



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2022

No. 116

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we know that You exist. Every time we hear a baby cry or touch a leaf, we are reminded of Your presence in our world. Lord, continue to look with favor upon our Senators. Enable them to go from strength to strength as they strive to live in day-tight compartments. Guide them around the obstacles that hinder them from living for Your glory. As they strive to please You, empower them to stand for right and leave the consequences to You.

We pray in Your great 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, July 14, 2022.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,  
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

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 Kate Elizabeth Heinzelman, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

### INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday's CPI report told Americans what they already knew all too well: The disastrous effects of Washington Democrats' spending binge last year still have our economy in a vice grip.

Year-on-year, inflation has hit 9.1 percent for the first time since the fall-out of the Carter administration. And the signs are inescapable. Price hikes on everything from food to fuel to housing are setting new multidecade highs.

A shopper out in Oregon told a reporter recently she doesn't buy beef anymore. Here is what she said:

We kind of try to eat what we have while we have it.

Yesterday, we learned exactly what she and millions of Americans are up against: the fastest rising grocery prices since 1979.

In Nevada, the owner of a local diner says:

My concerns are that my food costs have escalated dramatically. I used to gut wrench about [raising menu prices] 2 or 3 percent. Now it is way more than that just to keep my doors open.

Yesterday's report says he is not alone. Nationwide prices for food outside the home haven't risen this fast since back in 1981. And this new reality is especially frustrating for those working to help.

As the head of one South Dakota food bank put it, "The donation load seemed to lighten up. . . . When we give out food boxes, they're not as full as they used to be."

Right as working families are struggling the most, so are the organizations trying to help them. Just one more cruel twist of Washington Democrats' runaway inflation.

One of the first and most painful consequences of the Biden administration's failed policies have been the soaring costs of energy. Remember, on their party's watch, the cost of heating a home rose by double-digit percentages last winter. Electricity prices climbed at their fastest rate since 2006. Prices at the gas pump have doubled since President Biden took office. One Pennsylvania woman said that ever since her heating bill skyrocketed last winter, she has had to scale back her spending big time. Here is what she had to say:

I need to hide under my bed and save every dollar I can.

And in Maryland, one retiree reports that "skyrocketing gas prices mean that visits to the local library—about 5 miles round trip—no longer feel free."

From day one, the Biden administration has worked overtime to make it

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3285

harder to produce the most affordable and reliable forms of energy that Americans rely on at home. Now, as their radical climate agenda takes its toll on domestic production, millions of Americans are facing the possibility—listen to this—of summer blackouts.

The heartland, the West, and the Southwest face the highest risks. The people of Arizona and Nevada, for example, are already at what experts call “elevated risk” for this summer.

Are Arizonans and Nevadans clamoring for a new tax hike on natural gas electricity on top of everything else? I doubt it. Are they desperate to double down on the very unreliable green sources that set us up for these blackouts in the first place? I don't think so.

Our electric grid is overburdened already, but Democrats apparently want to strain it even more by eliminating the most reliable sources of energy we have, all the while spending hundreds of billions on schemes that depend on Chinese minerals, components, and supply chains.

Trading American energy independence for less reliable sources that depend on forced child labor and foreign producers with questionable environmental standards—really, is this what our colleagues think will usher in a big transition to green daydreams?

Washington Democrats are the only ones who would define higher energy costs and lower reliability as a victory. Real-life Americans know that higher costs and rolling blackouts are just two more symptoms of a failed government with failed leadership pushing failed policies.

Working families are still reeling from the time Democrats decided to spend us into inflation. They have got no appetite for being taxed into recession.

#### U.S. SUPREME COURT

Madam President, on another matter, all week long I have been discussing the historic Supreme Court term that wrapped up last month. Over the course of several months, a textualist and originalist majority issued the most consequential victories for our Constitution since the Court overturned *Plessy v. Ferguson* with *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954.

It was the best Supreme Court term in generations.

The Court corrected one of the worst moral and legal mistakes of the 20th century and returned power to the American people to implement popular and commonsense protections for unborn life and bring America back inside the global mainstream.

The Court handed down two historic wins for religious liberty, rolling back decades of infringement on the rights of Americans to worship and to raise families as they choose.

The Court strengthened the rights of law-abiding Americans to defend themselves outside the home in a resounding reaffirmation of the Second Amendment.

And the Court took a huge bite out of the unconstitutional administrative state and rolled back a big part of the Obama-Biden administration's totally illegal Clean Power Plan. With electricity prices skyrocketing on Democrats' watch, experts warning about impending summer blackouts, and more pain at the gas pump, the last thing Americans need is a holy war on fossil fuels that Congress never actually authorized.

The Court's decision in *West Virginia v. EPA* was a victory for working Americans and a reminder that the power to make law rests with their elected Representatives, not unelected bureaucrats.

But, today, I want to talk about something that runs even deeper than these historic rulings. As in any high-profile term, last month, the Court arrived at rulings that some politicians and some citizens liked more than others. Goodness knows that I have been disappointed in my share of Supreme Court rulings over the years, including some extremely consequential cases. Going back decades, there have been countless times when the Federal judiciary has left conservative citizens feeling every bit as disappointed in a particular outcome as far-left activists seem to feel right now. After all, the courts don't exist to enforce any one political ideology or policy agenda. The Justices' sacred job is to follow the written text of our laws and Constitution wherever it may lead them and let the chips fall where they may.

But there is something funny. I can't recall any time when our side, the right-of-center side of America, engaged in prolonged mob protests outside judges' private family homes. The attacks on the judiciary, on this fundamental institution of our society, seem to only run in one direction.

A few weeks ago, the Speaker of the House and the Senate Democratic leader teamed up to issue a, frankly, unhinged statement. Most of the top Democrats in the country followed suit. Their reckless statements did not stop—indeed, barely even took a pause—when a disturbed leftwing person very nearly tried to assassinate a sitting Justice.

Frankly, the inflammatory tone of all of these attacks echoed the furious attacks on the Court, ironically, from the Democrats of the day after *Brown* overturned *Plessy* back in 1954. We are hearing absurd calls from the far left to have Congress politically persecute individual Justices because of their views of the law. They want to take off Lady Justice's blindfold and scare the Court into becoming politically partial.

Well, this didn't start now. Sadly, it has been years in the making. Along the path to this moment, the far left has stoked reckless rhetoric, and we have heard it from Democrats in elected office, like in the amicus brief from several Senators who declared the Court unwell—unwell—and warned it

to “heal itself before the public demands it be ‘restructured.’” In other words, do what we want you to do or we will change the makeup of the Court—or in the named threats from the Democratic leader himself that sitting Justices would—listen to this—“pay the price” for ruling in ways he didn't like. He said that over in front of the Supreme Court.

We have spent a year and a half now hearing Democrats say over and over and over again that a core principle of democracy is accepting the legitimacy of an outcome when you don't like it. Sound familiar? Our colleagues need to practice what they preach.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whips.

#### INFLATION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Republican leader comes to the floor regularly with heartfelt concerns about the burdens facing America's families. I share those concerns. I think all Senators share those concerns. Inflation is a tough thing to deal with in the family budget. I go home to Illinois to see the price of gasoline at the gas stations. I shop in my local stores and see what it costs for the basics. I understand that, although it is an inconvenience for me, for many people, it is a hardship. So for the Republican leader to come to the floor and remind us of that problem which we are facing in our economy is certainly understandable.

Yesterday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the Consumer Price Index for the month of June. It came in higher than anticipated. Prices rose by 1.3 percent in June, and when compared to June 2021, prices are up 9.1 percent—the fastest year over year increase since 1981. When you dive into the data, you will see that prices jumped within categories that affect almost every household: food, energy, rent, gas. We know, for many American families, a break can't come soon enough.

So what are we going to do about it, give speeches? There are a lot of opportunities for us to do that, for the Republican leader and the Democratic leader—or are we going to do something?

The Democrats think it is time to do something, and we have picked one category of cost that is particularly important to American families. It is the category of cost that not only is a life-and-death issue but that determines the cost of health insurance for families. We know that because we are told by the largest health insurers in the United States that the cost of prescription drugs is driving the cost of premiums for health insurance, so Democrats have decided to tackle this directly.

Credit should go to our Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, who is in negotiation now on prescription drug pricing with Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia. I have been skeptical of the outcome of that negotiation, but I am beginning to be encouraged by what I

hear from Senator SCHUMER and from Senator MANCHIN; that, in fact, we can give relief to American families on the life or death inflationary cost of prescription drugs.

Wouldn't that be a breakthrough? Wouldn't it be something if this 50-50 Senate could end up doing something on a bipartisan basis that American families actually feel and for which seniors in our country would be able to say, "There is a limitation on how much I am going to be asked to spend for prescription drugs, and beyond that, I won't have to pay"? That is amazing—a breakthrough. Would it have made a difference when it comes to the cost of living for families? Of course it would.

So you would think that the Senator from Kentucky, who comes to the floor every day to give a speech on inflation, would be the leading cheerleader in our effort to contain the cost of prescription drugs. Wouldn't you think so? No. No. He has announced that he would oppose the increased effort to lower the cost of prescription drugs because it might raise taxes on the wealthiest people in this country. Hard to imagine, isn't it? His sympathy for millionaires and billionaires gets in the way of his caring for working families.

I think he should set it aside and should ask his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle to join in a bipartisan effort to contain the cost of prescription drugs.

We recognize how these price increases are squeezing household budgets across America, and we take it seriously. We have plans to lower prescription drug prices, decrease the price of gas at the pump, help families with the cost of childcare, and increase the supply of housing, all of which will address inflation, but item No. 1, priority No. 1, is prescription drugs.

The Senator from Kentucky has said he will oppose that. I hope he changes his mind. I hope, as he tells the stories of working families who tell him of the burdens they face with inflation, that he will also ask them the questions: How about reduction? How about prescription drugs? Are those expensive for you? Does it create a hardship? You know they do.

It is time for us to do something, and we would certainly like to have the Republican leader on our team to deal with one of the serious problems of the cost of living in America today.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Madam President, on an unrelated topic, the majority leader comes to the floor and characterizes the Supreme Court as the best in history. He refers to decisions they have made and compares them to *Brown v. Board of Education*.

For those who have forgotten, in 1954, the Supreme Court, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, basically said that separate but equal does not work in America anymore; that we are going to provide real equality and real opportunity when it comes to education. It was a historic decision.

The Senator from Kentucky compares it to the *Dobbs* decision on a

woman's right to choose, but there is a critical difference. *Brown v. Board of Education* expanded the constitutional protections of Americans. It expanded the constitutional rights of Americans. Those are historic, and those are consistent with the most celebrated decisions in our Supreme Court's history. *Dobbs* did just the opposite. For the first time ever in recorded history, the U.S. Supreme Court removed a constitutional protection for its citizens. And what was that protection? The right of women to make their choices for their own reproductive health.

So it is very painful to hear a comparison between *Brown*, which extended the constitutional protection and rights of individuals, and *Dobbs*, which, in overturning *Roe v. Wade*, went in exactly the opposite direction.

It is interesting to me to hear the Court being described by the Senator from Kentucky as a Court that is originalist; that it just looked to the Constitution; that it just looked to history. Well, they also looked to something else. Every single nominee on the Supreme Court who had been installed under the Trump administration, with the facilitation of the Senator from Kentucky, had to check one important box: approved by the Federalist Society.

What is the Federalist Society?

You can search the Constitution, and you will see no reference to it whatsoever, but it is very real.

President Trump made no bones about it. He wouldn't consider a Federal court judge, particularly for the Supreme Court, who had not been approved by the Federalist Society. The Federalist Society is an extreme right-wing conservative group that approved judges during the Trump administration and the three judges who were approved for the Supreme Court.

So the loyalty of these Justices may be to the Constitution, but it is also to the Federalist Society's agenda, and that agenda applauds, of course, the *Dobbs* decision in overturning *Roe v. Wade*.

Madam President, I want to make a point about attacks on Supreme Court Justices: unacceptable, unforgivable, and we should do something about it.

Now, here is what the Senator from Kentucky failed to mention: The Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, has enacted a law and has sent it to the floor, which would extend the protection of Federal judges in the *Alderl* Act so that there are more resources put into their protection. It passed overwhelmingly, on a bipartisan basis, in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

You would think, with all of the speeches that we are hearing on the floor about the safety of judges and how we should take care that they are not in danger, that we would have passed that law on the floor of the Senate immediately, right? Wrong. That bill, which gives more resources to protect Federal judges, has been stopped by one Senator, and he has announced publicly that he has done it.

Can you guess where that Senator is from? He is from the same State as the minority leader—Kentucky.

Senator RAND PAUL has held up this bill for additional resources to protect Federal judges for weeks on end. Why? Why don't we want to protect them? He objects to the way we have done it, and he has held up the bill. He won't even let us vote on it.

So I would say to the minority leader from Kentucky: If you really care about the security of judges in the Federal system, pick up the phone and call your colleague from the State of Kentucky and ask him to withdraw his hold on this bill.

We should pass that bill this week. If something terrible happens to a Federal judge, God forbid, how in the world can we explain that one Senator from Kentucky has held up the bill that might have created the resources to protect that Federal judge? That is the reality.

So when you talk about judicial safety, start at home. Start with the State of Kentucky—one Senator for it; the other Senator blocking it. If both of them would be for it, we would do it this afternoon.

FREEDOM TO TRAVEL FOR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2022

Madam President, I would also like to address one of the aspects of the *Dobbs* decision in overturning *Roe v. Wade* which will be addressed by our colleagues a little later this morning.

Our Nation is in the midst of a healthcare crisis because of this *Dobbs* decision. In the weeks since the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*—erasing a longstanding constitutional right to abortion—pregnant women across America have been thrust into chaos. From the moment this decision came down, abortion was declared illegal in nearly 12 States. Some of these States' abortion bans make no exception even in cases of rape and incest. Even when exceptions are made to save the life of a mother, they are confusing and leave medical professionals uncertain of their legal status.

The sad reality is that these laws will most certainly result in there being pregnant women in danger, especially women of color who are more likely to experience severe and even deadly complications as a result of pregnancy.

Earlier this week, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing to examine the damage that has been created by overturning *Roe*.

During that hearing, we heard testimony from Dr. Colleen McNicholas. She is an OB-GYN doctor and abortion provider who practices in both my home State of Illinois and the neighboring State of Missouri.

Dr. McNicholas told the committee:

When the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, they effectively created two nations: one where those reproductive freedoms belong to themselves, and those whose reproductive freedom belongs to a small group of

politicians who effectively appointed themselves as the decision-makers over the bodies, lives, and futures [of women].

Dr. McNicholas informed us that the demand for care at her facility in Illinois has tripled since the *Roe v. Wade* decision was overturned by the Supreme Court. She said:

The Supreme Court's decision has already pushed people—the people each one of you represent—into extreme, and sometimes dangerous, circumstances in order to access one of the safest and most common healthcare procedures.

The radical, far-right majority on the Alito Supreme Court has put lives at risk by revoking a constitutional right, which was on the books for almost 50 years. Now, Members of this Senate must act to protect another constitutional right related to this debate: the right to travel across State lines to access healthcare, in this case, reproductive care.

That is why I am joining my colleagues Senators CORTEZ MASTO, PATTY MURRAY, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, and KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND in cosponsoring the Freedom To Travel Healthcare Act of 2022.

Women and their health providers are counting on us to pass this bill. They find it hard to imagine that State legislators, and even some Federal officials, would try to restrict the right to cross a State boundary for medical care because the anti-choice legislators who have already outlawed abortion in their State are not content with what they have done already. In fact, right now, they are proposing legislation that would turn many State borders into Checkpoint Charlie in America. These lawmakers are hell-bent on denying women fundamental freedoms, no matter how many constitutional rights they infringe upon.

The question is, How far are we willing to let them go? Will we allow them to penalize and prosecute healthcare professionals who provide essential care to their patients in States where abortion remains legal? Are we going to allow these lawmakers to hold American citizens hostage in their own States, forcing them to give birth? Does that sound like the America that we know? No, it doesn't. And we need to draw the line here and now by passing the Freedom To Travel for Healthcare Act of 2022.

#### 2022 NATO SUMMIT

Madam President, during the first part of the July recess, I traveled with several of my Senate colleagues to the historic NATO summit in Madrid, Spain.

On Tuesday, several members of our bipartisan group—Senators SHAHEEN, TILLIS, COONS, ERNST, and BLUNT—spoke on the floor about the trip. Senator FISCHER was also with us at that summit meeting.

I think Senator TILLIS of North Carolina said it best, that despite policy differences within our group of Senators, there was no daylight between us on two profoundly important matters: We

agree, Finland and Sweden should be welcomed into NATO. And we also agree that the illegal, barbaric war on Ukraine by Russian dictator Vladimir Putin must not succeed.

At the summit, we met with leaders from a number of our allies, including, for the first time, leaders from the Indo-Pacific region who joined the NATO summit.

Japanese Prime Minister Kishida was clear when he told us:

The security of Europe and the Indo-Pacific are inseparable.

And German Chancellor Scholz expressed an unwavering commitment to take as long as needed to make sure Ukraine retains its sovereignty against Russia's barbaric aggression.

But perhaps what was most notable was the overwhelming sense of unity and defense of common values found among our NATO allies in the face of Russian aggression. For that, I want to give President Biden credit. He spent an hour or more with our bipartisan delegation at the summit meeting. He and his able team, Secretary of State Blinken, Secretary of Defense Austin, and others, met with us and discussed in detail what was being debated at the summit.

I have been traveling to Eastern Europe and meeting with allies for many years. I can tell you, I have never felt such a shared sense of purpose and determination to stop the Russian threat.

As Senator TILLIS noted on Tuesday, our safety at home is inextricably linked to the security of Europe. Our bipartisan delegation understood this. The world leaders at the NATO summit understood it, and President Biden certainly understands it. Vladimir Putin would serve his people well by understanding it as well.

In the Senate, we can help Putin understand the unbreakable unity and resolve of the world's democracies by being one of the first NATO members of nations to approve Finland and Sweden's membership. We should do that without delay.

#### SWEDEN

Madam President, before arriving at the NATO summit in Spain, I joined my colleagues in visiting one of the prospective new NATO aspirants: Sweden.

Sweden has long been a security ally. For nearly 200 years, it has tried to maintain the semblance of nonalignment. That changed swiftly with Vladimir Putin's aggression. It triggered an overwhelming Swedish support to join NATO, and Sweden began shipping weapons to Ukraine to help in the war effort, something it hadn't done since helping Finland resist Nazi aggression in 1939.

Swedish leaders recognize Russia's aggression today as the same kind of behavior seen in Europe in World War II. They know that the collective NATO security arrangement is critical to stopping Russia. I agree completely and look forward to their NATO membership.

Putin thought he could fracture NATO by invading Ukraine. Look what he did. He stoked petty grievances against NATO, and in the end, we are picking up two valuable, important allies.

And, incidentally, Vladimir Putin, you are now going to have 800 miles of new NATO territory on your border.

#### LITHUANIA AND BELARUS

Madam President, I was unable to join my colleagues who visited Finland as their first stop, as I was in Lithuania, a Baltic State with long memories of Russian tyranny.

In no place is the value of the collective NATO defense more stark than in the Baltic States, which Putin, no doubt, would like to forcibly return to Soviet dystopia.

Lithuanian leaders, including President Nausėda, the Speaker of Parliament Cėmylytė-Nielsen, are keenly aware of the Russian threat. But Lithuania is undeterred in helping its neighbors in Ukraine and Belarus stand up to Russian aggression, and they are unafraid to stand up to the Chinese bullies as well.

I was glad again to spend time with Valdas Adamkus, a highly successful Lithuanian immigrant to Chicago who returned back to his homeland of Lithuania and successfully ran for President. He was there shortly after Lithuania gained its independence from the Soviet Union.

President Adamkus' historic leadership and foresight helped bring Lithuania not only into the European Union, but equally important, into NATO. And for that, the Lithuanian Parliament recently honored his achievements. Quite simply, Lithuania is safer today because of his vision.

The awe and esteem Lithuanians feel for this historic leader was clear from the reverence shown by the Lithuanian people.

I also want to mention the tireless work of Belarusian opposition leader Svetlana Tsikhanouskaya, who lives in Lithuania after fleeing from Belarus from the henchmen of the strongman leader Alexander Lukashenko. You see, 2 years ago, her husband, Sergei, ran for President against Lukashenko. We know from history that anybody who was courageous enough to run against Lukashenko is going to end up in prison after the sham elections which he stages with regularity.

Lukashenko, worried that he couldn't win a fair election, jailed Sergei, her husband. Rather than back down in fear, Svetlana, the wife, ran in his place. She probably won the rigged election but had to flee with her family, leaving Sergei to face an outrageous 18-year prison sentence.

This is a picture of Sergei Tsikhanouskaya facing an 18-year sentence in Belarusian prison because he had the temerity to challenge Lukashenko. Now his wife, a courageous woman if I ever met one, is trying to plead his cause and is safely with her children in Lithuania.

Thousands upon thousands of Belarusians protested the stolen election. Twelve hundred were jailed as a result of it, including Sergei. Putin helped Lukashenko at that moment of crisis, and Lukashenko is now repaying Putin by using Belarus as a staging ground to attack and kill Ukrainians.

Many brave Belarusians still resist, sabotaging Russian supply lines, fighting alongside their Ukrainian brothers and sisters. They understand the fate of Ukraine is tied to their own fate and that Putin must not prevail.

Yesterday, I introduced a resolution with Senators TILLIS, SHAHEEN, VAN HOLLEN, MARKEY, FISCHER, CARDIN, and RUBIO recognizing the second adversary of this stolen election, the historic peaceful protest, the continued heroic efforts of the Belarusian people, and those still languishing in their nation's jails. They and their fight for freedom and democracy cannot be forgotten. And I urge the administration to continue its support for their effort by appointing a new special envoy for Belarus without delay.

Let me conclude with a note of thanks to the many fine members of our State Department Foreign Service who worked tirelessly to represent our diplomatic interests overseas and also make these congressional visits possible. They, along with our military servicemembers serving around the world, are national treasures. I thank them for their service.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

#### INFLATION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, yesterday morning, June inflation numbers were released. And, as usual with this administration, the news was not good.

Inflation rose once again in June to 9.1 percent—the highest inflation since November of 1981. November of 1981. I was in college the last time inflation was this bad.

Americans are suffering. Everywhere Americans turn, they are being asked to pay more—more for cleaning supplies, more for gas, more for health insurance, more for groceries.

A new analysis yesterday from the Joint Economic Committee found that inflation will cost the average American household a staggering \$718 a month over the next year—\$718 per month. That will happen even if prices stop going up tomorrow—\$718 per month, more than \$8,600 for the year. No working family can afford that.

A major reason that we are in this crisis is because of Democrats' decision to flood the economy with unnecessary government money with their so-called American Rescue Plan Act. And, unfortunately, there is no easy solution to the crisis they helped create. But the first thing—the first thing—should be to do no more harm.

Incredibly, however, Democrats are currently attempting to double down on the strategy that helped create this

crisis in the first place by passing a version of the Build Back Better tax-and-spending spree they tried to force through last year.

Apparently, Democrats think more government spending—like the government spending that helped get us into this mess—plus new taxes are a good solution for an inflation crisis and an economy teetering on the brink of recession.

Madam President, if Democrats want to help our country get out of this inflation crisis, more unnecessary government spending and new taxes are the exact wrong way to go about it. In fact, the biggest thing the Democrats can do to avoid making this crisis worse is by flooding the economy with more unnecessary government money.

