginald Cooley;
- (105) Zachary D. Cottongim;
- (106) Daniel P. Cox;
- (107) Buddy R. Crabtree;
- (108) Thomas C. Craig;
- (109) Darryl D. Cross, Jr.;
- (110) Clifford D. Crouch;
- (111) Gary W. Crump;
- (112) David G. Crumpler;
- (113) Juan Cruz, Jr.;
- (114) Fred S. Cueto;
- (115) Christopher W. Cummins;
- (116) Robert T. Daniel;
- (117) Jimmie J. Daniels;
- (118) George F. Darini;
- (119) Stanley Dash;
- (120) Kyle J. Davis;
- (121) Matthew L. Davis;
- (122) Rodney L. Davis, Sr.;
- (123) Broderick R. Daye;
- (124) Juan A. Delgado;
- (125) James E. Dement, Jr.;
- (126) Edward S. Dennis;
- (127) Paramhans D. Desai;
- (128) Stephen R. Desfosses;
- (129) William N. Diaz;
- (130) Kerry D. Dick;
- (131) Cedric G. Dixon;
- (132) Dennis W. Dixon;
- (133) Ross W. Dixon;
- (134) Horacio S. Dominguez;
- (135) Luis H. Dominguez;
- (136) Victor J. Donate;
- (137) Harry O. D’Onofrio;
- (138) Willie L. Dortch;
- (139) James A. Driver;
- (140) Garry P. Duplessis, Jr.;
- (141) Christopher J. Dye;
- (142) John A. Eckerson;
- (143) Hasain El-Amin;
- (144) Stephen M. Evans;
- (145) William F. Evans;

