



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 2022

No. 131

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, August 5, 2022, at 3 p.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 2022

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, our souls long for You, for we find strength and wisdom in Your presence. Guide our lawmakers to put their trust in You, seeking in every undertaking to know and do Your will. When they go through difficulties, may they remember that, with Your help, they can accomplish the seemingly impossible. Give them a faith that will trust You even when the darkness is blacker than a thousand midnights.

And, Lord, as we mourn the deaths of Congresswoman Jackie Walorski and her two staffers Zachery and Emma, comfort our hearts. We pray in Your merciful 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, August 4, 2022.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY RELATING TO "NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS REVISIONS"

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 55, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Council on Environmental Quality relating to "National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Regulations Revisions".

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

FLOODING IN KENTUCKY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Kentucky officials are working literally overtime to deliver supplies to those affected by ongoing flooding. Heat and humidity are rising to dangerous levels in the areas that still lack power.

My team is helping coordinate relief efforts in any way we can. With the Senate still in session, my State director joined the Kentucky National

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4003

Guard yesterday as they distributed food and water to displaced residents.

Many of the roads in Eastern Kentucky are still impassable, so the Kentucky National Guard is flying dozens of helicopter missions daily to drop water, MREs, and vital supplies to Kentuckians in remote areas of our State. My State director was on board as they flew over flooded roadways and homes to visit the community centers operating as supply hubs in areas isolated by rising water. The landings are difficult, sometimes nearly impossible, but the heroes of the Kentucky National Guard will do whatever it takes to reach those stranded by the floods.

And that is just one part of the flurry of activity. Emergency responders have deployed boats and trucks across the affected region. In Buckhorn, residents are even loading up horses to take supplies to areas where the roads are literally washed out. It is truly, truly heroic work.

This emergency is far from over, but when their neighbors are in need, Kentuckians will always help other Kentuckians. I will visit the region myself soon to survey the damage and help with relief efforts. While here in Washington, I remain in close contact with those who are out on the ground.

I am grateful to everyone for taking on the colossal task of providing for Kentucky amid this disaster.

REMEMBERING JACKIE WALORSKI, EMMA THOMSON, AND ZACHERY POTTS

Mr. President, now on another sad note, yesterday, Congress was shaken by the news that a tragic automobile accident had killed Congresswoman Jackie Walorski and three others, including Emma Thomson and Zachery Potts, members of her staff.

Our former colleague here in the Capitol was back home among her fellow Hoosiers in Indiana's Second District, in circumstances that are familiar to each of us: long days on the road with trusted aides, meeting with the people we represent.

By all accounts, Congresswoman Walorski had two stellar young people by her side.

At 27, Zach was already a 7-year veteran of her team, having served as both campaign manager and district director.

Emma, her 28-year-old communications director, was already a Capitol Hill veteran, whose "intelligence" and "drive," one former boss described as "second-to-none."

The last day's outpourings of grief and admiration demonstrate just how great a hole Jackie Walorski is leaving behind among her friends here in the Capitol. They marveled at both her tremendous personal kindness and her fierce advocacy for the families she represented.

I had the personal pleasure of breaking bread with Congresswoman Walorski several years ago and looked forward to every time that our paths would actually cross.

According to those who knew Jackie best, her infectious passion and bound-

less energy for service were rooted in the faith that guided her entire life. That faith also led her and her beloved husband Dean to found a charity and to spend years living and serving needy people in Romania.

Today, we trust that this faith has reunited our colleague with her eternal Father, and we pray that He will comfort Dean, all her family and friends, and those who mourn Zach and Emma, in these terrible days.

S.J. RES. 55

Mr. President, later today, the Senate will vote on a resolution to peel back a significant layer of regulatory redtape that has been causing headaches all across our country.

Thanks to the leadership of the junior Senator from Alaska, this resolution would overturn a Biden administration action that aims to give the Federal Government even more authority to slow and stall critical infrastructure projects.

For years, our Republican government made headway in rolling back some of the countless roadblocks liberal bureaucrats have put in the path of new highways, bridges, and pipelines. We took big bites out of the bloated permitting process, and, just last year, Republicans ensured that bipartisan infrastructure legislation included clear limits designed to speed up Federal permitting reviews.

But earlier this year, the President fired off a far-left Executive action that directly contradicted some of that bipartisan headway. Catering to radical environmentalists, the new Biden rule reinstates sweeping jurisdiction for Federal bureaucrats to slow down all sorts of critical infrastructure. This Democratic action is taking a process that is already known for years-long waiting periods and multihundred-page Federal reports and actually making it worse.

Every single Senate Republican is proud to cosponsor Senator SULLIVAN's resolution. The future of our infrastructure needs at least one Democrat to see the light as well.

INFLATION

Mr. President, now on one final matter, a year and a half ago, every Senate Democrat cast the deciding vote for a \$1.9 trillion disaster that caused the worst inflation in 40 years.

Democrats have crushed working families with runaway prices. More than 80 percent of the country says our economy is in bad shape. President Biden's approval on the economy is down to 30 percent and falling. By the traditional rule of thumb, our country is now in a recession, and a supermajority of Americans are aware of it.

American families are crying out for relief, but Democrats have decided to spend hundreds of billions of dollars of the people's money on a bill that laughs at the people's priorities.

Americans say their No. 1 concern is inflation and the cost of living. So here is what the Democrats' taxing-and-spending spree would accomplish on

that issue: It would make inflation worse over the next few years and then do nothing to cut inflation in the long term.

Even the Democrats' favorite estimates say that their bill would take 9 years—9 years—to subtract the amount of inflation we have been adding every single week.

I will say that again. Even the Democrats' favorite estimates say their bill would take 9 years—9—to subtract the amount of inflation we have been adding every single week.

After inflation, in particular, another huge group of Americans say that their biggest issue is the overall state of the economy in general, and here is what Democrats want to accomplish on that subject. They want to ram through giant new tax hikes in the middle of the recession—new multihundred-billion-dollar tax hikes on American jobs that specifically target the manufacturing sector, leaving Americans with fewer jobs and lower wages; new tax hikes on American natural gas and crude oil, higher fees for producing energy on Federal land—leaving Americans with higher electric bills, higher utility bills, higher gas prices, and more dependence on foreign countries that don't like us.

In a time of inflation, Democrats also want to spend \$80 billion to roughly double the size of the IRS so they can shake more money out of the American people through harassment and audits—using taxpayer money to make taxpayers' lives worse.

So what do Democrats want to do with all the money they want to drain out of Americans' pockets in the midst of this recession? They want to lavish hundreds of billions of dollars on an issue that exactly 3 percent of the country says is our biggest problem: far-left environmental and climate spending.

American families have been hemorrhaging financially for a year and a half. Working people can barely tread water. And the Democrats' focus is Green New Deal nonsense that only 3 percent of the country wants prioritized, big subsidies to help rich people to buy luxury cars and new stoves, taxpayer funding for environmental protesters—a huge catalog of nonsense that would not put a dent in global emissions, while countries like China continue to emit more and more.

So I dare any of our Democratic colleagues to walk up to a working-class American on the street and ask them what the government ought to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on.

Well, first off, in a time of inflation, they would probably tell them not to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in the first place. But I doubt a single American worker or middle-class parent would say: You know what? My top priorities are doubling the size of the IRS and giving my boss a government kickback if he buys an \$80,000 electric car.

Do you know a single normal American family that is clamoring for this

nonsense? Americans want lower prices. They want border security. They want more police and public safety. Americans don't want tens of thousands more IRS agents. They want more Border Patrol and ICE agents. Americans don't want Democrats to regulate us into an even deeper recession. They want liberals to let police officers bring law and order back to our streets.

Democrats want to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on a 3-percent issue while they completely neglect crime and border security and make inflation and the recession even worse.

Democrats are catastrophically out of touch with what American families actually do care about. Their approval ratings show it, and their reckless taxing-and-spending spree proves it as well.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATION OF ROOPALI H. DESAI

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today the Senate will continue fulfilling its constitutional duty to confirm the President's highly qualified judicial nominees.

This afternoon, we will vote to confirm the 76th Federal judge since the beginning of President Biden's term, Roopali Desai, nominated to serve as a circuit judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Not long ago, a nominee like Ms. Desai would have been rarely seen in the Senate. But under President Biden, the Senate is confirming more and more nominees who break away from that norm. Over 75 percent of President Biden's nominees are women and nearly half are women of color. Let's not forget the bench. People say: Why shouldn't it be the same percentage of the population? That is what we are trying to get to, but we are way behind and putting more women and people of color on the bench gets those percentages a little closer to the American norm, but we have a ways to go.

Moreover, Ms. Desai will make history as the first South Asian judge to serve on the Ninth Circuit and only the fifth AAPI woman ever to sit on the Federal Circuit Court.

Ms. Desai's resume leaves no doubt she merits confirmation: a graduate of Arizona School of Law; a clerk for Judge Mary Schroeder, the first woman to ever serve as a Ninth Circuit chief judge. She has excelled in every step of her legal career. She is one of Arizona's top election lawyers, having played a

crucial role in protecting her State's elections in 2020. She has fought for everyone from children in foster care to children in public schools during the pandemic.

As my Arizona colleagues Senator SINEMA and Senator KELLY will attest to, Ms. Desai is deeply respected by all corners of Arizona's legal community and will make an excellent judge when we confirm her later today.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. President, Senate Democrats are getting things done. This has been one of the most productive stretches the Senate has seen in recent times.

In the past few months, we have seen an amazing string of achievements passed through this Chamber in extremely fast succession: the first major gun safety bill in 30 years, the largest investment in American manufacturing and science in a generation, the largest expanse of veterans' benefits in decades. And just last night, we strengthened NATO by approving the accession of Sweden and Finland, sending Russia a signal that they cannot intimidate America or Europe. Gun safety, CHIPS, PACT, NATO—getting any one of these accomplishments done is a significant feat for the Senate. The fact is, we have done them all since Memorial Day, and that is quite remarkable.

This doesn't even include a once-in-a-generation infrastructure bill, a historic rescue package to vaccinate the Nation and lift America out of the pandemic, and the confirmation of Ketanji Brown Jackson as the first Black woman to ever serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

I always said that when the opportunity arises, Democrats would be ready to work with our Republican colleagues on important legislation, and many of the accomplishments I have listed are examples of just that. But when we must, Democrats have also made clear we are ready to go at it alone to deliver big things that the American people sent us here to work on, like fighting inflation and lowering healthcare and prescription drug costs; like holding drug companies accountable and making Big Business play by the rules, the same rules as everyone else; like passing historic investments in clean energy to create millions of good-paying jobs and make energy more affordable for American families.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. President, Democrats are going to deliver on all these things and more when we pass the Inflation Reduction Act in coming days.

Let me talk a little bit about the Inflation Reduction Act. Soon the Senate will vote on this groundbreaking legislation. I expect we will have some late nights and extended debates here on the floor. But in the end, we are going to make good on our word to pass the Inflation Reduction Act.

For years, many in Washington have promised to tackle some of the biggest challenges facing our Nation only to

fall short. But with the Inflation Reduction Act, Senate Democrats will finally hold drug companies accountable and make prescription drugs cheaper.

Senate Democrats will lower energy costs while passing the largest investment in clean energy ever. Our clean energy proposals will reduce air pollution, prevent thousands of needless deaths each year, and reduce asthma attacks by about 100,000 per year. We have all seen kids, often in poor neighborhoods, struggling with asthma because they have so much pollution put in their areas by transportation and factories and whatever. Reducing that by 100,000 a year is amazing.

Senate Democrats will also close tax loopholes and reduce the deficits and will ensure that no small business or family under \$400,000 a year will see their taxes go up. Leader MCCONNELL, himself, conceded yesterday that our proposal "includes no new tax rate increases, that's true." Those are McConnell's words: "includes no new tax rate increases, that's true." Let me repeat that again. Leader MCCONNELL concedes that now the Inflation Reduction Act includes no new tax rate increases.

The American people overwhelmingly support these steps. A recent poll by the well-respected Navigator shows 65 percent of Americans approve of our plan to reduce drug prices, keep premiums low, and invest in clean energy. A Morning Consult poll found that over 70 percent of Americans—over 70 percent—support letting Medicare negotiate prescription drug prices, which our plan will do. Another group, Data for Progress, found the Inflation Reduction Act has a net approval of 51 points—51 points—wow.

It is not hard to understand why Americans feel this way. Democrats' agenda prioritizes them. We prioritize the middle class and working families instead of those at the very top. God bless them; they are doing fine.

But when Senate Republicans had the majority, they tried to rip healthcare away from millions of Americans and blew a \$2 trillion hole in our deficit in order to soak the ultrarich with massive tax cuts.

Just this week, one Republican called for ending the days that Medicare and Social Security are guaranteed by turning them into discretionary spending. Do you know what that means when we make things discretionary? Do we want to tell our senior citizens that your Social Security, which you paid into, was discretionary? That is what Senator JOHNSON from Wisconsin wants to do. That is so wrong. But, unfortunately, it represents a lot of the views of lots of Republicans who don't want to say it publicly because they know it is so unpopular.

Back in February—listen to this one—the chair of the Republican Senate Campaign Arm, the junior Senator from Florida, released a platform for raising taxes not on the wealthy but on millions of low-income Americans. You can't make this stuff up.

They want to make your Social Security discretionary but then want to raise your taxes. What kind of bull is that?

Just listen to this tsunami of disastrous proposals: taking away people's healthcare, tax cuts for the rich, putting Medicare and Social Security on the chopping block, raising taxes on working Americans. These are just some of the things that Senate Republicans have openly called for recently.

Democrats' agenda is something entirely different. The Inflation Reduction Act will lower inflation, lower the cost of prescription drugs, close loopholes long exploited by Big Business that pays no or little taxes. That is what the Inflation Reduction Act is at its core.

It is what the American people want; it is what the country so desperately needs; and it is what Democrats will deliver on in the coming days.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I was just listening to the majority leader outline some of the disastrous policies that Republicans have proposed to make, including putting Medicare on the chopping block by making it discretionary.

I want to talk a little bit about the good things that Democrats have done, some on a bipartisan basis and some which it looks like we are going to have to do alone for the American people. In just the last few weeks, this U.S. Senate has made historic progress tackling a number of very real and very urgent challenges that our country faces.

We passed the first major gun reform bill in 30 years. We passed historic legislation to boost American manufacturing of essential semiconductor chips—important to our economy and our national security. We passed the PACT Act so that veterans exposed to toxins will get the care they deserve. Just yesterday, we voted to admit Finland and Sweden as new members of NATO, therefore expanding and strengthening the Atlantic alliance in the face of Putin's brutal war against Ukraine.

These are major accomplishments, but now is not the time to rest on our laurels, now is not the time to coast, because we have to do everything we can to fight back against rising prices, against inflation, which has been driven in recent months by what I call the three p's: Putin's war and its impact on energy and food prices; the pandemic and the supply chain disruptions it has caused; and price gouging by big oil companies that are reaping record profits. Those have been big drivers of inflation.

I have listened to my Republican Senate colleagues here on the floor week after week trying to exploit inflation as a campaign issue, as if it were all caused by the policies of President

Biden. The American people know much better. They also know that while Republicans are talking up inflation and talking down the economy, we in the Democratic majority had a plan to do something about rising costs, and it is called the Inflation Reduction Act.

In coming days, we are going to be voting on that, and I hope—I hope—our Republican colleagues will have a change of heart, at least some of them, because here is the bottom line: The Inflation Reduction Act will drive down prices over time, it will reduce the deficit, and it will do that without raising taxes on anyone making under \$400,000 a year, not by one dime. It does all that while addressing four major issues facing our country: the need to lower healthcare costs, the need to address the climate crisis, the need to fix parts of our broken tax system—this is a start on that—and reducing the deficit.

First, on healthcare, all of us in this Chamber have known that the costs of prescription drugs in the United States are way too high, out of control. Our constituents—Americans—pay twice as much on prescription drugs as people in other advanced economies around the world. And it is not just squeezing people's pocketbooks—that, of course, hurts—it is also jeopardizing their health.

If you look at the 2022 study by the Kaiser Family Foundation, they found that nearly one in three adults reported that they had not taken their medications as prescribed due to cost. They were too expensive. They couldn't afford them. That financial pressure is hard on everybody. It is especially so on many of our seniors. Nearly 9 in 10 older adults take prescription medication, but millions of Americans 65 and older say they struggle to afford their medicine.

Here is what adds insult to injury: American taxpayers spend over \$40 billion every year to support cutting-edge medical research happening at the National Institutes of Health in my State of Maryland. That is a great investment for our country. It helps discover and it helps develop and produce many of the life-changing medications that are available to American families today and to people around the world. But it is just not right for American taxpayers to invest \$40 billion a year in developing drugs that are then sold by American pharmaceutical companies here in the United States for two, three, four times as much as they are sold overseas.

People throughout the world benefit from the great research done at places like NIH, and they pay lower costs on the medicines developed from that research than Americans who helped fund the research in the first place. That is just not right. That is why the Inflation Reduction Act finally empowers the Medicare Program to negotiate prices with the pharmaceutical industry. Private insurance companies negotiate volume discounts every day, all

the time, to try to get a better deal for their members. Why should we tie the hands of the Medicare Program?

I say "finally" because the Presiding Officer and I and many others in this Chamber have worked for not just 1 or 2 years but for decades to try to achieve this, and every time, the pharmaceutical industry has succeeded in blocking it because if you take away the power of Medicare to negotiate drug prices, it means they get to write the bill themselves. So this is important.

It is also accompanied by a cap on Medicare Part D out-of-pocket spending to \$2,000 a year.

Last but not least, this legislation extends the important work we achieved through the American Rescue Plan to lower the healthcare costs for people who get their insurance through the affordable care exchanges. In my State, Marylanders are saving an average of \$80 every month on their healthcare premiums because of that provision from the American Rescue Plan, which this bill will extend for 3 more years.

We are joined in this effort by a vast coalition of Americans who have been pushing for years to address prescription drug prices, including AARP and its 38 million members who support this bill.

Meanwhile, we have seen some billion-dollar pharmaceutical companies pouring their profits into negative ads to try to defeat this bill. In fact, just last night, I saw two or three of them within the space of about an hour as I was flipping channels at home. But I think the country is pretty clear on what is at stake here. On the one hand, you have tens and tens of millions of Americans who will benefit from lowering the costs of prescription drugs. Yet you have Big Pharma trying to maintain this privileged position where we don't have to negotiate with them in order to boost their profits.

So let's be clear on what we are going to do. We are going to allow Medicare to negotiate prices, and that will lower the costs for seniors. We are capping out-of-pocket spending for seniors. We are making it more affordable to get health insurance through the Affordable Care Act marketplaces. Yet, right now, as of today, we have every one of our Republicans voting no.

When I go around Maryland, this is not a party or a partisan issue. All of my constituents want us to take this action. The same is true of climate change. Most Americans, regardless of party, recognize the very real harm caused by climate change. They just have to look around them or turn on the news. But apparently, when you enter the Senate Republican Cloakroom, you go into a science-free and fact-free zone. Many of our colleagues still doubt the fact of human-caused climate change. But that is out of touch with the American people, who see the harm every day and also see the promise of developing a clean energy industry.

That is why our legislation makes this big investment in more rapidly deploying clean energy technology, and in doing so, we are projected to cut U.S. emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases by 40 percent by 2030. We should move even faster, but at least this gets us in the game to hitting the targets that we have to. We will do that while supercharging the development, manufacturing, and deployment of wind, solar, and battery power.

I want to talk about a couple of provisions in this bill—there are many—a couple that I have worked on over the years.

First, this bill includes what is called the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, \$27 billion, some of which could support a national climate bank, which is an initiative I have been working on since my time in the House of Representatives and now in the Senate with my colleague ED MARKEY and in the House today with Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL.

A national climate bank would be a magnet for private investment in new sustainable technology, channeling more capital into the clean energy space and lowering the risk to investors. For every \$1 of public financing through a national climate bank, we project it will draw in \$7 to \$10 of private investment, to turbocharge investments and jobs in clean energy. In addition, it targets a large share of investments to low-income and disadvantaged communities that often lack access to financing for clean energy and energy efficiency projects.

This bill also includes another provision I have worked on for a long time, the bill I introduced called HOPE for HOMES. I have worked on it with a bipartisan group of colleagues in both the House and Senate. In the House, that includes Congressman PETER WELCH and Congressman DAVE MCKINLEY and, here in the Senate, Senator COONS and Senator SHAHEEN.