After that, the biggest thing Democrats and the administration in particular can do to help alleviate this crisis is to unleash American energy production. I don't need to tell anyone that energy prices have been a major contributor to our inflation crisis. Gas prices are up nearly 60 percent—60 percent. The current cost of a gallon of regular gas is \$4.60—almost double what it was when President Biden took office just 18 months ago—and the price of diesel is even worse, which is a big concern for farmers and ranchers back home in South Dakota and around the country, not to mention all of our truckers. Electricity—that is up 13 percent. Utility gas service is up 38 percent. Americans everywhere are feeling the pinch.

Of course, high gas prices and utility prices don't just cause direct pain at the pump; they also contribute to higher prices across the economy, which means that lowering energy prices is one of the most important things we can do to help ease high prices on a variety of goods. The way to lower energy prices is to unleash American energy production, including and especially conventional energy production. Unfortunately, the President has shown and continues to show a clear hostility to conventional energy production despite the fact that our economy cannot function without conventional energy.

Now, I am a longtime supporter of alternative energy, from wind to biofuels, and I come from a State that derives a substantial portion of its electricity generation from wind. In fact, in 2021, over 50 percent of our State's power generation came from wind and 30 percent came from hydroelectric power on the Missouri River. But if it weren't for traditional fossil fuels backing up that generation, we would be left in the dark.

The fact is, no matter how much Democrats might wish it were otherwise, alternative energy technology has simply not advanced to the point where our country can rely exclusively on alternative energy. That means that, unless we want Americans to be permanently buried under the pain of high gas prices, we need to invest in responsible production of oil and natural gas.

We have tremendous natural resources here at home, and the ability to extract those resources is a far more environmentally responsible way than frequently happens in other countries. But unleashing American production is going to require action from the President, who, despite the current energy price crisis, continues to display hostility to domestic production. He touts the number of leases oil and gas companies have available, but he fails to mention that just 3 months ago his administration made it harder for oil and gas companies to actually make use of the leases in question by increasing the regulatory burden for environmental reviews. On top of this, thousands of drilling permits, which are required to actually begin drilling on oil and gas leases, are currently stuck in the approval process at the Department of the Interior.

At the beginning of this month, the administration released a new offshore drilling plan which includes an option to offer, at most, a paltry 11 new leases over the next 5 years. It also leaves the door open for zero new leases—zero. If this proposed 5-year plan doesn't make it clear that the President isn't interested in increasing our domestic energy production, I don't know what does.

Madam President, I could go on. I could mention the administration's proposed SEC climate-disclosure rules that are designed to discourage investment in conventional energy or the President's quest to increase taxes on domestic oil and gas production or Democrats' efforts to impose a new fee—or tax—on methane that could cost consumers an additional \$35 billion to \$69 billion annually, but I will leave it there.

Madam President, I hope—I really hope—that the President and his administration will take a good, hard look at their hostility to conventional energy production. Inflation is at 9.1 percent—9.1 percent. American families are paying nearly twice what they were paying in gas prices just 18 months ago, and utility gas prices have increased sharply.

Unless Democrats want Americans to be facing staggering prices at the pump and on store shelves for the long term, the administration needs to start encouraging domestic production of conventional energy. That means not just approving leases but making it easier for oil and gas companies to actually develop those leases and produce oil and natural gas. It means encouraging, not discouraging, investment in responsible conventional production and infrastructure like natural gas pipelines. It means giving up attempts to discourage domestic energy production with new and higher taxes or burdensome ESG regulations.

American families are struggling, Madam President. The President can actually do something to help them, and I sincerely hope that he will.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4504

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act—something that Senator CORTEZ MASTO, our colleague from Nevada, is leading.

I do want to take a moment, however, to note that there are many things we need to do to reduce costs. I appreciated the words of my colleague from the neighboring State of South Dakota, and I think he is well aware that pharmaceutical prices are No. 1 on the minds of people in many of our States. I ask Republicans to join us in pushing Medicare to finally negotiate lifting the ban so we can negotiate less expensive drugs under Medicare Part D—something that every Democrat is committed to in our caucus and we hope to get done in the next month.

I also note that the President recently came out for E15—something Senator THUNE and I have worked together on for years, and that is now in place as one competitive fuel that should help—not alleviate everything but be a major help—and the release of the oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and so many other areas where we are working together.

I don't think anyone thought we could emerge from a 2-year pandemic and everything was going to be the same. Obviously, there is work left together for the country to bring down costs, and that is on all of our minds.

Madam President, also on our minds is what has recently happened with the Supreme Court and the decision in the Dobbs case. Twenty days ago—only 20 days ago, and you can see everything that has happened since that time—the Supreme Court issued a ruling shredding nearly five decades of precedent protecting a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. Now women are at the mercy of a patchwork of State laws governing their ability to access reproductive care, leaving them with fewer rights than their moms and their grandmas.

In just 20 days, over 20 States have laws in place that could be used to restrict access to abortion. Twenty-five States in total are expected to ban abortion in the days and the weeks ahead. But, colleagues, I am afraid the worst is yet to come.

Legislation was introduced in Missouri to allow private citizens to act as vigilantes and sue people who help women cross State lines for reproductive care—vigilantes, just like we saw in Texas. In Texas, legislators are working on a bill to criminalize businesses that provide resources simply to help their workers obtain abortion services in other States.

These proposals don't just hurt those in need of care; they are also creating an uncertain environment for doctors and straining resources at clinics in States like Minnesota where reproductive rights are protected, two major States in the Midwest—that is it—Illinois and Minnesota.

I spoke on the phone with the head of the Red River Women's Clinic out of Fargo, ND, who had to resort to a GoFundMe page to get the money she needs to move her clinic across the river to Minnesota to a safe place.

Planned Parenthood in Moorhead, MN—I met with them only a week ago about the services and the work they are doing right now.

In Montana, clinics have already begun requiring proof of residency from women seeking abortion pills because they are afraid they might be pursued by out-of-State prosecutors.

Of course, we should never settle for a situation where women in Minnesota have different rights than women in Missouri or where women in Illinois have different rights than women in Texas, but with so many extreme Republicans racing to State capitals to be the first to take away women's rights, it is clear we must explicitly protect the right to travel to other States to access reproductive care. We don't have to imagine why this might matter. We don't need to conjure up hypotheticals. We already know what has happened.

Think about the heartbreaking, enraging story about the 10-year-old girl in Ohio who had to go to Indiana to get an abortion after she was impregnated by her rapist. When that story came out last week, some people doubted it. Now, in clear print in the criminal complaint out of the State of Ohio, we saw yesterday that, yes, this happened. This man raped a 10-year-old girl, and she got pregnant, and then she couldn't even get the care she needed—at age 10—to get an abortion. She had to go across State lines to the State of Indiana just to get her care.

Should the next little 10-year-old's right or 12-year-old's right or 14-year-old's right to get the care that she desperately needs be put in jeopardy? What about her mom? What about her doctor? Where will this end?

That is why we must not just codify Roe v. Wade into law with the bill that we voted on just last month, but we must also pass the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act by unanimous consent right now. That is a bill that our great colleague Senator CORTEZ MASTO is leading.

Our bill protects women and girls from being punished for traveling to another State to access abortion services. It also ensures doctors won't be punished for providing reproductive care outside their home States. As clinics across the country struggle to navigate this post-Roe nightmare landscape, they should not have to add to their list of worries whether they will be criminally prosecuted for serving patients in a nearby State. This is an issue, as I noted, that hits close to home because of Minnesota being in the neighborhood that includes the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, all of which have various issues with reproductive healthcare.

The freedom to travel cannot be an empty promise. That is why the bill

gives the Department of Justice, as well as women and doctors, the power to sue people who infringe on the right to travel for healthcare. Women in States with abortion bans already face enough obstacles to care. We can't wait to see what anti-choice State legislators criminalize next. We have to act now.

All of this comes down to one question: Who should get to make the personal decisions for a woman or for a 10-year-old girl? Should it be her family? Should it be a woman herself? Or should it be politicians, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who supported these Justices, put them in place in the Supreme Court, and got us to where we are right now? I think the answer is clear.

Today, each and every one of my colleagues has the opportunity to show where they stand. Will we come together to protect this essential right to seek healthcare across State lines for the sake of the women and, yes, the young girls across this country? I hope we do.

I thank Senator CORTEZ MASTO for her leadership.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I thank the senior Senator from Minnesota for her remarks and for what brings us to the floor today.

This is the first time in American history that a fundamental constitutional right has been stripped away from the American people—and especially American women—by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In Dobbs, the U.S. Supreme Court demolished 50 years of precedent—half a century of Democratic- and Republican-appointed Justices upholding a constitutional right to privacy that has now been obliterated by the U.S. Supreme Court, a fundamental right that has been upheld over and over again by Justices appointed, as I said, by Presidents of both sides of the aisle.

Madam President, if you had said to me when I was in law school in the early nineties that this day would ever come, that the U.S. Supreme Court, using a radical—a radical—method of constitutional interpretation called originalism that was invented basically when I was in law school—if you had told me that there would be a President of the United States who would appoint a majority of the Supreme Court with that radical interpretation, I would never have believed it. I would never have believed it. And that is what happened because of the Justices Donald Trump put on the Supreme Court.

I want people to hear me who are Republicans in this country and this Chamber. Look it up. I know it is called originalism, but it started in the 1980s and started in the 1990s. It is not the way our Constitution has been interpreted all these years.

This is radical. It is not conservative. In no sense is this a conservative decision. And it has happened, and now

Americans no longer have a constitutional right to privacy to make their own health and reproductive choices.

I can tell you, I read every one of these opinions. In Justice Alito's opinion for the majority, he never even had the courage to grapple with the nature of this fundamental right, what stripping it away would mean for millions of Americans and especially millions of American women, like my three daughters. Instead, what he said was—what he wrote was: If it wasn't a right in 1868, it is not a right today. That was the depth of his analysis—an opinion dripping with hostility and a cavalier attitude toward what he was stripping away from the American people.

I know. I live in a State where there are people who hold very sincere beliefs on both sides of this question. This is a question that is hard for many Americans. That is why I have always believed the right place for this decision to be made is by a woman with her doctor, not by the State, not by a State saying that you have to carry your pregnancy to term without any regard for the individual circumstances that you might face. Instead, as a result of this Court's decision, State laws to ban abortion that are literally from the 1800s are coming back into being. Politicians are writing new State laws to force a woman to carry a pregnancy to term, as I said, without exception. Think about that. Even for women and children who have been raped, like that 10-year-old girl in Ohio who had to travel to Indiana for an abortion—she is living in a State where they are talking about passing a personhood bill.

Soldiers serving—and I have heard in my own State from women who have served in the Armed Forces who are worried about women who are serving in the Armed Forces today on U.S. military bases in States like Mississippi that have banned abortion. What is supposed to happen to them? What has happened to their right to privacy? Even if we paid for them to travel, everybody is going to know what is going on.

Pregnant women could easily find themselves in America today in an emergency room with life-threatening complications—it happens literally every single day, every day—with doctors unable to help because somebody has to go and consult a lawyer. Doctors are afraid to prescribe medications for their patients or even have a conversation about their reproductive health for fear of prosecution.

All over the country, there are elected leaders—so-called leaders—politicians who are putting themselves between a woman and her right to choose.

Nothing I am saying here is fantastic. Everything I am saying here is being talked about, contemplated, legislated in America today all across this country as a result of what the Supreme Court has done.

A woman with cancer could learn she is pregnant—it happens every day,

every day—and learn she can't get the treatment she needs for her cancer.

This is literally crazy—it is literally crazy—but, as you have heard on the floor today, this isn't even crazy enough for some of these elected politicians around the country. Now they are threatening to use the law to prevent women, American citizens, from exercising their right to travel across State lines to access reproductive healthcare in the United States of America. It wasn't enough to strip women of this fundamental right and have the State force them to bring a pregnancy to term. That is not enough. Now they want to use the law to prevent her from traveling from one State to another in the United States of America.

I see the pages sitting here today who are the age of my daughter—one of them—who is 17 years old. I can't believe this is what we are handing over to the next generation of Americans. I can't believe it. I cannot believe it. This is despicable, especially coming from the same people who can never stop telling us how devoted they are to freedom and liberty. What a lie that is. What a lie that is.

I am coming to the end. I know that my colleague from Oregon is next. But I just want to say one last thing. I am so grateful to live in a State like Colorado, a western purple State, where we have already codified a woman's right to an abortion, a woman's right to choose. We understand and we have always as a State understood that protecting a woman's personal liberty to make these decisions is fundamental to her freedom to participate in our society.

If people from other States need to come to Colorado to access the care they need, Congress has the obligation to shield them from prosecution. We need to make sure that healthcare providers, no matter where they are—Colorado and other States—are safe from prosecution, to say nothing of the women themselves, to say nothing of teenage girls themselves.

I can't believe we are even having this conversation on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I can't believe it. But that is the America we live in now because of this Supreme Court, because of this radical ideology they have perpetrated.

That is why I strongly, strongly support this bill from my colleague from Nevada, CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO. On behalf of my three daughters, I want to thank her for her invaluable leadership on this issue.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator the Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, many colleagues want to speak, and I am going to be brief.

The name of Senator CORTEZ MASTO's bill sums up what this is really all about. The Senator has proposed—and she is a former attorney general, a very skilled lawyer—she has proposed legislation, the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act. I just want us to take

a second to think about the name of my colleague from Nevada's legislation.

I would submit to the Senate that you know something has gone horribly wrong in America when the Senate is forced to consider a proposal entitled the "Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act." Colleagues, just look at those words, the "freedom to travel for health care." My colleague has introduced a bill that is as basic as it gets—freedom.

The fact is, six Republicans on the Supreme Court have ripped that freedom out by the roots. Now State governments are moving toward criminalizing travel for healthcare. They are even moving towards criminalizing helping—helping—people travel for healthcare. That is unthinkable, in my view, except millions and millions of Americans are, in fact, thinking about it and being terrified every single day.

In my home State of Oregon, we are fortunate to live in a State that protects women's health and women's basic freedoms. My home State is going to be there for people to get the healthcare they need, including an abortion.

But the fight cannot be left up to the States. That is why I am so pleased to stand with my colleague from Nevada, Senator CORTEZ MASTO, and my partner from the Pacific Northwest, Senator MURRAY, to call for the Senate to pass legislation with the name the "Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act." What my colleague's legislation does is protect women and doctors, and she does it by protecting a constitutional right—the constitutional right to interstate travel.

Colleagues, even 3 weeks after the ruling that overturned Roe, it is shocking and appalling to see what has come next. We see States sprinting towards banning and criminalizing abortion outright. Are you a victim of rape or incest? No exceptions. Are you a child? You will still be forced to birth a child. Is your life in danger if you carry a pregnancy to term? You better get your affairs in order. That is the world millions and millions of American women are living in now that the Republicans on the Supreme Court have ripped away Roe v. Wade. More women's lives are in danger. More American freedoms are disappearing.

The legislation proposed by my colleague from Nevada is as basic as it gets. The Senate needs to act now, and it needs to act without any further delay.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senate should absolutely support the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act.

Currently, abortion is banned in 10 States, with many more set to follow—now, not in Colorado, where we acted strongly to support access to reproductive care. Like other pro-choice States,



we are seeing a large influx of patients. Yet we have heard tragic stories of women sleeping in their cars overnight outside of clinics, after traveling hundreds of miles, as they wait for appointments.

After the Texas abortion ban took effect, one woman had her water break at 19 weeks—actually, on her wedding day. She had moved up her wedding day. The doctors recommended terminating her pregnancy to protect her life, increase the possibility, the likelihood, she could have children in the future. But it wasn't allowed in Texas, so she flew to Colorado for emergency care. Her doctor had her make a plan for this travel, make a plan in case she went into labor on the flight. The plan was to sit near the bathroom.

That is what it will soon come to for women in half of America. Without this legislation, a woman could face prosecution for traveling across State lines. Let that sink in: Her choice would be possible jail or probable death.

This bill will protect every woman's right to travel to seek reproductive care—basic freedom. It would also protect doctors who would practice in States like Colorado and protect them from prosecution and lawsuits for helping out-of-State patients.

Fundamentally, as my fellow Senators have said, this is about freedom. In this new post-Roe era, women can be forced into government-mandated pregnancies. States are stripping women of the freedom over their bodies and their future. The least we should do is protect every patient traveling to receive care that just a few weeks ago was permitted nationwide.

Threatening millions of women and doctors with jail time for seeking or providing reproductive healthcare would be a stain on this Nation. I hope we can find 60 Senators to support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to stand with Senator CORTEZ MASTO to support this legislation and also recognize the leadership of Senator MURRAY on this issue as we fight to protect fundamental rights belonging to the women of America.

For nearly half a century, women relied on Roe's recognition that the Constitution protects their right to decide if and when to have children. A radical and captured Supreme Court has revoked this constitutional right, disrupting the reliance and trust of generations of women to make fundamental decisions about their own health and their own futures.

Overtaking Roe is wildly unpopular, which is why extremists went to the captured Court to get a change that they could not get through the democratic process. Deep-pocketed extremist interests invested hundreds of millions of dollars over decades to build a Court where that kind of stuff could get done.

It is an outrage. Women across this country are angry. Democrats in Congress are angry, and we are fighting back in every way we can.

In addition to State abortion bans, emboldened legislatures are readying even more extreme restrictions on women, like proposals to investigate, prosecute, and sue women who travel out of State to get the care they need. You think I am kidding? Legislation to this effect has already been introduced in Missouri. The Constitution already protects the right to interstate travel, but as we have now seen, we can't rely on an increasingly extremist Supreme Court to protect our rights.

Remember, in a large number of pregnancies, abortion actually becomes medically necessary—medically necessary—for the health of the woman to bear children in the future, for the life of the woman to survive, the risk the pregnancy presents, for the risk to have other children.

So it is extremely important to make sure women can get that medical care. It is extremely important to protect their right to make this choice themselves. And it is extremely important to protect medical professionals in States like Rhode Island, my home State, from punishment for providing care to women from States where State legislatures have made abortions illegal.

I was proud to work with Senator CORTEZ MASTO from the outset to help draft the Freedom to Travel for Healthcare Act. It will protect women's rights to cross State lines and seek medical services and protect providers in States that they are traveling to. I join my colleagues to urge swift passage of this bill. This is just one step. There is much more work to be done to stand against this continuing assault on women's constitutional rights.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, while other colleagues are joining us to speak on behalf of the Cortez Masto language, I wanted to thank the Senator from Nevada for her legislation and just emphasize how important this is to people all through the United States, including my State. It happens to be a border State, but even in Seattle, providers are worrying about a chilling effect.

I was wondering if the Senator from Nevada—while our colleagues have been talking about how this impacts individuals, people seeking healthcare in other States, what is happening now with the chilling effect to providers and their anxiety over people pursuing them for seeing patients from States in which *Roe v. Wade* is not fully protected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Washington and the question posed because

it is exactly part of the concern we have. I was home in Nevada just recently, and I am very proud Nevada is a pro-choice State.

Our providers are concerned. There is a chilling effect when they are hearing other States that are literally criminalizing—looking to pass laws to criminalize providers for providing healthcare and a woman traveling across State lines.

What I hear from my providers is we want to help women. We want them to come to our State, but if their State is going to pursue legislation or criminalize or penalize or prosecute us or a private citizen can come after us from that State, then we are having second thoughts about this because they do not want to be embroiled in some sort of litigation. That is part of this.

I think it is so important. Thank you for the question because that is exactly what their intent is.

These anti-choice States—individuals who are taking away the liberty and freedom of women are also utilizing this chilling effect, this threat, this scare tactic for providers, employers, and anyone else who wants to help women to get to States where they can seek this healthcare that they need. That is the challenge we see. That is why this law is so important because it is having an impact on our providers in these legitimate choice States like ours who want to provide this healthcare.

Ms. CANTWELL. I want to thank the Senator from Nevada. We were joined by the American Medical Association that also expressed this concern. They are speaking on behalf of the providers that want to provide reproductive choice in States that pass this law, and they are concerned. We need to get this legislation passed.

I thank the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank Senator CANTWELL for her leadership and especially Senator CORTEZ MASTO for her legislation which I am about to address. I know that she is running to things today—was in the Banking, Housing Committee and is doing this on the floor. I am so appreciative of her time and efforts from housing to protecting women's health and protecting women's rights.

I want to comment on some of the things that she said and that Senator CANTWELL said about this issue and then one specific thing that has happened in my State, which is outrageous and immoral.

The extreme decision a few weeks ago of five Justices took away women's freedom to make their own personal healthcare decisions and hand it over to politicians. We are also seeing how this put women's health at risk. Senator CORTEZ MASTO and many others on the floor already said that.

My State is, unfortunately, worse in what has happened. Fewer than 10 hours after the Supreme Court's announcement, Ohio's 6-week abortion



ban took effect. They even banned abortion in cases of rape and in cases of incest. That night, women across Ohio received calls from their doctors letting them know their appointments had been canceled. They need to travel to another State for necessary medical care. Ohio politicians are forcing Ohioans—those that can—to take extra time off work to find childcare, to spend resources that they may not have to travel to get the lifesaving care that they need.

One group at a roundtable I did—I do this job much by listening to roundtables of 10 or 15 or 20 Ohioans who talk to me about veterans' care or healthcare or, in this case, women's health or jobs or all the things that I learn and take back to Washington.

I did a roundtable recently where I was hearing from doctors that because Ohio's laws are so extreme—so extreme—that women and men—especially women but men, too—young doctors who might do their residency at some of the best hospitals in the world, the Cleveland Clinic or University Hospital or Cincinnati Children's or Nationwide Children's—that doctors are having second thoughts about wanting to move to Ohio because these abortion laws are so radical and so immoral and so extreme.

I am also hearing that prestigious colleges or colleges of all kinds that we attract—Ohio has more small colleges and small universities, private 4-year schools, than almost any other State in the country. We have great State universities in Ohio and great community colleges. I am hearing from college Presidents that students who are considering coming to Ohio to go to school are having second thoughts, again, because of the extremism of this legislature on abortion and, as the Presiding Officer knows, the Senate's expert on this issue, the extremism on gun laws in Ohio.

One candidate was campaigning for Congress in Northwest Ohio, and he had a holster—under a new Ohio law, he had a holster with a gun in it as he was walking along the side of the street handing candy to children. It is just ludicrous.

Back to this issue that Senator CORTEZ MASTO is leading on. Earlier this month, a 10-year-old girl—a child, a survivor of rape—was forced to travel to Indiana from Ohio to receive healthcare. She was past the 6 weeks. Republican politicians first tried to deny it. They mocked her. They mocked this—they didn't know who she was at this point. They mocked the story. They said it couldn't be true. Then the man who did it was arrested. There was no real apology from these well-known Republican politicians, Members of Congress, statewide officeholders.

They had mocked this story just saying it couldn't be true when it was true. Yet did they apologize? No. They should look into a camera—they should stand in front of many of us and say: I

am sorry. They should apologize to that little girl's family, that little girl's doctor, that little girl's support group that she has.

No 10-year-old—no American—should have to go through what she went through. Since May, 50 reports of rape or sexual abuse involving children under the age of 15 have been reported in Columbus alone. Fifty—50—reports of rape or sexual abuse involving children under 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10—10 years old—children who have been abused like that have been reported in Columbus alone.

I don't know. Are the rightwingers in the legislature who think abortion should have no protection—that no women should be protected, rape, incest, life and health of the mother, that they just deny any of this happened—are they going to do that again and continue to attack these families?

Now, because of the Ohio Legislature's fixation on controlling women's bodies, victims of rape in Ohio won't be able to access the care that they need.