- (146) Ruben Facio;
- (147) Emmanuel Familia;
- (148) Christopher A. Farrar;
- (149) Lazaro R. Febles;
- (150) Gregory J. Ferency;
- (151) Jose Ferrer-Pabon;
- (152) Michael R. Flagg;
- (153) Kevin J. Fletcher;
- (154) Alejandro Flores-Bañuelos;
- (155) Jose V. Fontanez;
- (156) Connell Foreman;
- (157) Gabriel K. Forrest;
- (158) Logan S. Fox;
- (159) Eric A. Frazier;
- (160) Thomas W. Frazier;
- (161) Russell K. Freeman;
- (162) Ella G. French;
- (163) Charles L. Friend;
- (164) Teresa H. Fuller;
- (165) Bruce R. Gadansky;
- (166) Vincent A. Gala, Jr.;
- (167) Thomas J. Gallo;
- (168) Michael G. Garbo;
- (169) Jimmy Garcia;
- (170) Erasmo Garcia-Torres;
- (171) James R. Gardner;
- (172) William L. Gardner;
- (173) Michael D. Garigan;
- (174) Clay E. Garrison;
- (175) Michelle B. Gattety;
- (176) Adam C. Gaubert;
- (177) William W. Gay;
- (178) Clay M. Germany;
- (179) Allen S. Giacchetti;
- (180) Peter Gianfrancesco;
- (181) Kenny L. Gibbons;
- (182) Adam S. Gibson;
- (183) John A. Gilbert;
- (184) Donald R. Gilreath, III;
- (185) Daniel J. Giorgi;
- (186) Albert R. Gomez;
- (187) Juan M. Gomez-Lopez;
- (188) George R. Gonzalez;
- (189) Beverly M. Good;
- (190) Mia D. Goodwin;
- (191) Joseph B. Gore;
- (192) Melton L. Gore;
- (193) Ledell Graham;
- (194) Richard M. Grant;
- (195) Lesley S. Green;
- (196) Joseph L. Greinke;
- (197) Sarah A. Grell;
- (198) Harminder S. Grewal;
- (199) Luke R. Gross;
- (200) William H. Gudgell, Sr.;
- (201) Genaro Guerrero;
- (202) Dominic E. Guida;
- (203) Randy J. Guidry;
- (204) Patricia E. Guillen;
- (205) Eric T. Gunderson;
- (206) Frankie A. Gutierrez;
- (207) Danny J. Guynes;
- (208) Alexander D. Gwosdz;
- (209) Jack E. Gwynes;
- (210) Brent N. Hall;
- (211) Donald Hall;
- (212) Willie E. Hall;
- (213) Shad E. Hammond;
- (214) Todd A. Hanneken;
- (215) Anthony L. Hardie;
- (216) Scott P. Harn;
- (217) Julie A. Harper;
- (218) Bradley J. Harris;
- (219) Alexandra B. Harris;
- (220) Charles W. Harris, Jr.;
- (221) John A. Harris, II;
- (222) John M. Harris;
- (223) Dylan M. Harrison;
- (224) Jeremiah W. Hart;
- (225) Hassan F. Hassan;
- (226) Bryan C. Hawkins;
- (227) Joshua C. Hayes;
- (228) Ryan A. Hayworth;
- (229) Keith A. Heacock;
- (230) Mathew A. Hefter;
- (231) Jerry S. Hemphill;
- (232) Lonny Hempstead;
- (233) Barry E. Henderson;
- (234) James N. Henry;
- (235) Carlos A. Hernandez;
- (236) Jose A. Hernandez;
- (237) Luis A. Hernandez, Sr.;
- (238) Eliezer Hernandez-Cartagena;
- (239) James A. Herrera;
- (240) Julio C. Herrera, Jr.;
- (241) Gary S. Hibbs;
- (242) Michael L. Hill;
- (243) Anthony W. Hinshaw;
- (244) James R. Hirtzel;
- (245) Roger J. Hodge;
- (246) Phillip D. Holbert;
- (247) Frank G. Holguin, III;
- (248) Gregory C. Holland;
- (249) Havonia D. Holley;
- (250) Keona S. Holley;
- (251) John S. Horton;
- (252) Richard L. Houston, II;
- (253) Nicholas A. Howell;
- (254) Timothy L. Howell;
- (255) Sean C. Hryc;
- (256) Charles R. Hughes;
- (257) Jaymes R. Hughes;
- (258) Martez K. Hughes;
- (259) Jody Hull, Jr.;
- (260) Richard W. Humphrey;
- (261) Ronald M. Hunter, Jr.;
- (262) Harry M. Hutchinson, Jr.;
- (263) Eddie B. Hutchison, III;
- (264) Scott A. Hutton;
- (265) Alfredo M. Ibarra;
- (266) Onochie S. Ikedionwu;
- (267) Tomas Infante, Sr.;
- (268) Jimmy A. Inn;
- (269) Maurice J. Jackson;
- (270) Edward C. Jamandron;
- (271) Vickie V. James;
- (272) Darian R. Jarrott;
- (273) David J. Jeanbaptiste, Sr.;
- (274) William J. Jeffrey;
- (275) Alfredo Jimenez, Jr.;
- (276) Bonnie N. Jones;
- (277) Elizabeth A. Jones;
- (278) Stephen G. Jones;
- (279) Terrell K. Jordan;
- (280) Tony M. Jordan;
- (281) Bradley K. Kam;
- (282) Stanley J. Kasper;
- (283) Michael A. Keathley;
- (284) Toby J. Keiser;
- (285) Kevin P. Kennedy, Jr.;
- (286) Jared M. Keyworth;
- (287) John R. King;
- (288) Kenneth R. Kirkland;
- (289) Christopher W. Knight;
- (290) James J. Kouski, Jr.;
- (291) Craig A. Kriner;
- (292) Joseph J. Kurer;
- (293) Brenda L. Lafaso;
- (294) Jason S. Lagore;
- (295) Joe C. Landin;
- (296) Sherry K. Langford;
- (297) Eugene L. Lasco;
- (298) Danny K. Laughner, Jr.;
- (299) Brian R. Lavigne;
- (300) Henry N. Laxson;
- (301) Noah R. Leblanc, Sr.;
- (302) Michael E. Lee;
- (303) Lonnie R. Lejeune;
- (304) Leslie L. Lentz;
- (305) Mark S. Lentz;
- (306) Samuel A. Leonard;
- (307) Eric S. Lindsey;
- (308) Jerad M. Lindsey;
- (309) Louis M. Livatino;
- (310) Clay Z. Livingston;
- (311) Juan F. Llanes;
- (312) Richard Longoria;
- (313) John R. Lowry, II;
- (314) Paul Luciano;
- (315) Mathew L. Lyons;
- (316) David E. Macalpine, Sr.;
- (317) Andrew R. Macdonald;
- (318) Vanessa P. Mackey;
- (319) Charlie W. Mackie, Sr.;
- (320) Patrick W. Madison;
- (321) Blaize A. Madrid-Evans;
- (322) Jesse P. Madsen;
- (323) Michael J. Magli;
- (324) Scott D. Mahoney;
- (325) Melissa R. Maldonado;
- (326) Ramsey O. Mannon;
- (327) Lee D. Manns;
- (328) Luis A. Marrero-Diaz;
- (329) William E. Marsh;
- (330) Lena N. Marshall;
- (331) Steven L. Marshall;
- (332) Amelia T. Martinez;
- (333) Dung X. Martinez;
- (334) Salvador Martinez, Jr.;
- (335) Valentin C. Martinez;
- (336) Joseph A. Martini;
- (337) Micah D. May;
- (338) Robert A. Mayer, Jr.;
- (339) Steven W. Mazzotta;
- (340) Erica N. McAdoo;
- (341) Chad E. McBroom;
- (342) Ray W. McCrary, Jr.;
- (343) Michael S. McDonald;
- (344) Robert L. McFarland;
- (345) Richard A. McMahan;
- (346) John B. McManus;
- (347) William O. McMurtray, III;
- (348) Pedro J. Mejia;
- (349) Armondo C. Mendoza;
- (350) Carlos C. Mendoza;
- (351) Scott E. Merritt;
- (352) David F. Miller;
- (353) Monty R. Mitchell;
- (354) Roger A. Mitchell;
- (355) Martinus M. Mitchum;
- (356) Daniel M. Mobley;
- (357) Brian E. Mohl;
- (358) Thomas J. Mohnal;
- (359) James J. Monda;
- (360) Joseph H. Montgomery;
- (361) Jeffrey M. Montoya;
- (362) Paul K. Mooney;
- (363) Rodney L. Mooneyham;
- (364) Troy K. Morin;
- (365) Edgar A. Morris, III;
- (366) Hector Moya;
- (367) Joshua J. Moyers;
- (368) Mirosław Mroczkowski;
- (369) Michael R. Mundy;
- (370) Marze M. Murray, Jr.;
- (371) Jacinto R. Navarro, Jr.;
- (372) Shantay Neal-Baker;
- (373) Michael D. Neau;
- (374) Ginarro A. New;
- (375) Richard W. Newkirk;
- (376) Madison Nicholson;
- (377) Robert W. Nicholson;
- (378) Anthony Nicoletti;
- (379) Matthew R. North;
- (380) Michael A. Nowak;
- (381) Taiwo C. Obele;
- (382) Christopher N. Oberheim;
- (383) Richard L. Odum;
- (384) Theodore J. Ohlemeier;
- (385) Joe M. Olivares;
- (386) Michael O'Neil;
- (387) Sonny L. Orbin, Sr.;
- (388) Miguel A. Ortiz;
- (389) LaShonda Owens;
- (390) Shane T. Owens;
- (391) Edgar Pales, Jr.;
- (392) Joseph M. Paolillo;
- (393) David D. Parde;
- (394) Arnulto Pargas;
- (395) Al-Mustafa I. Pearson;
- (396) Sherman Peebles;
- (397) Mitchell A. Penton;
- (398) Anibal A. Perez;
- (399) Edward Perez;
- (400) Robert Perez;
- (401) James R. Peri;
- (402) Christine L. Peters;
- (403) Ronald R. Phillips;
- (404) Brian R. Pierce, Jr.;
- (405) Joshua L. Pierson;
- (406) Brian J. Pingry;
- (407) Donald A. Poffenroth;
- (408) Andrew J. Pollack;
- (409) Jackson M. Pongay;