The HOPE for HOMES legislation that has been incorporated into this bill will provide Americans with sizable rebates and with tax credits to retrofit their homes with clean energy and energy efficiency technology. So it will not only help us meet our climate goals and our pollution reduction goals, it is also going to save consumers up to \$750 every year on their heating and cooling bills. So we are going to give people a rebate to make their homes more energy efficient, and they will save money as a result.

It also invests in clean energy jobs training so that we have the people power to help folks in every neighborhood around the country access the help and the workers they need. It is estimated to help generate 80,000 jobs over the next couple years in this important area.

The Inflation Reduction Act also includes major investments to develop a clean energy manufacturing base to reduce our reliance on foreign imports of

clean energy products, including \$30 billion in tax credits designed to accelerate the manufacturing of solar panels, wind turbines, batteries, and critical minerals right here in the United States.

China has made it one of its goals—and they have been very open about it—to dominate the clean energy technology space for years to come. We need to make sure that we manufacture critical technologies and products right here in the United States.

I want to give you a great example from my State of Maryland, which is at the vanguard of a budding offshore wind industry. Right now, we have two companies in Maryland—Orsted and U.S. Wind—that are building new wind turbine fabrication centers in our State to support their offshore wind farms coming to the mid-Atlantic—two major projects off Maryland's Atlantic coast.

The Deputy Secretary of Commerce was just in Baltimore yesterday talking about apprenticeship programs that will help support 10,000 jobs, 10,000 Maryland jobs, as part of this offshore wind manufacturing. That is just in the State of Maryland, and we can do that across the country in terms of offshore wind in coastal States and, of course, interior wind for others.

These are really important provisions that I have talked about—fighting the climate crisis, lowering the cost of prescription drugs—so let's talk about how they are paid for.

Unlike the Republican tax bill in 2017, which provided huge tax giveaways to big corporations and very wealthy individuals, this legislation actually will both pay for itself through the cuts made and recycled and through fixing parts of our broken tax system. We have a lot of work to do to fix our tax system, but this is a downpayment in terms of the policy changes in this bill.

First, we are going to beef up IRS enforcement to go after wealthy tax cheats, and this is an important issue. I chair the subcommittee that oversees the IRS, and we have been pushing for years to make sure that the IRS has the resources and the expertise to track down taxes that are already due and owing from very wealthy people who come up with elaborate tax dodges.

Right now, we estimate there is anywhere from \$500 billion to \$1 trillion in taxes each year that are owed but not paid. Think about that—up to \$1 trillion every year in taxes that are owed but not paid, and the people who are suckered are all the people who pay when you have these very wealthy tax cheats skirting their responsibilities. So this bill will address that issue.

Second, we make sure that big corporations invest in the success of everyday Americans. In 2020, 55 huge American corporations paid zero—zero—in taxes, despite a combined \$40.5 billion in profits—\$40.5 billion in profits from these 55 companies; zero taxes paid.

Small businesses across the country are paying their taxes while some of these big corporations are not. That is not fair. It needs to change.

That is why the Inflation Reduction Act includes the 15 percent minimum tax on profits of corporations that have over \$1 billion in annual profits.

And I want to thank the Presiding Officer for his leadership on this issue.

Third, our legislation would tighten the rules on what is known as carried interest, which allows hedge fund managers to pay a lower rate on their income than the rate their employees pay on theirs—the classic example of how a big hedge fund CEO can pay a lower tax rate than their receptionist. This is a fact under our current Tax Code, and I hope we will keep this provision in this bill because this loophole, the carried interest loophole, is Exhibit A of some of the biggest unfairnesses in our Tax Code.

So taken together, the measures to lower the cost of prescription drugs, lower the cost of energy to American households and consumers, reduce the deficit—these measures will reduce inflationary pressures that are bearing down on working families. You don't have to take my word for it. In just the last few days, economists from all over the country have spoken out in favor of this approach and supporting this legislation.

One hundred twenty-six leading economists recently wrote to the congressional leadership:

This proposal addresses some of the country's biggest challenges at a significant scale. And because it is deficit-reducing, it does so while putting downward pressure on inflation.

And that is key. Unlike that Republican tax giveaway in 2017 that added \$2 trillion to our national debt, we are actually reducing our deficit, and by reducing the deficit, you also put downward pressure on inflation.

In recent months, I have heard the Republican leader, Senator McCONNELL, often citing former Secretary of Treasury Larry Summers about Larry Summers' views on the economy and inflation.

Well, here is what Larry Summers had to say recently about the bill we will be voting on:

The prescription drug provisions, energy incentives, and the increased Medicare benefits will all contribute over time to much needed inflation reduction.

And just yesterday, former Secretary Summers was joined by former Secretary of the Treasury Hank Paulson, who, of course, served under former President George W. Bush, who with other Secretaries wrote:

... we support the Inflation Reduction Act which is financed by prudent tax policy that will collect more from top-earners and large corporations.

And, again, by using those revenues to reduce the deficit, we put downward pressure on inflation.

I just, as we close here, want to contrast that to the approach that Republicans took in 2017 with their tax giveaway.

As I said, that ballooned the deficit by \$2 trillion. It also handed the top 1 percent income earners an average tax cut of \$69,000 each in 2018 alone. So just in 1 year, about a \$70,000 tax cut to the top 1 percent. And the Congressional Budget Office estimated that 43 percent of the growth in economic output from the 2017 tax law flowed to foreign investors in that space. So foreign investors have holdings in U.S. corporations. That tax cut to American corporations—yes, it flowed to some very wealthy Americans, but a lot of it flowed offshore to foreign investors.

So what we have seen from our colleagues across the aisle is big tax cuts to corporations and the very wealthy, not just here at home but benefiting others around the world, in contrast to this, which does ask big corporations to pay their fair share—minimum of 15 percent—and reduces the deficit as we invest in job creation and reduce prices here at home.

So this is a win for families; it is a win for seniors; it is a win for our planet, our economy. It is a win for the country.

So I hope as this debate goes forward, that we will focus on the facts, listen to what it does, because this is a comprehensive piece of legislation that does help us tackle some of the key priorities in front of our country, and we are hearing that from our constituents every day.

So I am proud to support this legislation. Let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week, Democrats unveiled their so-called Inflation Reduction Act, a bill that will do nothing to reduce inflation but will double down on Democrats' wasteful government spending, along with imposing hundreds of billions of dollars in tax hikes—yes, hundreds of billions of dollars in tax hikes.

Our economy has posted negative economic growth for the past two quarters, and Democrats think it is a good idea to raise taxes on American businesses. Perhaps Democrats think that current prices aren't high enough or that businesses aren't struggling enough with the inflation that Democrats helped create.

The worst part, of course, is that a substantial part of the burden of these tax hikes will fall on ordinary Americans, Americans who are already struggling with historically high inflation, Americans who are seeing their grocery bills balloon and their rent skyrocket, Americans who are paying more than \$4 per gallon every time they fill up their car.

Now, Democrats are going to pass tax hikes that will hit these Americans hard—a tax hike on businesses that will almost undoubtedly result in lower growth, lower wages, and fewer jobs; a tax hike on investment—investment that we need to grow our economy and

create opportunities for American workers; and tax hikes on energy production.

That is right, tax hikes on energy production to the tune of \$60 billion.

Now, as I mentioned, Americans are still, on average, paying more than \$4 a gallon every time they go to fill up their cars, as they have been for months. Their electricity bills are up. The price for utility gas service is up by almost 40 percent. And Democrats think now is a good time to raise taxes on oil and gas production?

I guess maybe they are hoping that they can force Americans off conventional energy by continuing to keep gas and energy prices high.

And in case anyone was thinking that Democrats would be content with shutting down domestic production—with a methane tax, higher royalties, excise taxes, and costly permitting delays—and would rather Americans receive conventional energy from abroad, well, Democrats have a tax hike for that too.

The Democrats' bill would impose a new tax hike on U.S. refiners importing crude oil and petroleum products intended to make conventional energy prohibitively expensive.

But, of course, Americans will need conventional energy, and that will continue to be true for a while yet, no matter how much wishful thinking Democrats engage in.

And Democrats' energy tax hikes are setting ordinary Americans up to continue to suffer under high energy prices for the foreseeable future.

So what are all these tax hikes for? What government spending is worth imposing tax hikes that run the risk of pushing our economy into a longer recession or, worse yet, stagflation?

Well, let me just review some of the priorities that Democrats will be spending that tax hike money on.

There is \$1.5 billion—billion dollars—for a grant program to plant trees, and \$1.9 billion for things like identifying gaps in tree canopy coverage. That is right, identifying gaps in tree canopy coverage.

There is \$1 billion for electric heavy-duty vehicles like garbage trucks. I am not really sure why the Federal Government is going to be spending money on electric garbage trucks or how that is going to reduce inflation.

There is \$3 billion for the U.S. Postal Service to purchase zero-emission delivery vehicles. Quite a lot of money, I might add, for an Agency that is supposedly self-funded.

There is funding for road equity.

All told, there is more than \$60 billion in funding for "environmental justice"—\$60 billion. That is more than the Federal Government spent on highways in 2019.

There is also at least \$30 billion in climate slush funds, part of which is allocated for, among other things, climate-related political activity—yeah, political activity.

So, in other words, Democrats are raising taxes on Americans so that

they can provide Federal funding for Green New Deal activism. And I haven't even talked about all the tax credits for adopting Democrats' preferred green energy technologies.

There are tax credits for purchasing electric vehicles and for refitting windows and skylights and doors to meet Democrats' required level of energy efficiency. That is right, Democrats are raising the tax burden on working Americans to pay for tax credits for wealthy Americans to purchase a brandnew electric vehicle or to do some home remodeling.

Of course, these tax credits aren't officially limited to wealthy Americans, but I am hard-pressed to think of many working families who can afford to spend \$60,000 on a new electric vehicle while inflation is at a 40-year high.

I am a longtime supporter of clean energy. I come from a State that is leading the way toward cleaner and more efficient energy technologies, and I have worked with colleagues from both parties to advance clean energy, including through the responsible use of energy tax credits to bring clean energy technologies to the point where they can compete on their own.

But this bill has nothing in common with the bipartisan work I and many others have done to responsibly advance clean energy. This bill is wasteful and irresponsible and will do essentially nothing to reduce warming globally as others nations continue to skate by.

It will, however, waste a lot of taxpayer dollars and create a lot of economic pain for hard-working Americans.

One think tank analyzed a plan similar to the one Democrats are pushing and found that it would result in staggering job losses, higher energy bills, and a tremendous reduction in economic growth.

One sensible move to advance clean energy and necessary investment in conventional energy would be to address the arduous permitting process which can hold up both renewable and conventional energy projects for years. That is something we should be focused on, to promote investment in the conventional energy we still need and in the renewable energy technologies of the future.

Instead, we are being asked to support a bill that will squander billions and billions of taxpayer dollars on Green New Deal activism and road equity and monitoring tree canopies.

And we are supposed to vote for it based on the vague promise that the Senate will consider—consider, mind you, not pass—permitting legislation; permitting legislation that may or may not meaningfully address the broken and burdensome permitting process or negate spurious lawsuits from far-left environmentalists. And even if it did provide meaningful reform, my hopes are not high that the Biden administration would actually act on the legislation.

Canceling the Keystone XL Pipeline, a project that endured a decade of permitting, was already underway, and was to be paired with \$1.7 billion in private—yes, private—investment for renewables—it doesn't install confidence that even approved projects are safe from the President and Democrats' Green New Deal ideology.

The Democrats' reckless \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan spending spree helped plunge our economy into an inflation crisis that has left Americans struggling to make ends meet. If this new, partisan tax-and-spending spree passes, Americans can look forward to a lot more economic pain in the future. But at least they will be able to console themselves with the knowledge that their tax dollars are going to fund tree canopies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to support Senator SULLIVAN's resolution of disapproval to nullify the Biden administration's rollback of reforms to the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, process.

We have heard a lot about permitting and how everything is going to be improved. If you want to make a statement on how you want to improve permitting, this should be a "yes" vote for everybody.

I want to thank my colleague from Alaska for his leadership on bringing together half of this Chamber in support of S.J. Res. 55, which is cosponsored by 50 Senators.

This resolution is vital to take us towards a path of quicker, more predictable environmental reviews as we seek to improve our transportation—remember, we just passed a big infrastructure bill with a lot of transportation—our water infrastructure, energy infrastructure, reclaim our energy independence, and build our domestic supply chain.

Instead of making the environmental review process more efficient, the Biden administration is doing everything in its power to make it much, much more difficult.

Environmental reviews are notorious for holding up energy and infrastructure projects. What happens? Well, some of them don't get done, and a lot of them get a heck of a lot more expensive and take longer to do.

We all know it is important to make sure that we assess the environmental impacts that a project will have before moving forward on construction, but the Biden administration is focused on making them more complicated and longer when the status quo is already unacceptable.

In 2020, the White House's Council on Environmental Quality found that it took an average of 4½ years to complete an environmental impact statement under NEPA. One-quarter of the 1,276 projects analyzed took more than 6 years to complete their environmental impact statement. The average

time for a Federal highway project was more than 7 years on their EIS. The average time for the U.S. Corps of Engineers was 6 years.

The average length of a final EIS was 661 pages, and many of these swelled to thousands of pages, running contrary to the original intent of NEPA, which was to provide transparency of Federal Agencies' decision making to the American people.

The previous administration tried to streamline the Federal environmental review process by reforming the implementing regulations for NEPA. Now, rather than continuing to improve environmental reviews under NEPA, the Biden administration has decided to make them more burdensome.

Earlier this year, the Biden administration rolled back key modernizations the previous administration made to the more than 40-year-old NEPA regulations through its so-called phase 1—which tells me phase 2 is coming—NEPA rule.

The Biden administration has created sweeping new obstacles to the environmental review process, including new avenues for delays and lawsuits that will slow down or, as I said, kill projects. In particular, the phase 1 rule's expanded definition of "effects"—to include "indirect" and "cumulative effects" of projects—will greatly delay and kill energy projects when we sorely need them right now.

With the damaging phase 1 rule already in place, the Biden administration is now working on even more onerous revisions to the NEPA process. If these revisions are not stopped, they will enshrine lengthier, more burdensome, and even, in some cases, insurmountable hurdles for any infrastructure, whether it is mining, industrial, or energy.

We keep hearing we need more energy. Well, if you can't get permitted, you can't do these projects, and that is what is happening.

The Biden administration is hamstringing our Nation's ability to source materials and build infrastructure of all kinds for all Americans. Whether it is roads and bridges, pipelines, electric transmission, mining, or renewable energy projects, an efficient environmental review process is critical to completing projects that support job creation and economic activity. It is also vital to building out and securing our domestic supply chains to ensure we have the fuel and mineral inputs to power critical services and to manufacture those products.

We are not going to have all the solar farms and wind turbines and critical minerals and green jobs that the administration has promised to energy workers when the environmental process takes 5 to 7 to 10 years.

So how do you build an economy out of a recession when you can't build at all? Now it is time to come together and reform the environmental review process to expand our infrastructure, invigorate our economy, increase our

energy capacity and supplies, advance our domestic industries to lower prices, create those much wanted jobs, and build a brighter future for Americans and certainly for my State of West Virginia. It starts with doing away with the roadblocks the administration is throwing up by passing this resolution and us moving on to legislate common-sense environmental review reforms.

We are told that in September, Senate Democrats will cast aside their "regulate first" philosophy and pass strong permitting reform legislation. After years of regulatory actions that decimated energy production in my State and permitting delays that have held up important infrastructure projects across the country, I am skeptical that the Democrats will reverse course next month.

So here we have an opportunity to have a test vote. As this NEPA rule-making reflects, the Biden administration is hard at work creating more hurdles for our projects. If there isn't overwhelming bipartisan support for this resolution of disapproval that simply stops the permitting process from getting worse, then I don't know how anybody can believe that Senate Democrats will join to pass meaningful legislation to make the process better.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution to free our country from the stagnation and endless delays the administration is pressing forward with.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, normally at this time of the week, Senator CAPITO and I are gathering for a face-to-face meeting or maybe having a meeting by phone as she heads back to West Virginia. Today, it looked like we were not going to have a chance to meet, but here we are. Ironically, most of those conversations we have—we are in sync. It is pretty amazing. Most folks around the country probably think we never agree on anything here, but we do. And we actually turned out to be pretty good friends—a couple of West Virginia kids who grew up and made out all right. It is always a pleasure to be with her and to serve with her, like with the bipartisan infrastructure legislation.

Last week, we were here to pass not one, not two, but three bipartisan pieces of legislation. A couple of them were pretty big. There were two big recycling bills and then another one dealing with the Water Resources Development Act with the Army Corps of Engineers. I think we had only one negative vote on the reauthorization—one. The vote on the recycling legislation—one of which was your bill and one of which was mine, and we were cosponsors—we had no opposition on those bills.

So I would say to folks who are watching today who say: Oh, there they go again, well, you should have tuned in last week because we were on the same page.

Having said that, let me say that I rise today to speak on the joint resolution of disapproval to nullify President Biden's National Environmental Policy Act regulations, oftentimes referred to as NEPA.

Last year, as we drafted legislation that became the bipartisan infrastructure law for our country, Senator CAPITO and I, along with our colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee, of which my colleague from Alaska is a valued member—the Senator is here. He has offered this resolution today, and he will be back here in a minute, I am sure.

But as we drafted legislation that became the bipartisan infrastructure law, Senator CAPITO and I, along with our colleagues on the EPW Committee, considered ways to get infrastructure projects done more efficiently while maintaining environmental protections.

I will say that again. We considered a number of ways to get infrastructure projects done more efficiently while maintaining environmental protections.

We included several changes that were reflective of those shared goals. In fact, we included quite a few of those changes. I will give an example of one of those. The bipartisan infrastructure law codified something that is called One Federal Decision, the One Federal Decision permitting structure. It set a goal for completing environmental reviews of transportation projects within 2 years—within 2 years. It also permanently authorized the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council and more.

But, as we considered changes to the way we deliver infrastructure projects, we always tried to make sure that we were not undermining important environmental safeguards. That sentiment reflects really the essence of the law that we call NEPA.

Over 50 years ago, President Richard Nixon—a Republican, as you will recall—signed this bedrock environmental policy into law with overwhelming bipartisan support. In the time since then, NEPA has helped to ensure that Federal actions protect our quality of life and avoid costly environmental impacts.

NEPA is not just a means of protecting resources and conserving a pristine environment; NEPA also helps to improve Federal decisions. How is that? Well, by requiring Agencies to take a hard look at the impacts of their actions before they make decisions—before they make decisions.

For example, through the NEPA process, just a few years ago, officials in Colorado—this is a good example—officials in Colorado heard robust public feedback when planning improvements on State Highway 9 that led them to take steps to minimize disturbances to communities and to the environment. The final project was ultimately delivered with lower emissions, less harm to wildlife, and safer

spaces for cyclists. Importantly, these benefits did not come at the cost of efficiency. The project was done on time and under budget. And this is only one of any number of examples that I can cite today.

Making smart decisions has never been more important. After all, the science is clear: We must rapidly drive down greenhouse gas emissions if we hope to avoid the worst impacts of climate change.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration made changes to the NEPA rules. These changes prevented Agencies from considering how their actions impact climate change and from taking commonsense steps to minimize environmental harm. The regulatory rollbacks also undermined public involvement in the Federal decision-making process. This rollback harmed communities of color, including Tribal and Native Alaskan communities, that rely on NEPA to defend their voices.

Fortunately, the Biden administration has taken steps to fix the error of these regulatory revisions. Under President Biden's instruction, the Council on Environmental Quality finalized a rule in April to make narrow, targeted changes to NEPA regulations. One of the most important changes was restoring the requirement for Agencies to consider the cumulative and indirect impacts of their actions. Considering such impacts can help ensure that we avoid actions that worsen climate change and negatively impact communities.

President Biden's NEPA rule would ensure that Agencies conduct environmental review processes in a commonsense, holistic manner, one that neither sacrifices efficiency for environmental protection nor the other way around.

This action comes at a critical time for our Nation. The bipartisan infrastructure law will fund more than \$1 trillion of investments in projects that will last not for years but for decades and maybe even longer.

I believe the decision here is clear. The projects under review today will either help address the climate crisis and protect communities or they will exacerbate emissions and make us more vulnerable.

With thoughtful environmental analysis, we can build new facilities that are less emissions-intensive. We can build highways and bridges to withstand the kind of extreme weather that we are experiencing all over this country—in fact, all over the planet—and we can save money while we do it with infrastructure that is built to last.

Blocking these regulations from taking effect is the policy equivalent of burying our heads in the sand, unfortunately, with the rate at which the sea level is rising around us—and it is. During the course of debate on this one proposal today, we are going to see in the State of Louisiana terrible sea-level rises going on. Every 100 minutes, they lose a piece of land in Louisiana

that is the size of a football field. During the course of this debate alone, they are going to lose several more football fields in Louisiana and a lot more in the days to come.