Even in cases where it may technically be allowed, doctors will be afraid to provide it. I heard the fear in doctors' voices in that round table in Cleveland earlier this week. And I heard Senator MURRAY talk about this, who has joined us in the Chamber. I heard doctors talk about the fear that their colleagues have to even get near a pregnant patient who might have another healthcare issue.

Women and girls shouldn't have to travel around the country to receive care—in many cases, care that will save their health or their lives. Doctors shouldn't have to wait on lawyers to tell them if they can provide the care. Again, the fear of these doctors—these were brave women—two women and a man—who were talking to me, they were talking about the fear in others, other physicians, that they are afraid they are going to have to wait on lawyers to tell them if they can provide the care their patients need.

That is what happens when politicians insist on making medical decisions for women and for girls that doctors and the women and girls themselves in their family should be making.

Now, anti-choice politicians attacking Senator CORTEZ MASTO's bill are trying to criminalize interstate travel. Politicians can't hold pregnant women and girls hostage. Politicians should not be able to decide who can travel where. This is America.

In my State, it is Ohio. You are allowed to travel wherever you want, whenever you want. As long as you are doing it legally, interstate travel is a constitutional right.

That is why the Senate must pass the Freedom to Travel for Healthcare Act to protect that right, to protect Ohio women and girls, to protect the healthcare professionals who serve them, all of them.

When, how, and whether to have a family is the most personal and mean-

ingful decisions we make in life. The freedom to make those decisions for yourself free from political interference should be available to everyone—everyone. We can't accept a world where our daughters and our granddaughters have fewer rights and less freedom than their mothers.

As soon as I heard about that decision, about the Dobbs case and *Roe v. Wade*, first thing I thought about is my wife who will celebrate her 65th birthday in 2 weeks, and I thought that my mother—my deceased mother—and my wife have more rights than my daughters in their thirties and early forties and my granddaughters who are still too young to really understand what this is about.

What kind of world is that where people of my generation had more rights than we are bequeathing to our children and our grandchildren?

I won't stop. I know Senator MURRAY won't stop working to protect women's freedom—all Americans' freedoms to have life, to have families, and live their lives how they want, when they want, free from meddling politicians.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday, I chaired a hearing focused on driving home the devastating repercussions of the healthcare crisis Republicans caused by overturning *Roe* and ending the right to abortion.

At that hearing, doctors and patients and experts spoke directly to the chaos and harm Republicans are causing. Tens of millions of women across the country now live in States where abortion has been banned or is likely to be banned soon.

Republicans have ripped away every woman's ability to decide for herself whether or not to keep a pregnancy. And it forced them to be pregnant when they do not want to be. Republicans are denying women control over their own bodies, endangering their health and putting patients and providers in impossible, indefensible situations: doctors unsure if they can save their patients without being punished; pharmacists unsure if they can fulfill a prescription; people unsure if they will be able to get Plan B, unsure if they will be able to use IVF to start a family and afraid they could get reported or investigated or even arrested for having a miscarriage.

And so many women forced to travel across State lines to get the reproductive care they need. People forced to drive miles and miles just to get the care that could save their lives. Good God, this should be unthinkable. But as we saw at yesterday's hearing, that is exactly the sort of oppressive regime, exactly the sort of nightmare reality Republicans have chosen to champion.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas, actually said the fall of *Roe* was "a positive development." Leader MCCONNELL even called it a "gigantic leap forward." My colleagues

really think the devastation, the harm playing out across this country is positive? That is despicable.

Of course, another thing we saw at that hearing is that Republicans will do anything they can to change the subject from the damage that we will see, to ignore the reality of how deadly their policies are.

News flash: When you force someone to be pregnant, they are going to notice; they are going to remember; and they are going to be painfully aware of the difference between their personal decision and the reality Republican politicians are forcing on them.

And the horrifying thing is Republicans aren't just trying to mislead about the real impact of this cruel agenda, they are pushing for a national abortion ban. And Republican lawmakers have already set their sights on ripping away the right to travel.

Let's be really clear what that means. They want to hold women captive in their own States. They want to punish women and anyone who might help them for exercising their constitutional right to travel within our country to get the services that they need in another State.

I hope everyone really absorbs how extreme and how radical and how un-American that is.

I mean, just imagine what bans like that would mean for people. In my home State of Washington, the city of Clarkston is separated from Lewiston, ID, by a river—just a bridge, that is it. People cross that bridge every single day, without a second thought. And they cross State borders just like it every day, by the millions.

Surely, we can all agree that crossing that bridge, crossing any State border to go to the doctor and get healthcare you need should not be a crime. Surely, that is common sense. Surely, every Republican who has railed against Big Government could agree with me about that.

I will be honest, based on the shameless hypocrisy I have seen this week, I doubt it. But we are about to find out because we are about to request we pass a bill that my colleague from Nevada, along with Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and I, introduced on Tuesday, the Freedom to Travel for Healthcare Act. It is telling that some Republicans are already saying that this is a solution in search of a problem.

Well, let's be clear about the problem because it is real and it is imminent. Conservative legal organizations are right now drafting legislation to ban travel for abortion. It was discussed at two anti-abortion conferences already.

Republican Texas legislators are saying out loud they are working with the National Association of Christian Lawmakers to draft bills restricting travel modeled after their barbaric, vigilante abortion ban. And there is already legislation introduced in Missouri to ban abortion travel. Anyone telling you this is not a threat is not paying atten-

tion or they are just trying to mislead you.

So there is a problem. Now, here is the solution. What this bill does is simple, it protects every American's constitutional right to travel across State lines and to travel in order to get or provide a lawful abortion.

It prevents States from restricting or impeding Americans' right to travel to access care and ensures there is legal recourse if States attempt to restrict that right.

And it protects healthcare providers who are licensed to provide abortions in the States where they are practicing. This should not be controversial. We should all agree, Americans have a right to travel within the United States and get the reproductive care they need.

So I urge my colleagues to support this proposal and to work with us to make sure that Americans get access to the healthcare they need where they need it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, recently the Supreme Court righted a historic injustice, and it was clearly written in the opinion by Justice Alito. It said this is to return the power to the people, return the power to the people's elected representatives, instead of nine men back in 1973 in black robes to decide this very important issue.

It said the people should decide the right parameters to protect moms and their babies from the violence of abortion. And rather than use this opportunity to protect life, very soon, the Senate Democrats will try to pass a very extreme—extreme—abortion bill.

Remember how extreme our colleagues have become on the other side of the aisle on the issue of abortion. They want to codify the ability to abort babies up until the moment of birth.

In fact, we have seen my colleagues across the aisle reject trying to protect babies that are born alive as a result of an abortion. It is chilling. This bill that is going to be presented does nothing to help pregnant moms in crisis or their unborn babies.

This bill, just even looking at it, which has been hastily put together in the last 48 hours, this bill would give fly-in abortionists free rein to commit abortion on demand up to the moment of birth and even—it seems—to perform them within a State with strong pro-life laws.

This bill also protects the greed, frankly, of woke corporations, who see that it is cheaper to pay for an abortion and abortion tourism than maternity leave for their employees.

We must reject this radical legislation that will endanger pregnant mothers and endanger their babies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes prior to the scheduled vote.

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my colleagues, and I want to thank my colleagues, Senators MURRAY, WHITEHOUSE, and GILLIBRAND, for their good work with me on the legislation we are talking about today, which is the Freedom to Travel for Healthcare Act.

As you have heard from my colleagues and as we know in the past few months, we have seen women's right to choose taken away in States around the country overnight.

Less than 3 weeks ago, the Supreme Court explicitly overturned *Roe v. Wade*, depriving women of a right they held for 50 years. When the Court decided *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, it repeatedly insisted that its holding would, "return the issue of abortion to the people's elected representatives" in the States. Forget women, forget women's rights, but let's give it to the politicians.

As a result, in 18 States, abortion is either effectively banned or will be within 30 days. Ultimately, around half of States are expected to get rid of most or all abortion services within their borders.

In the face of these profound restrictions on reproductive health services, American women, who are able to do so, have had to travel to States, like mine, that still protect the women's right to choose.

Thanks to a 1990 referendum, Nevada has enshrined the right to choose in statute in my State. That is why we are already seeing women make their way to Nevada to get the healthcare that they need and they deserve.

But radical anti-choice policymakers have been emboldened by the Supreme Court decision and its discord and its shocking disregard for precedent. Yet they are not satisfied with a country where abortion is only banned in half the States.

We know now they are working to introduce legislation in Congress to ban abortion nationwide. And until they can pass it, they want to stop women from traveling for critical care and to punish people who support these women.

Anti-choice State legislators in Missouri, Texas, and Arkansas have said they want to pass bills to fine or prosecute women who travel for healthcare and do the same to providers who offer abortion services and the many employers who have said they will support their employees who need to seek reproductive care in another State.

Let me be specific about this because this is devastating already to so many, including in my State.

In Missouri, a State legislator has repeatedly introduced legislation that would allow private citizens to sue those who help Missouri citizens receive out-of-State abortion services.

In Texas, State legislators have said they will introduce legislation to ban businesses that help employees travel

to receive abortions. They have also written cease-and-desist letters to companies like Lyft, Citigroup, and even law firms to tell them to stop helping employees who seek abortion out of State.

In Arkansas, a State senator has called for a law targeting businesses helping employees travel for care.

Let's not forget South Dakota because the Governor of South Dakota refused in an interview to rule out laws that target women who travel for abortion.

But we are not done yet because we also know that some anti-choice groups are actively pushing for such bans. The Thomas More Society, an extremist anti-choice group, is working on draft legislation. Its vice president told the Washington Post:

Just because you jump across a state line doesn't mean your home state doesn't have jurisdiction. It's not a free abortion card when you drive across the state line.

The National Association of Christian Lawmakers, an anti-abortion organization led by Republican State legislators, is also reported to be working on similar legislation modeled after the Texas law.

There is no doubt in my mind that some States are going to continue to move forward with these kinds of legislation.

I want to note that, quite frankly, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to have it both ways for years, insisting that the right to choose was safe—in my State, they have done it—at the same time they supported increasingly extreme limits to it. We even heard nominees testify that they would follow Supreme Court precedent, including Roe and Casey. Yet now we all know those reassurances were all false. We have seen women's reproductive rights eroded steadily for decades, and we know that anti-choice activists won't stop. This is a form of gaslighting, to keep insisting that American women will be able to get care when we know that anti-choice legislators and groups are working to stop them from doing so.

What legislators are doing across the country to restrict women from traveling is just blatantly unconstitutional. They constrain the fundamental constitutional right to travel, they are anti-woman, they are anti-business, and they are anti-provider.

Let me just say, merely proposing this legislation, merely talking about civil action or prosecuting a woman or a provider or even an employer who helps a woman to travel, is having a chilling effect.

In my State, they are already seeing that these proposals are having a chilling effect on my providers, who are worried about offering quality abortion care in the face of potential lawsuits. In Montana, reproductive health clinics are even limiting care to in-state residents only. Imagine traveling hundreds of miles for essential healthcare, only to be turned away for fear of a lawsuit.

That is why I and my colleagues have introduced this bill to make it crystal clear: States cannot and must not prosecute women who travel across State lines for critical reproductive care.

Our legislation also protects healthcare providers in destination States and anyone who helps women travel for the care they deserve, from businesses to taxi drivers, to doctors.

Today, we are calling to pass this legislation. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe in States' rights and the liberty of freedom for women in this country, they should support this bill. If they believe in the fundamental right of all Americans to travel, they should support this bill. If they fail to protect women who travel for healthcare and those who support them, then they need to go on record for the American people to explain why.

I will tell you what. It is not enough to stand there and say that somehow this legislation is a fly-in abortionist legislation. My colleague from Montana failed to read this legislation. And fearmongering at this point in time when women's fundamental rights are being eroded in this country is not the answer that women and so many Americans in this country now need.

What we need is for people to recommend and support and identify with the freedoms that this country brings to all of us, whether you are a woman or a man in this country. This is about the right to choose and make those decisions for women. It is a fundamental right. It is an important right. It is our healthcare and our decision. We are 50 percent of this population, and we deserve to be treated equally.

With that, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 4504 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Reserving the right to object, this is my first time to be able to stand and speak since the Court made its decision in Dobbs. I have been on this floor I actually don't know how many times talking about the value of every single child.

The conversation today is not just about the right to travel and the right to healthcare. It is deeper than that. It is the right to live.

The conversation today is not just about women. There are two people in this conversation—a child with 10 fingers and 10 toes and a beating heart and DNA that is uniquely different than the mom's DNA or the dad's DNA. They have a nervous system. They feel pain. There is a child in this conversation as well.

In my conversation when I have come to the floor over and over again, it has

been to say that at some point our Nation should look at basic science and to say when you have DNA and you have a functioning nervous system and you have cell division, in every health book everywhere in the country, they call that life, but for some reason, on this floor, it is just tissue.

I actually come to be able to thank millions of women and millions of men who for five decades have not written off children, who have walked out, who have marched, who have silently prayed, who have gathered in places and said: When are we going to recognize what is self-evident? That child in the womb is a child, and that child may be inconvenient, but that is a child. When are we going to recognize that basic thing?

For 50 years, that conversation has gone on with the simple statement of, at what point will we be able to speak out for the value of every person, and I do mean every person, including the mom?

It has been interesting to be able to hear all the misinformation in the past couple of weeks. I have read story after story and seen all these breathless news reports about how women with an ectopic pregnancy will not be able to get care; they will be doomed to die—except there is no State law that would prohibit someone getting treatment that is lifesaving for an ectopic pregnancy in any State. I have seen all these breathless reports about how there will be miscarriages and you won't be able to get care—except that is not true in a single place, not one. This over and over riling people up.

What I have seen are 50 churches that have been attacked. What I have seen are 57 crisis resource centers for pregnancy resource that have been attacked and firebombed. I have seen that. Now, we don't seem to discuss that here on the floor. No one is actually saying that all this conversation, all this misinformation, all this noise is actually leading to actual violence across the country. Everyone is like: Oh, no, no; that is not related. Oh really? So when a pregnancy resource center is firebombed and spray painted on the side of it "If abortions aren't safe in America, neither are you"—we should probably just ignore that? Because that is what is actually going on across the country right now as well.

To be very clear, no State has banned interstate travel for adult women seeking to obtain an abortion. No State has done that. Now, am I confident there are some people who are out there talking? Yes. But there are also in this Senate 5,000 bills that have been filed. And how many of them are actually going to move—as it is in every legislature across the country, and everyone in this body knows it. Everyone knows it. But this seems to be just trying to inflame, to raise the what-ifs.

It has been interesting to me that there is another bill that is actually being discussed that would literally—if you are a pregnancy resource center

dealing with crisis pregnancies, if you don't perform abortions, they would call that misinformation. In the other bill that is being discussed right now, they would fine you \$100,000.

I can't even begin to explain my emotion when I think, if you take the life of a child, there is pressure to say: We want Federal funding to take the life of a child. If you protect the life of a child, we are going to fine you \$100,000. Is that really where we are? Is that really what this debate has become?

This administration has quickly become the most pro-abortion administration in American history and has rapidly moved to accelerate abortions across the country, while millions of other Americans just ask a simple question: Does that child in the womb have the right to travel in their future? Do they get to live?

Some would say: No. They are terribly inconvenient. They need to die.

Others would say: Why don't we actually live by our values, including the right to life?

So while there is conversation about how to put a piece of legislation out that may very well protect individuals who are being trafficked to go to other States to get an abortion or all kinds of other issues that are there, I come back to the most basic thing: There is a child in this conversation, and maybe this body should pay attention to children as well and to wonder what their future could be to travel in the days ahead as well.

I look forward to the day when we are talking more about that little girl and less about misinformation.

I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I would ask for 5 minutes to respond.

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I do appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma coming here to talk. I disagree with his argument, but I do appreciate his profound belief in what he is saying.

I think it is ironic that the issue here before us is really a States right issue. It is exactly what Justice Alito did in the Dobbs case and referred this issue to the States to make that decision, and all my legislation says is, respect my State. We are a choice State. We have made that decision as a State, and if women want to travel to my State to seek services and my providers want to provide those services and employers want to help women travel, then let the States do that. We shouldn't be impeding on those decisions.

So it is kind of ironic. I hear my colleagues talking about, in this case, let's take the emotion out of it, except when they want to put emotion into the issue, or let's take the emotion out of it when it is not convenient for the arguments they are making.

Let me also address a couple of things because now I have learned from some of my colleagues, really, the argument they are going to start making is that somehow this legislation is flying in abortions, which it absolutely is not. It is a States rights issue. And nobody is flying into my State to provide healthcare. The actual healthcare is already there.

The other thing I have heard, which is actually very offensive to me and I think to so many, is that somehow this is trafficking women. Well, let me tell you about trafficking. I know trafficking. I wrote the law to prevent sex trafficking and sexual exploitation in the State of Nevada for so many who were being sexually exploited across this country, to hold predators accountable, to make sure that they can become survivors. This is not trafficking. And for anyone to stand up and say that it is has a complete misunderstanding. And quite honestly, I will welcome you to the fight about human trafficking in this country and sexual exploitation of women and children across the country. That is so offensive. But I am not surprised because in this day and age, unfortunately, some of these radical ideas coming out of this Congress miss what is happening across this country.

A majority of Americans in this country support the right of women to choose because you know why? I don't know what it is like to step in their shoes and walk in their shoes and nor do you, nor does anyone here. I shouldn't impose my beliefs, my religion, my ideas on what they should do for their lives. None of us should. That is the freedom in this country. That is who we are when we stand for freedoms and liberties. It doesn't mean we get to pick and choose those freedoms and take away the rights of the very individual because we believe differently or our religion thinks that we should do differently. That is what we do when we come into this Congress and we all work together to the benefit of everyone and not erode their rights and their future and their opportunities. That is what this is about.

This legislation is very simple. Let's protect those freedoms. Let's make sure we protect those States rights and allow women, healthcare providers, and employers to actually support and help one another in this country. That is what this legislation does. To say otherwise is misconstruing, it is fearmongering, and a continuing erosion of the debate of the constitutional rights and the American rights in this country right now. And that is the problem with Congress.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON HEINZELMAN NOMINATION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Heinzelman nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. 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 Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 41, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 254 Ex.]

##### YEAS—50

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

##### NAYS—41

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

##### NOT VOTING—9

Blumenthal	Leahy	Sanders
Cramer	Lujan	Sasse
Hagerty	Markey	Schumer

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. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julianna Michelle Childs, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas.

## THE ECONOMY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, inflation continues to batter American families at a rate we have not seen in 40 years. Since last year, the prices of items that Texans use every day have increased more than 9 percent. That is, if your paycheck is still the same, you have 9 percent less purchasing power just since last year. At the grocery store, the price of bread is up nearly 11 percent. Chicken is up more than 17 percent. And the price of eggs has jumped a whopping 33 percent.

I sense there is a huge disconnect between the folks here in Washington—perhaps in Congress—that this does not have a dramatic effect in terms of our daily lives; but to the people we represent, the 29 million people I represent, this is real, it is happening now, and it is to the detriment of their quality of life.

Groceries aren't the only thing that are challenging family budgets. Electricity is up 14 percent.

I will be traveling with some colleagues to the Rio Grande Valley this afternoon. I looked at the weather forecast for today and tomorrow. It will be 104 degrees in the Rio Grande Valley; and, no, it will not be a dry heat. And demand on our electricity is real because people cannot live without air-conditioning and climate control; but in order to run your air-conditioning, you are going to have to pay 14 percent more for that electricity this year as opposed to last year.

Propane used at summer barbecues costs 26 percent more. And gasoline prices—there are about 280 million cars on the road today that run using gasoline. The price has jumped 60 percent since last year. If people want to go on a vacation, they just commute to work, they want to take their kids to summer camp, they have got to pay 60 percent more for gasoline than they did last year. And, for the first time, the national average price has exceeded \$5 a gallon. Over the last few weeks, thankfully, prices have fallen slightly—and I emphasize the word “slightly”—but there is no reason to celebrate. The national average is still about \$4.60 a gallon, which is about a buck and a half higher than it was last year alone.

So the American people are looking to Washington, DC, to their elected leaders, and they are wondering: Why aren't you doing something about it? They want to know what the Biden administration's plans are to address these rising costs, especially when it comes to things that are not—I mean, there are some things you can substitute for others. I even saw a woman on the news who said she decided to become a vegetarian because she couldn't afford the meat cost in the grocery store. But there are some things that are simply irreplaceable, and gasoline to drive your car is one of them.

Well, one of the most logical ways to increase the supply of gasoline—because it really is about supply and de-

mand—would be to boost American production of our domestic energy supply. That way, we could reap the economic benefits of strong production here at home, along with the jobs that go along with it. We could continue to use our capability to export things like natural gas to countries that previously were dependent almost exclusively on the Russian Federation.

Actually, the capacity of the United States to produce energy at home and export it around the world has changed the geopolitics of the planet in a very positive way. But, unfortunately, we see the Biden administration has taken a different approach. He knows that a part of his political base would have an absolute meltdown if the President showed anything other than contempt for the domestic energy producers. So he has come up with a different strategy that, frankly, makes no sense whatsoever.

So he is on a trip to the Middle East. He is going to visit with Muhammad bin Salman, Crown Prince of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and ask him to increase production of oil and gas from not the United States but from Saudi Arabia. Forget American energy producers. President Biden would rather go, hat in hand, and talk to an autocrat, an oligarch in the Middle East, than take his boot off the neck of American energy producers.

So, apparently, the President is not anti-fossil fuels; he is just anti-American fossil fuels. President Biden's trip illustrates a remarkable show of his priorities. He views the crown prince in Saudi Arabia as a more dependable ally than energy producers in Texas.

Well, the decision to shop for oil in the Middle East instead of harnessing what is in our backyard is absolutely baffling. The sooner the administration views domestic energy producers as a friend and ally rather than enemies, the better we will all be off.

We are fortunate to live in a resource-rich country. Growing up, I learned in school that countries that are endowed with great natural resources have an advantage over other countries that do not have those natural resources. And we do have them here in the United States, along with the technology to develop them. But, for some strange reason, we just simply refuse to do so—take what is a gift and ignore it completely and go, hat in hand, and talk to autocrats in other parts of the world and ask them to do what we should be doing here domestically.

## BORDER SECURITY

Well, Mr. President, on another matter, I am eager to head home this afternoon to Texas, where, as I mentioned, the weather is a little warm. We have been having, I think, about 33 days of plus-100-degree temperatures. And as I was telling some of my colleagues here, no, it is not a dry heat, which is usually the response when you tell somebody how hot it is. They say: Well, at least it is a dry heat.

It is not. It is very hot. But it is summertime in Texas, so we expect it, and we adjust to that.

But we are going specifically to the Rio Grande Valley, which is that 1,200-mile strip of land that is contiguous to Mexico, between Texas and Mexico. And we are going with some of our Senate colleagues so they can see for themselves what Senator CRUZ and I have seen before and have come to learn as a result of talking to the world's best experts in what is happening at the border, and that is the people who live and work there.

The men and women who live and work along our border are the experts and the best people to talk to and learn from, which is one reason why I continue to be disappointed that the Vice President, having been appointed border czar or immigration czar, has yet to make a substantive visit to the border to do what we will do this afternoon and tomorrow, which is to listen and learn. And maybe—just maybe—it would prompt a change in the failed policies which have created a huge humanitarian crisis. Well, the folks who live and work on the border know the strain this has placed on local law enforcement, on their hospitals, on their schools, and the danger it creates for their communities.

Just to be clear, I am not talking about safety concerns in those communities. Cities in the Rio Grande Valley and along Texas's southern border are not dangerous and lawless places, but the people who pass through there can be. And amid the 3 million people that the Border Patrol has encountered in the last year and a half, there, unfortunately, presents opportunities for people with criminal records and people who are members of gangs and drug traffickers to be obscured by the vast flow of these 3 million people.