(410) Fred A. Posavetz;  
 (411) Ty A. Powell;  
 (412) Treva T. Preston;  
 (413) William J. Prevatt;  
 (414) Jonathan D. Price;  
 (415) Julian A. Priest, III;  
 (416) Carl L. Proper;  
 (417) Ryan J. Proxmire;  
 (418) Huey P. Prymus, III;  
 (419) Michael F. Raimo;  
 (420) Donald W. Ramey;  
 (421) David B. Ramirez;  
 (422) Esteban Ramirez, III;  
 (423) Frank Ramirez, Jr.;  
 (424) Juan R. Ramirez-Padilla;  
 (425) Mark H. Rawdon;  
 (426) Jason R. Raynor;  
 (427) Matthew D. Razukas;  
 (428) Anthony J. Redondo;  
 (429) Steven Reighard;  
 (430) John E. Reynolds;  
 (431) Vassar O. Richmond;  
 (432) Sean I. Riley;  
 (433) Monica J. Riola;  
 (434) James N. Risner;  
 (435) Eric O. Ritter;  
 (436) Marlene R. Rittmanic;  
 (437) Juan R. Rivera-Padua;  
 (438) Susan A. Roberts;  
 (439) Thomas D. Roberts, Jr.;  
 (440) Echo Rodriguez;  
 (441) Miguel Rodriguez, Jr.;  
 (442) Roberto Rodriguez-Hernandez;  
 (443) Juan Rojas;  
 (444) Ignacio J. Romero;  
 (445) Juan F. Rosado-Lopez;  
 (446) Michael D. Rudd;  
 (447) David E. Ruiz;  
 (448) Juan M. Ruiz;  
 (449) David B. Saavedra;  
 (450) Luis X. Salaman-Conde;  
 (451) Crispin S. San Jose;  
 (452) Rafael G. Sanchez;  
 (453) Gregory M. Santangelo;  
 (454) Angel M. Santiago;  
 (455) Camerino Santiago;  
 (456) Richard J. Santiago;  
 (457) Thomas E. Sawyer;  
 (458) Eric J. Scherr;  
 (459) Lorena Y. Schulte;  
 (460) William R. Schwartz;  
 (461) Laura A. Schwartzberger;  
 (462) Clint R. Seagle;  
 (463) Craig Seijos;  
 (464) Richard A. Sepolio, Sr.;  
 (465) Jennifer B. Sepot;  
 (466) Timothy J. Sheehan;  
 (467) Cleadas G. Sherman;  
 (468) Jesse E. Sherrill;  
 (469) Byron D. Shields;  
 (470) Jimmie A. Shindler;  
 (471) Brandon A. Shirley;  
 (472) Cesar D. Sibonga;  
 (473) Brian D. Sicknick;  
 (474) Derek E. Sidwell;  
 (475) Joshua J. Sieman;  
 (476) Theresa E. Simon;  
 (477) James E. Simonetti;  
 (478) Christopher S. Simpkins;  
 (479) Randall L. Sims;  
 (480) James A. Sisk;  
 (481) Glenn R. Skeens, Jr.;  
 (482) Erik J. Skelton;  
 (483) Dustin L. Slovacek;  
 (484) Charles A. Smith;  
 (485) Harold P. Smith, Jr.;  
 (486) Howard K. Smith, III;  
 (487) James K. Smith;  
 (488) Jeffery R. Smith;  
 (489) Jody J. Smith;  
 (490) Randall V. Smith;  
 (491) Ronald W. Smith;  
 (492) William H. Smith, Jr.;  
 (493) Wayne D. Snyder;  
 (494) Christopher E. Sorrenti;  
 (495) Daniel A. Stainbrook;  
 (496) Brandon M. Stalker;  
 (497) Thomas E. Stanley;