Refusing to consider the impacts of climate change will not stop the climate from changing. It will not save lives from being lost from wildfires, from floods, and heat waves. It will not stop asphalt from melting under extreme heat, which is what was happening a couple of weeks ago in England. Then, over at the Tour de France, we had to spill thousands—tens of thousands—of gallons of water on the course they were running the bicycle races on. This was for the Tour de France—literally tens of thousands of gallons on the course in order to keep the roads from melting. Can you believe that?

By refusing to consider the impacts of climate change now, we will only help to ensure that its worst impacts come to pass. It will continue to cost us. It will cost us not just in dollars but also in lives.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote on this well-intentioned but, I think, misguided resolution.

Before I yield the floor, let me just say what a privilege it is to work with my colleague from Alaska. He and I actually agree on more than you might imagine. We both wore the uniform of our country for many years, those of the Marine Corps and Navy. The Navy salutes the Marine Corps today. I like to say: different uniforms, same team. While I can't be with him on this one, we will find other things that we can agree on today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks before the 1:45 p.m. vote.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to compliment my friend from Delaware. He and I do work together on a number of issues. We are going to part ways on this really important issue for me today. I do want to just make a comment to his comments.

I would say—I wouldn't say—I know there is no group that has suffered more at the hands of the Biden administration's Executive orders and far-left environmental groups than Alaska Natives. I know that for a fact.

I would invite my colleague to come up to Alaska with me, and I will take him to these communities. They can't do anything—no jobs, no nothing—because every far-left group in America wants to shut down their opportunities. It happens all the time.

So I would love to take him and others up to Alaska to let them see that when people talk about Alaska Native groups and try to speak for them. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do that. No

way. You are not going to get away with that on this one.

Mr. President, we have a resolution that we are going to be voting on here in about 10 minutes. This is my Congressional Review Act resolution, and I have spoken on the Senate floor a number of times about this.

The CRA today, what we call a CRA, is quite simple. It would rescind the new Biden administration's NEPA rule—that is the National Environmental Policy Act rule—promulgated in April, which will clearly have the impact of slowing down the construction of literally every infrastructure project in America: the construction of roads, bridges, wind, solar, hydro—heck—even chip fabrication facilities, critical mineral projects. Pretty much everything is going to be slowed down by this.

It is pretty straightforward. Our resolution just says: We want to rescind the resolution, the regulation, from April.

But the vote on this is much more significant than just one Senate resolution. It is a test for all Senators on two key issues.

First, are you really serious about permitting reform so that America can build the infrastructure that everybody knows our country desperately needs?

Second, who do you stand with—the working men and women of our great Nation who build things or the far-left elite special interest groups who want to shut this country down?

Let's take these two issues in order.

First, permitting reform. My colleagues know this is a passion of mine. Actually, it is a passion of a number of Senators. It sounds wonky; it sounds boring; it sounds technical—"permitting reform." But in reality, it is so important for our Nation—for every community in America, for the dignity of work, for good jobs in this country.

Here is why: We used to build big things in America—engineering marvels on time, on budget—the source of pride for literally all Americans and the envy of the world. We did that all the time. Think about it: the Empire State Building—410 days to build; the Pentagon, the biggest building in the world—16 months; a little closer to home for me is the 1,700-mile Alaska-Canadian Highway through some of the world's most rugged terrain—11 months; the Trans-Alaska Pipeline system that feeds a hungry nation with energy from Alaska to the lower 48—800 miles with 70,000 sections of 48-inch pipe joined and welded together, 3 mountain ranges, 800 river beds from the Arctic Ocean to the Pacific—3 years. Incredible.

Why did we do this? Why can we do this? Why can we still do this in America? Because we have the best workers—the most productive workforce—in the world.

Unfortunately, those days of building great things in America in an efficient, timely fashion are gone. We all know it. Every mayor knows it; every city

council member knows it; every Governor knows it; and, yes, every U.S. Senator knows it.

We see it every day. We don't see the great building of things, but we see the other things: 8 to 9 years to permit a bridge—yes, in America, to permit a bridge; 9 to 19 years to permit and build a highway. The Gross water reservoir in Colorado, for clean water, took 20 years to permit. The Kensington mine, which is a gold mine in Alaska that is now employing hundreds of people with an average wage of \$110,000—really good jobs—took 20 years to permit with litigation.

This is killing our country, our economy, and good jobs. We all know it, and we all know the reason for it. Every single Senator knows the reason: a broken Federal permitting system that has turned into a labyrinth of red-tape; a system that invites and incentivizes delay and litigation by groups whose goal is to shut down the building of our country. Everybody knows it. It is a fact.

Now, how can I be so sure? Because everybody in this body likes to talk about the need for permitting reform so we can get back to building this country and putting Americans who do these hard jobs to work.

Last year, I worked hard with a number of my colleagues on the bipartisan infrastructure bill, which I voted on. In the EPW Committee—and my colleague from Delaware is still here—we got some important permitting reforms in it. That was good. They were not enough, in my view, but it was a good start.

Today, as we consider Senator SCHUMER's reconciliation bill, which I will oppose, we are all now being assured that Senator SCHUMER, Speaker PELOSI, and even the President are fully committed to additional robust permitting legislation in the fall, sometime in the future, once their massive tax-and-spending reconciliation bill passes. So everybody is talking about permitting. We all know we need it.

But here is what happened. In the meantime, between the "important but not as ambitious as I would have liked" permitting reforms in the infrastructure bill last fall and all of the talk of permitting today, something happened. What happened?

The Biden administration promulgated a new NEPA rule, supported by far-left environmental groups, that will clearly have the effect of slowing down the permitting of infrastructure, inviting endless litigation and putting people out of work. No one who has seriously looked at this broad, nebulous, and destructive Biden rule disputes this. I have read it. It is a delay bomb for infrastructure.

So here is the first test. It was noted in a very good, recent Wall Street Journal editorial this week. It is this: If my colleagues—all of my colleagues but especially my Democratic colleagues—really support permitting re-

form so we can get back to building America, let's get rid of this destructive, overbroad, vague, litigation-inviting rule. Vote yes on my resolution. Right now, 50 Republican Senators are cosponsors of this resolution.

To my Democratic colleagues, join us. Do the right thing for America. We all know that this is the right thing for America.

Here is the second test. I asked you to join us in doing the right thing for America. Join us in doing the right thing for the working Americans and building trades that heroically built this country and continue to do so today.

Now, I love this photo. It is iconic. It says so much, and I have had it on the floor a number of times. But these are the kind of men and women who built this great Nation—hard-working Americans who are doing incredible stuff. That is a lunch break, by the way, in the building of the Empire State Building.

This shouldn't be hard to support the men and women who build this country, and this shouldn't be hard for my Democratic colleagues who often claim to support the working men and women of America. In the past, I certainly will acknowledge that that has been true, but today—and I have learned this lesson the hard way back home in Alaska. Today, whenever national Democrats have to choose between the interests of the far-left elite environmental groups and these men and women who produce things and build things in America, they sell out the working class every time—every time. I see this every day in my State.

I mentioned this in a Congress committee hearing a few months ago. One of my Democratic colleagues, who is a friend—and almost everybody on the other side of the aisle is a good friend of mine—got upset with me.

He said: Hey, that is not true. You shouldn't have said that.

Well, here is what I say: All right. Prove it.

Today's vote is a chance to prove me wrong or to prove me right. Here is why, and this is really important.

Let's look at the lineup of the groups that support my resolution today and those that oppose it. These are just some of the 50 groups in America that are supporting my resolution that we are going to vote on here in a couple of minutes, and I am very proud of this incredible, broad, and diverse groups of Americans who are saying to vote yes on the Sullivan resolution. They all have one thing in common: They produce things and they build things for this great Nation.

Take a look at this chart. It is kind of hard to decipher who is on it. Let me give you a couple.

The American Farm Bureau: So this is all of our farmers and cattlemen—all of our cattlemen, farmers and ranchers, and ag retailers.

The National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association: These are the guys who build infrastructure.

It is the same with the Associated General Contractors of America, the same with the U.S. Chamber, the same with the National Association of Manufacturers, the same with the American Mining Rights Association.

Of course, the entire energy sector is supporting this, groups from Alaska, the resource development sector, groups from West Virginia, and groups from Ohio. This is a huge, broad-based group of supporters.

I will tell you this. I am most proud of the strong, robust support for my resolution from organizations that represent the men and women who build stuff and keep our country's economy humming.

Take a look at some of them: The North America's Building Trades Union—that is all the unions that build things. The Laborers' International, LIUNA—that is the largest construction trade union in the country. The Operating Engineers—these guys do everything. Another trade union: the Alaska Teamsters, the Alaska AFL-CIO.

These are the great men and women who built this country and built the middle class of America. I have the utmost respect for them, and, indeed, my family is part of this labor union heritage. My great-grandfather was one of the cofounders of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. That is a source of pride in my family.

But here is the question: Why are they all strongly supporting my resolution to rescind the Biden NEPA regulations? It is a simple answer: because they know that these are job-killing regs. They know that these are the types of regs in America that delay or indefinitely stop the building of infrastructure in our country, and their members are the ones who suffer the most. And the dignity of the work—the dignity of work that we all say we care about—also suffers.

Don't take my word for it. Here is what some of the leaders of these organizations have said—and they are great Americans. Let me begin with Terry O'Sullivan, the head of the Laborers' International. This was his letter to the Biden White House when they were contemplating this rule in April. Just take a look. He said:

The rollback of updates to NEPA reinstates burdensome requirements that will cause excessive permit delays and allow project adversaries—

Far-left environmental groups—to use frivolous lawsuits—

Which they always do—to disrupt or upend long overdue construction. Once again, communities in need of vital infrastructure and the hard-working men and women who build America will be waiting as project details are subjected to onerous reviews.

That was Terry O'Sullivan saying: Don't issue the rule.

They ignored him. They ignored him because they chose the interests of the far-left environmentalists.

Here is James Callahan writing in support of today's resolution. He is the

head of the Operating Engineers. You want to talk about great unions—LIUNA, Operating Engineers—these are men and women who build things. This is an incredible statement, and he nails it. This guy really knows what he is talking about.

Since its modest beginnings, NEPA has evolved into a massive edifice, capable of destroying project after project, job after job, in virtually every sector of the economy. Dilatory strategies employed by the project opponents—

Far-left environmental groups—

frequently exploit provisions in NEPA, weighing down projects, frustrating communities, and raising costs to the point that many applicants, whether public or private, simply walk away.

And when they walk away, it kills jobs. That is from James Callahan's letter, 1 of the 50 groups that is supporting this resolution.

The men and women who build our Nation support my resolution, like so many groups.

So who is opposed? Well, it is pretty simple. It is pretty obvious. It is the usual groups of far-left, coastal-elite environmental groups that I see every day in Alaska trying to crush jobs and stop infrastructure and put people out of work.

I will just give you few. You know, they are the usual suspects: Center for Biological Diversity, Earthjustice, CODEPINK—I am not sure why they jumped in on this—Friends of the Earth.

By the way, if you are watching this speech, go take a look at some of those websites and see what they stand for. So that is who is opposed.

One more point that I think is important to raise. To be honest, there is something else going on here. Not only is there always opposition by those groups to building anything in America—including my resolution—regardless of how many pink slips result from the actions of these groups to shut down things, there is sometimes a subtle and not so subtle condescension looking down on the Americans who build things. Workers can feel it. Workers can sense it.

No one epitomizes this condescending elitist attitude toward American workers more than this guy. You might remember that last year, around this time, he was asked if the Biden administration's Green New Deal policies would put American coal and natural gas workers out of work and end their livelihoods. John Kerry responded:

What President Biden wants to do is make sure that those folks—

Men and women who build stuff, coal miners, natural gas workers—have better choices—

Better choices—

That they can be the people who go to work to make solar panels.

Sure, "better choices," from a guy who flies in a jet, owned a 76-foot yacht, several mansions, and has the carbon footprint of a small nation. Yet he tells American energy workers to go

make solar panels, when the Biden administration's regulations are killing their jobs.

I will end with this, back to the workers: When you are voting today, keep the heritage of these men and women in mind. The Biden NEPA rule that we are trying to rescind today will kill jobs. I am sure it has already killed jobs. That is why we need to rescind it.

This should be an easy vote for all of my Senate colleagues today. If you really care about permitting reform, so we can get back to building things in America, you should vote yes. If you really put the interests of working men and women like these incredible Americans over those of elite far-left environmental groups, you should vote yes. And if you truly support the men and women who build this country, feed this country, and grow this country, you should vote yes.

I yield the floor.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before you do that, I would ask to be recognized for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for not objecting.

Let's just stop for a moment before we vote. The National Environmental Policy Act was not signed into law by FDR, not signed into law by Lyndon Johnson or John Kennedy, not signed into law by Barack Obama. It was signed into law by Richard Nixon, with bipartisan support—strong bipartisan support—some 50 years ago.

The reason for the law was that they wanted—President Nixon and those who served in the Congress at the time—to make sure that, as we are proposing to build, we will say, large infrastructure projects around the country with Federal support, they wanted to make sure that the voices of the people whose lives would be affected by that would actually be heard. That was the idea behind doing this.

I have been in the Senate about 21, 22 years and served on the Environment and Public Works Committee with Senator Simpson and others, and am privileged to chair the committee now. And about every year or 2, we pass major infrastructure legislation, and, a year ago, the largest infrastructure bill in the history of the country—roads, highways, bridges, water, drinking water, wastewater, you name it.

Just last week, we passed, with one dissenting vote, the Water Resources Development Act legislation to reauthorize the Army Corps of Engineers to do projects all over America.

I live in Wilmington, DE. I-95 goes right through Wilmington, DE. It cuts my city in half. I-95 is being rebuilt for about a 5-mile space, from Route 202, which goes up into PA, on down to

Route 141—5 miles, right through the middle of our major city. It is going to be done in, I think, less than 2 years. Imagine that: 4 lanes, 6 lanes, all the exits, done in 2 years.

They are talking about not being able to get a big project done. We are doing big projects in a little State all the time.

The last thing I would say is that our colleagues JOE MANCHIN and LISA MURKOWSKI cohorted bipartisan meetings a month or 2 ago—6 or 7 or 8 of them—in the afternoon to talk about a path forward on reconciliation and infrastructure legislation, but also to talk about permitting and permitting reform.

Every time we do a major infrastructure bill, we do permitting reform, and we do streamlining. We have done it. We did it last year, and we are going to do it again with the WRDA legislation too.

Later, sometime this fall, in September, October, we will do permitting reform debate and legislation again. We can't do it in the context of reconciliation because the Parliamentarian won't let us do that. It has to be as stand-alone legislation.

We will have the opportunity to do that. People can offer their ideas. We will debate them. We will vote them up, and we will vote them down.

I just wanted to add that for the record.

With that, I guess we ought to ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time is expired.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The yeas and nays have been previously requested.

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 Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Cruz	Kennedy
Blackburn	Daines	Lankford
Blunt	Ernst	Lee
Boozman	Fischer	Lummis
Braun	Graham	Manchin
Burr	Grassley	Marshall
Capito	Hagerty	McConnell
Cassidy	Hawley	Moran
Collins	Hoeven	Murkowski
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cramer	Inhofe	Portman
Crapo	Johnson	Risch

Romney
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)

Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis

Toomey
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

Coons
Cortez Masto
Cramer
Crapo
Duckworth
Durbin
Ernst
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hassan
Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
Kennedy
King

Klobuchar
Lujan
Lummis
Manchin
Markey
Marshall
McConnell
Menendez
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Portman
Reed
Risch
Romney
Rosen

Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Tillis
Toomey
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden
Young

NAYS—47

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Hassan

Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey
Menendez
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed

Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Cornyn Leahy Merkley

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 55

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Council on Environmental Quality relating to "National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Regulations Revisions" (87 Fed. Reg. 23453 (April 20, 2022)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Roopali H. Desai, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN).

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 284 Ex.]

YEAS—67

Baldwin	Brown	Carper
Bennet	Cantwell	Casey
Blumenthal	Capito	Cassidy
Booker	Cardin	Collins

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Hawley	Rubio
Blackburn	Hoeven	Sasse
Blunt	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Boozman	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Braun	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Fischer	Paul	Wicker
Hagerty	Rounds	

NOT VOTING—4

Burr Leahy
Cornyn Merkley

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, for the information of Senators, the Senate will next convene on Saturday at noon. The next vote will be at 12:30 p.m. on Saturday on a motion to discharge a nomination.

We expect to vote on the motion to proceed to the reconciliation legislation on Saturday afternoon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Committee on Environment and Public Works being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Committee on Environment and Public Works from further consideration of the nomination of David Uhlmann, to be Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Environmental Protection Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with no

motions, points of order, or amendments in order.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE
CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to discharge the Uhlmann nomination occur at 12:30 p.m. on Saturday, August 6.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

S.J. RES. 55

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I just want to thank my colleagues for the vote that just occurred here on the floor of the Senate. It was a bipartisan victory, 50 to 47, on the Congressional Review Act that I had put forward with all of my Republican colleagues to rescind the onerous, job-killing Biden administration rule that came out in April that would make it harder to build things in America. It would make it harder to employ people, especially our incredibly productive American workers.

So that just passed. That was a repudiation of the Biden White House in a bipartisan vote on the Senate floor.

Here is the thing. Even my Senate colleagues—because I was working the vote pretty hard down there in the well—even my Senate colleagues who voted against it, several of them came up to me and said: You know what. You are right. We have really got to fix NEPA. It is killing the country. It is killing our ability to do anything. So that was an important vote, but a good conversation is starting here.

We have the best workers in the world. If we let them build, we can do great things again in terms of building this country and not let redtape, far-left environmental groups, regulations, and endless litigation stop us.

So I also want to thank all the groups that supported this resolution.

I had a bigger sign down on the Senate floor when I was giving an earlier speech, but the groups that were supporting this legislation are very diverse. There are over 50 groups of men and women who produce things, grow things, and build the country. I want to thank them for the great support of this Congressional Review Act that just passed.

I really want to give a shout-out to the building trades, the laborers, the operating engineers, and the trade unions that are doing such a great job building this country who want to work. They know these regulations are killing workers' ability to get good jobs.

We have a long way to go to fix the broken system of permitting in America and the endless litigation by environmental lawyers who want to stop everything, but today was an important start and an important vote on the floor of the Senate, showing America that a bipartisan group of Senators will stand up to these far-left groups

and say: Hey, you know what? We gotta build. We need to build. And that was the message here.

We are going to try to move this in the House and get it on President Biden's desk. He says he is blue-collar Joe. Well, let's see if he is blue-collar Joe when this comes to his desk and he would veto or not veto something that all the building trades in America support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

COLOMBIA

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the acute dangers to American national security that have formed and are deepening across the Western Hemisphere.

These dangers have coalesced because of the comprehensive and catastrophic policies pursued by President Biden and his administration. Already, nine governments across South America, Central America, and the Caribbean are controlled by socialists. All of these governments, with only one exception, are also overtly and ideologically anti-American. They are committed to undermining American security and to endangering Americans.

This weekend, on Sunday, Colombia will become the 10th government in the region controlled by the hard left when the country's new President, Gustavo Petro, will take office. I am deeply worried that once he does, Colombia will also join the ranks of anti-American forces in Latin America.

Petro is the first openly Marxist to be elected President of Colombia. He was brought to power by Colombia's leftist fringe, including guerrillas and terrorist groups.

Colombians had rightly and for decades resisted Marxism and rejected the hard left. The first reason for this is that Marxists have long been violent guerrillas who have wreaked havoc in Colombia. The second reason is that Colombians are well aware of what has happened in other Latin American countries that have elected or have seen leftists seize power. Cuba and Venezuela, for example, have endured socialist and communist regimes that have tortured, killed, silenced dissidents, have denied freedom and driven countless people into exile, forcing many to flee or be murdered.

People are rightly asking: What happened? The answer, unfortunately, is as straightforward as it is worrying. Joe Biden and his policies happened. The Biden administration seems ideologically committed to systematically alienating our allies and empowering our enemies. In this goal—and perhaps only this goal—they have been wildly successful.

Since Joe Biden has been in office, we have seen forces for evil in Iran, in Afghanistan, in Russia, in China, in Venezuela, and in Cuba gain strength while our friends and allies in Israel, Ukraine, Hong Kong, and Taiwan have felt abandoned and alone. And this pat-

tern has been repeated in the Western Hemisphere.