But once people cross the border, they want to get to places like Chicago, San Diego, New York, Seattle, Atlanta. These are all places that have a presence of the drug cartels. What I don't think enough people realize is once the drugs come across the border—the same drugs that took the lives of 108,000 Americans last year through drug overdoses—once those drugs come across the border, the network by which they are distributed is largely criminal street gangs, who are also responsible for most of the violence in our communities across the country because they are fighting each other for territory, for market share, to sell these illegal drugs to unsuspecting consumers.

This is another reason for the spiking crime waves that we have seen in recent months across America. People want to act like this is something that is just contained in cities like Chicago, that it is a local problem. No. This is a systemic problem that flows from the Biden administration's unwillingness to provide any level of controls to people coming across the border or to deter people from making the long,

dangerous journey and perhaps dying in the process.

I have been in Brooks County, which is where the Falfurrias checkpoint is. What happens is the smugglers smuggle people across the border, they put them in stash houses, and then periodically they will get them in some vehicle and travel up the highway. But that is why we have Border Patrol checkpoints about 50, 60 miles inland. But what will happen is the smugglers will tell the migrants: Get out of the car and meet me on the north side of this checkpoint.

And maybe, if they are lucky, they will get an old milk carton full of water and maybe a power bar, something to sustain them. But I have seen the bleached bones of migrants who have been left behind and simply died in the process, and recognizing the extreme temperatures that exist, particularly at times like this in places like Texas, it is no surprise that a number of these migrants don't make it.

Well, our Border Patrol is simply the frontline in our law enforcement efforts along the border; but due to the failed policies of the Biden administration, the Border Patrol is unable to do the job that they swore to do, which is to defend and protect our borders, because they are simply overwhelmed by the number of people coming across.

Last month, the Rio Grande Valley Sector agents arrested 10 MS-13 members, one of the most violent gangs in the world, and 2 other gang members within a 4-day span—12 gang members in 4 days. And that was in just one of 20 Border Patrol sectors. Since October, the Border Patrol has arrested more than 450 gang members, and we have already surpassed the total for the entire previous year.

And the scary thing is, these are just the ones who were caught, because we know, with the volume of people coming across, there are what the Border Patrol calls the get-aways, and they estimate that as many as 300,000 more people are getting across the border unbeknownst to the Border Patrol because they are simply preoccupied with these huge numbers, and they get away into the interior of the country.

And once they get across the border, particularly if they are people who have an intention to do harm and commit crime in the United States, they will end up in Boston, Sacramento, Detroit, Miami, or any other city in the United States.

Somebody said: Well, every city is a border city now, and, for all practical purposes, that is true. Folks who live thousands of miles from the border can't write this off as a problem for somewhere else. This is a national problem. Gangs and cartels are sending their henchmen to our cities and our communities. They are trafficking in fentanyl, heroin, methamphetamine, and other deadly drugs, along with guns and human trafficking.

They are what one person called years ago commodity agnostic. In

other words, they are in it for the money. They don't care how they make the money. They don't care about the people. They are just in it for the money. And in doing so, they are ushering in crime and violence and creating unsafe communities all across our country.

This administration has ignored the crisis at our southern border in an effort to appease open-border members of their political party. They have created a gateway for cartel and gang members to come into our country and wreak havoc on our communities.

Criminal organizations are very sophisticated. Their business model is to overwhelm our capacity to stop them and to make that buck by selling people drugs or other contraband in the communities all across our country. So the situation at the border is not simply about immigration. It is about security. It is about public safety. It is about knowing who is crossing the border and coming to live in your community.

So I am eager to get back home to the Rio Grande Valley to talk to some of these women who are doing heroic work on the frontlines of this crisis, who are getting no help from the Biden administration.

As I said, I wish President Biden would come to the border. We would welcome him and show him what we have learned ourselves from our frequent trips there. Maybe if the President saw and learned about the impact of the failed policies of his administration in person, he would begin to take this crisis seriously.

Every State is impacted by the security breakdown at the border, and something needs to be done before the situation becomes even more dangerous than it currently is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Illinois.

#### HIGHLAND PARK SHOOTING

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, 2-year-old Aiden McCarthy was lying bloodied and pinned underneath his unconscious father when he was found—just a toddler, Aiden was still in diapers, had somehow lost one shoe and was down to just one blood-soaked sock, with scrapes across his body.

It was last Monday, July Fourth, and Aiden was rescued from the site of a massacre, from the site of the latest mass shooting that has marred our country and left scarred all those who bore witness to its senseless terror.

I was at a nearby parade in Illinois when I heard about the shooting. I rushed to the emergency operation center and was there the moment the police came in and told us that two Good Samaritans had found this young boy sheltered under his father's body.

When Aiden was rescued, he kept asking for his mom and his dad. But, tragically, horribly, we later learned that they were never going to be able to comfort him ever again. Both his mother and father were among the

seven people murdered during that Fourth of July parade shooting in Highland Park. Their names were Irina and Kevin McCarthy. And they, like so many of us, had spent that holiday morning eager to take pride in our country, eager to celebrate the freedom and goodness and greatness that has defined our Nation since its first breaths on that first July Fourth, eager to celebrate America at her best.

Instead, they experienced the very worst of it. They saw firsthand what can happen when a sick fealty to the gun lobby is prioritized over American lives. And Aiden is an orphan because of it.

I woke up today unable to get the image of 2-year-old Aiden's one bloodied sock out of my mind. I woke up, as I have every day since that day, unable to stop thinking about how his mom or his dad put on his diaper that morning, just like I have done thousands of times with my own two little girls.

I woke up thinking about how, when the first shots of that military-style rifle rang out, his parents' first thoughts must have been about saving him, shielding him.

So today, I come to the floor to say their names and the names of the five other victims, my constituents who should still be breathing at this very moment but aren't: Katherine Goldstein, Jacquelyn Sundheim, Stephen Straus, Nicolas Toledo-Zaragoza, Eduardo Uvaldo, and Irina and Kevin McCarthy.

There are too many victims of preventable gun violence to name all of them here. In fact, gun violence is the largest killer of children under the age of 16 in this country—not disease, but the disease of gun violence. It happens in Buffalo, in Chicago, in Uvalde, in Newtown, in Pittsburgh, in DeKalb, in Virginia Beach, in El Paso, in two different Auroras, in Las Vegas. It happens in wealthy suburban communities, in low-income rural communities, and in urban areas across our Nation.

It happens everywhere in America but almost nowhere outside of this country. It happens so much here that we only hear about it in the national news when a large enough number of people are killed at one time and in one place.

Think about that. Every time gun violence occurs, someone decides whether or not the number murdered is worthy of column inches and breaking news graphics on TV. And, too often, the answer is no because there have been more mass shootings thus far in 2022 than there have been days in the year and because we, as a country, have grown numb.

We witnessed that just last week in Chicago, as over the holiday weekend, Chicago's death toll climbed even higher than the devastation seen in Highland Park. Yet there was no national outcry.

In Chicago's communities, gun violence is now viewed as all too common,



and kids can no longer be kids. They have all heard too many stories of toddlers in strollers killed by a stray bullet or parents murdered while picking up their own kids from school.

But these everyday gun deaths no longer garner the attention they demand. We have become desensitized, even as elementary schoolers' lives are being stolen and survivors' innocence are lost. Every gun death is a tragedy that can and should be prevented. This is a uniquely American disease, and it requires a national solution.

So I am here on the floor today to plead with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to help keep another toddler from having to cry out for his parents amidst gunshots and terror; to help stop another day of patriotism, another math class, another trip to the grocery store from turning into a living nightmare.

I plead with them to help prevent all that by passing the assault weapons ban, legislation that would block the further sale, transfer, manufacture, and importation of military-style assault weapons and high-capacity magazines for civilian use.

I spent 23 years in the Army. So I recognize a weapon of war when I see one. I know why you would need to use them, the power they wield, and what they can do to a human body.

I understand that the M4, the M16, and their civilian variants—known generically as AR-15 rifles—were designed for the battlefield. From their portability, rapid rates of fire, power and accuracy to their effective range, these weapons were designed to rip apart the human body so your enemy cannot get back up and fire back at you on the field of combat.

These are weapons of the battlefield and have no business being on our streets and in our schools. There is a reason why the parents in Uvalde had to submit DNA to identify their murdered children. These AR-15 style rifles fire small caliber ammunition at a velocity that can easily penetrate many kinds of body armor even at a distance. So when an unprotected child is shot with an AR-15 at close range, the results are horrific.

And as anyone who has ever carried an M4 into combat understands, the American people should not be misled into thinking that AR-15 rifles are safe for our communities or that a ban on fully automatic machine guns is sufficient to protect our children from the most dangerous weapons of war.

Mass shooters are hunting mothers in malls, fathers in theaters, and children in their schools. For that evil purpose, a semiautomatic rifle is the perfect weapon because it is lightweight, portable, and easy to load with high-capacity magazines.

It couples the speed of automatically chambering the next round after each shot with maximum accuracy—a combination designed to kill as many people as possible, as fast as possible, as efficiently as possible.

So the first thing I thought when I heard the audio of last week's tragedy was that it sounded like war because the last time I heard the sound of gunfire that rapid and that many rounds going off on the Fourth of July was when I was serving in Iraq. I never thought I would hear that on this holiday again, let alone here on U.S. soil.

And I live, like so many other moms, in daily fear that my own daughters will be forced to hear that nightmarish soundtrack of war in their own classrooms or their own local parade.

You know, a few weeks ago I went to talk to my daughters' class about Memorial Day. Both girls' teachers had asked me to come and explain the meaning of Memorial Day, to talk about the sacrifices of our troops, what we have done to safeguard our freedoms and rights as a nation, including, as the Constitution says, our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As I was talking, I happened to look outside the window of my older girl's classroom, only to see my younger daughter walking in a line, following behind the other kids in her class in the middle of a shelter-in-place drill. And I watched as that little row of 3- and 4-year-olds crouched down as small as they could get, and my daughter, with her head against the wall, put her hands over her head, learning to protect herself should there be a mass shooting.

She is just 4 years old. And she was already being taught how to survive if someone with a weapon of war comes into the classroom where she is just beginning to learn her ABCs, believing that their right to fire assault rifles matters more than her right to make it to age 5.

What I felt was close to horror. And I know other parents have felt the same. I am far from the only mom who will hug their kids a little tighter while putting them to bed tonight, then spend hours looking up ballistic backpacks to protect my girls in case the worst-case scenario becomes reality. But the horrible truth is, even ballistic backpacks may not stop these rounds.

This week alone, hundreds of Illinoisans and survivors from other mass shootings were gathered at the Capitol. These people—mostly moms—are still recovering from major trauma. And they have jobs and childcare responsibilities and no experience lobbying Congress. Yet they made the trip to Washington, DC, because they know that their children's lives depend on it and because they are beyond furious at the lack of action to ban these weapons of war that have terrorized all of our communities.

What these moms want isn't impossible. It wouldn't even be that difficult if more folks would grow a conscience. These parents want us to do better for them, for their kids, for all those in Highland Park last week, and for every person who has so needlessly lost their

life to gun violence, whether in a mass shooting or in a tragedy involving a single bullet.

The folks at that parade last Monday were there to celebrate life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Seven of them will never be able to do so again.

We have to stop this. We have to end this cycle. And we can take a step towards doing so right now by getting these weapons of war off our streets and passing this bill immediately.

To anyone who says no, to anyone who objects to passing this bill, I want to know how you can show off taking pride in our country on a holiday, then turn your back on its citizens 1 week later. I want you to say all the names of the ever-growing list of victims of these preventable tragedies.

I want you to remember Aiden's pleas for his mom and dad, to think of the sounds of the gunshots that those children in Uvalde heard, to try to fathom the anguish of the parents whose teenagers are gunned down in senseless, everyday violence on our streets. I want you to explain to them why the dollars that you get from the NRA are worth their pain, their tears, their tragedy.

Please, I am asking, explain how that campaign contribution is worth this endless cycle of blood and death. Explain how your gun-lobbying, fattened campaign funds are worth another parent having to bury their first grader in their favorite pair of Converse sneakers.

Or, if you don't believe those checks are worth it, if you don't actually value your political self-interests more than those Americans' lives, then please join me in passing this bill. It is that simple.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

GENERAL MARK A. MILLEY

MR. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am here today in the Senate to sound the alarm about one of America's guiding principles—everybody knows about this—the constitutional principle of civilian control of our military, very much a cornerstone of our Republic.

This fundamental principle of self-government may have been in jeopardy during the final days of the Trump administration, but before I get to that, I will provide a historical context.

That principle became part of the American fabric on June 14, 1775, when the Congress of the Continental Congress appointed George Washington commander of the Continental Army. His commission ordered him to report to civilian authorities.

It specified:

You—

Meaning the new General Washington—

are punctually to observe such orders and directions, from time to time, as you shall receive from this, or a future Congress of these United Colonies.

Well, he followed that. At the war's end, General Washington gave this



principle lasting purpose, and he did it with power and grace.

On December 23, 1783, in a solemn ceremony at the statehouse in Annapolis, George Washington voluntarily surrendered his commission, as well as his military power, to civilian authority, the President of the Continental Congress. The scene is memorialized in a dramatic John Trumbull painting that is displayed in the Rotunda not far from here. All of my colleagues go through that part of this Capitol every day and probably don't pay a lot of attention to it, but it is an important description of our basic constitutional principles.

We know there are other ways of doing these things in other countries. We know that dictators rule their nations with an iron fist because they control the sword. Washington selflessly laid down that sword to ensure America's destiny for generations to come. He chose to disband the Army and return to private life at Mount Vernon.

One scholar explained it this way:

The Virginian . . . went home to plow.

By this noble act, Washington cemented a crown jewel of self-rule: civilian control of the military. Five years later, as Washington was elected President, this bedrock principle was enshrined in our Constitution.

While this governing rule is essential to the preservation of democracy, it has been challenged with grave consequences. The Truman-MacArthur dispute over conducting the Korean war is a case in point. President Truman wanted to limit the war. General MacArthur disagreed. General MacArthur defied orders, and General MacArthur criticized his Commander in Chief's—Truman's—decision, and he did that publicly, so Truman fired him for insubordination.

Now I want to get to the main purpose of coming to the floor. Recently, several books, including a book entitled "Peril" by Bob Woodward and Robert Costa, suggest that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Milley, may have trampled on this principle. The book "Peril" provides an alarming account of his words and deeds.

Milley told the authors he "was certain" that the Commander in Chief was "in serious mental decline . . . and could go rogue and order military action or the use of nuclear weapons. Milley felt no absolute certainty the military could control or trust the President."

So Milley, in his words, "took any and all necessary precautions."

"His job," he said, was "to think the unthinkable" and, in his words, "pull a Schlesinger." To "contain Trump," he had to "inject a second opinion." His opinion was then injected into the command structure.

In doing so, he may have stepped out of his lane as the President's principal military adviser and into the statutory chain of command where law doesn't

allow him to go because, by law, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has no command authority.

When President Nixon faced a crisis over impeachment and resignation, Secretary of Defense Schlesinger feared that he might order an unprovoked nuclear strike. So he, Schlesinger, reportedly took extra legal steps to prevent it. That is the same Schlesinger that Milley referred to as he was being interviewed for this book.

It happens that "pulling a Milley" as opposed to a "Schlesinger" is a very different kettle of fish. A four-star general can't "pull a Schlesinger." Schlesinger was at the top of the chain of command, just below the President. He kept the President's constitutional command authority firmly in civilian hands as the Constitution requires. Milley allegedly placed military hands—his hands—on controls that belong exclusively to the President.

According to "Peril," the book I am referring to, he summoned senior operations officers in the Military Command Center to his office. He had them take "an oath" not to "act" on the President's orders without checking with him first.

These brazen words and actions, if accurate, strike at the heart of our democracy: civilian control of the military. They turn this guiding rule upside down and show utter contempt for the Commander in Chief. Coming from the Nation's top general, they are dangerous and contrary to military code 10 U.S.C. 888.

After describing Milley's actions, the book's authors rightly ask this question: "Was he subverting the President?" Had he "overstepped his authority and taken extraordinary power for himself?"

Milley assured this Senator in a letter to this Senator that his actions were on the up and up. The book, however, seems to imply a different story. I had a hearing where the general was. Senator BLACKBURN asked him about the mismatch. He replied: "I haven't read any of the books, so I don't know."

She said to him: "Read them and report back to us."

He said: "Absolutely," he agreed. "Happy to do that."

Nine months later, he is still dodging the question with the same lame excuse.

To crank up the pressure, I joined Senators Paul and Blackburn a few months ago in a letter pushing for a straight answer. When none came, I began sending handwritten notes to the general. I soon received a 10-page letter from General Milley that ignored the question. My second note sparked an email. It claimed that our letter did not raise "a direct question" and asserted "General Milley answered the specific questions."

I think I can legitimately ask: Is that Pentagon baloney or what is it?

After my third note, General Milley responded with the same old smoke-

and-mirrors routine: "I have never read the books."

Years of oversight have taught me this lesson: Evasive answers usually offer revealing clues about the truth. I think General Milley knows better. He knows the score. If those books and all attendant press coverage of those books contained gross misrepresentations, we would have heard about it a long time ago. He would have hammered the authors and corrected the record. However, to date, not a peep from the general. His silence speaks volumes.

Something doesn't smell right. As the Pentagon watchdog, when I get a whiff of wrongdoing, I sink in my teeth and don't let go.

So Congressman JIM BANKS, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, and I upped the ante on April 11. With 12 pointed questions, we gave General Milley a second bite of the apple to clear the air. Now, 2½ months later, we still have no response.

General Milley, you said you were going to answer Senator BLACKBURN's question. Honor your word. Answer the question. Come clean with the American people. We are all ears.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

FREEDOM TO TRAVEL FOR HEALTH CARE ACT

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise to offer my own thoughts on the Dobbs decision that the Supreme Court rendered a couple of weeks back right after we went into a July Fourth recess.

My colleagues were on the floor earlier advocating for a bill that would go after the pernicious practice of States in trying to penalize women from traveling to seek reproductive healthcare. I am a strong supporter of that legislation. I understand it will be proposed for floor action later today.

I wanted to focus on two particular elements of the Dobbs decision that, as a former civil rights lawyer, struck me very, very deeply. Never in my life—I am 64 years old—has the Supreme Court taken away constitutional rights that had been counted on by generations of Americans. The Court has narrowed rights, redefined rights, articulated new standards for judging rights, but they have not taken rights away.

In this instance, the Supreme Court took away rights that had been established in both *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. They took away those rights for women to make reproductive healthcare decisions and ruled that the 14th Amendment to the Constitution—which protects citizens' ability to enjoy privileges and immunities of other States and persons' abilities to be treated equally under the law and not have life, liberty, or property—be taken from them without due process.

The Court ruled that the 14th Amendment, the Constitution, had nothing to do with women's reproductive rights. In my view, that is a horrible

misreading of the history of the 14th Amendment.

Further, the Court went on to say, in sort of a sunny way, but no worries. You can now rely on State legislatures to solve these issues.

What I want to do is address how wrong the Court is about the 14th Amendment and how their belief that reliance on State legislatures is somehow a substitute for constitutional protection is so fundamentally wrong-headed.

What is the 14th Amendment? Before the 14th Amendment was passed—this is hard to believe—the Constitution had no definition of what it was to be a U.S. citizen, none. And the pre-14th Amendment Constitution also established a system of laws in this country where you were primarily subject to the laws of your State. The 50 States could have very different laws. A person from Virginia visiting Maine, for example, could be treated by Maine laws in a harsh and punitive way just because they happen to live in Virginia.

That was the way the Nation used to be. We were more citizens of States than citizens of the United States of America. The pre-14th Amendment Constitution led to one of the seminal decisions in the history of the Court: *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, in 1856, where the Court ruled that no person of African descent, even a free person, could be considered a U.S. citizen. Even if their families had been in the country for more than 200 years, they could not be a citizen.

In the aftermath of the Civil War, this Congress, this Senate, the States of this Nation banded together to pass three very critical amendments, the first, the 13th Amendment banned slavery. The 15th Amendment banned States from blocking people from voting based on the color of their skin.

But what the 14th Amendment did, finally, after 90 years from the beginning of the Nation, the Declaration of Independence, what the 14th Amendment did was define what it is to be a citizen of the United States.

There was a definition, for the first time, if you were born here or naturalized, you are a citizen of the United States. And citizens of the country were given rights to not be discriminated against because of moving into other States, privileges and immunities accorded to all citizens.

No person shall be deprived of equal protection of the law. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process. For the first time in the Constitution, we began to not just be a collection of people living in 50 States but actually have a definition of what it is to be an American.

I don't have enough time to go over the whole history of the 14th Amendment, but where it really begins is in World War I.

In World War I, many States, including the State of Nebraska, made it illegal for parents to teach their children

German. Some even made it illegal to learn other languages. We were in the midst of the First World War, and so States made it a criminal offense for teachers and parents to teach their children German.

The case of *Meyer v. Nebraska* came to the Supreme Court in the early 1920s, a family and an instructor challenging this State law. And under the 14th Amendment due process clause, the Court unanimously, in an opinion by Justice McReynolds, said: Wait a minute. What is it to be an American?

Well, the 14th Amendment doesn't say anything about language instruction. It doesn't say anything about education, but the 14th Amendment created a national identity, and clearly being an American must involve the ability of a family to decide if they want to teach the children their native language or practice an occupation, elicit a whole series of things that were naturally connected with what it was to be an American citizen.

That was the first use of the 14th Amendment, to basically say: Clearly, if you live in this country, you get a zone of protection to make decisions that the criminal law of States and the Federal Government cannot intrude upon.

A few years later, hard to believe, during massive Ku Klux Klan activities the State of Oregon made it a criminal offense to send your children to parochial schools. There was anti-Catholic sentiment that was being drummed up by the Klan in Oregon and elsewhere, and so now the criminal law of Oregon was marshaled against parents who wanted to send their kids to Catholic schools.

And, once again, a unanimous Supreme Court said: Hold on a second. The 14th Amendment says nothing about education, but this is a deprivation of liberty in such an extreme way. To be a citizen of this country means you should have the ability to make decisions about the education of your children and no State can use the criminal law to deprive a parent or child of that liberty.

And just as in *Meyer v. Nebraska*, when the 14th Amendment was used to strike down prohibition on foreign language instruction, *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, the 14th Amendment was used to strike down a bar on attending parochial schools.

Fifteen or 20 years later, the State of Oklahoma had a statute that said if you get convicted of a crime three times, you will be sterilized. Passing a check, making a false statement on a loan application—habitual criminal law, you would be sterilized. That was the law that was passed. And it was a law that was pretty common in other States. In Virginia, for years, people were sterilized if the State judged that they were "feebleminded."

In *Skinner v. Oklahoma*, the Court said: Under the 14th Amendment, it says nothing about procreation and nothing about sterilization, but could

there be a deprivation of liberty more severe than being sterilized so that you can't have children for life if you were in prison for an offense that might be just an offense that would have you there for a few years?

And so even though the 14th Amendment didn't specifically discuss sterilization, the Court's rule was this comes with being an American that you have some zone where you are protected to make decisions in your own life without the long arm of the criminal law putting you in prison or, even worse, maiming your body and making you unable to have descendants forever.

An important case in Virginia, 1966, *Loving v. Virginia*, Virginia like many States made it illegal by the criminal law to marry someone whose skin color was different. Richard and Mildred Loving got married in Caroline County, and the police broke into their bedroom hoping to find them having sex. They pointed to their marriage certificate on the wall.