(498) John D. Starks;  
 (499) Joshua W. Stewart;  
 (500) Brandi M. Stock;  
 (501) Michael J. Stokes;  
 (502) Andrew D. Stromfeld;  
 (503) Calyne Stval;  
 (504) Philip T. Sudario;  
 (505) William J. Sullivan, Jr.;  
 (506) Jason T. Swanger;  
 (507) Dennis D. Sylvester, Jr.;  
 (508) Eric H. Talley;  
 (509) Timothy M. Tanksley;  
 (510) Michael P. Taylor;  
 (511) Michael D. Teachout;  
 (512) Jonathan A. Terrazas;  
 (513) Anthony C. Testa;  
 (514) Kendall L. Thomas;  
 (515) Michael T. Thomas;  
 (516) Reginald B. Thomas;  
 (517) Tyler N. Timmins;  
 (518) Francisco J. Tobar;  
 (519) Jonathan H. Tosh;  
 (520) Robert L. Travelstead;  
 (521) Lewis A. Traylor;  
 (522) Christopher S. Triplett;  
 (523) A. Bruce Trivett;  
 (524) John L. Trout, Sr.;  
 (525) Daniel J. Trujillo;  
 (526) Anatasios Tsakos;  
 (527) Lakiesha L. Tucker;  
 (528) Olynthia J. Turner;  
 (529) Steve Urias;  
 (530) Juan M. Urrutia;  
 (531) Dominic D. Vaca;  
 (532) Kevin A. Valencia;  
 (533) Antonio A. Valentine, Sr.;  
 (534) Wolf R. Valmond;  
 (535) Robert J. Vanzeyl;  
 (536) Freddie Vasquez;  
 (537) Rosa E. Vasquez;  
 (538) Phillip Vavrinec, Jr.;  
 (539) Clinton J. Ventra;  
 (540) Nemesio Vera;  
 (541) Jason L. Vice;  
 (542) Robert J. Vidimos, II;  
 (543) Arturo Villegas, Sr.;  
 (544) Bernard T. Waddell, Sr.;  
 (545) Joseph C. Wagner;  
 (546) Dusty L. Wainscott;  
 (547) Chad M. Walker;  
 (548) Kuo-Sheng Wang;  
 (549) Christopher D. Ward;  
 (550) Andrew Waring;  
 (551) Reuben G. Warren, Jr.;  
 (552) Shaun C. Waters;  
 (553) Christopher D. Watson, Sr.;  
 (554) Daniel E. Watts;  
 (555) Michael R. Webb;  
 (556) Michael Weiskopf;  
 (557) Robert L. Welch, III;  
 (558) Joshua J. Welge;  
 (559) Alvis J. West, III;  
 (560) Wayne S. Weyler;  
 (561) Adam D. Whisenant;  
 (562) Anthony R. White;  
 (563) Codie Whitley-Turner;  
 (564) John D. Wilbanks;  
 (565) Jeremy M. Wilkins;  
 (566) Bobby Williams;  
 (567) Robert A. Williams;  
 (568) Raymond O. Williamson;  
 (569) Christopher R. Wilson;  
 (570) Dominic J. Winum;  
 (571) Peter C. Woods;  
 (572) William J. Yancey;  
 (573) Gregory R. Young;  
 (574) David T. Yu;  
 (575) Ricardo Zarate; and  
 (576) John C. Zonneveld; and

Whereas, according to the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (also known as the "LEOKA Program"), since the beginning of 2022, 92 law enforcement officers were reported to have been killed in the line of duty: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 15 through May 21, 2022, as "National Police Week";

(2) expresses unwavering support for law enforcement officers across the United States in the pursuit of preserving safe and secure communities;

(3) recognizes the need to ensure that law enforcement officers have the equipment, training, and resources that are necessary in order to protect the health and safety of the officers while the officers protect the public;

(4) recognizes the law enforcement community for continual unseen acts of sacrifice and heroism, especially in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis faced by the United States;

(5) acknowledges that police officers and other law enforcement personnel, especially those who have made the ultimate sacrifice, should be remembered and honored;

(6) expresses condolences and solemn appreciation to the loved ones of each law enforcement officer who has made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty; and

(7) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Police Week by honoring law enforcement personnel and promoting awareness of the essential mission that law enforcement personnel undertake in service to their communities and the United States.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5040. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Ms. ERNST) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7691, making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5041. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Ms. ERNST) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7691, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 5040.** Mr. PAUL (for himself and Ms. ERNST) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7691, making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VI, insert the following:

**SEC. 6. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION AND UKRAINIAN MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND HUMANITARIAN AID.**

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to provide for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to Ukraine for military, economic, and humanitarian aid;

(2) to provide for the independent and objective leadership and coordination of, and recommendations concerning, policies designed—

(A) to promote economic efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of the programs and operations described in paragraph (1); and

(B) to prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse in such programs and operations; and



(3) to provide for an independent and objective means of keeping the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies fully and currently informed about—

(A) problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of the programs and operations described in paragraph (1); and

(B) the necessity for, and the progress toward implementing, corrective action related to such programs.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED OR OTHERWISE MADE AVAILABLE FOR THE MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND HUMANITARIAN AID TO UKRAINE.—The term “amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, and humanitarian aid for Ukraine” means amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year—

(A) for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative;

(B) for Foreign Military Financing funding for Ukraine; and

(C) under titles III and VI of the Ukraine Supplemental Appropriations Act (division N of Public Law 117–103)

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(3) OFFICE.—The term “Office” means the Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction and Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid renamed under subsection (c)(1).