In Mexico, we are seeing deepening civil unrest and the erosion of civil society. The breakdown of the rule of law across our southern border—a crisis directly caused by Joe Biden's policies and political decisions—poses acute national security challenges and dangers to the United States.

Mexican President Lopez Obrador seems intent on making these trends worse, and when I questioned a Biden State Department official on Obrador's targeting of American companies and the nationalization of energy in Mexico, he wouldn't even admit that those were bad things. And if he is not willing to admit to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the leftist President of Mexico's targeting of American companies and the nationalization of energy in Mexico are bad things, then we can be certain the Biden administration is also unwilling to convey that to Mexico.

When we saw Cubans flood the streets last summer, yelling "Libertad" and waving American flags, the Biden administration couldn't even bring itself to come out with a strong support and statement for the people marching in the streets of Cuba. In statement after statement, as protesters swept into the streets, administration officials failed to unequivocally support the protesters and critically failed to condemn the brutal thugs that the communist regime was sending to assault, brutalize, and silence the speech of Cuban citizens seeking freedom.

When it came to Colombia, the Biden administration went out of its way to undermine and to alienate the pro-American government of Colombian President Duque. President Biden denied Duque a call for the first 5 months of the administration, providing morale and momentum for Duque's domestic enemies. Biden did finally call Duque at the end of June that year—after his helicopter came under attack by anti-government terrorists.

And what was the reward Biden had for the terrorists?

Well, just a few months later, Biden removed the FARC, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, from the list of terrorist organizations. He also dismantled terrorism sanctions on individual FARC members. FARC is an organization of Marxist-Leninist narcoterrorists who, for decades, have killed, kidnapped, and extorted Colombians and seized and murdered American citizens.

FARC continues to pose an acute threat to Colombian security and to American interests in the region, but the Biden administration has treated it like other terrorist groups, with weakness and appeasement and worse. Just last week, House Republicans announced that the administration may well be distributing assistance to former FARC terrorists. So the inevitable occurred; the Colombian far left

gained momentum, and Petro was elected.

This is what happens—this is what always happens—when America abandons our friends. Colombia has been an indispensable ally to the United States. Our relationship stems back 200 years. We have deep economic and security ties. We provide Colombia with almost a half a billion dollars in aid every single year—a testament to the breadth and depth of our ties.

Petro says he will work hand in hand with Nicolas Maduro's oppressive regime in Venezuela. He is looking to work with the National Liberation Army, a terrorist organization in Colombia. He will embrace the FARC. He says he wants to stop oil production and to roll back cooperation with the United States on stopping drug trafficking. In fact, Petro seems deeply committed to weakening and undermining the United States-Colombian relationship.

I hope and pray that he doesn't weaken it. I hope and pray that his rhetoric and language in the past is not carried forward in policies when his administration begins. I want to see Colombia remain a close U.S. ally. I don't want to see Colombia follow the example of other socialist governments in the Western Hemisphere. We know where that leads.

Both Cuba and Venezuela used to be prosperous countries until leftists came to power. Venezuela, in 1950, was the fourth wealthiest country on the face of the Earth. The United States was first. Switzerland was second. New Zealand was third. Venezuela was No. 4. Then socialist dictators came to power, including Hugo Chavez and Nicolas Maduro, and they destroyed much of that mighty nation. The quality of life deteriorated so much in Venezuela that people are literally eating out of trash cans in alleyways as they flee the country by the millions.

In Cuba, when Fulgencio Batista staged a coup and became a brutal dictator in the 1950s, my father was a teenager in Cuba, and he fought against Batista's cruel regime. My father was imprisoned and tortured. He was beaten in a Cuban jail. He had his nose broken. He had his teeth broken out of his mouth. My father fled Cuba in 1957. He came to America—he came to Texas—seeking freedom. He had \$100 in his underwear. He didn't speak English. He washed dishes while making 50 cents an hour.

In 1959, Castro and the communist revolution succeeded there. Shortly thereafter, my father returned to Cuba only to be horrified at the evil and oppression that Castro had brought—at the murder, at the torture, at the suffering, at the poverty. My aunt, my Tia Sonia—his kid sister—was still in Cuba. My Tia Sonia fought in the counterrevolution against Castro, and my Tia Sonia was imprisoned and tortured by Castro's thugs.

This is the future that may well be awaiting Latin American countries

that embrace socialism. This is the pattern we have seen over and over and over again. Petro was elected, but if he follows the pattern of other leftist dictators, it may prove to be the last free election in Colombia.

So how has the Biden administration handled Petro's rise to power, which their own weakness and their own appeasement facilitated? With yet more weakness and appeasement.

Both Joe Biden and Secretary of State Blinken effusively congratulated Petro: How great, an anti-American Marxist and a close ally of ours in Latin America.

They said they looked forward to working with him on shared interests. I hope those shared interests don't include undermining the United States of America.

There is value in clarity. There is value in telling the truth about what socialism does to a country from the bully pulpit of the United States.

If the Biden administration won't support American allies, if they will actively undermine American allies like they did the pro-American government of President Duque's, and if the President won't check our adversaries and stand up to our enemies, then Congress must.

Last month, I introduced legislation that would reimpose terrorism sanctions on the FARC and on FARC-related terrorists. Those sanctions should never have been removed, and doing so highlighted the lack of respect and support for our friends and allies in Colombia. Mere months before the Colombian election, Joe Biden's delisting of the FARC contributed to the election of an anti-American Marxist. My bill is a commonsense first step to restoring America's policy toward Colombia. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted on my bill, and, sadly, every Senate Democrat voted no.

However, much of the damage has already been done, and this weekend, Petro will take office. American policy, I believe, must be recalibrated to acknowledge that reality. Again, I hope and pray that Petro does not lead his country into the camp of anti-American socialists who have become ascendant during the Biden administration, but we would be reckless and maybe even delusional not to take him at his word because that is what he has said he intends to do.

So I will shortly be introducing another bill—the CAUTION Act—the Colombia Assistance Used Transparently by Institutionalizing Oversight Now.

This bill will comprehensively condition all of our aid to Colombia based on what path Petro will choose. If he cuts back defense coordination with the United States, my bill will ensure that he gets no more money for security coordination. If he cuts back cooperation on drug trafficking, my bill will ensure he gets no more money for counter-narcotics. If he refuses to help dampen illegal immigration, my bill will en-

sure he gets no more money for development assistance.

I am not interested in giving anti-American leftists American tax dollars as aid. I believe our foreign policy should use carrots and sticks in order to incentivize other countries to behave in a way that benefits American interests and strengthens our friendships and in a way that discourages countries from seeking to harm and undermine the United States of America.

This is an inflection point, and America must be clear: We don't support Marxists in Latin America. Any leftist leader who chooses socialism will be held accountable by the United States and, at a minimum, will no longer be funded by the U.S. taxpayers to undermine our great Nation.

I hope this bill earns bipartisan support because standing up for the interests of America and standing up to save the United States-Colombian friendship and alliance is a national interest that transcends partisan lines. If President Biden won't stand up for America, then I hope and pray that the Congress will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, as cochair of the Senate Recycling Caucus, I am all for efforts to reuse material in a manner that gives it a second life unless we are talking about recycling bad ideas. The reckless tax-and-spend plan the White House and the majority are threatening to bring forth once again is a terrible idea to revive.

The Senate wasted almost all of 2021 chasing this apparition. Now here we are, over a year later, and our economic situation is much more dire. Inflation is over 9 percent—the highest in more than four decades. Many economists predict we are headed for a recession by next year. There are indications that we are already there. Americans feel this daily as prices at the pump and the grocery store eat away at disposable income and as home price affordability becomes a thing of the past.

According to a CNN poll last month, 64 percent of Americans feel the economy is currently in a recession, but President Biden and allies of his think that raising taxes, eliminating jobs, and spending billions more will somehow help. Their wild claim that all of this spending will reduce inflation was almost immediately debunked by the Penn Wharton Budget Model, which found that, if enacted, the bill will have no measurable impact on inflation.

Americans are struggling with high prices at every turn. Yet the majority wants them to pay billions for Green New Deal programs that could exacerbate energy security and food security concerns while using fuzzy math to sell it as fighting inflation.

Their message to Americans is, We are sorry you are paying so much for

every necessity you need, but we really have to plant some trees in Brooklyn.

That is right. Tree equity—a Green New Deal program resurrected for this bill—is the majority’s secret weapon to fight inflation.

As the lead Republican on the Senate Ag Committee, I can attest to how our section of the bill is chock-full of misplaced priorities like this, but worse than that, when it comes to agriculture policy, this bill sets a particularly bad precedent for farm bill programs. If they go down this road, we very well might be looking at reconciliation as the only way future farm bills are actually written. Whoever holds the pen wields the fate for vital programs that farmers, ranchers, and foresters depend on, not to mention nutrition programs that help low-income families and policies that allow conservationists to achieve our shared goals.

We haven’t had a single hearing on this bill. Yet its agriculture title spends \$40 billion—a huge amount allocated, with no input from stakeholders, Republicans, and, quite frankly, most Democrats.

The majority is extending conservation programs until 2031—well beyond the life of the next two farm bills, deliberately taking away Congress’s ability to change the focus of these programs or how they operate.

The bill unilaterally creates a multi-billion-dollar slush fund for farm bill priorities shared by the President and his allies. That is a terrible idea for any legislation, much less a bill that is historically written in a very bipartisan fashion.

The current farm bill passed this Chamber with a record number of “yes” votes on the floor. My goal, as current ranking member, is to top that. To say this reckless bill jeopardizes the chances of that would be an understatement. We have never written a farm bill in this manner. It is antithetical to how the Senate—and the Ag Committee, in particular—should operate. We have a storied history of working together on the Agriculture Committee. Our stakeholders value the fact that we approach the issues they face together rather than as Republicans and Democrats. They appreciate that their voices are heard.

Unfortunately, with this decision, the majority has changed that dynamic. In their zeal to pass their reckless tax-and-spend agenda, they have undermined one of the last successful bipartisan processes remaining in the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, while we haven’t yet seen any bill text for this reckless tax-and-spending bill, we have seen or we have heard an outline of it, some chatter about it, snippets about it—about what is in this reconciliation bill. So, Madam President, let me state the obvious: Billions

of dollars in reckless spending and major tax hikes—they will not solve the economic crisis our Nation finds itself in. Yet, somehow, this concoction of truly terrible economic policies is exactly what my colleagues on the Democratic side are pursuing.

Let’s start with the tax hikes. In the Schumer-Manchin bill, they have proposed imposing a corporate minimum tax on those big, bad corporations. Well, 50 percent of this change would be borne by the manufacturing industry—an industry that both Republicans and Democrats have been trying to grow. We have been trying to grow that, not harm it with bad policies.

Manufacturers are already struggling to navigate inflation and supply chain crisis, but this bill will punish manufacturers, and there is no question that this would hurt the middle class by raising prices and lowering wages. At a time of historic inflation, manufacturers will have no choice but to pass on higher prices to the consumer.

That is just one part of it. Democrats say the rich should pay their fair share. OK, let’s look at that.

A nonpartisan analysis of the entire bill found that it would cause a \$16.7 billion tax increase for American taxpayers earning less than \$200,000 in 2023. President Biden is going back on his promise and raising taxes for those earning less than \$400,000, and he is doing this during a recession.

What about the claim that this proposal will address inflation? The Penn-Wharton Budget Model, which Senator MANCHIN frequently cites for producing the best economic analysis, found the proposal produces no meaningful reduction in the deficit or with inflation. Any suggestion otherwise is insulting to the intelligence of the American people.

OK, now let’s look at the spending. Why, during a time of significant economic hardship, should the American people be on the hook to fund \$369 billion in incentives to the Green New Deal businesses to promote those energy policies? Can anyone in this Chamber argue with a straight face that subsidizing Tesla purchases will help to ease inflation? I can tell you it certainly will not help working families.

Then there is the \$80 billion for the IRS, which is six times the Agency’s current annual budget. Our folks on the other side of the aisle are once again trying to hire an armada of new IRS agents—87,000, to be exact. This would unleash a wave of new audits. Half of those new audits would hit Americans making \$75,000 or less.

You know, we have been here before. The public does not want this deal. The bottom line: It is clear this economy is not working for the American people.

The Biden administration’s policies have saddled this country with two consecutive months of negative economic growth—which is the definition of a recession—9.1 percent inflation, a negative 3.6 inflation-adjusted decline

in pay for workers, and more Americans than ever before are now holding two full-time jobs.

In the face of all this hardship, we need real solutions, not more of the same backward spending policies.

The cute name that Senators SCHUMER and MANCHIN have come up with for their proposal should not hide these facts. And the facts are massive tax hikes and billions of dollars in reckless government spending. That is the last thing our country needs right now.

So why are we even debating such a terrible bill? A short history lesson may offer some answers. People may recall something called the Cornhusker Kickback—an agreement in 2009 between my predecessor and Senator Harry Reid. In exchange for a special carve-out only for Nebraska to reduce the costs of enacting ObamaCare in our State, my predecessor agreed to vote for ObamaCare. Well, the kickback, once public, it angered and it embarrassed Nebraskans.

History often repeats itself, and from what I am hearing, it seems as though we have a new kickback—the Mountaineer kickback, a deal only for West Virginia; tax hikes and reckless spending that all of us will have to bear in exchange for a pipeline.

I will close by saying again, this is not an inflation reduction bill. Like a bad Hollywood franchise that just won’t die, this is simply the third installment in the “Build Back Broke” trilogy. I hope it does as poorly in the box office as the first two.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in talking about the tax-and-spend bill that is being put forward by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I rise today to discuss the harmful economic consequences that this tax-and-spend bill will have on American families.

Americans are facing soaring inflation that we haven’t seen in generations. In June, the Consumer Price Index was up 9.1 percent from a year earlier. The price increases families are seeing at the grocery store, at the gas pump, and for basic housing needs have far outpaced wage gains and left Americans struggling to make ends meet.

The news last week that our GDP shrank for a second consecutive quarter is only further evidence of this administration’s failed economic policies.

Now, my colleagues across the aisle are doubling down on their failed approach, proposing to increase taxes on nearly every single hard-working American by \$750 billion and spending nearly \$370 billion on a Green New Deal policy.

And, again, don’t just take my word for it. Analysis by the Joint Committee on Taxation shows this bill will increase taxes on millions of Americans across every income bracket, with more than half of the tax increase impacting Americans making less than \$400,000 a year.

Next year alone, the bill will increase taxes by \$16.7 billion on American taxpayers earning less than \$200,000—a clear violation of President Biden's promise to not increase taxes on Americans earning less than \$400,000 a year.

Further, the Joint Tax analysis also shows that the corporate tax increases in this bill would overwhelmingly hurt U.S. manufacturers—U.S. manufacturers—with nearly 50 percent of the corporate tax increase hitting the manufacturing industry.

Manufacturers are already struggling with inflation, supply chain disruptions, and an impending recession. This tax increase would undermine U.S. manufacturing investment in critical research and development and in emerging technologies. And it will also result in higher costs for American families.

Think about that young couple starting out. They have to buy a refrigerator, a couch, furniture—all of these different things. They are going to pay higher prices. I mean, that tax is going to impact them on the manufactured goods they need, regardless of their income or their ability to pay. That is increasing inflation in this country. And inflation is the cruelest tax because it hits low-income people the hardest.

Not only that, the bill, as I say, will actually increase inflation. Analysis by economists at Penn Wharton at the University of Pennsylvania, the Federal Reserve, Moody's Analytics, and the CBO all show that it will not reduce inflation.

When you look at things like the tax on, not just manufacturing but other companies that produce oil and gas, here we are fighting with the highest prices we have seen at the pump in years that people pay every time they pull up to fill up their car. And now with increased taxes, that is going to exacerbate the cost of fuel at the pump. It is going to impact the price of groceries at the grocery store at a time when we are not only fighting inflation but we are fighting economic stagnation—stagflation, something we haven't had in this country since the late seventies and the early eighties.

Economists at the nonprofit Tax Foundation projected this bill will reduce long-term economic output, reduce average wages, and eliminate 30,000 full-time jobs. Let me repeat that. Economists at the nonprofit Tax Foundation have projected that this legislation will reduce long-run economic output, reduce average wages, and eliminate 30,000 full-time jobs in this country.

Rather than tightening our fiscal belt and reducing spending, Democrats are continuing down the same old path that has led to record-high inflation and our economy on the verge of recession.

Increasing taxes and more Federal spending will not reduce inflation. It will not create jobs. It will not lower gas prices, which are still about 60 percent higher than they were just a year ago.

Instead, we should be empowering our domestic energy producers, restoring our energy independence, reducing our reliance on foreign oil imports, and creating more jobs here at home—not eliminating 30,000 jobs, creating more jobs. Less spending, less taxation, less regulation gets this economy growing. This bill does just the opposite.

Democrats are proposing new energy taxes and Green New Deal-style subsidies that will only worsen our current energy crisis and weaken our Nation's economic and our energy security. And energy security is national security.

As part of the \$370 billion in spending on Green New Deal subsidies, this bill includes: \$51 billion to extend and modify the production tax credit to subsidize the already profitable wind, solar, and geothermal industries; \$27 billion to establish a greenhouse gas reduction fund to deploy low-carbon technologies in disadvantaged communities; \$3 billion for a neighborhood equity, safety, and affordable transportation program; \$3 billion for environmental and climate justice block grants.

Further, the bill includes new taxes on natural gas and increased fees and royalty rates for oil and gas produced on Federal lands, which will only result in higher costs for American families at the pump, at the gas station, or their utility bills, and higher prices for goods across the board because all of those goods have to be transported to the grocery store. And now you are going to pay higher transportation costs, and that is going to be reflected in the food prices. So you don't just see it at the pump at the gas station when you are filling your car, you see it at the grocery store.

And with this tax on manufacturers, you are going to see it on all the manufactured goods as well. Low-income people are going to be paying those higher prices, more inflation. That means the tax gets them.

Gas prices are already \$2.25 higher a gallon than when President Biden took office. Diesel prices are even higher—nearly \$2.81 per gallon more than in January of 2021.

In short, look, we need to unleash our domestic energy production, not ask for help from OPEC or Venezuela. We need to unleash our oil and gas resources in States like my home State or the Presiding Officer's home State. We can produce a lot more oil and gas in this country, and we have the best environmental standards.

That is how you bring the price down at the pump: more supply, not higher taxes; more supply, not taxes that will drive prices up and reduce supply when we still have increased demand. That is why we have the inflation in the first place.

The Biden administration policies are creating the inflation and now the stagflation, and this legislation will make it worse. It is going down the same path.

We need to unleash our domestic energy production. We need to get our debt and deficit under control. We need to work on behalf of farmers, ranchers, the ag supply chain to continue to produce the highest quality and the lowest cost food supply in the world. We need to unleash our energy resources.

Those are the things that will increase supply, reduce inflation, and get our economy going so we don't have a recession or stagnation. Those are the things that benefit all American consumers, all American workers, regardless of their income level. This bill does none of those things. This bill makes the problem worse, and it should be rejected.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The Senator from Ohio.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6929

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the men and women at the company Delphi Technologies helped make General Motors the world's largest automaker. Yet those workers lost the retirement they earned through no fault of their own when their company went bankrupt during the great recession.

That was a time—some of us were here then; Senator CRAPO and I were both here then—when Washington bailed out Wall Street, the people who caused the crisis, but left too many Americans like the Delphi retirees—again, who did nothing wrong—on their own.

Now, after years of effort by workers and retirees in Ohio and in other States, it is past time for the U.S. Senate to do its job to restore full retirement benefits for the thousands of Ohioans and tens of thousands nationally of Delphi salaried retirees across the country.

I have been fighting for them and urging the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to do the right thing since 2009. I thought we had this problem solved years ago when I blocked President Obama's nominee to head the PBGC, Josh Gotbaum. We hoped that would signal to the President that we were serious: PBGC needed to do the right thing for Delphi workers. Unfortunately, Delphi retirees know what happened: He got the job anyway; they didn't get the help they needed.

President Obama didn't do it. The next President, President Trump, promised, went to Youngstown, went to Dayton, promised he would take care of these retirees, and Ohioans voted for him. Ohioans thought President Trump, this time, would be different, that he would do something. Once again, American workers were left on their own.

We kept working. These retirees never gave up. This year, we reintroduced legislation—with Congressman RYAN, a Democrat from Ohio; Congressman KILDEE, a Democrat from Michigan; Congressman TURNER, a Republican from Ohio—to save these pensions. We named the bill in honor of

Susan Muffley, a Delphi retiree so cash-strapped after losing her pension that she avoided seeing her doctor, and she passed away too early as a result.