They were arrested and jailed. The judge said that your only path out of jail is to move out of Virginia. They moved to DC, but they couldn't come back and visit their families, their mothers and fathers and sisters and brothers. And eventually, they challenged the Virginia law, and it went up to the Supreme Court. And under the 14th Amendment, the Supreme Court said, Well, yes, the 14th Amendment doesn't say anything about marriage, but there is something about being an American that gives you the right to marry whom you choose without the long arm of the criminal law forcing you to leave the State of your birth and exile yourself from your own family.

And so in *Loving v. Virginia*, the Supreme Court struck down anti miscegenation bans, which still existed in Virginia and many other States.

A few years later, *Griswold v. Connecticut*, the State made it a criminal offense to use contraception. The Supreme Court: Well, there is nothing in the 14th Amendment about contraception, but clearly, there is this zone where Americans can make decisions without the long arm of the government throwing them in jail, and contraception is one of those areas.

*Roe v. Wade*, a few years later, the State of Texas criminalizing women and providers for seeking an abortion. The Court used the same rationale. Well, the 14th Amendment, the word "abortion" isn't in it, we will grant you that, but all the way back to the passage of the 14th Amendment and certainly back to the *Meyer v. Nebraska* case, we have said that being a citizen of this country gives you some rights that the government can't, by criminal law, take away from you.

Since *Roe*, there has been Casey reaffirming that right. Since *Roe*, there has been *Lawrence v. Texas* saying a State can't make it a crime to have sex with a same sex partner when they

don't make it a crime to have sex with a partner of an opposite sex.

Again, the 14th Amendment says zero about intimacy or sexual relations or reproduction, but there is a zone of decisions we are entitled to make as citizens of this country that the criminal law cannot intrude upon.

Obergefell, you can marry someone of the same sex, same rationale.

So when the Supreme Court said: Well, there is nothing about abortion in the 14th Amendment, well, they are right. The word "abortion" is not in the 14th Amendment. But it has been clear now for more than 100 years, and it was really clear when the 14th Amendment was added to the Constitution that we are no longer just citizens of 50 States; we are citizens of a country that believes individuals have decision making power and autonomy, and the criminal law of this country can't reach in and throw you in jail for making decisions about how you operate the most intimate areas of your life.

That is why the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs* is so destructive. It is as if they do not understand the history of this country before the 14th Amendment, when there was no definition of citizenship, and it is as if they do not understand what the 14th Amendment was designed to do.

I will conclude by making one other comment. The Court sort of sunnily suggests that, well, no worries; abortion now gets no constitutional protection, but this can be resolved by State legislatures.

It was State legislatures that were the problem that the 14th Amendment was designed to address. It was State legislatures that passed the laws about slavery. It was State legislatures that prohibited women in the State of Illinois from taking the bar exam. It was State legislatures that imposed all kinds of restrictions upon the right to vote.

So the notion that, OK, there is no constitutional protection for privacy anymore, but State legislatures will take care of it is a fundamental misunderstanding.

And why weren't State legislatures sufficient? It was because slaves weren't represented in State legislatures, and women, at the time, weren't represented in State legislatures. And so we needed a zone of protection for decision making because people who have traditionally not been represented in State legislatures or this Congress can hardly look with confidence on the ability of a majority that does not include them to protect their interests.

One example, Congress today, the U.S. Congress today is about 26 percent women. That is our North Star in our history. That is the best we have ever been.

Guess what. That ranks us in the world, if you look at national parliamentary bodies that ranks us about 75th, below the global average, below nations like Mexico, below Iraq and Afghanistan, far below leading nations

like Rwanda, where more than 50 percent of the legislature is women.

To say to the women of this country: We are taking away rights you have relied upon for more than 50 years but no worry, no worry; you can go to the State legislature, where you are dramatically underrepresented, which is the case in most of our State legislative houses, you can go there, and they will give you a fair shake, is to put on blinders instead of looking at reality.

The 14th Amendment was put in the Constitution for a reason. It was to give a right for individual decision making to every citizen in this country, no matter whether they were politically powerful or not, no matter whether there was anybody in the legislative body who looked like them or not, and to say that being an American gave you those rights and those rights couldn't be taken away couldn't be taken away by the long arm of the criminal law in statutes that were elected, enacted by State legislatures where you were not represented, that is why this ruling is so destructive.

And that is why my colleagues and I must work so hard to make sure that we don't devolve back to a pre-14th Amendment society, where your ability to exercise fundamental decisions depends upon the ZIP Code you were born or live in, but that instead we accord the right to make fundamental personal decisions equally to everyone who is an American.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Virginia. Every Member of the U.S. Senate should have heard his words and, if not, read his words to understand the gravity of the decisions by the Supreme Court and the threats that have been made by Justice Thomas to venture into even more areas, depriving us of our basic constitutional rights in the name of States' rights.

I want to thank the Senator from Virginia. He gave a big part of his life to civil rights litigation. And if you are a lawyer and heard his presentation today, you would not want to be on the other side of the courtroom. He is convincing; he is well-prepared; and he explains with clarity why this is a moment in history which we should not ignore.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1035.

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 Nina Nin-Yuen Wang, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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. 1035, Nina Nin-Yuen Wang, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

Richard J. Durbin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Jeanne Shaheen, Chris Van Hollen, Elizabeth Warren, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tim Kaine, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher Murphy, Maria Cantwell, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Gary C. Peters, Tammy Duckworth.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 988.

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 Nancy L. Maldonado, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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. 988, Nancy L. Maldonado, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Tammy Baldwin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Christopher Murphy, Jack Reed, Alex Padilla, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Jacky Rosen, Edward J. Markey, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Jeanne Shaheen, Sherrod Brown.

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

### 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 bill 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. 968, Julianna Michelle Childs, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Alex Padilla, Christopher A. Coons, Gary C. Peters, Elizabeth Warren, Mazie K. Hirono, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Mark R. Warner, Edward J. Markey, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Jeanne Shaheen, Sherrod Brown, Margaret Wood Hassan.

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 Julianna Michelle Childs, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 255 Ex.]

### YEAS—58

Baldwin	Coons	Hirono
Bennet	Cornyn	Kaine
Blackburn	Cortez Masto	Kelly
Booker	Duckworth	King
Brown	Durbin	Klobuchar
Burr	Feinstein	Manchin
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Menendez
Capito	Graham	Merkley
Cardin	Grassley	Murkowski
Carper	Hassan	Murphy
Casey	Heinrich	Murray
Collins	Hickenlooper	Ossoff

Padilla	Scott (SC)	Warner
Peters	Shaheen	Warnock
Reed	Sinema	Warren
Romney	Smith	Whitehouse
Rosen	Stabenow	Wyden
Rounds	Tester	Young
Sanders	Tillis	
Schatz	Van Hollen	

### NAYS—33

Barrasso	Hawley	Moran
Blunt	Hoeben	Paul
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Braun	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Toomey
Ernst	Marshall	Tuberville
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker

### NOT VOTING—9

Blumenthal	Leahy	Portman
Cramer	Lujan	Sasse
Hagerty	Markey	Schumer

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

The senior Senator from Maryland.

### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a critical issue that continues to take a heavy toll on the health and financial well-being of Americans: high prescription drug prices.

This uniquely American problem has U.S. families paying the highest price compared to other countries, leading to millions of Americans having to leave their pharmacies with their prescription drugs left on the table. No one should have to go into debt to buy prescription drugs that they need to stay healthy, productive, and to have a healthy life.

Twenty-nine percent of Americans either cannot afford their prescription drugs or are rationing them. And the United States stands alone in this among the developed nations of the world.

The United States spends approximately \$575 billion annually on prescription drugs, or about 14 percent of the total healthcare expenditures. In 2019, the United States spent, on average, \$1,126 per capita on prescription medicines, twice as high as a comparable amount spent in the industrial world.

Americans and Marylanders are struggling to pay their prescription drug medications, and it is long past time for Congress to remedy this problem. Prescription drugs have been lifesaving for millions, but if they are not affordable, then their benefit is moot. High prescription drug prices drive health inequalities that we are fighting to eradicate since groups in fair or poor health most struggle to afford their medications.

For years, Congress has been working on commonsense solutions to increase access to affordable prescription medications, reducing costs for patients and taxpayers. It is now time to act.

U.S. prescription drug prices are set through an opaque process by manufacturers, pharmaceutical benefit manu-

facturers, and payers. Prices are often disconnected from the health impacts of the products being purchased.

Opponents of addressing the high drug costs claim that more affordable prices will come at the expense of innovation. I say, and the research agrees, this is a false choice. To ensure access through innovative treatments and prescriptions, the U.S. Government makes significant investments in biomedical research. The Presiding Officer knows that very well from his position on the Appropriations Committee. No greater example of this investment is the National Institutes of Health located in our home State of Maryland, which is the world's largest government funder of biomedical research. Almost all drugs rely on NIH-supported basic research, and the returns on these investments are very high.

Researchers from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have found that every \$125 million NIH grant leads to \$375 million more in private market value, 33 more patents, and one new drug.

Another study estimates that the rate of return on NIH investment is 43 percent and that each dollar in NIH funding leads to an additional \$8.40 in private research and development spending. So the government investments are well done—it leverages a lot more—but the government is the key player.

Further, the Small Business Innovation Research and the Small Business Technology Transfer, SBIR/STTR programs, also support innovation. SBIR/STTR currently are the largest U.S. Federal Government programs supporting small businesses to conduct research and investment. SBIR began in 1982 and currently requires that each Federal Agency spending more than \$100 million annually on external research set aside 3.2 percent of those funds for awards to small businesses. SBIR is very selective, with only about 22 percent of the applicants receiving funding. For many small firms, the SBIR “serves as the first place many entrepreneurs involved in technological innovation”—where they get their funding.

Through the SBIR/STTR programs, NIH supports drug innovation by setting aside more than 3.2 percent of its overall Intramural Research and Development budget specifically to support early stage small businesses through the Nation. Many companies leverage this NIH funding to attract the partners and investors needed to take an innovation to the market.

For example, Amgen, which was founded in 1980, received SBIR investment in 1986. Today, it is a multinational biopharmaceutical company with over 20,000 employees. Despite these significant taxpayer investments, prescription drugs are often priced at levels that limit access to lifesaving drugs, particularly among those who are underinsured or uninsured. Even after accounting for the costs and risks

of research and development, evidence shows the returns to new products exceed normal rates of return.

Drug companies continue to raise prices on consumers without justification, and we must crack down on price gouging and enforce transparency and drug pricing. That is why I strongly support the policies the Senate Finance Committee recently released, which comprise of comprehensive reform to lower prescription drug prices for Americans.

One policy included in this package that I have long supported is empowering Medicare to begin negotiating directly for the price of prescription drugs. This is just common sense. This is what businesses do. This is a free market. We negotiate.

In the private sector, no plan sponsor or manager would ever accept responsibility without the ability to decide how to negotiate. No private sector company would parcel themselves out in order to negotiate; they would use their full size as a market force. We don't do that in Medicare. Medicare negotiations will ensure that patients with Medicare get the best deal possible on high-priced drugs.

Another policy I support in prescription drug affordability is capping Medicare patients' out-of-pocket costs at no more than \$2,000 per year. Today, there is no cap on spending for prescription drugs for seniors on Medicare. This policy will prevent Medicare beneficiaries from paying tens of thousands of dollars to purchase lifesaving drugs prescribed by their doctors.

The policies I have just outlined, along with additional reforms—and there are several others that are included in this package, including a required rebate if a drug manufacturer increases their price beyond the cost of inflation. There are other issues here to protect the solvency long term of prescription drug benefits and Medicare beneficiaries. This will make prescription drugs affordable for individuals and families who desperately need it.

I urge all my colleagues to come together to address this urgent issue. We have done the work. Now it is time to vote, getting these savings back into our constituents' pockets.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Maryland.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 924, 979, 982, and 983; 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; and that the President immediately be notified of the Senate's action.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of 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; Margaret C. Whitman, of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kenya; Michael J. Adler, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Sudan; and John T. Godfrey, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 987 and 1039; 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; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Stephen Henley Locher, of Iowa, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa; and Michael Cottman Morgan, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### AFGHANISTAN

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, following my submission yesterday, I ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the next part of an investigation directed by the U.S. Central Command concerning the Abbey Gate bombing in Afghanistan in August 2021.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ACTS-SCK-DO

Subject: Findings and Recommendation—Attack Against U.S. Forces Conducting NEO at Hamid Karzai International Airport on 26 August 2021

(5) 82nd Airborne Division and 1/82 IBCT.

(a) The 82nd Airborne and 1/82 IBCT, (as the designated Immediate Response Force (IRF)), were notified for deployment at the request of Gen McKenzie (exhibits 10, 13, 21). 1/82 IBCT and 2/504 Parachute Infantry Regiment (PIR) began the flow of forces to HKIA on 15 August at 2200, and arrived with approximately 300 personnel (exhibit 121). This force coordinated with JTF-CR and occupied Camp Alvarado in the northwest corner of HKIA (exhibit 121). During the period of darkness on 16–17 August, 2/501 PIR arrived to HKIA (exhibit 123). Elements of the brigade's artillery battalion arrived with the infantry battalion, making the total force about 1000 (exhibit 121). Shortly after their arrival, 2/504 began securing the airfield, as civilians had breached the South Terminal and were on the runway (exhibit 121). 2/501 were immediately put into the line at the South Terminal when they arrived a little over 24 hours later (exhibit 121). Both units took up security positions on the South and West of HKIA, and expanded to relieve Marines on the perimeter so they could begin opening gates on 19 August (exhibits 121, 123). By 18 August, 1/82 had security responsibility for all of the West side of HKIA. 2/501 had responsibility for security from the perimeter at Abbey Gate westward to the International Terminal (exhibit 123).

(b) The 82nd Airborne TAC, commanded by MG Donahue, arrived on 18 August at approximately 1200 (exhibits 121, 125). Upon arrival, MG Donahue conducted a leader's reconnaissance, assessed the perimeter and gates, met with RADM Vasely to shore up the task organization, and began initial planning for withdrawal and JTE (exhibit 125). The 82nd started clearing the HKIA road system to prepare for MASCAL events and quick reaction force (QRF) movements (exhibit 125). As part of their security task, the 82nd detained 40–50 people each night who jumped the airfield fence (exhibit 125). Additionally, 1/82 operated two gates and flowed in evacuees via the South and West Gates (exhibit 121). From 19–25 August, 2/501 processed and directed convoys of evacuees the Taliban had allowed to pass through the outer cordon at South Gate (exhibit 121). 1/82 opened West Gate periodically to allow precision evacuation passages of lines, which were coordinated movements (exhibits 121, 125). During the latter half of the NEO, South and West Gates accounted for a significant number of daily evacuees, averaging greater than 200 daily from 24–30 August, with 1600 coming through on 26 August (exhibits 125, 143). The DoS Consular rarely worked with 1/82 personnel at South Gate, so the convoys had to be American citizens (AMCITs) or Lawful Permanent Residents (LPRs) to get through (exhibit 123). Starting 19 August, MG Donahue served as the primary coordinator with the Taliban LNO, (TEXT REDACTED) and spoke with him on a near daily basis (exhibit 23, 125). 1/82 IBCT subordinate unit commanders coordinated directly with the Taliban local gate commanders for security and to facilitate evacuee movements (exhibits 121, 123, 125).

(c) As part of withdrawal and JTE planning, the 82nd TAC developed a plan for a relief in place (RIP) at the gates and established timelines to facilitate withdrawal of the Marines from HKIA (exhibit 125). U.S. and U.K. Forces negotiated the timeline for closing Abbey Gate, and after changing the timeline multiple times, eventually settled on 0900 on 27 August. While the U.S. Forces wanted to close the gate as early as 24 August, the U.K. Forces needed more time to finish processing their evacuees (exhibits 121, 125). On 25 August, Bravo Company, 2/501 PIR moved behind Abbey Gate to facilitate the RIP, however the timeline moved to the right (exhibits 123, 124). (TEXT REDACTED) 2/501 PIR, attended a meeting at 1600 on 26 August with the Taliban, the U.K., and 2/1 Marines to discuss the RIP and passage of lines for the U.K. (exhibit 123). They agreed the U.K. would pass through Abbey Gate in the early morning hours of 27 August, the Marines would shut the gate, and Bravo Company, 2/501 PIR would take over security of Abbey Gate (exhibit 124). Shortly after the meeting, the attack on Abbey Gate occurred (exhibits 66, 123, 125). (TEXT REDACTED) sent his QRF, Delta Company, over to Abbey Gate, and dispatched his field litter ambulances (FLAs) to assist in the casualty evacuation (CASEVAC) (exhibit 123). Additionally, he set up his Role I facility inside Abbey Gate to assist in treating the wounded (exhibit 123). The Marines closed the gate immediately after the attack and conducted the RIP with Bravo Company, 2/501 PIR at approximately 0500 on 27 August (exhibit 124). The U.K. Forces passed through Abbey Gate at approximately 0700 on 27 August (exhibits 124, 127). Bravo Company maintained security at Abbey Gate until their departure from HKIA at approximately 2355 on 30 August.

(d) As part of JTE execution, 82nd Airborne took responsibility for demilitarization efforts at HKIA (exhibits 125, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162). Millions of rounds of ammunition, weapons, numerous military vehicles and aircraft, and U.S. Government property had to be destroyed or rendered inoperable (exhibit 125). The 82nd Airborne assigned zones of responsibility to the various units occupying HKIA to ensure they executed a methodical demilitarization plan and no information or equipment was missed (exhibits 125, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162). Cyber element subject matter experts ensured computer systems were corrupted or destroyed, and engineers dug trenches to cover equipment with cement and bury it before departure from HKIA (exhibits 125, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162).

(e) The 82nd Airborne departed HKIA and completed the JTE at approximately 0002 local on 31 August (exhibit 246).

(6) 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit.

(a) The 24th MEU was a II Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF)/Camp Lejeune based unit, aligned to U.S. European Command (EUCOM) for the first half of their deployment (exhibits 100, 102). In June 2021, the Secretary of Defense Orders Book realigned the MEU to CENTCOM in anticipation of a NEO (exhibits 100, 102). Throughout May and June, the MEU conducted NEO planning with JTF-CR, and executed a PDSS to HKIA in July (exhibits 100, 102). The MEU postured Marines ashore at Ahmed al-Jaber Air Base, Kuwait (Al-Jaber) in July to prepare for the potential NEO (exhibits 100, 102). Preparation included multiple rehearsals for a NEO, ECC operations, airfield security, and gate operations (exhibits 100, 101). These rehearsals continued throughout July, into August, until the MEU received notification they would deploy to HKIA on 13 August (exhibits 100, 101, 102).

(b) The MEU originally planned to frontload its ECC forces for deployment, but

the dynamic situation at HKIA forced the MEU to prioritize 1/8 Marines to ensure they had the necessary combat power on the ground (exhibit 102). On 14 August at approximately 0200, one rifle company from 1/8 Marines, a 1/8 Marines HQ element, to include 1/8 Battalion (TEXT REDACTED) and one logistics company from CLB-24 (CLB from 24th MEU) arrived at HKIA (exhibit 102). The size of the force on the ground increased with the arrival of two more rifle companies, 1/8 Marines battalion enablers (snipers, engineered, scouts), and some MEU CE personnel, to include the MEU (TEXT REDACTED) that evening (exhibit 102). The 1/8 Marines elements secured North Gate and sought to begin processing evacuees through the ECC, but civilians came through the South Terminal area and flooded the runway (exhibits 102, 104). This MEU force rebuffed the breach of the airfield on the night of 15 August and throughout the day of 16 August (exhibits 15, 18, 100, 102, 104): Echo Company, 2/1 Marines reinforced 1/8 early in the morning of 16 August, and after they forced the crowds off the runway, another breach occurred at a new opening in the southern perimeter (exhibit 104). The Marines spent all of 16 August controlling crowds and clearing runways as more forces, specifically Taliban and NSU, became available (exhibit 104).

(c) On 17 August, 1/8 Marines began establishing security at the North and East Gates and attempted to begin processing evacuees (exhibit 104). North and East Gates had approximately 3000–5000 people outside at any given time starting on 17 August (exhibit 102). JTF-CR maintained TACON of the MEU throughout the NEO, even after the change to COMREL on 17 August (exhibits 10, 11). 24th MEU retained TACON of 1/8 Marines, but only nominally had TACON of 2/1 Marines, whose Battalion Commander reported directly to the JTF-CR Commander (exhibit 53, 77, 100).

(d) From 17 August until departure on 30 August, 24th MEU managed tactical execution of the NEO, which primarily included security and initial screening at North, East, and Abbey Gates and processing evacuees at the ECC (exhibits 100, 104). 1/8 received nearly all of its combat power by the end of 18 August (exhibit 104). CLB-24 established the ECC at the PAX Terminal in North HKIA and was processing evacuees as early as 15 August (exhibit 101). During the NEO, CLB-24 Marines also conducted various support activities to resupply the gates, and assisted with base life support operations (exhibit 101). CLB-24 planned for contractors, to continue providing base support throughout the NEO, but many contractors departed early on, forcing the CLB to absorb those support responsibilities, in addition to operating the ECC (exhibit 101). The SPMAGTF's Combat Logistics Detachment assisted CLB-24 with providing combat service support to units at HKIA (exhibit 101).

(e) BLT 1/8 Marines assumed responsibility for security of North and East Gates, and the perimeter around the East side of HKIA after the 82nd Airborne arrived (exhibit 104, 155). Gate operations for North and East Gates were difficult and sporadic (exhibits 100, 102, 104). North Gate was vulnerable to attack due to a lack of standoff, an absence of obstacles or barriers, and proximity to civilian roads (exhibits 100, 102, 104). North Gate quickly became the hardest gate to control (exhibit 100). East Gate was a single gate, which was always at risk of being forced open by the crowd, because there was no standoff (exhibits 100, 102, 104). Marines at East Gate dealt with crowds crushing people against the perimeter wall, making it difficult to open the gate (exhibit 102). The Taliban provided support at both North and East Gates, but the Taliban commander at

North Gate was the least helpful (exhibits 125, 146). North, East, and Abbey Gates closed from 20–22 August due to a lack of flights and capacity within HKIA. In total, there were 18000 evacuees waiting to fly out, which created a humanitarian and security problem (exhibits 102, 104). The JTF-CR Commander closed North Gate from 23–25 August, except for some targeted entries, because of the VBIED threat (exhibits 100, 102). East Gate closed permanently on 24 August because of the threat of mortars from the Taliban, and an inability to process evacuees without losing control of the gate (exhibits 100, 102, 104). By 25 August, Abbey Gate was the only gate operating in the MEU's sector of HKIA (exhibit 102).

(f) Aside from 1/8 Marines' rifle companies, additional MEU elements supported gate operations. BLT 1/8's (TEXT REDACTED) tasked his engineer platoon to support North, East, and Abbey Gates (exhibits 103, 104). The engineers spent a disproportionate amount of time improving East Gate, shoring up gaps in the perimeter to prevent fence jumpers, and removing towers on the exterior of the perimeter (exhibit 103). The engineers emplaced shipping containers to form the obstacle at the southern end of Abbey Gate, later known as the Chevron, on the morning of 20 August (exhibit 103). Otherwise, support to Abbey Gate was limited (exhibit 103). CLB-24 provided the bulk of the personnel assigned to the Female Search Team (FST), and tasked them to support the gates and the ECC (exhibit 101). The FST began with searching women and children prior to DoS screening, then transitioned to conducting initial searches outside the gates, escorting rejected females out through the gates, and helping identify eligible evacuees in the crowds (exhibit 107). The MEU Commander re-tasked organized the 2nd Reconnaissance (Recon) element to work directly for him later in the NEO, specifically to conduct targeted recovery of privileged personnel (exhibit 108). Recon element personnel were at the gates constantly, working with 1/8 and 2/1 Marine leaders to identify and pull specific people from the crowd for processing (exhibit 108). The MEU also organized PSYOP and cyber assets under the direction of the MEU (TEXT REDACTED) for employment at the gates (exhibit 105). The PSYOP teams employed capabilities at the gates to communicate with the crowds, and provided updates on required documents or gate closures (exhibit 105).