(4) SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The term “Special Inspector General” means the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction and Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid renamed under subsection (c)(2).

(c) EXPANSION OF THE OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION.—

(1) RENAMING OF OFFICE.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction shall be referred to as the Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction and Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid and shall carry out the purposes described in subsection (a).

(2) RENAMING OF SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction shall be referred to as the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction and Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid.

(3) COMPENSATION.—The annual rate of basic pay of the Special Inspector General shall be the annual rate of basic pay provided for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) PROHIBITION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of section 7324 of title 5, United States Code, the Special Inspector General is not an employee who determines policies to be pursued by the United States in the nationwide administration of Federal law.

(5) REMOVAL.—The Special Inspector General shall be removable from office in accord-

ance with section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) ASSISTANT INSPECTORS GENERAL.—The Special Inspector General shall be assisted by—

(1) the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing appointed pursuant to section 1229(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), who shall supervise the performance of auditing activities relating to programs and operations supported by amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; and

(2) the Assistant Inspector General for Investigations appointed pursuant to section 1229(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), who shall supervise the performance of investigative activities relating to the programs and operations described in paragraph (1).

(e) SUPERVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Special Inspector General shall report directly to, and be under the general supervision of, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

(2) INDEPENDENCE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND AUDITS.—No officer of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, or any other relevant Federal agency may prevent or prohibit the Special Inspector General from—

(A) initiating, carrying out, or completing any audit or investigation related to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; or

(B) issuing any subpoena during the course of any such audit or investigation.

(f) DUTIES.—

(1) OVERSIGHT OF MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND HUMANITARIAN AID TO UKRAINE PROVIDED AFTER FEBRUARY 24, 2022.—In addition to any duties previously carried out as the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, the Special Inspector General shall conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations of the treatment, handling, and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, and of the programs, operations, and contracts carried out utilizing such funds, including—

(A) the oversight and accounting of the obligation and expenditure of such funds;

(B) the monitoring and review of reconstruction activities funded by such funds;

(C) the monitoring and review of contracts funded by such funds;

(D) the monitoring and review of the transfer of such funds and associated information between and among departments, agencies, and entities of the United States and private and nongovernmental entities;

(E) the maintenance of records regarding the use of such funds to facilitate future audits and investigations of the use of such funds;

(F) the monitoring and review of the effectiveness of United States coordination with the Government of Ukraine, major recipients of Ukrainian refugees, partners in the region, and other donor countries;

(G) the investigation of overpayments (such as duplicate payments or duplicate billing) and any potential unethical or illegal actions of Federal employees, contractors, or affiliated entities; and

(H) the referral of reports compiled as a result of such investigations, as necessary, to the Department of Justice to ensure further investigations, prosecutions, recovery of funds, or other remedies.

(2) OTHER DUTIES RELATED TO OVERSIGHT.—The Special Inspector General shall establish, maintain, and oversee such systems, procedures, and controls as the Special Inspector General considers appropriate to discharge the duties described in paragraph (1).

(3) CONSULTATION.—The Special Inspector General shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees before engaging in auditing activities outside of Ukraine.

(4) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—In addition to the duties specified in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Special Inspector General shall have the duties and responsibilities of inspectors general under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) COORDINATION OF EFFORTS.—In carrying out the duties, responsibilities, and authorities of the Special Inspector General under this section, the Special Inspector General shall coordinate with, and receive cooperation from—

(A) the Inspector General of the Department of Defense;

(B) the Inspector General of the Department of State;

(C) the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development; and

(D) the Inspector General of any other relevant Federal agency.

(g) POWERS AND AUTHORITIES.—

(1) AUTHORITIES UNDER INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—In carrying out the duties specified in subsection (f), the Special Inspector General shall have the authorities provided under section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including the authorities under subsection (e) of such section.

(2) AUDIT STANDARDS.—The Special Inspector General shall carry out the duties specified in subsection (f)(1) in accordance with section 4(b)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

(h) PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND OTHER RESOURCES.—

(1) PERSONNEL.—The Special Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the duties of the Special Inspector General under this section, subject to the provisions of—

(A) chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service; and

(B) chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(2) EMPLOYMENT OF EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Special Inspector General may obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at daily rates not to exceed the equivalent rate prescribed for grade GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title.

(3) CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—To the extent and in such amounts as may be provided in advance by appropriations Acts, the Special Inspector General may—

(A) enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons; and

(B) make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Special Inspector General.

(4) RESOURCES.—The Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, shall provide the Special Inspector General with—

(A) appropriate and adequate office space at appropriate locations of the Department of State or the Department of Defense, as appropriate, in Ukraine or in European partner countries;

(B) such equipment, office supplies, and communications facilities and services as may be necessary for the operation of such offices; and

(C) necessary maintenance services for such offices and the equipment and facilities located in such offices.

(5) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request of the Special Inspector General for information or assistance from any department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government, the head of such entity shall, to the extent practicable and not in contravention of any existing law, furnish such information or assistance to the Special Inspector General or an authorized designee.