It is a bipartisan bill. We have Senator PORTMAN and Senator YOUNG on board in the Senate, along with 39 Republicans who joined Congressman TURNER from Dayton voting for this in the House last week. The White House supports it as well. The White House said:

By ensuring that those who put in a career of hard work will receive the pension benefits they earned, this legislation supports a secure retirement for affected workers.

That is what the White House said.

So we have Senator PORTMAN and Senator YOUNG here. We have 39 House Republicans on board. A number of Democrats are on board. The President of the United States is on board.

Promises from President Obama and President Trump—now is the time. These Ohioans and workers across the Midwest earned these pensions. It is past time to restore them. The Senate has that opportunity today.

I hope my colleagues of both parties will join Senator PORTMAN and me.

I yield the floor to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Ohio, Senator BROWN, and I thank him for working with us on this bipartisan legislation that impacts thousands of retirees in our home State of Ohio.

In the summer of 2009, as the Federal Government took General Motors into bankruptcy, the Obama administration terminated the pension plans covering thousands of Delphi workers. While union employees were protected, these 20,000 salaried retirees, ranging from shop floor supervisors and salespeople to engineers, office managers, were left out. They had spent many years working at Delphi, a major employer and economic engine in Dayton, OH, in Youngstown, OH, and in Sandusky, OH.

These people had followed the rules. They had earned their pensions the American way, through hard work and dedication and contribution. But instead of honoring the promises that had been made to these salaried, middle income employees after 30, 40 years of service, the administration terminated their pensions. People who had worked hard their entire lives and played by the rules saw benefits cut by as much as 70 percent. It is just not fair and no fault of their own, and it has devastated some of them, particularly those who have healthcare issues in their later years, who have not been able to lead the standard of living that they assumed they would, based on the pensions they had.

So it is about fairness, and it is very simple. It ensures that these Delphi retirees receive the retirement benefits they were promised. It would reinstate their pension plan and restore their benefits that were unnecessarily and unfairly reduced.

Some of my colleagues may characterize this as a bailout, but I respect-

fully must correct the record. The Delphi pension was over 80 percent funded when the Federal Government terminated the pensions in 2009 and took over these assets. By the way, it would have been fully funded by the next year based on all the data we now have showing what happened with market conditions. So it was 80 percent funded when the government stepped in and said that it was massively underfunded, and a year later it would have been fully funded.

Despite this, the government, again, treated the pensions as though they were underfunded and slashed the benefits. It is simply about keeping our promises to these workers.

There were 20,000 participants. Some say: Well, that is not a lot of people. Well, to them, it is really important, and it is really important to Ohio. About a quarter of those 20,000 live in our home State of Ohio.

That is why I am proud to stand with them, my colleagues from Ohio, and with others here in this body and over in the House to ensure that fairness is what they get at the end of the day.

This should not be controversial legislation, in my view. I am pleased to say that it has bipartisan support. We just saw 36 Republicans support this on the House side. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to also support these workers, to make them whole with this legislation so that we can make good on the Federal Government's promise to them.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank my friend Senator PORTMAN for our work together on this.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 6929, which was received from the House and is at the desk; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I appreciate my colleagues' commitment to this issue and to their constituents. As you know, this legislation has been before us for some time now, and there is controversy over it.

This bill would retroactively reinstate pension benefits for a small subset of participants whose pensions have already been transferred to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, or PBGC. That would create a precedent that other plans would follow.

The PBGC exists specifically to cover pension benefits if a plan is terminated. So we should let the system work. This system does not require taxpayer dollars for a bailout or for whatever one would like to call it. That is part of the reason for the objection.

We also have an obligation to be deliberate in how we spend taxpayer money. Before we inject more money into the system, we should explore the implications of this bill, which brings me to my final point. The Finance Committee has not held a hearing—not a single hearing, let alone a markup—on this bill. The Finance Committee exists to examine proposals such as this and to provide all Senators an opportunity to weigh in.

I am willing to work with my chairman, Senator WYDEN, on this and with Senator BROWN and with Senator PORTMAN and other Senators who are interested in the issue so we can see if there is a need and a way that we can address this issue specifically without creating a precedent that would deal with the rest of the entire system that has been put together to address terminated plans.

Because of the need for us to have regular-order deliberation and consideration of this legislation, I must, today, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank Senator CRAPO. Senator CRAPO and I have worked together on a number of things. He was chair of the Banking Committee the last 4 years. I was his ranking member and worked with him and Greg and his staff on a number of things. I take him at his word.

I know that Senator PORTMAN and Senator CRAPO and I sit also on the Finance Committee. And I am serious about this. I just had a private conversation with Senator CRAPO. He seems serious. I know Senator PORTMAN is.

We have waited too long. There are far too many people. It is not a huge number, as Senator PORTMAN said—not a huge number of people—but it is awfully important to them. I know what it means to a community that is struggling, like the Mahoning Valley and the Miami Valley. Those two communities happen to have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of these retirees. When their pension shrinks like this, it affects their buying power, it affects their standard of living, and it affects the prosperity of the community.

So we will be back together working on it. I thank Senator CRAPO. I am disappointed, but I thank him.

TRIBUTE TO BILL NELL

Mr. President, I rise today on a cheerful duty, if you will, to recognize Bill Nell, who retired this month after a long career of service, not working in the Senate but sort of working around the Senate.

Bill was deputy director of the Congressional Program at the Aspen Institute, something not particularly known to the public. It is a nonprofit working to bring together diverse perspectives to solve challenges facing the United States and the world.

Bill was the second hire when the Aspen Institute's Congressional Program began. He is one of the Aspen Institute's longest serving employees—35 years at Aspen.

Almost every week, for as long as I can remember, that the Senate and the House were in session, Bill brought together Democrats and Republicans from across the ideological spectrum for breakfast and conversations with leading public policy scholars. Typically on a Thursday morning at 8, you could come, and there would be 10 or 15 or 20 House and Senate Members—fairly evenly divided, depending on the topic, perhaps, between the parties—and a scholar or an activist or someone that Bill generally recruited came in and talked to us.

It helped educate us, for sure. It brought us together in ways that the public doesn't necessarily see but helped us discuss issues with each other. And we learned in so many ways about each other and about these public issues. We learned from experts. We learned from each other.

Bill helped host 636 breakfasts—someone counted them at Aspen—over his career of service. During the hustle and bustle of the workweek, these Aspen breakfasts were a welcome respite where Members of Congress could come to listen and discuss and learn from experts, with little partisanship involved. But Bill had brought in these experts. We learned from them. We learned from one another.

I wish everyone could sit in on those breakfasts and see the thoughtfulness of so many Members of both parties in Congress. It really taught me a lot about partisanship and that most of my colleagues here—I would not say everyone, but most of my colleagues here—are here for the right reasons and want to do a good job, and the thoughtfulness exhibited in those meetings was so important.

Bill was diligent about bringing a balanced presentation of topics and experts at the forefront of their fields. These breakfasts helped us to consider others' perspectives and think about things we might not have thought about otherwise. Sometimes we found common ground, an experience or opinion or a priority that our constituents share. It is how we got things done. Whenever we could find agreement, we worked together to accomplish things for the people whom we served.

It brings to mind one of my colleagues who is about to retire, ROY BLUNT from Missouri. He served with me in the House. I knew him, actually, even before that. He one time said—and he is a conservative Republican, and I am decidedly not. He said:

I have known SHERROD BROWN for 30 years, and we have agreed exactly five times.

Then he laughed, and then he said:

But all five of those are Federal law.

And that is what really matters. Senator CRAPO and I look at the world very differently. Senator PORTMAN and

I look at the world very differently, but Senator PORTMAN and I put together the strongest language ever in Federal law on "Buy American."

We have done a number of issues like that. You may look at things differently, but you find things you can agree on, and you go to town and make it happen.

So back to Bill. Those who work closely with him describe him as one of the hardest working people they know, and you can see that in these records. By virtue of his diligence and his preparation, Bill was able to make his job, which was anything but this, appear effortless.

His longtime colleague, former Ag Secretary, Congressman Dan Glickman, recognized Bill as the "soul of Aspen," as a natural leader and a jack-of-all-trades.

His current boss, until his retirement last week, former Congressman Charlie Dent—Glickman is a Democrat; Dent is a Republican—called Bill an anti-procrastinator when I called him on the phone to talk about him. It is a title rare in a town where "procrastination" seems to be everyone's middle name. Bill's enduring personality is kindness, and he was nothing if not kind. He brought so many together. He made people feel comfortable. He made people heard. I have no idea what his ideology or his party was. We didn't talk about that. He just served and helped us understand. He seemed to have no enemies in doing his job.

In retirement, Bill is spending time back in his beloved Montana, just outside of Yellowstone, one of my favorite places in the country, where I, years ago, took my daughters, as a single parent, on a train to see Yellowstone for a week. He is spending time in his beloved Montana with his beloved wife Cindy, a retired public school teacher and an education activist.

The Aspen breakfast will continue. Bill will be missed by all of us who were blessed by his kindness, his curiosity, and his capability. He made this place work better. He reminded us of the importance of self-government, of democracy. It is up to us to uphold that legacy, to keep working with each other towards a better future for the people whom we serve.

Thank you so much, Bill Nell. We wish you the best in retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4394

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 4394 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am very concerned that this bill would overrule FDA experts and do so without even going through regular order. We should be setting a very high bar for doing anything like this.

I do appreciate my colleague's concern that he is bringing to the floor today for growers in his State. Greening disease is a serious and alarming environmental issue. But skipping regular order here today to override FDA's experts and meddle with its longstanding process for modifying food standards of identity does not get to the root of the problem. So, today, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I regret that that is the case. I understand the argument and if I could explain a little further.

Florida is identified with the citrus industry. People have long understood it. It is a big part of our State. Here is the best way to describe this to people. About 60 years ago, the FDA created a standard for what they consider pasteurized orange juice. For orange juice to be marked with a stamp that says "pasteurized," no less than 10.5 percent of the weight of the juice has to be accounted for by soluble solids, such as naturally occurring sugar. So this is just an arbitrary number.

By the way, the 10.5 percent of the weight has nothing to with the nutrition. It has nothing to with the safety. It has nothing to with the quality.

They had to come up with a number to define the difference between orange juice and something that is not orange juice, and that was the number they came up with.

So for decades, the citrus industry in Florida has been following that specification, and it hasn't been a problem. Then Florida was impacted by this thing called citrus greening, pests that came from Asia, particularly from China. What it has done is it has ravaged the trees. It ravaged the trees to the point where one of the impacts it has is that now the sugar content—you wouldn't notice it if you drink it or if you eat one, but the sugar content of the fruit that is now on the trees, because of the greening, often falls under the 10.5. Again, no one would know. It is not any less safe. It is not any less nutritious. It just falls under that number. Then, obviously, the hurricane we had in 2017 made those problems even worse when they suffered the loss of a bunch of trees.

So now, to meet this arbitrary 10.5 percent threshold, the juice processors in Florida now have to blend in oranges and orange juice that have higher sugar content, and they usually have to import it from a foreign source. Again, there is no health benefit to doing that. In fact, you could probably argue that less sugar is probably better. You wouldn't taste the difference.

You wouldn't know it. If I put two glasses of orange juice in front of you—one with the number they are asking for, which is 10 percent, and the other one with 10.5—you wouldn't notice the difference.

So they have been asking the FDA to change the standard so they don't have to import a bunch of oranges from Brazil and mix it just to be able to hit the sugar content. If they can't do it, the only thing that changes is that the final product can't be marketed as "Florida orange juice." That is really the challenge we are facing.

We would love for this to go through the normal process. The problem is, by the time the FDA makes a decision on it, there may not be any growers left. Let me explain why that is a problem.

These citrus growers sit on valuable land. Every developer in the State is trying to get their hands on that land. They would love to develop it into a mall, into an industrial park. We are facing those problems everywhere. Once you turn farmland into a commercial use, industrial use, a housing development, you never get it back. I have seen farms turned into commercial development; I have never seen a commercial development be turned back into a farm.

Once we lose this land, we lose it forever. We lose it forever. So not only is it important to have it from a food security standpoint but from an environmental standpoint. Having something remain in agriculture, where the people who own it care deeply about the quality of the land and the water usage because it is key to their existence, is a better use of the land than turning it into an industrial park.

But, eventually, these agriculture owners will have to do something. Some have been in the business for generations, but at some point, they cannot grow enough food to justify continuing in business. They have people offering millions and millions of dollars to buy their land from them.

So this simple bill that I filed would provide certainty to the orange growers. By lowering the 10.5 content to 10.0—that is all it does, from 10.5 to 10.0—they will have some level of certainty that they will be able to continue in business.

I regret that there is an objection here today. I understand the desire to follow the FDA process, but I just want to be clear. No one is arguing—who knows about this—that going from 10.5 to 10.0 has any safety issue or anything of that nature. It is literally an undetectable difference, but it would make a big difference for the citrus growers of Florida.

If we are not going to do it this way, I hope we can get a hearing and get this passed. I am not sure if a couple of years from now, we are going to have a citrus industry. If we lose them or lose that land, we will never get it back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4469

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, across this country, Americans are facing aggressive attacks on their reproductive freedom. An extremist Supreme Court and radical rightwing politicians have made clear that they see women as second-class citizens and that government—government; not the person who is pregnant but government—should be making decisions about whether or not to carry a pregnancy to term.

In this extraordinary moment, we must do everything we can to ensure that patients get the healthcare and reproductive services they need. That includes protecting patients from the deceptive practices of some so-called crisis pregnancy centers, or CPCs.

Nationwide, there are over 2,500 known CPCs, although some claim that number is closer to about 4,000. Before Roe was overturned, over 16 million women of reproductive age lived closer to a crisis pregnancy center than to an abortion clinic. Now, some estimate that as many as 34 million women do. Today in Massachusetts, CPCs outnumber true abortion clinics by about 3 to 1.

CPCs often lure women seeking legitimate reproductive care, including abortions, into their facilities by advertising themselves as comprehensive reproductive healthcare providers, but this is flatly untrue. Many of these CPCs are not healthcare providers, and they often operate specifically to deceive pregnant women, with the goal of preventing them from having abortions.

CPC websites often feature images of people in white lab coats and promises of services like ultrasounds or STD tests. Yet CPCs rarely employ licensed physicians or offer a full range of reproductive health services. According to one study, 84 percent of CPCs had no physician and 75 percent had no registered nurse even affiliated with the staff. In fact, of the staff that did have some medical training, most work part time or as volunteers. As for the services they provide, the same study found that only 1 out of 607 crisis pregnancy centers provided contraceptive care and 95 percent of CPC offered no prenatal care—none, zero. Most have no doctors, no nurses, and offer no medical care, but they sure have a lot of medical opinions. Nearly two-thirds promoted medically unsound claims, such as offering information about unproven and unscientific abortion pill reversal treatments.

Deception is at the heart of the operation for many CPCs. The director of a crisis pregnancy center in Texas explained to the Washington Post how she revamped operations so her center could pull in more people who were seeking an abortion. The director paid thousands of dollars to ensure that searches for phrases like "need an abortion" would lead people to her center, and she filled the website with phrases like "I want an abortion" and promised "CONFIDENTIAL ABOR-

TION CONSULTATION—NO COST TO YOU." The website is so deceptive that the director said she even receives angry calls from anti-abortion advocates who want to know why her center even talks about abortion, to which she replies: "How else do you get an abortion-minded girl to know that you are there?"

Deception is wrong. No one should be deceived directly or indirectly about the services they can access or the risks of receiving care. That is particularly true for someone under great stress and time constraints who is coping with an unplanned pregnancy.

That is why I am glad to introduce the Stop Anti-Abortion Disinformation Act with Senator MENENDEZ and why I am joining him today in calling up this legislation for a vote. Our bill directs the Federal Trade Commission to prohibit deceptive or misleading advertising related to the provision of abortion services. It also empowers the Commission to enforce these rules and collect penalties from organizations that violate the law. This is far from a radical proposal. For more than 100 years, the FTC has been authorized to prosecute entities that use deceptive practices.

And let me be clear. Any crisis pregnancy center that operates fairly, disseminates factual information, and is clear about what services it does and does not provide would be free to continue its work.

This bill is not about preventing parents from receiving diapers or other supplies if they have chosen to continue a pregnancy. This is about organizations that deliberately deceive women and girls who are seeking help to terminate a pregnancy. Unfortunately, deception is at the heart of the typical CPC's business model.

As the director of a CPC explained, the deception begins when women search for an abortion provider. The deception then continues once women walk through the doors of a crisis pregnancy center.

I just want to tell you a bit about the experience of a young woman living in Massachusetts who visited a crisis pregnancy center earlier this year. After finding the facility, which promised a "free abortion consultation," this woman was asked to fill out forms to disclose personal information. She was repeatedly lied to about how far along she was in her pregnancy. She was told falsely that terminating her pregnancy would increase her risk of breast cancer and depression and that an abortion could mean that she could never become pregnant in the future. Sadly, her experience is not unique.

Here is the kicker. Women and girls visiting CPCs, like this young woman, often fill out forms and answer questionnaires requesting both personal identification and personal health information, which women provide because they believe they are in a medical facility that will protect their privacy. But because CPCs are not

healthcare providers, these women have no legal protection, and these centers have no legal obligation to protect those data. These unlicensed facilities are not subject to Federal privacy laws like the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, or HIPAA. This means that crisis pregnancy centers could pass along private information about who was seeking an abortion, where that person lives, and so on—information that, in the wake of the Dobbs decision, is particularly dangerous.

The evidence of abuse is overwhelming. It is time to crack down on deceptive and misleading practices that many crisis pregnancy centers employ because the last thing that a woman seeking reproductive care should have to worry about is whether she is being tricked, lied to, or deceived about the medical care she seeks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague Senator WARREN for beginning this debate, and we will move to a consent shortly. I want to thank her for working together with me on this most important issue.

At this moment, there are millions of women who face an uncertain future after the repeal of Roe v. Wade, millions of women who no longer have the right to make their own decisions about their own bodies. It is a heart-wrenching choice, no doubt one of the hardest decisions anyone will ever have to make.

But in the midst of this, in this post-Roe landscape we find ourselves in, there are organizations, as has been discussed here, known as crisis pregnancy centers that are preying on the fears of women, exacerbating the problems caused by the Dobbs decision.

Make no mistake, crisis pregnancy centers are anti-abortion organizations that cloak themselves in benign language about “providing answers” and “offering advice.”

They have an agenda; namely, to steer women away from abortion through a combination of guilt, concealment, harassment, and downright lies.

Crisis pregnancy centers in my State of New Jersey pretend that they are there to educate, support, and empower women facing unplanned pregnancies. And yet at the bottom of their websites, in very small print, you will find a disclaimer that lays it all bare.

Crisis pregnancy centers do not offer or refer for pregnancy terminations or birth control. Information should not be relied on as a substitute for professional and/or medical advice.

That is a disclaimer. You can hardly read it, but it is there. This is pulled straight from the web page of one center in my State. I will repeat that ending again.

Information should not be relied on as a substitute for professional and/or medical advice.

Ironically, this is the only objective and accurate piece of information you will find on the site and others like it.

As Senator WARREN mentioned, crisis pregnancy centers are not required to have a physician or a registered nurse on staff. Very few of them do.

They are not required to provide contraceptive care or even stick to medically sound claims. And because they claim to only provide so-called education services, they can promote blatant lies about how abortion increases risk for breast cancer.

Women in America do not deserve to be lied to. They shouldn't be preyed upon during moments of vulnerability or any other time. When assessing healthcare, they shouldn't have to shift to what is real and what is not.

And they certainly shouldn't have to parse through the carefully constructed language of crisis pregnancy centers that promote an anti-choice agenda.

Our bill, the Stop Anti-Abortion Disinformation Act, would empower the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules prohibiting false advertisement of abortion services. It would allow the FTC to penalize those who are found in violation. And it would provide greater oversight over crisis pregnancy centers that profit from the pain of unplanned pregnancies—sometimes while double-dipping on the taxpayer's dime.

Senator WARREN and I are leading this bill to end the practice of deceiving women and girls through false advertisement. We are leading this bill to promote truth in advertisement, to end misinformation and disinformation, and to protect women from harassment. Yes—harassment.

As Senator WARREN said, crisis pregnancy centers have no duty to uphold HIPAA privacy protections—the most significant information that you can give about your health and the status of your health and your condition. You do that thinking that you are in a medical center. And now you have given all this information that has enormous consequences to it if it is misused to these deceptive entities.

And after divulging personal information to them, they can freely sell it to scammers who would want to take advantage of them.

So I ask my colleagues, let's end the assault on bodily autonomy and the right to access reproductive care.