(g) On 26 August, all the gates in the MEU sector of HKIA were closed, with the exception of Abbey Gate and occasional targeted recoveries at North Gate (exhibits 102, 104). The IED threat was well known across the MEU, but threats lacked specifics on times and locations (exhibits 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107). MEU leadership ensured electronic countermeasures (ECM) were active at the gates, dispersion of personnel was enforced to the greatest extent possible, snipers were in overwatch, PSYOP personnel communicated the threat to the crowd and asked people to leave, and medical assets were repositioned (exhibit 100). At the time of the blast, only the PSYOP, FST, and Recon elements of the MEU were at Abbey Gate (exhibits 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108). The paragraphs below detail the actions of these personnel. The MEU JOC immediately put additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets over Abbey Gate, scanning for additional threats (exhibit 102). Post-blast, 1/8 Marines shifted security elements to Abbey Gate to help fill gaps, and provided numerous vehicles for CASEVAC, assisting in movement to the HKIA Role 11-E. CLB-24 also provided numerous CASEVAC vehicles to support the MASCAL (exhibit 101).



(h) On 27 August, all gates were essentially shut in the MEU sector and 1/82 IBCT secured Abbey Gate (exhibits 53, 56, 57, 100, 102, 104). CLB-24 continued to operate the ECC until 30 August, processing evacuees until two hours before their departure from HKIA. The MEU retrograded back to Kuwait primarily on 29-30 August, with the last elements departing at approximately 1000 on 30 August (exhibit 100).

(7) Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force, Ground Combat Element (GCE), 2/1 Marines.

(a) 2/1 Marines were the GCE for the CENTCOM SPMAGTF, located primarily in Camps across Kuwait and Prince Sultan Airbase (PSAB) in Saudi Arabia (exhibit 53). In July 2021, the SPMAGTF received notice it would potentially participate in NEO in Afghanistan (exhibit 53). The SPMAGTF initially task organized a "NEO Light" package, consisting of elements of Combat Logistics Detachment (CLD) and the crisis response company (Echo Company, 2/1) (exhibits 53, 54, 55). The "Light" package elements executed two mission rehearsals testing their ECC and gate operations, prior to deployment to HKIA (exhibits 53, 54, 55). In August, the SPMAGTF would task organize and deploy a "Heavy" package, that included the rest of 2/1 Marines' rifle companies (exhibits 53, 54, 55).

(b) 2/1 first arrived to HKIA at approximately 0100-0200 on 16 August (exhibits 53, 54, 55, 56, 57). The first flight included the Battalion HQ, Echo Company leadership, and one platoon from Echo Company (exhibits 54, 56). Upon arrival, the unit found the airfield breached by civilians, who were moving onto the runways (exhibits 54, 56). The Battalion (TEXT REDACTED) immediately tasked Echo Company to assist with clearing the runway, in hopes of resuming flight operations (exhibit 54). Over the next 24 hours, Echo Company was part of the line holding the southern perimeter with 3/10 IBCT, 1/82 IBCT, and 1/8 Marines (exhibit 56). There were several breaches of the perimeter and crowds gained access to the runway, attempted to board C-17s, and pushed towards the North HKIA compounds (exhibits 56, 76). Forces pushed the crowds back after NSU units joined the line, and the crowds recognized there were no more flights to board (exhibits 56, 76). 2/1 Marines, specifically Echo Company, were part of the security perimeter at HKIA from approximately 0600 on 16 August until 19 August, when they were relieved by units from 1/82 IBCT (exhibit 53).

(c) Force flow over the next two days brought in parts of the 2/1 Battalion HQ, Fox Company (-), Golf Company, Weapons Company, Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) teams, the Shock Trauma Platoon (STP), and finally the remainder of Echo Company (exhibits 56, 76, 65, 66). These units focused on securing the southern perimeter from the Domestic Terminal to Abbey Gate from 17-19 August (exhibit 76). Once 1/82's relief of the perimeter began, Golf Company, Fox Company (-), Combined Anti-Armor Team (CAAT) platoons, and Battalion Snipers moved to Abbey Gate (exhibits 53, 76, 77, 81, 83, 89). U.K.'s 2 PARA were at the outer Abbey Gate, as well as Air Force Pararescue (PJ) personnel and small partner nation elements (exhibits 53, 76, 77, 89). After initially planning to push from Abbey Gate to Camp Sullivan, 2/1 Marines opted not to execute due to the size of the crowds and lack of Taliban support to extend the perimeter (exhibits 53, 76, 81). Instead, (TEXT REDACTED) tasked the battalion to open the outer gate to begin processing evacuees (exhibits 53, 76, 81, 89). Opening the gate required an entire platoon, sometimes reinforced, to keep the crowds from breaching the outer gate and accessing the Abbey

Gate's inner corridor (exhibits 53, 76, 77, 81, 89). 2/1 Marines processed approximately 750 evacuees through Abbey Gate on 19 August, but only after tremendous effort to hold the gate (exhibits 53, 76, 77, 81, 89).

(d) In order to enable safe and efficient gate operations, (TEXT REDACTED) Golf Company, 2/1 (TEXT REDACTED) decided to push the crowds back to an area beyond the Barron Hotel egress lane. This would ensure U.K. Forces had better access to the gate from their evacuee staging area (exhibits 53, 77, 89). In the early morning hours of 20 August, platoons from Golf and Fox Companies opened the outer gate, and methodically forced the smaller crowd back nearly 200 meters (exhibits 53, 76, 77, 81, 89). (TEXT REDACTED) coordinated with U.K. Forces and MEU Engineers to emplace six shipping containers in the main south to north roadway leading to Abbey Gate to form a disrupting obstacle and aid in crowd control (exhibits 53, 76, 77, 81, 88, 89). The Taliban agreed to provide outer security beyond the containers, and the U.K. Forces and 2/1 provided security inside the containers, guarding the Barron Hotel egress route and canal areas (exhibits 53, 76, 77, 81, 88, 89). The containers became known as the "Chevron" (exhibits 18, 21, 53, 76, 77, 81, 88, 89). The emplacement of the Chevron on 20 August established the structural layout of Abbey Gate for the duration of the NEO, as depicted in enclosures 12 and 13.

#### 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF BUXTON, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Buxton, ME. It is a great pleasure to celebrate the generations of industrious and caring people who have made Buxton a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

Named for the famous spa town in England, Buxton has a rich history. For thousands of years, the Saco River Valley was home to the Abenaki. In 1728, the Massachusetts General Court granted land to establish a settlement that was called Narragansett Number One. As the population grew, the town of Buxton was incorporated on July 14, 1772.

The early settlers turned the dense forests and fertile soil into a thriving lumber industry and productive farms. With the Saco River providing power, sawmills and gristmills were built, followed by woolen mills, tanneries, churches, libraries, and flourishing retail stores.

Education has been central to Buxton from the start. The first schoolmaster arrived in 1761, more than a decade before incorporation. Soon, 17 homes in town hosted one-room schools so that every youngster was within walking distance.

Buxton's early prosperity as an industrial center produced many fine examples of New England architecture. Today, several homes, businesses, and the First Congregational Church are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Also on the Register is the Buxton Powder House, built by the townspeople at a cost of \$59 to store ammunition and arms during the War of 1812.

Since then, the people of Buxton have joined together to erect monuments and memorials in tribute to the patriots who have defended freedom throughout our Nation's history.

The spirit that built Buxton is evident today in many ways. Countless volunteers have come together to make the town's sestercentennial a memorable celebration. For nearly 30 years, townspeople have generously supported the Buxton Toy Box that helps bring holiday cheer to children. Buxton's active involvement on the Saco River Corridor Commission shows a commitment to protect the natural resources that are vital to the quality of life.

Nothing better demonstrates the Buxton spirit than a special moment at this year's annual town meeting on June 18, when the townspeople honored Deputy Chief Gene Harmon of the Buxton Fire-Rescue Department for 60 years of dedicated service to his community and his neighbors.

Buxton's 250th anniversary is a time to celebrate the people who pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Buxton, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RECOGNIZING THE STENNIS PROGRAM FOR CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS

• Mr. WICKER. Madam President, a number of our congressional interns this summer have greatly profited from a program conducted by the Stennis Center for Public Service. The Stennis Program for Congressional Interns is designed to enhance the internship experience for exceptional future leaders, giving them an inside look at how Congress works and enabling them to learn from senior staffers across both parties. These bipartisan relationships will serve them well throughout their future careers supporting Congress.

Interns are selected based on their employment experience, college course load, and prospective service to Congress. This summer, 18 interns were chosen for this prestigious opportunity. These interns serve us on both sides of the aisle, working for Democrats and Republicans in both the House and Senate.

I congratulate the interns on completing this distinguished program. I also thank the Stennis Center and their Senior Stennis Congressional Staff Fellows for providing a meaningful experience and promoting bipartisan work.

I ask that the names of the 2022 Summer Stennis Congressional Interns and the offices in which they serve be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

Jack Behan, Office of U.S. Senator Sam Peters; Courtney Cochran, House Committee on Natural Resources; Carmen Evans, Office



of U.S. Representative Lizzie Fletcher; Jacob Feit, House Committee on Homeland Security; Dory Finney, Senate Special Committee on Aging; Chanidu Gamage, Office of U.S. Representative Matt Rosendale; Christian Gentile, Office of U.S. Senator Tommy Tuberville; Jagaar Halverson, Office of U.S. Representative Randy Feenstra; Zach Jewkes, Office of U.S. Senator James Risch; Kenny Johnson, Office of U.S. Representative Fred Upton; Erin Kavanagh, Office of U.S. Representative Kevin Brady; Eslie King, Office of U.S. Senator James Risch; Sophie Laurence, Office of U.S. Senator Angus King; Clara Smith, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry; Peyton Witt, Office of U.S. Representative Fred Upton; Ana Worthington, Office of U.S. Senator Tommy Tuberville; Hasan Zai, Office of U.S. Senator Gary Peters; Grace Zehner, Office of U.S. Representative Michael Turner.●

#### RECOGNIZING THE KANSAS CITY, KANSAS, POLICE DEPARTMENT

● Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I rise today to honor and recognize Captain James Grasela III, Sergeant Lee Ann Shelton, and Officer Dallas Thompson of the Kansas City, KS, Police Department.

On January 7, 2022, while the Kansas City Police were conducting a burglary investigation, Officer Thompson found pills crumpled in an envelope belonging to a detained suspect. Captain James Grasela immediately recognized the pills as ones which might be laced with fentanyl. Officer Thompson did everything by the book: placed the pills and envelope in an evidence bag, sealed it, and removed his gloves, yet just minutes later, he dropped to the ground, struggling to breathe. It was only through the quick action of Captain Grasela and the other officers on the scene that Officer Thompson was able to survive.

If the officers had not been there to administer emergency medication, Officer Thompson would not have made it home to his two daughters. Thankfully, this accidental overdose did not end in tragedy. Unfortunately, deaths involving Fentanyl are not uncommon in this country. Fentanyl kills more Americans than any other drug and is a clear threat to our society. The fact that it takes less Fentanyl than can fit on the tip of a pencil to kill someone makes this crisis even more severe.

I want to honor these officers for everything they do to protect our citizens from the dangers of fentanyl. They put their lives on the line every day to shield Americans from this crisis, as seen this past January. I now ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the bravery of our Kansas City, Kansas, police officers and to honor them for their dedication to protecting their fellow Americans from the scourge of Fentanyl.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:16 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5274. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide training for U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on the use of containment devices to prevent secondary exposure to fentanyl and other potentially lethal substances, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6538. An act to create an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7174. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the National Computer Forensics Institute of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol on Thursday, July 14, 2022, for the lying in honor of the remains of Hershel Woodrow "Woody" Williams, the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient for acts performed during World War II.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 3373.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 3373. An act to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 5274. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide training for U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on the use of containment devices to prevent secondary exposure to fentanyl and other potentially lethal substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6538. An act to create an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7174. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Na-

tional Computer Forensics Institute of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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-4466. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4467. A communication from the Director of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological Artifacts and Ethnological Material from Peru" (RIN1515-AE73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4468. A communication from the Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reducing Burden on Families Acting as Representative Payees of Social Security Payments" (RIN0960-AI52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4469. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The FY 2017-2019 Competitive Acquisition Ombudsman"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4470. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "June 2022 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4471. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Open Payments Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4472. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fourth Annual Report to Congress Pursuant to the Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017"; to the Committees on Finance; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4473. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Administrator for the Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2022; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4474. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "To Walk the Earth in Safety"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4475. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the

Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2022-0091 - 2022-0104); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4476. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Extension of Jackson-Vanik Waiver Authority for Turkmenistan"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4477. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Extension of Section 907 Waiver and 60-Day Report"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4478. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of intent to provide military assistance to Ukraine, including for self-defense and border security operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4479. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Determination Under Sections 506(a)(1) and 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to Provide Military Assistance to Ukraine"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4480. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Determination Under Sections 506(a)(1) and 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to Provide Military Assistance to Ukraine"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4481. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of intent to provide military assistance to Ukraine, including for self-defense and border security operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4482. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13936 with respect to Hong Kong; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4483. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the intent to rescind the designation of Afghanistan as a Non-NATO Ally; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4484. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2021 Asertive Community Treatment Grant Program"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4485. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rescinding Requirement for Negative Pre-Departure COVID-19 Test Result or Documentation of Recovery from COVID-19 for All Airline or Other Aircraft Passengers Arriving Into the United States From Any Foreign Country" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4486. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Financial Assistance by PGBC" (RIN1212-AB53) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on July 11, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4487. A communication from the Senior Policy and Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Withdrawing Rule on 'Securing Updated and Necessary Statutory Evaluations Timely'" (RIN0991-AC24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4488. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4489. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Governors, United States Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Postal Services' Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4490. A communication from the Acting Principal Diversity Officer and Director, Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Civil Rights, Department of Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's fiscal year 2021 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4491. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Enix Smith III, of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Adair Ford Boroughs, of South Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### 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 Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. SASSE):

S. 4530. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish an Office of Civic Bridgebuilding within the Corporation for National and Community Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4531. A bill to codify certain public land orders relating to the revocation of certain withdrawals of public land in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HASSAN:

S. 4532. A bill to amend the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 to provide financial institutions with credit for providing community business development referrals or resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CASIDY):

S. 4533. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 4534. A bill to increase the supply of, and lower rents for, affordable housing and to assess calculations of area median income for purposes of Federal low-income housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 4535. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROMNEY:

S. 4536. A bill to study how the Great Salt Lake and other saline lakes are affected by drought and to require a feasibility study on drought solutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 4537. A bill to amend the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 to adjust for inflation the maximum amount of assistance provided by the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 4538. A bill to amend section 248 of title 18, United States Code, to provide adequate penalties and remedies for attacks on facilities providing counseling about abortion alternatives and attacks on places of religious worship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SASSE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LANFORD, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 4539. A bill to designate June as the "Month of Life"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4540. A bill to amend the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 to improve provisions relating to the development of hydropower at Corps of Engineers facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRUZ, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 4541. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to furnish tailored information to expecting mothers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 4542. A bill to establish the Dolores River National Conservation Area and the Dolores River Special Management Area in the State of Colorado, to protect private water rights in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Ms. WARREN):

S.J. Res. 56. A joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 709. A resolution expressing the commitment of the Senate to building on the 20 years of success of the George McGovern-Robert Dole Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. HYDE-SMITH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 710. A resolution congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels baseball team for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I baseball championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 711. A resolution expressing the condolences of the Senate and honoring the memory of the victims of the mass shooting at the Fourth of July parade in Highland Park, Illinois, on July 4, 2022; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. Res. 712. A resolution recognizing the need for greater access to rural and agricultural media programming; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 129

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 129, a bill to permit disabled law enforcement officers, customs and border protection officers, firefighters, air traffic controllers, nuclear material couriers, members of the Capitol Police, members of the Supreme Court Police, employees of the Central Intelligence Agency performing intelligence activities abroad or having specialized security requirements, and diplomatic security special agents of the Department of State to receive retirement benefits in the same manner as if they had not been disabled.

S. 481

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 481, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 1080

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1080, a bill to designate residents of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region as Priority 2 refugees of special humanitarian concern, and for other purposes.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to improve the safety and security of the Federal judiciary.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2372, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2736, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3295

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 3295, a bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV.

S. 3607

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3607, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 3656

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3656, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide hereditary cancer genetic testing for individuals with a history of a hereditary cancer gene mutation in a blood relative or a personal or ancestral history suspicious for hereditary cancer, and to provide coverage of certain cancer screenings or preventive surgeries that would reduce the risk for individuals with a germline (inherited) mutation associated with a high risk of developing a preventable cancer.

S. 3726

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3726, a bill to address research on, and improve access to, supportive services for individuals with long COVID.

S. 4182

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4182, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 4202

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4202, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 4203

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4203, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 4393

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4393, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the maximum capital gains tax rate, to modify the tax on net investment income, and for other purposes.

S. 4499

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4499, a bill to prohibit any requirement that a member of the National Guard receive a vaccination against COVID-19.

S. 4507

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4507, a bill to provide incentives for States to recover fraudulently paid Federal and State unemployment compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 4513

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4513, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide funding or innovations in community policing, mental health care, and community safety, and for other purposes.

S. 4515

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4515, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to stipulate, as a condition on the sale at auction of

any crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, that the crude oil not be exported to certain countries, and for other purposes.

S. 4529

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 4529, a bill to provide protections for children in immigration custody, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 692

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 692, a resolution recognizing and celebrating the 50th anniversary of the enactment of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 into law.

S. RES. 705

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 705, a resolution congratulating the pro-life movement on its historic victory in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 709—EXPRESSING THE COMMITMENT OF THE SENATE TO BUILDING ON THE 20 YEARS OF SUCCESS OF THE GEORGE MCGOVERN-ROBERT DOLE FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM

Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. RES. 709

Whereas the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (referred to in this preamble as the "McGovern-Dole Program") has improved the food security, nutrition, literacy, and primary education of school-age children, particularly young girls, and their families in over 48 countries in just 2 decades;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program was established by section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o-1) to procure agricultural commodities and provide financial and technical assistance to carry out preschool and school food for education programs in foreign countries and maternal, infant, and child nutrition programs for pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants, and children who are 5 years of age or younger;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program has provided over 5,500,000,000 school meals benefiting over 31,000,000 school-age children and their communities;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program has been successfully administered by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program is a key program of the Department of Agriculture aligned with the governmentwide Global Food Security Strategy;

Whereas in fiscal year 2021 alone, McGovern-Dole Program projects have directly benefited more than 4,500,000 children and community members through the distribution of United States-produced commodities that provide daily nutritious and high-quality meals and mitigate food insecurity;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program partners with farmers in the United States, who provide 46,770 metric tons ("MT") of food commodities in support of fiscal year 2021 McGovern-Dole Program grants in Central America, Africa, and Asia;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program complements United States agricultural commodities with food grown and purchased locally to support farmers and markets within the recipient's own communities and to build the capacity of local governments and communities to continue and sustain the benefits of the McGovern-Dole Program into the future;

Whereas during the COVID-19 pandemic when school closures were commonplace, the McGovern-Dole Program effectively shifted from providing meals in schools to providing take-home rations and distributed approximately 23,000 MT of commodities donated by the United States and 550 MT of locally procured commodities to more than 1,700,000 McGovern-Dole Program participants and their families across 26 active projects, ensuring that children continued to receive daily meals and learn while at home;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program recognizes the value of educating young girls and contributes to overcoming the barriers they encounter in accessing a high-quality education by promoting equality and the reduction of gender-based violence;

Whereas school meals provide an incentive for families to send girls to school and help girls to stay in school, effectively preventing early marriage and delaying first pregnancy, which can trap young women in poverty and limit their future potential;

Whereas the McGovern-Dole Program strengthens local community health and education through the formation of parent-teacher associations, teacher training, and improving the infrastructure of schools, classrooms, commodity storerooms, latrines, and water sources; and

Whereas the United States, as a member of the Global School Meals Coalition, is committed to and recognizes that investments in the McGovern-Dole Program, are central to bolstering food security, building resilience to future shocks, and supporting the nutritional, health, and educational needs of children and adolescents worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States is committed to—

(1) building upon the 20 years of successful work of the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (in this resolution referred to as the "McGovern-Dole Program") and its positive role in breaking cycles of hunger and poverty, providing opportunity through education and literacy, and improving overall nutrition and health;

(2) complementing humanitarian assistance efforts and development programs through the continued implementation of the McGovern-Dole Program that addresses global food insecurity and creates conditions for peace and stability; and

(3) supporting United States farmers, millers, shippers, and commodity groups that provide agricultural commodities for use in the McGovern-Dole Program to help combat

global malnutrition and food insecurity and advance global education.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 710—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI REBELS BASEBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2022 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BASEBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 710

Whereas, on Sunday, June 26, 2022, the University of Mississippi baseball team won the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the "NCAA") Men's College World Series at Charles Schwab Field in Omaha, Nebraska;

Whereas, by defeating the University of Oklahoma by a score of 4 to 2, the University of Mississippi baseball team became the first team in school history to win the NCAA Division I baseball championship;

Whereas the University of Mississippi baseball team lost only 1 game throughout the entirety of the 2022 NCAA-Division I Baseball Tournament Men's College World Series, finishing the postseason with a record of 10-1;

Whereas the Rebels completed a magical run through the postseason, finishing on top after being among the last teams included in the field of 64 for the NCAA tournament;

Whereas, on June 26, 2022, University of Mississippi pitcher Dylan DeLucia received the Jack Delsing, Sr., Most Outstanding Player of the Series Award for pitching a complete-game shutout against the Arkansas Razorbacks, becoming the first recipient of the award in school history;

Whereas infielders Tim Elko, Justin Bench, and Calvin Harris, outfielder Kevin Graham, designated hitter Kemp Alderman, and pitcher Dylan DeLucia were named to the 2022 NCAA Men's College World Series All-Tournament Team;

Whereas Head Coach Mike Bianco, having coached the University of Mississippi baseball team for 22 seasons, including 18 postseason appearances, led the team to a 42-23 record and the 2022 NCAA National Championship victory;

Whereas Head Coach Bianco was named National Coach of the Year by Collegiate Baseball Newspaper and the American Baseball Coaches Association;

Whereas the University of Mississippi baseball team hit back-to-back-to-back home runs and 16 hits in Game 1 of the 2022 NCAA National Championship, the first team to do so since 1998;

Whereas Tim Elko became only the sixth player in history to have 4 hits in a Men's College World Series final and recorded 46 career home runs, the second-most in school history;

Whereas Oxford-University Stadium/Swayze Field on the campus of the University of Mississippi is the home of the 2022 NCAA National Champions;

Whereas the victory of the University of Mississippi baseball team has brought back-to-back Men's College World Series wins to the State of Mississippi;

Whereas the University of Mississippi athletic program, through its football and baseball teams, was 1 of only 2 athletic programs in the country to appear in both a New Year's Six bowl game and the Men's College World Series this year;