(B) REPORTING OF REFUSED ASSISTANCE.—Whenever information or assistance requested by the Special Inspector General is, in the judgment of the Special Inspector General, unreasonably refused or not provided, the Special Inspector General shall immediately report the circumstances to—

(i) the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate; and

(ii) the appropriate congressional committees.

(i) REPORTS.—

(1) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter of each fiscal year, the Special Inspector General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense a report that—

(A) summarizes, for the applicable quarter, and to the extent possible, for the period from the end of such quarter to the date on which the report is submitted, the activities during such period of the Special Inspector General and the activities under programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; and

(B) includes, for applicable quarter, a detailed statement of all obligations, expenditures, and revenues associated with military, economic, and humanitarian activities in Ukraine, including—

(i) obligations and expenditures of appropriated funds;

(ii) a project-by-project and program-by-program accounting of the costs incurred to date for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, including an estimate of the costs to be incurred by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other relevant Federal agencies to complete each project and each program;

(iii) revenues attributable to, or consisting of, funds provided by foreign nations or international organizations to programs and projects funded by any Federal department or agency and any obligations or expenditures of such revenues;

(iv) revenues attributable to, or consisting of, foreign assets seized or frozen that contribute to programs and projects funded by any Federal department or agency and any obligations or expenditures of such revenues;

(v) operating expenses of entities receiving amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; and

(vi) for any contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism described in paragraph (2)—

(I) the dollar amount of the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism;

(II) a brief discussion of the scope of the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism;

(III) a discussion of how the Federal department or agency involved in the contract,

grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism identified, and solicited offers from, potential individuals or entities to perform the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism, including a list of the potential individuals or entities that were issued solicitations for the offers; and

(IV) the justification and approval documents on which the determination to use procedures other than procedures that provide for full and open competition was based.

(2) COVERED CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AGREEMENTS, AND FUNDING MECHANISMS.—A contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism described in this paragraph is any major contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism that is entered into by any Federal department or agency that involves the use of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, or humanitarian aid to Ukraine with any public or private sector entity—

(A) to build or rebuild the physical infrastructure of Ukraine;

(B) to establish or reestablish a political or societal institution of Ukraine;

(C) to provide products or services to the people of Ukraine; or

(D) to provide security assistance to Ukraine.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Special Inspector General shall publish each report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) on a publicly available internet website in English, Ukrainian, and Russian.

(4) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if the Special Inspector General determines that a classified annex is necessary.

(5) SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS TO CONGRESS.—During the 30-day period beginning on the date a report is received under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense may submit comments to the appropriate congressional committees, in unclassified form, regarding any matters covered by the report that the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate. Such comments may include a classified annex if the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense considers such annex to be necessary.

(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information that is—

(A) specifically prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of law;

(B) specifically required by Executive order to be protected from disclosure in the interest of defense or national security or in the conduct of foreign affairs; or

(C) a part of an ongoing criminal investigation.

(j) TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) REPORT.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 60 days after receiving a report under subsection (i)(1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly make copies of the report available to the public upon request and at a reasonable cost.

(2) COMMENTS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 60 days after submitting comments pursuant to subsection (i)(5), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly make copies of such comments available to the public upon request and at a reasonable cost.

(3) WAIVER.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—The President may waive the requirement under paragraph (1) or (2) with respect to availability to the public of any element in a report submitted pursuant to subsection (i)(1) or any comments submitted pursuant to subsection (i)(5) if the

President determines that such waiver is justified for national security reasons.

(B) NOTICE OF WAIVER.—The President shall publish a notice of each waiver made under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register not later than the date of the submission to the appropriate congressional committees of a report required under subsection (i)(1) or any comments under subsection (i)(5). Each such report and comments shall specify whether a waiver was made pursuant to subparagraph (A) and which elements in the report or the comments were affected by such waiver.

(k) USE OF PREVIOUSLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated before the date of the enactment of this Act for the Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction may be used to carry out the duties described in subsection (f).

(l) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall terminate on September 30, 2027.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Before the termination date referred to in paragraph (1), the Special Inspector General shall prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a final forensic audit report on programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine.

**SA 5041.** Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Ms. ERNST) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7691, making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VI, insert the following:

**SEC. 6. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR UKRAINIAN MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND HUMANITARIAN AID.**

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to provide for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to Ukraine for military, economic, and humanitarian aid;

(2) to provide for the independent and objective leadership and coordination of, and recommendations concerning, policies designed—

(A) to promote economic efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of the programs and operations described in paragraph (1); and

(B) to prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse in such programs and operations; and

(3) to provide for an independent and objective means of keeping the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies fully and currently informed about—

(A) problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of the programs and operations described in paragraph (1); and

(B) the necessity for, and the progress toward implementing, corrective action related to such programs.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED OR OTHERWISE MADE AVAILABLE FOR THE MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND HUMANITARIAN AID TO UKRAINE.—The term “amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine”



means amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year—

(A) for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative;

(B) for Foreign Military Financing funding for Ukraine; and

(C) under titles III and VI of the Ukraine Supplemental Appropriations Act (division N of Public Law 117-103)

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(3) OFFICE.—The term “Office” means the Office of the Special Inspector General for Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid established under subsection (c)(1).

(4) SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The term “Special Inspector General” means the Special Inspector General for Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid appointed pursuant to subsection (c)(2).