Let's end the barrage of attacks on their healthcare. Let's end deception in any delivery of any service. Let's end the fraud in any delivery of any “service.” Let's end the barrage of attacks on their healthcare.

Join us in passing our bill so that in the hardest moment of their lives, women all across our country can rest assured in knowing that what they are getting is the truth, not some biased agenda pretending to be medical advice, not some one-sided talking point that steers them toward one outcome, the truth—the truth.

Pregnant women in America deserve the truth, and that is what this bill

does. To oppose our unanimous consent request is to promote deception, is to promote fraud. I don't think anybody really wants to do that.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 4469 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 objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise in objection to this bill because it is an outrageous attack on life-affirming pregnancy resource centers. As a pro-life obstetrician, I have had the pleasure and honor of delivering over 5,000 babies, and I can attest to the life-saving, critical, and comprehensive care and resources these centers provide moms in need.

These pro-life charities not only help women in poverty choose life instead of abortion, but they also help women after babies are born. They also provide clothing and diapers and housing assistance and nutrition and sometimes just putting an arm around their shoulders and helping them get to their next appointment.

This legislation seeks to shut them down all around the country on the grounds that they purportedly spread disinformation about abortion.

Under this bill, charities could be fined \$100,000 or 50 percent of the revenues earned by the ultimate parent entity of the charity for violating the act's prohibition on disinformation related to abortion.

Now, I ask you, who would determine what counts as prohibited disinformation? There is no doubt it would be bureaucrats with a pro-abortion agenda. Is this not an infringement on our First Amendment rights?

This bill would turn the FTC into a national abortion disinformation board with an agenda of suppressing speech and spreading pro-abortion propaganda.

Nationally, pro-life pregnancy resource centers outnumber abortion facilities three to one, and that is a good thing—that is a great thing—and in some States by as many as 11 to 1. Knowing that many women choose abortion because they feel pressured that they have no other option, the pro-life movement has placed tremendous resources into these centers, which exist to offer alternatives to abortion, usually at no cost.

But right now in America, pregnancy resource centers are the ones in need of protection as zealous, pro-abortion terrorists have spent the past 2 months firebombing and vandalizing pro-life pregnancy centers all across the Nation.

These criminals, these terrorists do so not in the name of abortion access

but in retribution for daring to defy the ruling abortion regime and for daring to stand on the side of good in this spiritual battle.

There have been more than 60 pregnancy resource centers and offices that pro-life groups have attacked and vandalized since the draft Supreme Court opinion was leaked in May.

Pro-abortion domestic terrorists have claimed responsibility for these crimes.

Congress should be taking up the legislation instead to affirm, grow, and protect pregnancy resource centers and praise citizens for their great work, for volunteering to help and serve their community.

And Attorney General Merrick Garland should abide by his oath of office and prosecute the law. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. While my colleague is still here, I would like to propound a question to him through the Chair.

Does the First Amendment allow you to promote fraud? Does the First Amendment allow you to promote deception? Is it great work to lie to someone about what you are providing them? Is it great work to allow someone to get your vital health information believing that you are a health provider and then being able to use that private information?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. To answer my colleague, the fraud and deception is occurring in the abortion clinics. I could tell you story after story of patients crying in my office who went to Planned Parenthood for a pregnancy test and were scheduled for an abortion, coming to my office wondering, Do I have to do this abortion? That is where the fraud and deception is occurring, that these women aren't being told about the potential complications of these abortion procedures.

They are not being told that these abortion pills are going to cause pain and cramping and bleeding, that they could end up in the emergency room as well. They are not told about the complications from the abortion procedures. That is where the fraud and deception is present.

You talk about this as reproductive services. You are afraid to say the word "abortion" in these clinics. That is the fraud and deception. This isn't reproductive services. These are abortions. This is taking the life of the unborn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Could I ask a question then because I am a little confused by what has just happened here. I presume deception is wrong whoever does it. So if we just said no deception around pregnancy services, would you be willing to support this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And just as a reminder, questions need to be asked through the Chair.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Questions need to be asked through the Chair.

Ms. WARREN. Yes, I am asking you that question, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, we could never support any part of this legislation. I think the deception and fraud is occurring on the part of abortion clinics. This is a threat to our First Amendment rights, and like I said in my opening remarks, this is just simply unacceptable.

And that is why we continue to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, if I may continue to ask my colleague through the Chair, is it right, no matter who gets the information by fraud, to give your most private health—surely, as a doctor, the Senator would say that no one should give up their health information to an entity that does not preserve it under HIPAA laws.

So could the Senator not join us if we limit it to fraud that ultimately has that fraud create the insecurity of HIPAA information?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I think this is not the place to try to rewrite legislation. Of course, I am against all fraud. I think all fraud is bad. I am all for the truth. I am all for protecting patients' personal information, but I am also here proud to say what these great clinics do. I am not sure what you are even accusing them is even true. I have not witnessed that. The pregnancy clinics that I have seen do great work for these folks. They truly do sit down and talk with them. They give them a hand up. They do so many great things.

So I don't know where this fraud and deception is coming about, except that they are talking to women and saying: Do you realize your baby has a heartbeat? Do you realize your baby can feel pain at 14 weeks? Do you realize that your baby recognizes the voice of your husband right now?

So I think those are great things to share with patients; that how wonderful life is; that we are all wonderfully, beautifully made in the womb; that life begins at conception. I think that is all the truth that should be shared with them.

So, no, I don't think there is anything you could do with this legislation to change it that I could support, and I continue to object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, then can I ask through the Presiding Officer another question, and that is if we are

not talking about the fraud part, can we at least talk about collecting health information that any so-called crisis pregnancy center—I am sorry—is the Senator leaving, the one who said that it is important to protect private healthcare information?

That at least we could agree that private healthcare information—I guess the Senator is just going to walk off the floor.

So the question would have been how about agreeing that anyone who collects information about pregnancy and collects medical and personal information has to be bound by HIPAA so that that information is fully protected. That would be my question.

But since there is no one here to answer it on the Republican side, I guess we will have to leave it for today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would like to answer the Senator's question, and that makes eminent sense that we would protect HIPAA information, regardless of who is in a position to maybe have access to collecting it. And therefore, in the first instance, you shouldn't collect it, if you are not a medical entity, but if you do, you should be ultimately bound by the same guarantees that anyone else would be guaranteed. You know, it would baffle me that particularly a medical professional, a doctor, would suggest that HIPAA information is something that we shouldn't protect.

I think that at a minimum, we should all be able to agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, this is a reminder again why I am so honored to fight alongside Senator MENENDEZ.

I don't think anyone should be deceived, and particularly a woman who is seeking information about termination of a pregnancy, and I don't believe anyone's private medical information should be shared.

The idea that these crisis pregnancy centers gather information from women who believe they are giving it to a medical provider and that that information will be protected and that that is not the case is truly despicable.

Thank you again, Senator MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4774

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, gas prices are 64 percent higher in my home State of Kentucky than they were in January of 2021. This means Kentuckians are paying \$1.43 more for gas than they were at the beginning of last year.

For average Americans already struggling to put food on the table, sky-high gas prices are a daily punishment.

Every additional dollar an American spends on a gallon of gas is a dollar not going towards their mortgage, their retirement, or their children's college fund.

Rising prices are robbing Americans of the chance to plan for the future, as

they struggle to make ends meet in the present.

In an attempt to address rising gas prices, President Biden announced on April 12 that he would allow the sale of E15 gasoline this summer. Then-White House press secretary Jen Psaki had this to say about this decision:

[This] waiver [that President Biden passed to allow E15] is a critical step to address the fuel supply crisis and . . . build real U.S. energy independence, support American agriculture and manufacturing, and save Americans money at the pump. At current prices, E15 can save a family 10 cents per gallon of gas on average and many stores sell E15 at even greater discount and today's waiver will allow families to pay that lower price for months to come.

So this is a policy supported by President Biden, and it is currently the law since he is waiving the regulation.

E15 is a gasoline blend containing up to 15 percent ethanol. It is a renewable fuel typically made from corn. A 2008 study published in *Atmospheric Environment* found that ethanol-based fuels like E15 emit up to 16 percent less carbon dioxide than traditional gasoline.

A more recent study published by the U.S. Department of Energy's Argonne National Laboratory found that these fuels emit up to 23 percent less carbon dioxide and provide a cheaper alternative to typical gasoline, and yet the Clean Air Act currently prohibits the sale of E15 during the summer. So we sell it for 9 months of the year; we forbid it for 3 months of the year. But companies can't get used to either selling it or making it or distributing it because of the disruption during the summer.

Under the current law, gas with up to 10 percent ethanol, commonly known as E10, can be sold during the summer. But, inexplicably, the law treats E15 differently, even though the higher ethanol blend is better for the environment.

American drivers ought to be able to access E15 year-round. Prohibiting its sale in the summer months artificially restricts the supply, especially when Americans are paying historically high prices for a gallon of gasoline.

What we are asking to do today through this legislation is not to subsidize ethanol, not to force people to use ethanol, but to allow people to use ethanol at an E15 basis, a little bit higher than we are allowed to use already.

Republican and Democratic Presidents have both waived this rule. This is essentially what the law of the land is other than we are having to suspend the law to get what we have. The last President and this President have both waived the rule that we are trying to repeal today.

Both Presidents Trump and Biden approved the removal of barriers to the sale of E15 during the summer months; but in Congress, we have it in our power to permanently allow the sale of E15.

If we only do it by Presidential waiver, there is never enough certainty for

people in the marketplace to decide to sell it year-round because they are worried that at any one moment a President will flip a switch, and then we will go back to banning it again.

The EASE Act, which is what we will be asking to pass today, is a bill that will allow the sale of E15 year-round and will provide relief for Americans on the road—not only this year, but every year. This change is long overdue. I have advocated this policy for 7 years. I first introduced this legislation in 2015.

Passing the EASE Act would benefit consumers, farmers, and the environment by increasing access.

So as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4774, which is at the desk; further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

MR. HEINRICH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

MR. HEINRICH. Mr. President, what my colleague from Kentucky is attempting to do here is to really short-circuit the bedrock public health protections in the Clean Air Act.

And make no mistake. This is a major policy change; not a minor change. It would have far-reaching impacts. For example, this policy would clearly make food even more expensive; it would make air quality worse. And it is not even eminently clear that the impact on gas prices would necessarily be negative.

So, fundamentally, this is the kind of sweeping policy that should actually go through the committee of jurisdiction—in this case, the Environment and Public Works Committee.

So I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2022

MR. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the swift passage of the Inflation Reduction Act.

In the wake of COVID-19, global supply chains have been strained. There has been shipping disruptions, and Putin's illegal invasion of Ukraine has added to this. As a result of these many factors, inflation is up in almost every single country across the globe. The United States is among the world's wealthiest and most productive and diversified economies, but no nation on Earth is immune to the forces of inflation, particularly when it comes from so many different directions.

Let's remember also, 2021 was a huge year for U.S. economic growth. In fact, last year, the U.S. economy grew at its fastest pace since 1984. Our unemploy-

ment rate is back down to 50-year lows, wages have risen for many, and there is a job literally for any American who wants to work and is looking for work. Nobody thought that type of growth was sustainable, especially with the global economic headwinds we are facing and will continue to face.

The fact is that Americans are forced to pay inflated gas prices at the pump because of the immoral and illegal invasion of Ukraine by Vladimir Putin, because of the cartel—OPEC—that controls prices, and because of our failure so far to invest in clean energy, and that has made our economy crack.

So the question before us is: How do we help our economy gain firmer footing and lower prices for consumers; how do we make our country more energy independent; and how do we strike a blow for fairness and financial responsibility and make things better for families, businesses, and communities?

The Inflation Reduction Act accomplishes all of those goals. It makes forward-looking policy adjustments and investments to shore-up the economy. It takes long overdue steps to help lower out-of-pocket costs for things like energy, prescription drugs, and healthcare. It will strengthen America's energy independence and enhance our national security by moving production lines and jobs from China and other places back to the United States.

And don't just take my word for it. A wide array of economic experts have confirmed this bill will ease inflation in three ways: by lowering energy costs for families and small businesses, by cutting healthcare costs for millions of Americans and by ensuring wealthy Americans and large corporations pay their fair share.

Republican and Democratic Treasury Secretaries have said this, as have over 120 of our Nation's leading economists, including seven Nobel Prize winners. The Inflation Reduction Act will also reduce the deficit by more than \$100 billion, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. And budget experts agree, it will save another \$200 billion by empowering and equipping the IRS to crack down on tax cheats and enforce tax laws already on the books.

So independent arbiters are clear: This bill is good for the family budget and for the national budget. It is good for the health of our communities and our planet.

And here are some of the highlights. Let's start with the cost of prescription drugs. According to Families USA, nearly 3 in 10 American adults—that is about 80 million people—have not taken required medicine due to its high cost. For decades, the drug companies have taken advantage of every avenue to keep prices high.

They argue that the cost is justified in order to fund research and development, but that is not really what is happening. The bottom line is, drug companies are not playing fair. In fact, they are charging inflated prices even

on old medications, insulin being the classic example. Developed more than 100 years ago, the developers basically made their product available to everyone. They did not insist upon patent protection. Yet, the price of insulin, of a 100-year old drug, has gone up dramatically.

The Inflation Reduction Act will put the brakes on this type of profiteering. Under this bill, the government will finally be allowed to directly negotiate lower drug prices for Medicare beneficiaries. And I am fighting to include, as I mentioned before about insulin, a \$35 cap on insulin costs for millions of Americans in this bill. And I must applaud Senator WARNOCK for his leadership on this effort.

It is long past time to get this done. The Department of Veterans Affairs already does it and saves veterans and taxpayers billions of dollars a year. The Inflation Reduction Act would also limit drug price increases to the rate of inflation. It also caps out-of-pocket costs at \$2,000 annually for older adults buying prescriptions from pharmacies. It would also provide free vaccinations for seniors, and it helps keep health insurance affordable for millions of Americans.

Let's not forget, cutting healthcare costs for millions of Americans is a direct attack on inflation. So the benefits here are both health-related and economic.

Now, let's talk about how the bill will reduce energy costs and address climate change. The American people recognize that climate change is a serious threat. It fuels extreme weather, environmental degradation, and natural disasters. We are witnessing these phenomena at this moment all across the country. And, frankly, I haven't seen the kind of rapidity and severity of storms like this in sheer number in my time.

This is a result of our neglect of the climate crisis. And I must also applaud my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE because he has been a voice since his first day here in this Chamber about the dangers of climate change, the cost to families, and the cost to our environment.

Of course, all of these climate effects lead to food and water insecurity, economic disruption, and, indeed, human conflict. One of the areas which is most concerning to our Defense Department officials is the follow-on effects of famine and disruption of economies. It usually creates a whole generation of young people without any gainful employment but with access to weapons, which leads to instability and violence—threats to the whole world. And eventually threats to us.

Just this week, we had a hearing in the Banking Committee on the economic costs of climate change. One witness cited a particularly eye-popping statistic from OMB, that our lack of action on climate change costs the Federal Government up to \$2 trillion per year. That is \$2 trillion with a T.

So the cost of our efforts to reduce this will be more than exceeded, according to this number, by the benefits. And good economic analysis suggests, when you have a proposal in which benefits far outweigh cost, that proposal is something to consider.

The Inflation Reduction Act stops kicking the can down the road and takes urgent, overdue action to confront climate change and economic challenges head on. I don't have to remind anyone here that we have been talking about climate change for years and years and years. And now, we have a real opportunity to take positive steps. And if we don't, what we see now is upsetting, to say the least, but it is accelerating and you can sense the economic crises and the environmental crises we see all around us will grow.

Now, this legislation would invest \$369 billion in affordable clean energy, energy security, and initiatives to help combat climate change and make America more energy independent.

I will give you a very good example up in Rhode Island. We have the first offshore wind field in the United States off of Block Island. It was built and provided up to 300 workers—union workers mostly—with good jobs. It will continue to help employ people as it is maintained. It has provided us, the whole region, with an example of where to go. And now, you have significant wind farms that are being proposed in Federal waters off of Massachusetts and off of Long Island. This will bring energy without pollution. That is something that will benefit all of us, both in our pocketbook and in our well-being.

This is really a historic investment. And the savings will pay off for families and the planet month after month, year after year. It is something that we owe the next generation because right now, we are prepared to hand off to the sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters a world that is environmentally challenged, to say the least. And they will look back on us and say: You had an opportunity, and you failed.

We cannot fail.

Now, a report by nonprofit group Rewiring America found that the tax incentives included as a part of the \$369 billion dedicated to climate change initiatives in the bill would save the average household \$1,800 per year on energy costs. This will incentivize the use of heat pumps, the use of solar panels—a much more practical and cost-saving energy tool than what is available today.

The Inflation Reduction Act also sets up America to out-innovate and out-compete other countries and strengthens domestic clean energy manufacturing and reinforces our supply chain, making America more energy independent and self-reliant.

I want to make the important point that under the Budget Act, this bill must be paid for. And rather than cut Medicare or Social Security as some of

my colleagues on the other side like to suggest, this bill strikes a blow for fairness when it comes to our Tax Code. It sends a signal to the middle class that wealthy individuals who wish to avoid taxes will no longer be able to easily evade taxes because we are enforcing the auditing mechanisms at the IRS so that the laws are followed more scrupulously, and that will result in benefits to all of us.

It sends a signal to working families that the 150 most profitable companies will pay a minimum tax of 15 percent rather than zero, as is sometimes the case. It is not fair for a multi-billion dollar company to game the tax system to avoid any payment, while a truck driver or a custodian is paying 20 percent of their income to taxes—or even more.

It sends a signal that private equity and hedge fund managers who claim their income is carried interest will have to step up and pay more. Indeed, as the President stressed, this bill is written so that no family that makes under \$400,000 will see their taxes go up. That is what the President promised, and that is what this legislation will do.

So no one should be out making the claim that this hurts the middle class and the tax cuts will be paid for by them. In fact, it increases the taxpayers in our system. And any examination of our present system shows it is grossly unfair.

I will end with the words of the five former Treasury Secretaries, including one appointed by former President George W. Bush, who all agree that the Inflation Reduction Act will, in their words, “help increase American competitiveness, address our climate crisis, lower costs for families, and fight inflation—and should be passed immediately by Congress.”

Let me also quote over 120 leading economists who shared a similar message, writing: “This historic legislation makes crucial investments in energy, health care, and shoring up the nation's tax system. These investments will fight inflation and lower costs for American families while setting the stage for strong, stable and broadly-shared long-term economic growth.”

This isn't a partisan issue for economists, and it shouldn't be a partisan issue in Congress. The bottom line is that Congress has an opportunity to help lower prices for consumers and invest in scalable new energy technologies and solutions that will strengthen our economy and make the U.S. and the planet more secure, more prosperous, and more resilient.

We must seize the moment. The time to act is now. Generations from now, they will look back at this moment and ask the question: Did we stand up for them, for this country, for the planet, and for the future, or did we fail?

I urge us all to stand up and succeed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3012

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, before the COVID-19 pandemic, few people other than scientists and national security experts were familiar with gain-of-function research. Now, as we continue to search for the origin of this pandemic and begin to learn more about the dangerous research that has been largely kept from the public eye, it is becoming a household phrase.

Before we get started on the current state of play, I would like to give a brief history of this research and how the Federal Government has poorly, perhaps even negligently, approached its oversight and funding.

In late 2011, over a decade ago, the NSABB, which is the NIH's advisory board, stopped two scientists from publishing an avian influenza gain-of-function study. Why? Because they were afraid that this study would educate bioterrorists. That is right. In 2011, a decade ago, scientists had figured out how to make H5N1—a highly pathogenic avian influenza—more contagious, which would have been catastrophic for American agriculture.

Dr. Fauci personally called both scientists and convinced them to volunteer to pause their experiments. In early 2012, Dr. Fauci encouraged all influenza scientists to voluntarily pause influenza gain-of-function research and told them:

It is essential we respect the concern of the public domestically or globally, and not ask them to take the word of the influenza scientist.

Dr. Fauci was obviously concerned about the public's perception out there. Dr. Fauci also, almost prophetically, stated that he worried about "unregulated" laboratories, perhaps outside of the United States, doing work "sloppily" and leading to an inadvertent pandemic. "Accidental release is what the world is really worried about."

In 2014, after several biosecurity accidents in U.S. research labs, the Obama White House implemented the gain-of-function moratorium on influenza, as well as MERS and SARS research, because of the potential risk of lab accidents and inherent gain-of-function danger. These two moratoriums clearly demonstrate that the U.S. Government and the NIH, our primary public health Agency, understood the risk associated with this research and understood the threats it posed.