Whereas the University of Mississippi now boasts 30 total NCAA national championships;

Whereas the University of Mississippi baseball team, under the leadership of Head Coach Bianco, displayed outstanding dedication, teamwork, and sportsmanship throughout the 2021–2022 season; and

Whereas the University of Mississippi baseball team has brought great pride and honor to—

- (1) the University of Mississippi;
- (2) loyal fans of the University of Mississippi; and
- (3) the entire State of Mississippi: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Mississippi baseball team, including the athletes, coaching staff, administration, faculty, students, and alumni, for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I baseball championship;

(2) recognizes the University of Mississippi for its excellence as an institution of higher education; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the chancellor of the University of Mississippi, Dr. Glenn Boyce;

(B) the athletic director of the University of Mississippi, Keith Carter; and

(C) the head coach of the University of Mississippi baseball team, Mike Bianco.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 711—EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE MASS SHOOTING AT THE FOURTH OF JULY PARADE IN HIGHLAND PARK, ILLINOIS, ON JULY 4, 2022

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

##### S. RES. 711

Whereas, on July 4, 2022, a gunman opened fire at the corner of Central Avenue and Second Street in Highland Park, Illinois, during the annual Fourth of July parade;

Whereas the gunman took the lives of 7 individuals and injured 46 more individuals;

Whereas the 7 individuals who lost their lives that day were—

(1) Katie Goldstein, age 64, of Highland Park, Illinois, a beloved wife and mother, who was known for her kind, caring personality, and for bringing neighbors delicious baked goods during the holidays;

(2) Irina McCarthy, age 35, of Highland Park, Illinois, a wife and mother of 2-year-old Aiden, who met her husband Kevin through their mutual work in the pharmaceutical industry;

(3) Kevin McCarthy, age 37, of Highland Park, Illinois, a husband and father of 2-year-old Aiden, who died protecting his son from gunfire;

(4) Stephen Strauss, age 88, of Highland Park, Illinois, a brother, husband, father, and grandfather, who was a joke-teller and avid reader and greatly enjoyed the Art Institute of Chicago and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra;

(5) Jacquelyn Sundheim, age 63, of Highland Park, Illinois, a kind and caring wife and mother, who was a lifelong member of North Shore Congregation Israel in Glencoe, where she also taught preschool and served as the events coordinator;

(6) Nicolas Toledo-Zaragoza, age 78, of Morelos, Mexico, who was attending the pa-

rade with his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren; and

(7) Eduardo Uvaldo, age 69, of Waukegan, Illinois, who was a devoted husband, father, and grandfather;

Whereas dozens of individuals were wounded by gunfire or injured fleeing the scene of the mass shooting;

Whereas the Highland Park Police Department and the Highland Park Fire Department led dozens of agencies in responding to the shooting with bravery and professionalism, including the Illinois State Police, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States Secret Service, the United States Marshals Service, the Naval Criminal Investigative Service, the Lake County Major Crimes Task Force, the Chicago Police Department, the Lake County Sheriff's Office, the Cook County Sheriff's Office, the Northwest Central Dispatch System, the Regional Emergency Dispatch Center (RED Center), the Glenview Public Safety Dispatch Center, the Highland Park Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), the Deerfield-Bannockburn Fire Protection District, the Northbrook Fire Department, the Winnetka Fire Department, the Northfield Fire Department, the Buffalo Grove Fire Department, the Prospect Heights Fire Department, the Libertyville Fire Department, the Lincolnshire-Riverwoods Fire Protection District, the Evanston Fire Department, the Glenview Fire Department, the Lake Bluff Fire Department, the Skokie Fire Department, the Wilmette Fire Department, the Des Plaines Fire Department, Glencoe Public Safety, the Lake Forest Fire Department, the Morton Grove Fire Department, the Park Ridge Fire Department, the Waukegan Fire Department, the Niles Fire Department, the Addison Fire Protection District, the Streamwood Fire Department, the Hanover Park Fire Department, and the police departments of Addison, Antioch, Arlington Heights, Bannockburn, Barrington, Barrington Hills, Bartlett, Berwyn, Buffalo Grove, Carpentersville, Cary, Crystal Lake, Deerfield, Des Plaines, Elk Grove Village, Elmhurst, Evanston, Fox Lake, Franklin Park, Glencoe, Glenview, Grayslake, Gurnee, Hanover Park, Harwood Heights, Hoffman Estates, Inverness, Kenilworth, Kildeer, Lake Bluff, Lake Forest, Lake Villa, Lake Zurich, Libertyville, Lincolnshire, Lincolnwood, McHenry, Morton Grove, Mount Prospect, Mundelein, Niles, Norridge, North Chicago, North Riverside, Northbrook, Northfield, Palatine, Prospect Heights, Riverwoods, Rolling Meadows, Rosemont, Round Lake, Round Lake Beach, Round Lake Park, Schiller Park, Skokie, Streamwood, Vernon Hills, Wauconda, Waukegan, Western Springs, Wheeling, Wilmette, Winnetka, Winthrop Harbor, and Zion;

Whereas the emergency responders and the doctors, nurses, and other health care providers at Highland Park Hospital, Glenbrook Hospital, Evanston Hospital, Northwestern Medicine Lake Forest Hospital, Advocate Lutheran General Hospital, and University of Chicago Medicine Comer Children's Hospital provided professional and dedicated care to the victims;

Whereas dozens of volunteer counselors have traveled to North Shore School District 112 and Township High School District 113 to assist the community in beginning the process of healing, having already met with several thousand community members in need of counseling;

Whereas members of the Highland Park, Highwood, Waukegan, and North Chicago communities, along with communities across the entire North Shore, the State of

Illinois, the United States, and the world have come together to support the victims of this horrific massacre and their families;

Whereas, according to the Gun Violence Archive, the horrific mass shooting that occurred in Highland Park was 1 of 10 mass shootings that occurred on July 4, 2022; and

Whereas senseless gun violence has caused devastation, trauma, and grief to too many families and communities across the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) expresses sincere condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of Katie Goldstein, Irina McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Stephen Strauss, Jacquelyn Sundheim, Nicolas Toledo-Zaragoza, and Eduardo Uvaldo, the victims of the tragic shooting along the parade route on July 4, 2022, in Highland Park, Illinois;

(2) honors the lives and memory of the victims, with gratitude for their selfless dedication to others;

(3) extends support to the individuals who were injured and subjected to the trauma of the shooting;

(4) expresses gratitude to the law enforcement officers, medical personnel, and emergency responders who responded to the shooting with professionalism, dedication, and bravery; and

(5) stands in solidarity with the victims of senseless gun violence in communities across the United States.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 712—RECOGNIZING THE NEED FOR GREATER ACCESS TO RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL MEDIA PROGRAMMING

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DAINES) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

##### S. RES. 712

Whereas individuals living in rural areas in the United States need access to media content that is relevant to their daily lives;

Whereas rural and agricultural programming includes agricultural weather, agribusiness news, commodity market news, and western sports, and this programming is important to the farmers and ranchers of the United States for their way of life and making a living;

Whereas rural and agricultural programming covers matters that affect all individuals in the United States;

Whereas all individuals in the United States need to be exposed to, and informed about, what is occurring outside of the major cities and suburbs of the United States;

Whereas all individuals in the United States feel the effects of inflation and supply chain shortages, and rural and agricultural programming is in a unique position to inform viewers of the roots of these issues;

Whereas the population of the world is projected to grow from 7,000,000,000 to approximately 9,000,000,000 by 2050, and agricultural productivity will need to increase to meet the growing demand for food and the projected increase in consumption;

Whereas a decrease in investment in agricultural research and development would result in a negative shock to agricultural productivity;

Whereas an informed public is key to supporting the proper level of investment in agricultural research and development;

Whereas significant consolidation in the media market and prioritization of consolidated media has had a negative impact on

access to rural and agricultural programming; and

Whereas multichannel video programming distributors and providers of digital and streaming media should make delivery of rural and agricultural programming, including agricultural news and western lifestyle content, a priority: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate recognizes the importance of rural and agricultural programming and the need for greater access to rural and agricultural media programming.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I have four 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 Thursday, July 14, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 14, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 14, 2022, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 14, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

#### CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI REBELS BASEBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2022 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BASEBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 710, 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. 710) congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels baseball team for winning the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I baseball championship.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and 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. 710) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE MASS SHOOTING AT THE FOURTH OF JULY PARADE IN HIGHLAND PARK, ILLINOIS, ON JULY 4, 2022

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 711, 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. 711) expressing the condolences of the Senate and honoring the memory of the victims of the mass shooting at the Fourth of July parade in Highland Park, Illinois, on July 4, 2022.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and 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. 711) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 18, 2022

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time be considered expired on Executive Calendar No. 968 and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at a time to be determined by the majority leader, or his designee, following consultation with the Republican leader; further, that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 18; and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed

to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 1035; and that cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, finally, for the information of the Senate, the 5:30 p.m. vote will be on the motion to invoke cloture on the Wang nomination to be U.S. District Court Judge for the District of Colorado.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senator SULLIVAN, the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I just had the opportunity to host a lunch—the Thursday lunch—for a number of my Senate colleagues. This is an opportunity that Senators get to essentially brag about their State. It is kind of like what I do with the "Alaskan of the Week" speech that I give.

I know we have new pages here.

I am going to be putting out a Facebook post on the incredible bounty that we just had at the lunch—salmon, halibut, peonies flowers, which are now growing in abundance in Alaska. It was a really, really incredible meal, if I do say so myself, from Alaskans. So we are going to talk about that.

Next week I will be back to my "Alaskan of the Week" series, for the new pages. I promise you, this is going to be your favorite speech of the week because it is interesting, and it tells stories, and it is exciting about what is going on in Alaska.

Madam President, I want to talk about two other issues today that I care deeply about—I think most Senators do, and certainly Americans do—and that is two things that our country desperately needs: infrastructure and energy. Infrastructure and energy—and we all know that this is what is needed.

We talk about it here a lot in the Senate. However, some, especially in the Biden administration, talk a lot about these issues but, then, when it comes to taking action, maybe not so much. Maybe that is starting to change, maybe not.

But I am going to talk about something I introduced in the Senate yesterday that is going to be action, especially on infrastructure. So let's talk about infrastructure first.

Yesterday, I introduced a joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act—it is what we call the CRA—which will nullify the Biden administration's new regulations that are remarkably going to bog down



the ability to permit infrastructure projects. It is going to add to the red-tape that every single American who cares about this issue knows is a problem, and it is a new reg from the Biden administration—remarkably, because they supposedly are for infrastructure, and I am going to get to that. It is a new reg to make it harder to build infrastructure projects.

So let me unpack a little bit of that because it is something that I think all Americans care about. I know they care about it, but it can kind of be boring and technical, with permitting and things like that.

When the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, was passed in the late sixties, it required an environmental impact statement, an EIS, as we call these things. In the old days, you would do an EIS. It would take about a year, maybe. You would get public input. It was maybe 100 pages. OK? The process worked. People were engaged. It didn't bog down things, and you would have a couple of hundred pages that the average American could read and then you would build, which is what we all want to do in a responsible way.

Fast forward to today. NEPA has been completely abused. This is a huge passion of mine because it hurts everybody. Too many people, too many Americans now know the numbers: 4 to 6 years on average to complete any EIS in America. Most cost millions of dollars. Most EISes are thousands of pages so no one reads them. How can you read them? And it is undeniably killing our ability to build infrastructure.

The only people, in my view, who really like this new system are, A, radical far-left environmental groups that don't want to build anything—OK, that is a group; it is not a big group in America, but, unfortunately, they have a loud voice—and probably the Chinese Communist Party. When they know they have to compete against us, they love the fact that it takes 9 to 10 years to permit a bridge in the U.S.A.

Let me provide some examples. GAO did a study quite a while ago on new highway construction to build and design a new highway, 9 to 19 years, on average, in America. It is about 8 years, I think, for Federal permits to permit a bridge—a bridge—in America.

The Gross Reservoir in Colorado, which is going to offer clean water to the people of that State, it has been two decades—20 years—to permit that important infrastructure project.

The California bullet train project—holy cow—approved in the nineties and still not built. The Mountain Valley Pipeline in Virginia and West Virginia, it began in 2015 with 20 miles left to complete. I hate to say it. It will never be completed—litigation, back to the courts, NEPA, radical enviros stopping it. This is not America. This is not the way it should work.

My State, unfortunately, has been the epicenter of groups that try to stop any resource development projects—

any projects—a road, a bridge, a gold mine. The Kensington Mine in Alaska now employs over 400 people, average wage \$110,000 per year. That is great money. It took almost 20 years to permit if you include the litigation—20 years. Who is that benefiting?

I worked with the Trump administration on their NEPA Executive order. I worked in the Environment and Public Works Committee on this infrastructure bill that President Biden supported. We got good—not great—but we got some pretty darn good permitting reform, based on some of what we did in the Trump administration, to bring projects to be able to build in a timely, efficient manner, not cutting corners. There is one Federal Agency in charge of decision, time limits on NEPA requirements to 2 years, limitations on pages for NEPA. These are common-sense reforms. We got them into law. OK. That is pretty good. Bipartisan. The President hailed this as one of his big signature achievements. I voted for it, in part, because of NEPA reforms, because of permitting reforms.

What am I upset about? About 4 months ago, the Biden administration's Council on Environmental Quality not only revised the Trump Executive order on permitting, which the average American Republican and Democrat thought was good—they actually undertook new regulations for NEPA that are clearly—clearly—intended to make it harder to permit infrastructure projects, particularly energy infrastructure projects.

Just ask anyone. Go look at the regs. Go look at what they put out. What I find remarkable is that the President let this come out of his White House. He is supposedly “Mr. Infrastructure,” “Mr. Building Trades,” “Mr. Joe Six-Pack Union Guy.”

This is a product of the radical, elite, coastal Democratic special interests that is going to make it harder to build things. That is a fact. It is a sad fact, especially because a lot of us came together as Democrats and Republicans to pass permitting reform.

So what did I file yesterday? A Congressional Review Act resolution says that if Congress doesn't like a big regulation coming out of the executive branch, we can vote to rescind it. We can vote to rescind it. So, yesterday, I filed one of those resolutions targeting this new rule from the Biden administration meant to slow down the building of infrastructure.

Here is the thing. You don't see this a lot, but every single Republican Senator is a cosponsor of my resolution—50—50 cosponsors of our Congressional Review Act resolution on infrastructure.

The other good thing about the CRA law, Congressional Review Act law, it is a privileged resolution. What does that mean? It means Majority Leader SCHUMER, even if he doesn't like it, has to take it up.

Here is the other thing. Under the CRA law, you only need 51 Senators 51

Senators to make it pass the Senate. So my Democratic colleagues are going to have a tough choice here. I don't think it should be tough. I think it should be 100 to 0. If you want infrastructure for America and you want to stand with the men and women who build things in America, then you are going to vote for my resolution. Simple.

Let me quote the Laborers' International, LIUNA, the biggest construction trade union in America, led by a great American, Terry O'Sullivan. When the Biden administration was putting out their NEPA rule, the laborers said: What are you doing? Here is our statement. Here is what they thought about that rule:

Once again, communities in need of vital infrastructure and the hard working men and women who build America will be waiting as project details for infrastructure are subjected to onerous reviews [by these new rules].

That is the Laborers'. Those are the men and women who build America. Americans will continue to bear the expense of NEPA-related delays, which cost taxpayers millions of dollars annually.

Lengthy review processes and unpredictable legal challenges which will result from these new regs will have a chilling impact on private investment and infrastructure.

That is what the Laborers' said.

This is going to be an interesting vote because I have said this a number of times—I think some of my Democratic friends have gotten a little upset with me, but I think it is a fact; it is certainly a fact in Alaska—whenever the national Democrats have a choice between the radical far-left environmentalists, the coastal elites, and the men and women who build things and made our country great, they always choose the radical environmentalists. I mentioned this in the Commerce Committee hearing the other day. Some of my colleagues got a little upset with me. I said: All right. Guess what I am going to have—a CRA. I am going to put it on the floor, and it is going to be a test vote. I know where 50 Republicans stand. We are going to stand with the men and women who build stuff. If you support my CRA like the Laborers' do or will, the resolution, you are going to support it. If you support infrastructure for America, you are going to support our resolution. If you support energy for America, you are going to support our resolution. If you support the men and women who actually build stuff in this country, good wages, you are going to support my resolution. If you stand with the coastal environmental elites who want to shut down this country, you will vote against it.

I think it is going to be really interesting to see what the men and women of the U.S. Senate stand for: far-left environmentalists who just want to stop anything and shut it all down or the men or women who build stuff?



That vote is going to come in the next few weeks, and I am going to be down here on the floor a lot talking about it. I hope my colleagues do the right thing because we all know what the right thing to do is: to move this country forward, to build on the infrastructure bill, and to get working and support the men and women who do that hard work.

### ENERGY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to turn to energy now. You know the President is in Saudi Arabia. There is a lot of irony here, I believe, because his administration has clearly—clearly—made it harder for Americans to produce American energy with American workers, with American infrastructure. That is a fact. That is a fact, OK? I see it in Alaska every day—every single day. The Federal Government is trying to stop the production of American energy.

What are we seeing? Inflation, super high prices at the gas pump—literally, everything. Senior administration officials are going to Wall Street. Senior administration officials who are Federal regulators for finance are all trying to choke off capital to the American energy sector. It hurts my constituents. It hurts the country.

So the President is going to Saudi Arabia to beg them to produce more. He should send an envoy to Texas or an envoy to Alaska and say: Hey, how can we produce more here? How can we produce more here? I hope they are starting to change their tune. I hope they are starting to change their tune so that we don't need to beg the Saudis, dictators like Iran and Venezuela, and all these other autocratic regimes in the world to produce. We should produce it in our country. We have the highest standards in the world by far on the environment—by far. It is not even close. We have high standards of labor in the world.

The Biden administration, in my State, has been a disaster. They have issued 26 Executive orders or Executive actions solely focused on my State, solely focused on Alaska, none of which has been helpful.

Lately—lately—there has been discussion, constructive discussion, on a big project in Alaska called the Willow Project. The Biden administration is showing signs that they want to support it. That would make sense. The country needs energy. This would be done in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska set aside decades ago by Congress for oil and gas development—again, the highest standards in the world. I pitched the President on this project over a year ago in the Oval Office. By the way, it has some of the lowest emissions in the world of any big energy project. I am going to talk about who supports it.

This has been in permitting for years. I won't go through the timeline, but this project, the Willow Project,

has been in permitting for years. We could start building it this winter. As a matter of fact, we tried to start building it last winter.

Like I said, I pitched the President on this: 2,000 construction jobs; enormous support from the building trades, labor unions; lowest greenhouse gas emissions for a project this type and size in America. And it would help us not have to go beg from other countries.

But there has been a lot of press in the last week on the Willow Project. Of course, our mainstream media doesn't get it. They love to tell their kind of slanted story on the Willow Project, so I am going to push back. And, boy, if you are a reporter, I really hope you write down some of the stuff that I am going to talk about here because it is all factual. And with all due respect, most of you guys never write about these things.

I am going to start with this chart. This is a really important chart in my mind, and it is important because this chart goes to an issue that really, really strikes to the heart and soul of why resource development in my State is particular is so important.

This chart is from the American Medical Association, and it looks at life expectancy from 1980 to 2014: 25 years. And in different parts of America, you see different life expectancy in these different colors. The blue, darker blue-purple is areas where life expectancy has increased dramatically in the last 25 years.

Unfortunately, there is yellow, orange, and even red. Life expectancy has slowed or even decreased in a few places. If you look at the map, that is mostly due to the horrendous opioid epidemic that we had as a nation.

But if you look at this chart, the one State where life expectancy has increased the most, by far, is the State of Alaska. The one area in the State of Alaska that has increased the most in terms of life expectancy are many of our rural areas: North Slope Borough, Northwest Arctic Borough, Aleutian Island chain—13 years, 13 years. In 25 years, people's life expectancy went up that much.

I have asked many times my Senate colleagues, Give me a policy indicator of success more important than are the people you representing living longer. Give me one. There isn't one. That is about as important as it gets.

And in my State, it has happened. It has happened. Why has it happened? Why has it happened? Well, I will tell you why it has happened. First, in a lot of these rural areas, unfortunately, the life expectancy in the early eighties was quite low.

These are primarily Alaskan Native communities, and they had some of the lowest life expectancies of any Americans—sometimes of any people in the world—because they didn't have things, like good jobs and flush toilets and clinics. They lived in real poverty. So we started really low.

And then what happened? What happened that in these mostly Alaskan Native communities people started living longer? I will tell you what happened. They started getting jobs. Resource development happened, responsible resource development: oil, gas, mining, fishing.

So when I talk about these issues, when Senator MURKOWSKI talks about these issues, it is not just some kind of pie-in-the-sky issue of oil and gas. I mean, this is about life and death, which is why I come down here a little bit riled up sometimes because people don't have a clue. People don't have a clue.

The radical enviros who try to shut down the economies of my State all the darned time and some U.S. Senators—primarily the senior Senator from New Mexico—who come down here and try to shut this down, they don't understand.

So people are living longer in Alaska, much longer, more than any other part of the country because we have had responsible resource development, which brings me back to Willow.

So, again, you will see all these articles in the Washington Post, all these stories. Heck, there is three this week, I think, about this one project. And they are all slanted. And you have got some Lower 48 environmental group in New York City or San Francisco—oh my gosh, climate bomb—all this rhetoric that is hot air—pardon the pun—but not accurate. Who is supporting this project? Who is supporting?

You have an incredible diversity of people supporting this project. First, the unions, every major union in America—building trades, AFL-CIO—they are all supporting this project. They are all supporting this project.

But what I really want to emphasize is another group that is very special to me that supports the Willow Project. And you see here some of the symbols of these groups right here.

Some are the Alaska Chamber, Oil and Gas Association, Resource Development Council, but most of these symbols here are the Alaskan Native people—the Alaskan Native people, the leaders of a really important constituency in Alaska, the First Peoples of Alaska.

Why am I saying this? Because our national media never talks about this, right? They will pick one group, one leader—oh, we are against it—so they write about it. That is baloney.

The leaders of the Alaska communities, the Native communities are overwhelmingly supportive of this project. And here is my point: This administration loves to talk about environmental justice, environmental equity, communities that have been discriminated against to make sure they have access to proper environment, but you know what they do? They have been doing it for a year-and-a-half. When they talk about environmental justice, environmental equity, they always forget about Alaskan Natives.

They purposefully forget about Alaskan Natives. I see it all the time.

They can't do it this time. This project—and come on, media, write the story. This project has overwhelming support by the Native leaders and Native communities in Alaska.

So if you are for environmental justice and racial equity, all the things that the Biden administration says they are for, you better be a Willow supporter.

And for those in the Biden administration, Gina McCarthy and others, someone should ask her, Why are you discriminating against Alaskan Native people, because that is exactly what you are doing.

So you have, right here, some of our Alaska Native leaders in this statement:

The administration cannot proclaim to support meaningful tribal consultation and environmental justice while at the same time killing a critical resource [project] that supports . . . the Inupiat communities of the North Slope [region].

That is right there from our great Alaska Native leaders, the Alaska Federation of Natives. I have their letter. That is the group representing every single Alaska Native organization in the State, the biggest group in the State, fully supports the Willow Project.

The ANCSA Regional Corporation leadership fully supports the Willow Project.

The Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope fully supports the Willow Project.

Senator MURKOWSKI just put out a press release.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator MURKOWSKI press release be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS RELEASE,  
LISA MURKOWSKI,  
July 14, 2022.