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby established the Office of the Special Inspector General for Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid to carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (b).

(2) APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The head of the Office shall be the Special Inspector General for Ukrainian Military, Economic, and Humanitarian Aid, who shall be appointed by the President. The first Special Inspector General shall be appointed not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The appointment of the Special Inspector General shall be made solely on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

(4) COMPENSATION.—The annual rate of basic pay of the Special Inspector General shall be the annual rate of basic pay provided for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) PROHIBITION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of section 7324 of title 5, United States Code, the Special Inspector General is not an employee who determines policies to be pursued by the United States in the nationwide administration of Federal law.

(6) REMOVAL.—The Special Inspector General shall be removable from office in accordance with section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) ASSISTANT INSPECTORS GENERAL.—The Special Inspector General, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations governing the civil service, shall appoint—

(1) an Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, who shall supervise the performance of auditing activities relating to programs and operations supported by amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; and

(2) an Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, who shall supervise the performance of investigative activities relating to the programs and operations described in paragraph (1).

(e) SUPERVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Special Inspector General shall report directly to, and be under the general supervision of, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

(2) INDEPENDENCE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND AUDITS.—No officer of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, or any other relevant Federal agency may prevent or prohibit the Special Inspector General from—

(A) initiating, carrying out, or completing any audit or investigation related to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; or

(B) issuing any subpoena during the course of any such audit or investigation.

(f) DUTIES.—

(1) OVERSIGHT OF MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND HUMANITARIAN AID TO UKRAINE PROVIDED AFTER FEBRUARY 24, 2022.—The Special Inspector General shall conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations of the treatment, handling, and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, and of the programs, operations, and contracts carried out utilizing such funds, including—

(A) the oversight and accounting of the obligation and expenditure of such funds;

(B) the monitoring and review of reconstruction activities funded by such funds;

(C) the monitoring and review of contracts funded by such funds;

(D) the monitoring and review of the transfer of such funds and associated information between and among departments, agencies, and entities of the United States and private and nongovernmental entities;

(E) the maintenance of records regarding the use of such funds to facilitate future audits and investigations of the use of such funds;

(F) the monitoring and review of the effectiveness of United States coordination with the Government of Ukraine, major recipients of Ukrainian refugees, partners in the region, and other donor countries;

(G) the investigation of overpayments (such as duplicate payments or duplicate billing) and any potential unethical or illegal actions of Federal employees, contractors, or affiliated entities; and

(H) the referral of reports compiled as a result of such investigations, as necessary, to the Department of Justice to ensure further investigations, prosecutions, recovery of funds, or other remedies.

(2) OTHER DUTIES RELATED TO OVERSIGHT.—The Special Inspector General shall establish, maintain, and oversee such systems, procedures, and controls as the Special Inspector General considers appropriate to discharge the duties described in paragraph (1).

(3) CONSULTATION.—The Special Inspector General shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees before engaging in auditing activities outside of Ukraine.

(4) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—In addition to the duties specified in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Special Inspector General shall have the duties and responsibilities of inspectors general under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) COORDINATION OF EFFORTS.—In carrying out the duties, responsibilities, and authorities of the Special Inspector General under this section, the Special Inspector General shall coordinate with, and receive cooperation from—

(A) the Inspector General of the Department of Defense;

(B) the Inspector General of the Department of State;

(C) the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development; and

(D) the Inspector General of any other relevant Federal agency.

(g) POWERS AND AUTHORITIES.—

(1) AUTHORITIES UNDER INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—In carrying out the duties specified in subsection (f), the Special Inspector General shall have the authorities provided under section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including the authorities under subsection (e) of such section.

(2) AUDIT STANDARDS.—The Special Inspector General shall carry out the duties specified in subsection (f)(1) in accordance with section 4(b)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

(h) PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND OTHER RESOURCES.—

(1) PERSONNEL.—The Special Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the duties of the Special Inspector General, subject to the provisions of—

(A) chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service; and

(B) chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(2) EMPLOYMENT OF EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Special Inspector General may obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at daily rates not to exceed the equivalent rate prescribed for grade GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title.

(3) CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—To the extent and in such amounts as may be provided in advance by appropriations Acts, the Special Inspector General may—

(A) enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons; and

(B) make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Special Inspector General.

(4) RESOURCES.—The Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, shall provide the Special Inspector General with—

(A) appropriate and adequate office space at appropriate locations of the Department of State or the Department of Defense, as appropriate, in Ukraine or in European partner countries;

(B) such equipment, office supplies, and communications facilities and services as may be necessary for the operation of such offices; and

(C) necessary maintenance services for such offices and the equipment and facilities located in such offices.

(5) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request of the Special Inspector General for information or assistance from any department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government, the head of such entity shall, to the extent practicable and not in contravention of any existing law, furnish such information or assistance to the Special Inspector General or an authorized designee.

(B) REPORTING OF REFUSED ASSISTANCE.—Whenever information or assistance requested by the Special Inspector General is, in the judgment of the Special Inspector General, unreasonably refused or not provided, the Special Inspector General shall immediately report the circumstances to—

(i) the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate; and

(ii) the appropriate congressional committees.