Despite this pause, though, certain viral gain-of-function research projects continued at the University of North Carolina, research that was later shared with a Chinese virologist named Dr. Shi, the Bat Lady. She was famous for her copious amounts of research conducted on coronaviruses that live in bats.

Outside of the North Carolina studies, Dr. Fauci failed to heed his own call on U.S. scientists to pause their gain-of-function studies and offshored the paused research to China not just once and not just recently but practically continuously for over a decade. It is disturbing that one of our top public health Agencies directed this risky research to be offshored while encouraging the pause on that exact same research here in the United States.

In 2012, Dr. Fauci gave a new grant to Peter Daszak's EcoHealth Alliance, a company that America will soon know the name of all across America. He gave a new grant to Peter Daszak's EcoHealth Alliance for avian influenza research in China, which was truly gain-of-function research.

In 2014, Dr. Fauci gave another new grant, another gain-of-function grant, to Dr. Daszak and EcoHealth for SARS research in China. Through these grants, Peter Daszak partnered with the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

In late 2017, the NIH announced a lift on the gain-of-function pause, apparently without consultation with the Senate-confirmed State Department or with national security leadership. Significantly, there was no Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy in place, with only an Acting HHS Secretary at the helm. The NIH essentially lifted the moratorium on their own by slipping it in between administrations and self-policing.

Today, we can't see the research records from Dr. Fauci's offshored projects because the Chinese Communist Party has the possession—or at least supposedly has the possession—of EcoHealth's records, and the NIH resists in sharing theirs.

By all accounts, Dr. Fauci and EcoHealth's research in China led to the COVID-19 pandemic and Dr. Fauci's worst fears that a lab accident in a foreign lab would become a reality.

At a very important hearing yesterday at the Capitol, hosted by Senator PAUL, before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight, Dr. Richard Ebright, a renowned microbiologist, declared that it was indeed possible that this research did lead to the outbreak of COVID-19.

Dr. Steven Quay and Dr. Kevin Esvelt, other expert witnesses on the panel, agreed that viral gain-of-function offers no civilian use or benefit. Let me say that again. Both of these doctors agreed that viral gain-of-function offers no civilian use or benefit but that it is so risky that it can cause a pandemic that will have a worse impact than a nuclear attack. It is indeed a weapon of mass destruction.

Despite warnings and past lab accidents, our public health Agencies, like the NIH, continue to fund this weapon-of-mass-destruction research, often in China nonetheless. In fact, at one point, the NIH paid for more viral gain-of-function experiments than the De-

partment of Defense, according to hearing testimony given by Dr. Fauci on this topic in 2012.

Shockingly, Congress has minimal insight into the amount of research that the NIH performs. There is no transparency in the risk evaluation process, and there is no proper oversight.

Recently—and this is news—our office learned that the USAID is currently paying \$125 million to the Washington State University Paul Allen School for Global Health to collect potential pandemic pathogens in high-risk areas for outbreak. Once collected, these samples are being used in dangerous gain-of-function experiments through their DEEP VZN grant. This project initially partnered with five countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, but it could expand to others.

The university researchers are collecting, storing, and experimenting on these pathogens in foreign laboratories in each country. Even worse, these hazardous research techniques are being taught to foreign researchers while experimenting with potentially deadly pathogens in laboratories where the United States has no regulatory control or authority. No process exists to screen U.S. researchers or foreign researchers by intelligence analysts for their potential as threat actors. The United States has no ability to control who the technology or the deadly pathogens are shared with in these foreign labs and cannot enforce proper storage techniques.

The USAID is putting everyone at risk right now. Our U.S. public health Agencies, like the NIH and the CDC, cannot be entrusted to oversee risky research with the current guardrails that are self-selecting and self-policing. Certainly, our U.S. Agency for International Development cannot be entrusted. Yet Federal Agencies continue to dispense funds for gain-of-function research.

Dr. Fauci recently came before Congress and publicly declared that he had no intention to stop using U.S. taxpayer dollars to fund Chinese Communist Party research projects.

Folks, this is a national security issue. Since January of 2020, I have been trying to sound the alarm on this virus—on this issue, on this weapon of mass destruction—but it is largely falling on deaf ears in Congress and with the current administration. Yesterday's HSGAC hearing was the first time Congress had examined this subject since the outbreak of COVID-19. Unfortunately, none of my colleagues from across the aisle bothered to show up for this hearing, clearly declaring that this was not a priority for them. Additionally, mainstream media has attempted to bury concerns about gain-of-function research and the possibility of a lab leak.

This is unacceptable. We must pause this research until national security experts can help create appropriate risk metrics, guardrails, and processes for this research.

It is important to note that it is estimated that this research only comprises less than 0.1 percent of all biomedical research and less than 1 percent of virology research. Dr. Richard Ebright testified that because gain-of-function research of concern can cause pandemics, this small part of the biomedical research enterprise is highly consequential and requires effective oversight. Certainly, that current oversight is not effective.

This is a bipartisan national security issue. And anyone who studies this issue in depth will conclude that viral gain of function is a weapon of mass destruction.

Anyone who examines this will conclude that COVID is like a nuclear hand grenade, with its pin pulled out. It has already killed a million people and can kill millions more. Every witness will conclude, like we did yesterday, that the potential is much worse than any type of benefit from this research.

This COVID virus is likely a product of U.S.-funded gain-of-function research. The research has produced no benefit in 10 years and with seemingly no benefit on the horizon.

This is why I brought my legislation to the floor today to place a moratorium on all Federal research projects, grants to universities and other organizations conducting gain-of-function research and risky research on potential pandemic pathogens. This is an urgent matter that must be acted on today.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 3012, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, earlier this year, when we passed the PREVENT Pandemics Act out of our HELP Committee in an overwhelming bipartisan vote, we were able to include amendments from my colleague from Kansas and others to bolster oversight of the federally funded research involving pathogens of pandemic potential and make sure that we do have appropriate guardrails in place.

I appreciate the leadership my colleague from Kansas has shown on this issue. I know it is important to him. However, I am concerned this new bill brought forward today is far less targeted than the provisions the Senator from Kansas and I worked on within PREVENT and would have significant and unintended consequences for U.S. biomedical research.

Instead of passing this bill, I would respectfully ask my colleague from

Kansas to keep working with me and Ranking Member BURR to get his related provision and the rest of our PREVENT Pandemics Act across the finish line.

I thank the Senator from Kansas for his work and his focus on this issue. I really think we can continue to make bipartisan progress in the next few weeks on getting the PREVENT Pandemics Act and the Senator's provision he and I worked on into a good place and finally getting that much needed package signed into law.

For those reasons, I object today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4778

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague for her kind comments. Certainly, the chairwoman has my commitment to continue to work with her on the PREVENT Pandemics Act as well.

But if my colleagues do not agree with placing a full moratorium on gain-of-function research, I ask for unanimous consent to adopt the SAFE Risky Research Act, which stops Federal funds from being used to conduct risky research with countries that threaten our democracy and public health.

We recently learned that USAID has been paying for this dangerous research in China. We know that this research is being conducted in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, but we don't yet know all the other countries where they fund this risky research.

What we do know is that, despite their relationship with the State Department, this funding is being dispensed by USAID without State Department security consultations, oblivious to the proliferation potential.

Federal Agencies that oversee national intelligence maintain lists of countries that may pose a risk or threat to national security. The Department of State, for example, maintains a list that includes Burma, the People's Republic of China, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and others.

This legislation is common sense. We shouldn't be collaborating on dangerous research with our adversaries.

I think it is obvious that all members of our committee agree with us. They support this bill and this legislation.

On March 15, the HELP Committee held a markup where this amendment—the same text that is in this bill—was unanimously adopted in the bipartisan PREVENT Pandemics Act. I appreciate Chairwoman MURRAY working so hard collaborating with us.

During the markup, she supported this, specifically stating that it threads the needle in terms of protecting biomedical research enterprise while taking steps to address some of the concerns she has heard from other committee members.

Given the inherent risk, NIH's unwillingness to fully cooperate with con-

gressional oversight, and Senate Democrats' objection to taking the needed step of placing a complete moratorium on gain-of-function research, we must at least pass this narrow approach today.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4778, which is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, I do appreciate the Senator from Kansas's focus and leadership on this issue.

I am glad we were able to work together to include a provision similar to this bill in our PREVENT Pandemics Act that we did pass out of the HELP Committee by an overwhelming vote earlier this year.

Along with Ranking Member BURR, we are very focused on getting the PREVENT Pandemics Act passed into law. These reforms are overdue and vital to keeping our families safe.

The Senator's provisions within that package, as well as many others, are really key to making sure that our country is prepared for future pandemics.

I do hope we can continue to work on this bill in a bipartisan way and get it passed and put into law shortly. So while I look forward to continuing to work with the Senator from Kansas on this issue within the PREVENT Pandemics Act package, if he is asking today for unanimous consent to pass it, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The Senator from Massachusetts.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, 12 years ago, the U.S. Congress was on the precipice of passing historic climate legislation—legislation that may not have been perfect but would have cut carbon pollution by 80 percent by the year 2050, and it would have set us on a path to a healthier, cleaner, safer world.

Unfortunately, despite that bill passing through the House of Representatives, a bill which Congressman Henry Waxman and I were able to craft and to move through the House of Representatives, even though the Senate and the Senate Democrats had a supermajority, that legislation was ultimately defeated by the same legislative body, the U.S. Senate, that I serve in today. In 2009, the U.S. Senate chose to do nothing rather than something substantial that would give us a fighting chance against this generational crisis, which is why we have spent the

last 12 years in the climate wilderness, with full-blown Republican obstructionism and no meaningful congressional action on climate justice all the while. That wilderness literally burns to the ground because of climate change.

In the intervening decade, we have suffered the consequences of climate inaction. Weather that used to be extreme is now the new normal, and that normal is deadly. Our addiction to fossil fuels has put communities at risk—worsening asthma, cancers, and disease in general—and has exposed working people to criminal price gouging from Big Oil and Big Gas.

Throughout this summer, the United States has experienced devastating heat waves, putting 100 million Americans under heat warnings across the country. People are dying in Kentucky. Children are dying in Kentucky as a result of the extreme rain and floods—rain that still hasn't stopped. Those are so-called 100-year floods. Well, now they are happening on a weekly basis—in Kentucky. Over and over again, communities throughout the United States are facing deadly wildfires, storms, and droughts, all of which have become more frequent and more severe over the last 12 years.

But instead of giving up after that missed opportunity more than a decade ago, we reengaged. We rebuilt and reenergized a stronger, smarter climate movement, one that expanded carbon calculators to include climate justice; one that swapped complicated carbon trading systems for direct funding for environmental justice communities in our country; and one that exchanged an environmental-above-all strategy for a 21st-century contract with communities, with the promise of climate justice, well-paid union jobs, and cuts to climate pollution so all of our children and grandchildren can thrive on a livable planet.

So let me be clear. The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 is not the Green New Deal that America wants and needs. I wish it were. But I have learned a hard truth throughout my years in Congress: Perfect ideas can only live on through imperfect legislation.

As the author of both the Green New Deal and the Waxman-Markey climate bill, I know we cannot wait another 12 years for billions of dollars in investment to fight the climate crisis. This is not the bill we wanted. It is not the bill I would have drafted. But we need a package now to fight for and resources to fight with.

This bill will not correct every economic injustice in our society or rectify the economic disparities between Big Oil billionaires and working families, but it starts a process that we absolutely need to level the playing field.

The Inflation Reduction Act makes sure that every billion-dollar corporation finally pays a higher tax rate than a preschool teacher. Last year, a preschool teacher in Massachusetts paid 8

percent of their average \$39,000 salary in Federal taxes. ExxonMobil paid only 2.8 percent of their \$9.3 billion U.S. earnings in Federal taxes. Chevron paid a mere 1.8 percent of their \$9.5 billion in U.S. earnings in Federal taxes in 2021. A kindergarten teacher in Massachusetts paid 8 percent on \$39,000 of income.

Who did more for America last year—all of our kindergarten teachers or the executives at ExxonMobil and Chevron? Who contributed more to our society?

That is our challenge right now to pass this legislation because the status quo is immoral. It is outrageous. And unless we pass this bill, that disparity is perfectly legal. They can evade their responsibility to contribute to solving the problem which they created: the climate crisis.

Right now, they are letting preschool teachers contribute more than they are to a problem that families across our country are suffering from. By passing the Inflation Reduction Act, we can make sure that Big Oil finally pays more in taxes than preschool teachers. We can take that revenue and reinvest it into clean energy and healthier communities.

This bill will not give the climate movement the trillions needed to confront the crises of systematic racism, economic inequality, a broken health system, and climate injustice. But thanks to our relentless fighting, this bill contains a historic \$60 billion in environmental justice investments.

Let me say that again: \$60 billion will be in this bill to begin the process of rectifying the problems for Black and Brown and indigenous communities all across our country who have always been the victims of climate change, of environmental injustice.

This has never happened before in any bill in U.S. history. It is in this bill, finally. Now, that is the message of the Green New Deal. That was something that was driving FOX News and the oil companies crazy when we said we have to rectify environmental injustice as well as part of the Green New Deal. It is in this bill. It is in this bill, \$60 billion. And that will begin to start righting the wrongs brought by polluters in our most vulnerable communities.

This could be a downpayment on clean air and safer communities everywhere, not just the suburbs, which have always breathed cleaner air than inner-city communities because they don't plant these oil and gas and other facilities in the suburbs; they put them right next to what they believe are the least powerful communities in our country.

We know this bill will not get us to the critical mark of 50 percent emissions reductions, 2005 levels, by 2030, which is the baseline of what we need to meet our 2050 targets. However—however—this package gets us to 40 percent reductions economy-wide, and, more importantly, it puts our economy

on an emissions reductions trajectory that positions us to enact more clean energy and climate justice provisions in the future to meet the 50 percent goal. Securing these emissions reductions now is the start which we need, and we need it now.

This legislation reflects the largest single investment in climate justice and environmental protection in our Nation's history. And it meets the climate test. First, it reduces emissions, creates good-paying union jobs, and provides funding so that we can begin the long process of repairing historic harms in our environmental justice communities with that \$60 billion investment.

Second, the bill lowers energy costs for consumers. Price-gouging and tax-dodging big oil companies are charging Americans more than \$4 a gallon for gasoline, shaking money out of their pockets at the pumps all across our country. And what we are going to do is just point to the electric vehicle owners who pay an equivalent of 75 cents a gallon right now in our country in order to go the same distance. And we are going to open up this opportunity to tens of millions of additional Americans once we pass it.

The Inflation Reduction Act provides tax credits to low- and middle-income Americans so they can buy a new or a used EV, break their addiction to Big Oil, and save money on their daily commutes.

And, finally, the Inflation Reduction Act will make sure we make things in America again. The domestic manufacturing tax credits in this bill for the first time ensure that we will build electric vehicles, solar panels, wind turbines here in our own backyard, in the United States. American-made infrastructure means good-paying union jobs. And a new study released today shows that this bill will create—get ready—9 million new jobs in our country. That is what we are talking about. That is what we will be debating on the floor of the U.S. Senate over the next several days.

And I am especially proud of a provision I authored with Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL that would fund a national climate bank to ensure vulnerable American communities will have access to capital to invest in local clean energy projects and fuel a new generation of entrepreneurs from disadvantaged backgrounds.

How big is this program? Twenty-seven billion dollars and a climate bank that communities across the country can apply to at the lowest possible interest rates for their greening of their housing units, the greening of any other part of their community. And what McKinsey has estimated is that for every dollar that is in the bank, \$27 billion, it will unleash \$7 to \$10 of private sector investment—meaning we are looking at \$200 to \$300 billion that are going to get unleashed just in this section in that one program.

And critical Defense Production Act funding will ensure that we have robust domestic supply chains to install heat pumps in American buildings and responsibly source critical minerals for clean energy technologies made in America.

We have to break this whole addiction that we have not only to foreign oil coming into our country but also being dependent upon other countries for the clean energy technologies. We are going to do it here. That is what this bill says. We are going to tell people we don't need your oil any more than we need your sand. We are going to do it right here. We are going to build the technologies right here in our country.

So my time in Congress has taught me this: We cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Ending up with nothing might be a viable political option, but it is not a viable planetary option. This is a good bill with broad-based appeal that lowers costs for consumers, fights inflation with deficit reduction, protects our environment with critical justice investments, and provides affordable healthcare access to all Americans.

In 2009, zero was an option, which this Senate took. Zero is not an option we can take. We must pass this legislation. And we will begin a pathway for generations to come that says: We understood your anger. We understood why you as a younger generation believe that the system had failed you and that it had not provided the solutions which you deserve.

So let's pass this bill and keep fighting the cities and States and in the White House and in Congress so that we can finish the job in the years ahead, meet our climate targets, and finally pass the Green New Deal that our country deserves.

This is our moment. And the beauty of it is that there is a poetic justice in it. And it is that Chevron only paid 2.8 percent on their profits last year. ExxonMobil only paid 3 percent on their profits last year. They are the ones who are going to pay for the solutions to the problems which they created. They are going to be the source of the funding because we are going to force them to finally pay their taxes, to pay their fair share of the dues to live in this great country.

That moment of justice is arriving. And it is justice. They are the ones who should be paying for this. They are the ones who have a moral, political, and economic responsibility to pay for this bill. And they right now are screaming; they are absolutely angry that we are going to take this action. But I will tell you this. We are going to be forced to do it with no Republican support because the GOP now stands for "Gas and Oil Party." It now stands for "Gang of Polluters." That is the GOP of today. And they are going to say: Oh, my goodness, look at all the socialism that is going into this package for wind and solar and all-electric

vehicles and batteries. And you know what this young generation's response is? What do you call tax breaks for oil, gas, and coal for 100 years? If that is not socialism, what is? And all we are looking for is fair treatment for the renewable energy revolution because once we give them the same kinds of incentives, get out of the way because we are going to have that revolution that young people in our country have wanted for so long.

So it is all on us, the Democrats. It is our moment to deliver for the American people and guarantee the resources we need to keep fighting for the future we deserve.

And, by the way, after we have created those 9 million new jobs, that is forever going to be a new political constituency in our country. They are going to be saying to Senators who are going to vote no today: What are you doing? You are voting against my new job that has been created?

And so this is just the beginning. And we are going to telescope the timeframe ultimately in order to finish the job.

Yes, we are now in a sprint to solve the problem because every night on every TV station, the lead stories are: floods and fires and every other imaginable consequence of climate change. And it is time, the moment has arrived, and the U.S. Senate, with only Democratic support, is ready to take the action that the younger generation in our country has been ready for.

I thank you for giving me the opportunity of being here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wanted to come down here tonight to talk a little bit about the bill that we have in front of us this weekend, the Inflation Reduction Act. I have been in the Senate for 13 years, and I think this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have ever considered.

Let me just say, also, that the Presiding Officer and I have been here for a long time, and there have been weeks and weeks and weeks, months, years that have gone by here where it felt like we haven't gotten anything done.

What an amazing moment to be here when we have a bipartisan infrastructure bill that we passed with the biggest investment in our infrastructure since Eisenhower was President. We passed the first bipartisan bill to overcome the NRA just a few weeks ago. Last week, we were able to pass the CHIPS Act to bring back semiconductors to the U.S.A. and the PACT Act, the veterans bill last night.

Today, we are here to talk about the Inflation Reduction Act. It is quite an amazing moment in our democracy and, I think, in the country's history. It is not the subject of my speech tonight, but I want to say, with the Presiding Officer on the floor, that there might be a reason to think that we are

at a moment in our country's history when we are actually ready, finally, to turn the page on the trickle-down economics that have created such an unfair economy for so many families and so many young people in this country and create, once again, in the United States, an economy that, when it grows, it grows for everybody, not just the people at the very top.

This bill fits into that. The bill on infrastructure fits into that. The bill on the semiconductors fits into that, as well.

If you look at the agenda Washington has pursued for the last 40 years or so, it is pretty simple: Let the big corporations do whatever they want and call it "freedom"; cut investments in working families and our future; and instead of grappling with the income inequality we have, instead of grappling with the economic mobility that we have, cut taxes for the wealthiest people in the country, cut taxes for the largest corporations in the country, hoping that those tax cuts will somehow magically trickle down to everyone else and pay for themselves. That has never happened.