#### ALASKANS VOICE STRONG SUPPORT FOR WILLOW PROJECT

WASHINGTON, DC—In case you missed it, U.S. Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) issued the following statement in strong support of ConocoPhillips' Willow project, located in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A), after the federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for it late last week.

"From day one, I've elevated the Willow project to the Administration as my top priority, and I will continue to hold them accountable to their commitment to see this additional environmental review through so that construction can begin this winter. Responsibly-developed Alaskan energy benefits both our national security and American families who are facing near-record energy prices," said Senator Murkowski. "The Willow project has gone through several extraordinarily stringent environmental reviews and will adhere to Alaska's world-class safety and environmental standards. It's no wonder the project has such broad support from Alaskans—including the Alaska Federation of Natives, the Alaska AFL-CIO, the Alaska Chamber of Commerce, and Alaska Native stakeholders across the North Slope."

Willow is critical to Alaska's economy, throughput in the quarter-full Trans Alaska Pipeline System, domestic energy security, and making energy more affordable for families and businesses. The project is estimated to provide up to 160,000 barrels of American oil per day at peak production; \$10 billion in revenue for state, local, and federal governments during its lifespan; 2,000 construction jobs, and 300 permanent jobs.

Following last week's announcement, a wide array of Alaskans joined Senator Murkowski in voicing their continued strong support for the Willow project and thanking her for her longstanding advocacy of it. Murkowski encourages all Alaskans to weigh in, in favor of Willow's final approval, through BLM's 45-day public comment process.

#### WHAT ALASKANS ARE SAYIN

"RDC welcomed the news of the release of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) draft supplemental environmental impact statement for the Willow project," said Leila Kimbrell, Executive Director for the Resource Development Council for Alaska. "After a delay to the project because of an August 2021 court decision, RDC is pleased to see the draft SEIS released in time to keep a winter construction season and we thank Senator Murkowski for keeping pressure on the administration to put this project back on track. We know this will be a responsibly developed project, having already undergone a rigorous multiyear environmental review. It's time to move forward with a responsible domestic energy project that will create thousands of jobs, generate tens of billions of dollars, and strengthen our energy independence."

"The Willow Project is critical to the economic well-being of our region's eight Inupiat villages. Every delay in the project also delays the economic, infrastructure and employment benefits the project will bring to North Slope communities and our people. ASRC extends our gratitude to Senator Murkowski, Senator Sullivan and the late Congressman Don Young for their unwavering commitment to moving the Willow Project forward," said Rex A. Rock, Sr., President and CEO of Arctic Slope Regional Corporation.

"Thanks to Senator Murkowski for fighting for what is good for Alaska and America; more domestic oil in the pipeline, good jobs that support a family and lower fuel costs in our future. Once again, Lisa gets it done. Alaskans should be so proud of this tireless fighter for our state," said Joelle Hall, President of Alaska AFL-CIO.

"ConocoPhillips and many stakeholders, including residents of the North Slope and across Alaska are committed to the Willow project as it will supply much needed energy for the United States, while serving as a strong example of environmentally and socially responsible development that offers extensive public benefits. The Willow project has undergone an extensive and rigorous multi-year environmental analysis, including extensive baseline scientific studies. The project will also create employment opportunities for union labor and contribute local tax revenue that benefit communities on the North Slope, as well as significant state and federal tax revenue for many years. ConocoPhillips thanks the Alaska Congressional Delegation—Senators Murkowski and Sullivan, and the late Congressman Young—for their tremendous efforts in advocating for the Willow project," said Erec Isaacson, President of ConocoPhillips Alaska.

"Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope supports the development of the Willow Project. Responsible development for our region will provide infrastructure, jobs and economic growth for our tribal members.

ICAS is pleased with the environmental reviews that took place to ensure safe development," said Morrie Lemen, Jr., Executive Director of the Inupiat Community of The Arctic Slope.

"The desperate need for the Willow project could not come at a more critical juncture in time. Alaskans and Americans across the country are paying record high energy prices, while the more than 20 year struggle to get the Willow project developed serves as a chilling reminder that what stands between Americans and lower energy prices is nothing but bureaucratic red tape. Meanwhile, this vital project that can drive energy abundance, is tucked away in the NPR-A because government can't get out of the way. We appreciate Senator Murkowski's tenacity on this issue and we look forward to working with her to roll back despotic environmental regulations," said Bernadette Wilson, State Director of Americans for Prosperity Alaska.

"Energy security is vital to our country. Alaska has a critical role and ability to provide needed energy. Among the whole array of energy options, the Willow project can be a shining example of success," said Julie Kitka, President of the Alaska Federation of Natives.

"The release of the draft environmental review for the Willow project comes at a critical time for Alaska and the nation. Along with the majority of Alaskans, the Alaska Chamber is a steadfast supporter of responsible development projects that provide jobs, economic opportunity, and increased revenue to state, local, and federal governments. Now, more than ever, the United States needs to increase domestic energy supply and enact and defend sound policy that encourages development of our natural resources at home. The Chamber thanks Senators Murkowski and Sullivan for their persistence in keeping the Willow project at the forefront of the discussion with the Biden Administration and ensuring the project receives due process," said Kati Capozzi, President and CEO of the Alaska Chamber of Commerce.

"Through the North Slope Borough permitting process we exercise zoning and other oversight that has—in partnership with the State and Fed's—led to some of the strictest environmental regulations in our nation and one of the best examples of responsible development in the world. Senator Murkowski knows this and was a champion for our region on endeavors like the Willow project. Willow will not only lead to jobs, but better schools, health clinics, and transportation infrastructure and we can't thank the Senator enough for continuing to fight for the region and the State," said D.J. Fauske, Director of Government and External Affairs for the North Slope Borough.

"It is encouraging to see the Bureau of Land Management release the revised draft environmental review of ConocoPhillips' proposed Willow Master Development Plan in the National Petroleum Reserve, or NPR-A. AOGA and its allies will be fully engaged in the public meetings to come, and we encourage all Alaskans to learn more about the project's benefits and participate as the process moves forward. Willow represents a near-term opportunity to help return the United States to energy independence at a time when our country desperately needs more domestic sources of oil and gas. Of course, a project the size of Willow will also boost Alaska's economy, creating job opportunities and providing tax revenues to state, local, and federal governments. Alaskans have long supported development of our oil and gas resources. Now is the time to speak up and let the federal government know how those of us who call Alaska home feel about

projects like Willow: no one cares more about protecting our environment or safely developing Alaska's resources than Alaskans. Alaskans who want to be a part of this significant step forward have a 45-day comment period to make their voices heard," said Kara Moriarty, President and CEO of the Alaska Oil and Gas Association.

"The Willow project represents a valid compliment to rising energy needs while contributing to the health, well-being, security and self-determination of the region, state and country. Regulatory process would be better served by more effective implementation of process and less evaluation by political trends," said Douglas Whiteman, Mayor of the City of Atkasuk on the North Slope.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, Alaskans Voice Strong Support for the Willow Project. She has a huge list of Alaskan Native groups and others who are supporting the Willow Project.

I ask unanimous consent that the AFN letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES,

February 23, 2022.

Re AFN Continued Support for the Willow Project.

Hon. DEBRA HAALAND,  
Department of the Interior.

DEAR SECRETARY HAALAND: On behalf of the Co-Chairs and Board of Directors of the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN), I write to share our long-standing support for the Alaska Willow Project in the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska (NPR-A).

The Willow Project has undergone stringent environmental permitting and a vigorous community engagement process. It was planned based on the requirements of the 2013 NPR-A Integrated Activity Plan under the Obama-Biden Administration and Secretary Salazar with the highest standards for environmental stewardship. The permitting and environmental review process encompassed a period of well over two years and included multiple rounds of public comment and public meetings with Alaska Native stakeholders. AFN appreciates the outreach and communication between ConocoPhillips and the Alaska Native community and considers the process a model for other development initiatives.

AFN understands that the need for a proactive whole of government approach to deal with climate change; however fossil fuels will be with us for quite some time to come, and projects like Willow can help bridge the gap. As such, delaying Willow any further will only hinder Alaska's economic recovery. The Willow Project could jumpstart our economy with thousands of jobs and be a model in community and environmental stewardship for future opportunities.

Additionally, the international crisis in Ukraine highlights the Willow Project's importance to our national security. The looming invasion of Ukraine by Russia is already stressing global energy markets. The Willow Project is a critical opportunity for the U.S. to expand domestic energy supplies and security while creating economic opportunities to help Alaska recover from the pandemic. As such, I strongly urge you to support the current record of decision and allow the Willow Project to move forward as planned and previously approved.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

JULIE KITKA,  
President.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the ANCSA Regional Association letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 2021.

Hon. DEB HAALAND,  
Secretary Nominee, Department of the Interior,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY NOMINEE HAALAND: The ANCSA Regional Association (ARA) represents the twelve Regional Corporations created under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) which was approved by Congress and signed into law by President Nixon in 1971. The Alaska Native Village Corporation Association (ANVCA) represents 177 village and urban corporations created by ANCSA. Together these organizations represent over 150,000 Alaska Native shareholders.

We write today to urge the Department of Interior not to delay the ConocoPhillips Alaska Willow Project given the exhaustive and thorough review process it has already undergone, and the urgent need for vetted, economic opportunities for safe development in Alaska.

ARA and ANVCA strongly support responsible resource development in Alaska and are concerned about reports that the DOI intends to, once again, review the EIS Record of Decision (ROD) for Willow, which could delay or defer the project's progress.

There is no basis for further review of the ROD, given the extensive record of public hearings, documented BLM efforts to address all issues raised through public comment, completion of an in-depth environmental analysis, and the over 270 stipulations and best management practices the project will be required to follow. The Willow EIS was performed under the rigorous process in place during the Obama Administration, and was not expedited or granted any special consideration. The EIS took more than two years to complete and the report itself totals more than 2,600 pages of in-depth analysis. Given the extensive nature of the process used to perform the Willow EIS, we request that the Department of Interior not delay the Willow project for further unnecessary analysis, or political rhetoric.

The State of Alaska has been in recession for over five years, well before the COVID pandemic hit, which then caused further negative impacts in every industry important to our state. The federal government should be looking at opportunities to help Alaska respond to these impacts rather than exacerbating them. Delaying a project like Willow, which has already passed a rigorous EIS process, will cause ripple effects throughout the Alaskan economy. This project will support over 2,000 construction jobs and hundreds of long-term jobs, while providing over \$2 billion in revenues to the State of Alaska and \$7.6 billion in federal royalties. For context, \$2 billion is roughly the size of the current budget deficit faced by our state. Revenues received by this project allows our rural communities to receive continued support to schools, health clinics and basic public services like water and sewer treatments.

The Willow Project has passed every environmental and community test put before it and would provide a much-needed economic boost to Alaska. Delaying it any further will

only bring more harm to our state. It also harms the economy and budget of the North Slope Borough, the local government most closely impacted by the federal government's decision for review.

Best Regards,

KIM REITMEIER,  
Executive Director,  
ARA.  
HALLIE BISSETT,  
Executive Director,  
ANVCA.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the ICAS Community of the Arctic Slope be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

January 26, 2022.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: It has come to our attention that you are considering sending a letter to Secretary of the Interior Deb Haaland opposing the Willow Project, a project located in our region of Alaska. In your position as Chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, a committee that has jurisdiction on issues related to the Indigenous Peoples of the United States, we respectfully request that you meet with and listen to the indigenous people of the North Slope of Alaska before you take a position on the Willow Project.

The Inupiat of the North Slope have lived in the Arctic for over 10,000 years. We are proud of our self-determination efforts to ensure future generations of Inupiat continue to reside in our communities and have access to essential services. Without a stable economy, our communities will suffer and so too will our ability to engage in Inupiat cultural traditions, including a subsistence way of life.

The North Slope of Alaska spans an area nearly the size of the state of Minnesota and within that expansive area, there are eight Inupiat communities—Anaktuvuk Pass, Atkasuk, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut, Point Hope, Point Lay, Utqiagvik and Wainwright. None of our communities are accessible by road; all supplies must be flown or barged in making the cost of living extremely high, and economic opportunity generally low. Our North Slope residents are keenly aware that advances in our communities—running water, local schools, health care, public safety, electricity, and more have come as a result of the coordination and cooperation of Alaska Native leaders and entities across the region.

As you know, fifty years ago, the Federal Government directed Alaska Native people to organize in a new structure of indigenous representation. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971, commonly referred to as ANCSA, was a dramatically different approach by the Federal Government to Federal Indian policy Unlike the Lower 48 model of indigenous representation that typically has a central entity on the reservation, the Tribe, that administers the delivery of services like healthcare, public safety, education, land management and economic development to name a few, the passage of ANCSA created a fragmented system of Alaska Native representation and delivery of services.

Our region has a multitude of Alaska Native entities that work together to effectively serve, provide for and enrich the lives of the Inupiat people we represent. Our three entities, the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope (ICAS), the North Slope Borough

(Borough) and Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC) are three of those entities. While our roles are defined, our constituencies overlap which is why we work closely together to protect the cultural and economic interests of the North Slope Iñupiat.

Established in 1971, the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope is a federally recognized regional tribal government for the North Slope and represents over 13,000 Iñupiat tribal members. The mission of ICAS is to exercise its sovereign rights and powers for the benefit of tribal members, to conserve and retain tribal lands and resources including subsistence and environmental issues, to establish and carry out justice systems including social services under Iñupiat tribal law and custom, and to increase the variety and quality of services provided to current tribal members and for our future generations.

The North Slope Borough is a home rule government located above the Arctic Circle that represents the roughly 10,000 residents in the eight communities of the region. The Borough's jurisdiction includes the entire National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska (NPR-A) and the villages within it—Nuiqsut, Atkasuk, Utqiagvik, and Wainwright. In 1972, the Iñupiat people of the North Slope formed the Borough to ensure our communities would benefit from oil and gas development on their ancestral homelands. It was the first time Native Americans took control of their destiny through the use of a municipal government. The Borough exercises its powers of taxation, property assessment, education, and planning and zoning services. Taxes levied on oil and gas infrastructure have enabled the Borough to invest in public infrastructure and utilities, support education, and provide police, fire, emergency and other services. Elsewhere in rural Alaska, these services are typically provided by the state or federal governments.

Arctic Slope Regional Corporation was incorporated pursuant to the passage of ANCSA. ASRC is owned by and represents the business interests of our approximately 13,000 Iñupiat shareholders, many of whom reside in the eight communities on the North Slope. ANCSA extinguished aboriginal land title and conveyed nearly five million acres of fee-simple land to ASRC for the cultural and economic benefit of our Iñupiat shareholders. Mandated by Congress to not only operate as a for-profit corporation but to serve the social and welfare interests of the people it represents, ASRC is committed to providing financial returns to our Iñupiat shareholders in the form of jobs and dividends, and to preserving Iñupiat culture and traditions.

Over the decades, and even more so today, we have seen national environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS) attempt to wear the mantle of protectors of Indigenous interests in the U.S. Arctic—something that we, as elected and appointed leaders of the Iñupiat people of the North Slope, find unacceptable. ENGO's continue to push a false narrative to advance their agendas at the expense of the Indigenous people and communities of the North Slope.

To fully embrace the Biden Administration's priorities of racial equity, environmental justice and supporting underserved communities, leaders must take the time to listen to those they are aiming to serve, even if their perspective may not fit the political narrative being pushed on a national level.

We understand that your proposed letter not only requests Secretary Haaland oppose the Willow Project, but it calls for terminating the project in order to protect the resources that support Indigenous communities. The Administration cannot proclaim to support meaningful tribal consultation

and environmental justice while at the same time killing a critical resource that supports our regional economy and the Iñupiat communities of the North Slope region. If the contents of your proposed letter are true, this would be highly offensive to our region's leadership.

ICAS, the Borough and ASRC support the development of the Willow Project. Our region has a fifty-year relationship with the oil and gas industry, which came as a result of the Federal Government's desire to develop oil and gas resources on our ancestral homelands. While initially wary of any development on our lands, through open communication and transparency in planning and Iñupiat ingenuity, our relationship with the oil and gas industry has turned into a partnership. A partnership that has brought significant economic benefits to the region that would have otherwise been absent. The entities that represent the North Slope Iñupiat play an active role in oil and gas development projects that take place in our region. Our region has shown that responsible development and the continuation of our Iñupiat cultural traditions, including subsistence activities, can effectively coexist while also providing the means to deliver modern-day essential services such as police and fire protection, pre-K-12 education and water and sewer infrastructure (which again, are largely made possible through responsible development of oil and gas resources on our lands).

If you are truly concerned about curbing oil and gas development, examine the massive imports of Russian oil coming into the West Coast of the United States and also ask why the Biden Administration has recently called for OPEC to produce more overseas developed oil to stave off Russian aggression in Ukraine. None of these countries have the same stringent rules and regulations imposed on oil and gas companies that operate in the U.S., including in our region of Alaska. The North Slope region has developed our oil and gas resources safely and for the direct benefit of our Iñupiat community and the nation.

We would be grateful and honored to have the opportunity to meet with you on this topic and ask that you consider meeting with us before sending a letter that does not align with the interests of the Iñupiat of the North Slope of Alaska.

If there are any questions we can answer for you or your staff, or to schedule a time to meet please contact Bridget Anderson, ASRC's Vice President External Affairs.

Sincerely,

GEORGE EDWARDSON,  
*President,*  
*Iñupiat Community of*  
*the Arctic Slope.*  
HARRY K. BROWER, Jr.,  
*Mayor,*  
*North Slope Borough.*  
REX A. ROCK, Sr.,  
*President and CEO,*  
*Arctic Slope Regional*  
*Corporation.*

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, so here is my point: The next time the media writes a big story on Willow and environmental justice and racial equity—which they love to do—and Alaska, they need to include this. This is the truth. They need to include the strong union support.

Go talk to the laborers, go talk to the building trades, go talk to Sean McGarvey, Terry O'Sullivan. See what they think about Willow.

There is one group that doesn't like Willow. It is the same group that

doesn't like anything in America. It is the radical far-left environmental groups that are trying to shut down my State and keep Native Americans, Native Alaskans, impoverished in Alaska. I am not going to let that happen.

Here is one final thing. It is funny, not funny—Amusing, not amusing. Again, this is really important. This is about life and death.

You have all these stories about Willow in the national media, but what really, really kind of burns me up is there is a story—you know, they talk about the climate bomb, whatever the heck that means; it is not factual. But the one story I never see about Federal lands—real big increases in oil and gas production, real big increases in emissions—that never gets written about, again for our friends in the media—never—is what is going on in New Mexico, what is going on in New Mexico.

Well, we know some of the Members, the senior Senator from New Mexico, he loves to come after Alaska projects; I don't know why. Shut them down. Maybe to divert the media's attention from what is going on in his State. But I just want to give a couple stats.

Since 2019, New Mexico has increased production in its oil production by 700,000 barrels a day. It is pretty impressive. They were at 800,000 barrels; they have increased by almost 700,000. They have increased more than Alaska even produces in 3 years.

It is now the second largest oil producer in the country. The senior Senator from New Mexico recently bragged that is up 400 percent. OK. Good for him.

It is still amazing to me; he comes down here a lot, writes letters to try to shut down my State. But, whatever, I don't go after New Mexico. But I do want our friends in the media to just kind of ask the questions. Boy, oh, boy, you want to talk about climate bomb: 700,000 barrels a day. They have more carbon emissions than Alaska by far. Nobody is writing that story. But it is also how we do our environmental standards in different States. My State has the highest standards in the world on energy production—New Mexico, not so much.

Let me just give you a couple of examples: The average well in Alaska is 28,000 barrels a day because it is conventional. We are actually—the resource is so rich there, we are not fracking like they do in the unconventional area. The average well in New Mexico produces 100 barrels—a hundred barrels to 28,000. So what does that mean? You have to drill 280 wells in New Mexico just to reach the equivalent of one in Alaska.

So the environmental footprint is much bigger. The carbon emission is much bigger. New Mexico flares its gas. We reinject our gas—again, highest environmental standards in the world.

We conduct our exploration and drilling activities only in the winter. You have to build ice roads, ice pads. Zero impact. I used to be in charge of this.

It is very expensive to do that. One little drop of anything—chewing tobacco—on the tundra, you have to report it. So where is the story about what is going on there?

Where is the carbon bomb story on New Mexico? Where is the story that the Secretary of the Interior has directed almost half the Federal permits to drill in the country to one State? Do you think it is Alaska? No way. They are trying to shut us down.

You think it is Texas? Nope. North Dakota? Nope. It is New Mexico. Golly gee, isn't that interesting?

I sure hope—look, it is terribly suspicious from my perspective that one State has received more Federal energy permits in the last 15 months than all other States in America combined. The Secretary of the Interior is from New Mexico. OK. Maybe there is something there.

But here is the bottom line: There have been barrels of ink spilled on every single project in Alaska—Willow, this week. But reporters shrug their shoulders, look the other way. Maybe it is because it is a blue State, they don't want to touch those guys, when it comes to New Mexico. No wonder Americans don't trust the media.

I am going to conclude with this quote. It is from a Wall Street Journal editorial written by the North Slope Borough mayor, Harry Brower, the Inupiat leader of the North Slope community and Josiah Paktotak, who is the State rep. These are two Alaska Native leaders elected. They are fully supportive of Willow.

It was in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Let Alaska Sell American Energy to the World," and it was written in March, as Russia was invading Ukraine.

They said:

Even as Russian tanks lined up on the Ukrainian border in February, the Biden administration froze U.S. drilling on Federal lands and issued rules making it harder to build natural gas pipelines.

By the way, that is the rule that I am putting forth a CRA resolution to rescind.

They continue:

We may be Inupiaq Eskimos 5,000 miles away from the Washington policy machine, but we know crazy when we see it. And this is crazy.

And the American people know it.

Now, look, the President is in the Middle East, meeting with allies, asking for the Saudis to produce more oil. But as he would say: Come on, man. You got to start at home. You got to start at home.

The Willow Project in Alaska, supported by the Native community, supported by the unions—I would guarantee supported by probably 90 percent of Americans—it is time to get things like this done.

So our NEPA Congressional Review Act and our advocacy for commonsense projects, like Willow, supported by every single group in my State—and I sure hope the media writes about this—especially the Native people—if they shut this down, that will be the ultimate injustice to indigenous people in Alaska, and they know it. And that is one of the many reasons why they shouldn't do it.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
JULY 18, 2022, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, July 18, 2022, at 3 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:47 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 18, 2022, at 3 p.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### THE JUDICIARY

LAURA E. CRANE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE STEVEN NATHAN BERK, RETIRED.

VERONICA M. SANCHEZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE JOHN RAMSEY JOHNSON, RETIRED.

ADRIENNE C. NELSON, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON, VICE MICHAEL W. MOSMAN, RETIRED.

MATTHEW L. GARCIA, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO, VICE JUDITH C. HERRERA, RETIRED.

ANDREW G. SCHOPLER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE LARRY ALAN BURNS, RETIRED.

JAMES EDWARD SIMMONS, JR., OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE ANTHONY J. BATTAGLIA, RETIRED.

VIJAY SHANKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE STEPHEN H. GLICKMAN, RETIRED.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 14, 2022:

### CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

KATE ELIZABETH HEINZELMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

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.

MARGARET C. WHITMAN, OF COLORADO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KENYA.

MICHAEL J. ADLER, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN.

JOHN T. GODFREY, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE SUDAN.

### THE JUDICIARY

STEPHEN HENLEY LOCHER, OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA.

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MICHAEL COTTMAN MORGAN, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on July 14, 2022 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

TOVAH R. CALDERON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE KATHRYN A. OBERLY, RETIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 3, 2022.