## (i) REPORTS.—

(1) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter of each fiscal year, the Special Inspector General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense a report that—

(A) summarizes, for the applicable quarter, and to the extent possible, for the period from the end of such quarter to the date on which the report is submitted, the activities during such period of the Special Inspector General and the activities under programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; and

(B) includes, for applicable quarter, a detailed statement of all obligations, expenditures, and revenues associated with military, economic, and humanitarian activities in Ukraine, including—

(i) obligations and expenditures of appropriated funds;

(ii) a project-by-project and program-by-program accounting of the costs incurred to date for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, including an estimate of the costs to be incurred by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other relevant Federal agencies to complete each project and each program;

(iii) revenues attributable to, or consisting of, funds provided by foreign nations or international organizations to programs and projects funded by any Federal department or agency and any obligations or expenditures of such revenues;

(iv) revenues attributable to, or consisting of, foreign assets seized or frozen that contribute to programs and projects funded by any Federal department or agency and any obligations or expenditures of such revenues;

(v) operating expenses of entities receiving amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine; and

(vi) for any contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism described in paragraph (2)—

(I) the dollar amount of the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism;

(II) a brief discussion of the scope of the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism;

(III) a discussion of how the Federal department or agency involved in the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism identified, and solicited offers from, potential individuals or entities to perform the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism, including a list of the potential individuals or entities that were issued solicitations for the offers; and

(IV) the justification and approval documents on which the determination to use procedures other than procedures that provide for full and open competition was based.

(2) COVERED CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AGREEMENTS, AND FUNDING MECHANISMS.—A contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism described in this paragraph is any major contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism that is entered into by any Federal department or agency that involves the use of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, or humanitarian aid to Ukraine with any public or private sector entity—

(A) to build or rebuild the physical infrastructure of Ukraine;

(B) to establish or reestablish a political or societal institution of Ukraine;

(C) to provide products or services to the people of Ukraine; or

(D) to provide security assistance to Ukraine.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Special Inspector General shall publish each report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) on a publicly available internet website in English, Ukrainian, and Russian.

(4) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if the Special Inspector General determines that a classified annex is necessary.

(5) SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS TO CONGRESS.—During the 30-day period beginning on the date a report is received under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense may submit comments to the appropriate congressional committees, in unclassified form, regarding any matters covered by the report that the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate. Such comments may include a classified annex if the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense considers such annex to be necessary.

(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information that is—

(A) specifically prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of law;

(B) specifically required by Executive order to be protected from disclosure in the interest of defense or national security or in the conduct of foreign affairs; or

(C) a part of an ongoing criminal investigation.

(j) TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) REPORT.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 60 days after receiving a report under subsection (i)(1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly make copies of the report available to the public upon request and at a reasonable cost.

(2) COMMENTS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 60 days after submitting comments pursuant to subsection (i)(5), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly make copies of such comments available to the public upon request and at a reasonable cost.

(3) WAIVER.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—The President may waive the requirement under paragraph (1) or (2) with respect to availability to the public of any element in a report submitted pursuant to subsection (i)(1) or any comments submitted pursuant to subsection (i)(5) if the President determines that such waiver is justified for national security reasons.

(B) NOTICE OF WAIVER.—The President shall publish a notice of each waiver made under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register not later than the date of the submission to the appropriate congressional committees of a report required under subsection (i)(1) or any comments under subsection (i)(5). Each such report and comments shall specify whether a waiver was made pursuant to subparagraph (A) and which elements in the report or the comments were affected by such waiver.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2023 to carry out this section.

(2) OFFSET.—The amount appropriated under the heading “ASSISTANCE FOR EUROPE, EURASIA, AND CENTRAL ASIA” in title III of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2022 (division K of Public Law 117-103) is reduced by \$20,000,000.

(l) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall terminate on the day that is 180 days after the date on which amounts appropriated or otherwise

made available for the reconstruction of Ukraine that are unexpended are less than \$250,000,000.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Before the termination date referred to in paragraph (1), the Special Inspector General shall prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a final forensic audit report on programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the military, economic, and humanitarian aid to Ukraine.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 2 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

### COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during

the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

#### 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 Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 4:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, at last, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 19; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date and the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 368, H.R. 7691, to provide aid to Ukraine; further, that the cloture motions filed during Tuesday's session of the Senate ripen at 11:30 a.m. and that if cloture is invoked on H.R. 7691, all postcloture time be expired, the pending amendments be withdrawn, the bill be considered read a third time, and the Senate vote on the passage of the bill without intervening action or debate; that upon disposition of H.R. 7691, the Senate re-

sume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 344, S. 4008, Small Business COVID Relief Act; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 4008 and that if cloture is not invoked on the motion to proceed, the Senate immediately vote on cloture on the Davis nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, Senators should expect two rollcall votes at 11:30 a.m. and two rollcall votes at 1:45 p.m.

#### RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:34 p.m., recessed until Thursday, May 19, 2022, at 10 a.m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 18, 2022:

#### FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION

CHESTER JOHN CULVER, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

ELIZABETH SCHOFF WATSON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CAROL ANNETTE PETSONK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH LOWMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

#### THE JUDICIARY

JENNIFER LOUISE ROCHON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

SUNSHINE SUZANNE SYKES, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

TRINA L. THOMPSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BARBARA A. LEAF, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS).

#### SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

WILLIAM BRODSKY, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2023.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BRIDGET A. BRINK, OF MICHIGAN, 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 UKRAINE.