Here is what happened instead: 40 years of an economy that has worked really well for the wealthiest people and corporations but hasn't worked very well for anybody else; an economy with income inequality higher than at any time since the 1920s, where the top 0.1 percent of Americans, a mere 160,000 families, hold basically the same amount of wealth as the bottom 90 percent of Americans, nearly 145 million families—160,000 families, the top 0.1 percent, hold as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, 9 out of 10 Americans, nearly 145 million families—where kids—I am sad to say this in front of the kids here tonight—have a 50-50 shot of earning more than their parents, where that number used to be 90 percent; that charges families more for their healthcare than any other industrialized country in the world; that forces seniors in this country—and only in this country—to cut their pills in half or skip prescriptions or decide whether they are going to be able to eat or take their medicine; that is shackled to a global fossil fuel market dictated by tyrants like Vladimir Putin, despite our abundant resources at home and despite the urgent threat from climate change.

That is the legacy of the past 40 years of trickle-down economics. As I have said many, many times on this floor, we can't survive another 40 years like the last 40 years and expect to hold onto this democracy. I don't think we can survive another 10 years like this and expect to hold on to this democracy with this failed agenda.

Working families can't sustain it. Our democracy can't withstand it because, when people feel like they have lost the sense of opportunity for themselves and their families no matter how hard they work, that is when, you know, throughout human history,

somebody shows up. Some self-interested politician shows up and says: I alone can fix it. You don't need a democracy. You don't need the rule of law. You should expect your public sector and your private sector to be hopelessly corrupt, and you are a sucker if you don't believe that because people are going to take advantage of you.

We need a new agenda for America. I am pleased to say that we are closer, I think, tonight—this weekend—than we have been in a long time to pursuing one.

It started with the American Rescue Plan. It continued, as I said earlier, with the bipartisan infrastructure law we passed this year to rebuild our country and the bipartisan innovation bill that we passed last week to help us compete with China and bring thousands of good-paying jobs back home.

And, now, I hope we are close to passing the next part, the Inflation Reduction Act. This bill will lower costs for millions of families—at the pharmacy, at the pump, and on their monthly energy bills and insurance premiums. It will do more to achieve energy independence and fight climate change than anything that we have ever done as a nation.

And unlike the Trump tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, which added \$1.9 trillion to the debt, notwithstanding the arguments that we have heard going back to Ronald Reagan—the false arguments that we have heard going back to Ronald Reagan—that these tax cuts will pay for themselves. Once again, of course, they didn't pay for themselves. And unlike that, a \$1.9 trillion hole blasted into our deficit when unemployment was only at 3.5 percent. Every cent of that money was borrowed just for the privilege of giving tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. Fifty-two percent of that bill went to the top 5 percent of Americans. We borrowed every single cent to do that.

That would be no different than when the Presiding Officer was the mayor of Richmond, VA, and if he said to the people of Richmond: I have a really good idea for how we could spend a lot of money, but we are going to have to borrow money to do it.

And they said: Well, that sounds like a lot of money that you are borrowing. Tell us what you are spending it on. Are you using it for our roads and bridges?

No.

Are you using it for the parks?

No.

Are you using it for education, for mental health, which we desperately need in this country? Are you using it to transfer the local economy to greener energy?

No.

What are you using it for, Mr. Mayor, they would say.

And the answer is: I am going to borrow this massive amount of money, and I am going to give it to the two wealthiest neighborhoods in Richmond

and hope that it is just going to trickle down to everybody else.

I am not making it up. That is the theory. That is the policy. And that was the theory and the policy when Ronald Reagan was President. That was the theory and policy when Donald Trump was President.

And unlike those bills, every single cent in this bill is paid for. More than that, it cuts the deficit by over \$300 billion. If you listen to my Republican colleagues, at least some of them and the way they complain about this bill, you would think it was some sort of Bolshevik takeover of the U.S.A. It is ridiculous.

I think, sometimes, they just don't even want the public to know what is in this bill because what is in this bill is so popular with the American people.

Let's start with healthcare. For the first time ever, this bill requires Medicare to negotiate drug prices on behalf of the American people.

The Presiding Officer and I wrote a bill called Medicare-X. We introduced it, I think, in 2017, to create a public option so that everybody in America could have the benefit of choosing between their private insurance and public insurance. That is not in this bill. But in that bill, we said that Medicare ought to negotiate drug prices for seniors. This would allow Medicare to use its market power to drive down the costs of prescription drugs. That is going to save families thousands of dollars, and it is going to save our country billions of dollars.

The only reason we have not passed that is because special interests have succeeded at tying Medicare's hands so that pharmaceutical companies could keep charging Americans prices that no other developed nation in the world would tolerate—Americans like Julia from Denver. Her dad has a heart condition. He pays \$6,000 a month for medication. That is \$72,000 a year for something he needs to take for the rest of his life. That is outrageous, but I hear stories like that every day all over Colorado.

The Inflation Reduction Act also would cap out-of-pocket costs for seniors to \$2,000 a year so they aren't spending down their retirement to buy medication. I know seniors in Colorado who literally spend their entire retirement trying to figure out how to get the medication they need, the medication they have been prescribed by a doctor. The choices they have to make look unlike any other choices any senior has to make in any other country in the world.

I was with some people in Pueblo recently where one of the people said: I have three inhalers, but I can't afford the three inhalers. So I can only take one of them at a time, and I have been getting sicker and sicker as a result of that.

Another person in the room had worked her entire life at the local newspaper, and she was telling me that she was having to cut her medications

in order to make it through economically.

On top of that, this bill has a 3-year extension for tax credits to help millions of Americans pay for their health insurance, including over 150,000 Coloradans who are going to be able to afford their health insurance in ways they couldn't.

The second part of this bill closes tax loopholes for about 200 of the biggest corporations in America—those with over \$1 billion in profit. This comes directly from a bill that I wrote with Senator WARREN and with Senator KING. Today, these corporations use armies of lawyers and accountants that no middle-class family has, no working family has, no small business has to pay almost nothing in classes.

Last year, Chevron paid an effective rate of 1.8 percent. Bank of America paid 3.5 percent—3.5 percent. That is after the Trump tax cuts cut the corporate rate and took it down to, I think, it was 20 percent—which, by the way, there was no consensus to do. The consensus was at 25 percent. Here you have companies paying 1.8 percent, and 3.5 percent in the case of Bank of America. Amazon paid 6.1 percent. They might want to fire their CFO because they are paying a little more than the 1.8 and the 3.5. AT&T paid negative 4.1 percent. That means they got money back from the Treasury in tax credits.

In Colorado, a typical firefighter, teacher, or police officer has an effective tax rate of somewhere around 16 to 22 percent. So, on the one hand, you have working Americans paying 20 percent of their income in an economy that has barely lifted their incomes in 40 years, while billion-dollar corporations are paying virtually nothing.

I had a conversation the other day with a "Teacher of the Year" from Colorado. She is from Glenwood Springs. She said that she wasn't complaining, that she was just making an observation. She said 70 percent to 80 percent of her colleagues in the middle school in which she teaches and at the high school in Glenwood Springs have to work two and three jobs just so they can afford to live in Glenwood Springs.

Do we think it is all right for her to have to pay 22 percent of her income in taxes and the biggest corporations in America that are making more than \$1 billion in income don't have to at least pay 15 percent, much less the 20 percent gift that Donald Trump gave them when the number that everybody had basically agreed to was 25 percent? It is no wonder that Americans think this Tax Code is rigged against them.

We start to fix that problem with this bill. It is not everything that I would have wanted. I think we have a lot more to do to make this Tax Code fairer, not the least of which is to make permanent the expanded child tax credit that I worked on with SHERROD BROWN, CORY BOOKER, and KAMALA HARRIS; and the earned income tax credit that I worked on with

SHERROD BROWN to give working people the biggest tax cut they had in generations. That is one of the things that is not in this bill that I feel really terrible about.

This bill also is limiting something called the carried interest loophole. Most Americans have no idea what that is because 99.999999 percent of Americans are not hedge fund managers; they don't benefit from this loophole to lower their tax rate and pay less than their assistants or than their secretary.

That hasn't stopped my Republican colleagues from telling the American public that this bill would tax working people—that is what they are saying. And I guess that is true if by “working people” they mean hedge fund managers. Over half of them base their business in the Cayman Islands or billion dollar corporations. We are increasing their taxes—that is true—but there is nothing in this bill that is raising taxes on American families—nothing. Nothing.

It is amazing to me that people that I meet that simultaneously support the Trump tax cuts for the wealthiest people on the theory of trickle-down economics and are opposed to this bill on the theory that somehow the taxes that we are raising on, literally, the wealthiest humans in our country and the wealthiest corporations are somehow going to trickle down to people in the workplace. It is never going to happen. It never has.

The last part of this bill contains energy. And, first, I think it is important for us to have some context. It has been nearly 50 years since the 1973 oil crisis spurred America to seek “energy independence.”

It has been more than 30 years since NASA scientist James Hansen urged Congress to fight climate change, I think at a hearing held by my predecessor Tim Wirth. And until now we haven't had a plan, we have had no plan to accomplish either.

We haven't just stalled—in some cases, we have actually gone backward. At home, right now, our use of coal has increased during the Biden administration. Abroad, Germany has been forced to reactivate coal plants after Putin's attack on Ukraine, while other EU nations plan on rationing natural gas or turning on their coal plants.

Instead of leading the world with a coherent approach on these issues, Washington has been deadlocked in the same old, tired politics around climate and energy. And as usual, the American people have paid the price.

They have paid it at the pump with incomes that have barely budged in this economy. In Colorado, we have paid for it in homes incinerated by record wildfires, mountain passes washed out by mudslides, fields withering in extreme drought that nobody has seen for 800 years, the Colorado River in crisis, and a galloping fear that the American West will somehow be unrecognizable to our grandchildren.

When this deal fell apart 10 days ago or so, whenever it was, my heart was broken as a result of it, because I thought about what Colorado has been going through. And I thought about—I had to call and explain to my 22-year-old and 21-year-old and 17-year-old daughters that once again we had failed.

And their sense of disbelief, of incredulity—which, by the way, I think is shared with every single member of their generation in this country, whether they are Democrats or whether they are Republicans or independents or if they don't even know what political party they are in. How can you not deal with this? How can you place this burden on us?

And if we pass this bill, we are going to be able to look the next generation straight in the eye and say: We are actually living up to our responsibility to you, at least with respect to climate. And that fills me with joy. And that is the reason to support this bill and feel good about it.

We can't afford another 10 years of dysfunction on these issues. This transition should have started 25 years ago—25 years ago.

And in my opinion, we urgently need a plan, an energy policy that secures the energy our economy needs and relentlessly lowers climate pollution.

In other words, we need a plan for clean energy independence. And we can start by being honest about where we are; I think that is really important.

Today, 60 percent of our power generation comes from fossil fuel; only 20 percent comes from renewables. Over 90 percent—90 percent of our transportation relies on fossil fuels, and less than 3 percent uses electricity. Across the economy, 80 percent of primary energy consumption still comes from fossil fuel. Renewables are just 12 percent.

We have made some progress, but to hit our emissions targets, renewables have to scale from 12 percent today to at least 60 percent by 2050.

That is why, even under the most ambitious projections, some fossil fuels will likely remain in our energy mix for decades, even through 2050. Don't take my word for it; that is not me saying it. These projections are from the National Academy of Sciences, the International Energy Agency, and Princeton. And that is the reality that they confront us with.

So when I hear politicians and others whip up Twitter with promises to reject every permit for new infrastructure, they ignore this reality. And I worry that we cede the scientific high ground to critics of climate action, who then paint climate advocates as disconnected or deluded or even dangerous to the economy. And the only thing that wins is our fossil fuels. The only thing that wins is coal.

And I worry sometimes that these claims also repel the very Americans we need to support our energy transition. If our position in the short term is to oppose every new piece of infra-

structure, we are essentially forcing America to choose between scarcity and higher prices, to choose between either less energy or higher prices.

I was in Belgium and, with our colleague CHRIS COONS, met with the deputy prime minister there who said—we were on our way to Scotland for the climate conference, and he said: We have to meet these climate targets. We have to meet these climate targets in 2050.

And then he said: But I don't know how we are going to meet them and not lose the middle class.

And I said: What do you mean by that? And he said: I don't know how we are going to meet them and not have yellow vests break out all over Europe.

And we are seeing that now. We are seeing where Putin has cut off Russian oil and Russian gas because of his invasion of Ukraine—the challenges that it creates in democratic societies when it comes to energy. There is no country in the world better positioned on this question, better positioned to lead this transition to clean energy than the United States of America.

There is not a country in Europe; there is not a country in the Middle East. China is not better positioned than we are on this. We are the best positioned country in the world to lead this transition.

In fact, I think we are the only country in the world that can lead this transition—which, by the way, is why it was such a tragedy when it looked 10 days ago like this bill wasn't going anywhere, because then the rest of the world looks at us and says: Why should we do anything if the country that is most capable of being able to do this can't do it?

And what I want to assure you is that these outcomes of scarcity or higher prices, neither of those outcomes are going to support the broad and durable support that we need to be able to not just pass climate policy but keep it the law of the land and make sure that it lasts until the next generation of Americans can pick it up from us and say: Thank you for putting us in a decent position; we are going to finish the job.

And then if we can't pass this bill and we can't make progress on climate change, then what we have, instead, is our current policy, which is the status quo, which drives up prices, is bad for our national security, and is terrible at reducing emissions. That is where we are today. That is why coal is up, as I said, during the Biden administration.

For a successful transition, we have got to smooth the path with domestic energy production now to stabilize prices and bridge our way to a clean energy economy tomorrow. And to do that, we need every tool on the table.

This means deploying renewables like wind and solar, which my State has led in. We need to do it at record rates. We need to invest in next-generation technology from carbon capture to hydrogen to advanced nuclear.

That means we need to recognize the role that natural gas has played in our transition. Over the last 15 years, replacing coal with natural gas has accounted for 60 percent of our national carbon reductions, and that is really good. But we need to do a lot better because the time is ticking. And now we have the opportunity, because of this bill, to secure America's position as the global standard for production—modeled on our example in Colorado, where we passed the first law to capture fugitive methane when Senator HICKENLOOPER was our Governor—by driving down methane pollution and strengthening cleanup and monitoring across the supply chain.

The last thing we should accept is the leaking pipes that the status quo allows when we have tools available to do better.

And we can't accept the painful price shocks that the American people have to bear because of our lack of a coherent energy policy.

Fortunately, this bill lays the foundation for a responsible energy policy for the country, and it has the largest investment to fight climate change in the Nation's history. And it is full of proposals I have worked on for years, proposals to rapidly deploy clean energy and to provide industry the long-term certainty it needs, to boost American manufacturing for wind and solar and batteries to power electric vehicles and our energy grid, to invest \$14 billion to help rural communities transition from fossil fuels, along with over \$25 billion for environmentally friendly farming, conservation, and forest health.

We also have an opportunity in this bill to address the drought that is ravaging the American West and to do it in a way that measurably improves the situation of the Colorado River Basin, reflects the interest of the people of my State and other States in the Upper Basin, and actually deals, finally, with the long-term causes of the crisis that we face.

When you add it all up, this bill would put us on track to reduce carbon pollution 40 percent by the end of the decade. That is light years ahead of where we would be without it.

But even if you don't care about climate change, you should still like this bill because it lowers costs for families. How does it do that?

By increasing the supply of American energy with a responsible approach while reducing demand for oil and gas by putting more renewables and electric vehicles on the market.

According to a recent study, this bill would reduce the average family's electricity bill by hundreds of dollars a year. From my perspective, as I said, this transition should have started 25 years ago, and we can't wait any longer. Now is the moment to act.

Russia's invasion of Ukraine should finally rid America and our allies of the delusion that we can continue to rely on foreign dictators for our energy

needs. It should remind us how foolish we have been to surrender the lifeblood of our economy to the whims of tyrants.

So nearly 50 years after the 1973 oil crisis, let's make this the year that we finally pass a coherent plan for America's energy independence. Let's finally organize our thinking and advance a plan that liberates us from foreign energy and tackles the threat of climate change head-on.

And while we are at it, let's reforge the engine of American manufacturing to produce the clean energy we need and to create thousands of good-paying jobs along the way.

Let's support our European allies by exporting cleaner American energy so they don't have to rely on coal or Russian gas to heat their homes through the winter.

There is no country in the world better prepared than the United States to lead this effort. And this bill will do more than anything we have ever done to strengthen our hand in this regard.

In another era, a proposal like this would have received 70 votes on the Senate floor. Every provision in here is a victory for common sense and a victory for the American people over special interests and the status quo.

Frankly, I don't know how many people can go home and say they voted against a balanced approach to achieve energy independence, fight climate change, and lower costs for families at this moment in our history.

I don't know how you would go home and say they voted to preserve tax loopholes for hedge fund managers and billion-dollar corporations that no American family can even imagine as they are paying the rates of taxation that they are paying or how they voted to let pharmaceutical companies continue to gouge the American people instead of letting Medicare negotiate on their behalf; how they voted against reducing our deficit by \$300 billion.

But that is the choice we have in front of us. To me, it is a choice that is obvious. We have got to pass this bill. We need to seize the moment to lower costs for the American people, to make our Tax Code a little fairer, to secure our energy independence, and spark a new era of clean energy manufacturing and innovation to support our allies and lead the world in a fight against climate change and, hopefully, hopefully, leave something a little bit better for the next generation of Americans.

I thank my colleague from New Jersey for his patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was happy to listen to my colleague from Colorado's erudite exposition of what the opportunity is before us and what it means for the American people, and so I very much appreciate it.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH ROACHFORD

Mr. President, I come to the floor today for a very important reason. I

rise not to introduce a bill nor to ask my colleagues for unanimous consent. No.

I am here for one simple reason, and I want to make sure that the C-SPAN cameras are capturing this moment for posterity.

I come to the floor today to honor Keith Roachford, a member of my staff who has faithfully served the State of New Jersey, the U.S. Senate, and the United States of America for more than 35 years.

As you can see from Keith's face, it is clear that he had no idea this was happening. We told him he was coming for another reason, and I don't think we would have gotten him otherwise.

But, nonetheless, I rise today because, after 35 years and 18 Congresses, Keith is retiring from the Senate, and as result, I wanted to come to the floor to send him off with a tribute befitting his legendary career.

A native son of Willingboro, NJ, Keith has served not one, not two but four U.S. Senators for the Garden State. He is the very definition of institutional knowledge, and countless fellow staff members can attest to his experience, which has saved the day on more than one occasion.

Keith has sometimes said that he has been here so long he came with the furniture. It is a classic Keith line, a glimpse not only into his sense of humor but also his view of how staff work behind the scenes gets things done.

Now, that may be the case, but today, Keith, I rise to shine a spotlight on your illustrious career.

To start, I would like to share some of the stories that his colleagues have sent me:

Keith has not only been a mentor to me, he's also been a friend to anyone lucky enough to come into contact with him.

When I think of Keith, the words that come to mind are helpful, generous, thoughtful—a patient and understanding team player.

Another one said:

He is so kind to everyone, from interns to the Chief of Staff, and is always—always—willing to share his knowledge with others.

So it brings me immense joy to speak these words into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that, like Keith's legacy, they may stand the test of time.

But beyond his accolades, beyond his track record and sterling reputation, Keith, at heart, is a humble man. I know it isn't easy for him to be sitting here, listening to me shower praise on him, but to that I say: Well, you are still on the payroll so you will have to bear with it.

But above all, Keith is a family man, a devoted husband to his wife Sandy and an incredible father to his beloved children, Rick, Daniel, and Lauren.

He is a man that every day for the last 36 years has braved the brutal beltway traffic to come into work in the Hart Senate Office Building. And he is a man that every weekend has made a similar trip with his family to attend

services at St. George's Episcopal Church here in DC.

Keith credits his faith for guiding him throughout his life, and he would be the first to tell you that it has been a moral compass for him, season after political season. But as the Book of James asks, "What good is someone who says they have faith but does not have works?"

Fret not. In addition to his duties as senior warden of the Vestry at St. George's, Keith takes the time to give back to his community. He is a member of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew. He serves as the secretary of the convention of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, and he is a Boy Scout leader.

At every opportunity, he goes out of his way to give back. It is a trait he learned growing up. As the son and grandson of public servants, Keith was taught from an early age that service to others is the highest calling.

His grandfather was a transit operator for the city of New York, while his father, a veteran of the U.S. Army and the New Jersey Army National Guard, worked for the sanitation department for 37 years. It is no surprise, then, that Keith has followed in their footsteps. He is a throwback to a previous era, one where individuals spent years, if not decades, working for the same organization.

I know Keith never intended to spend 36 years working in the Senate. He used to joke with colleagues that he came to Washington fresh out of the college just to try it out. But in the process, he has gone from working as a constituent liaison, to mail director, to deputy chief of staff, and so much more.

Today, Keith is an indispensable resource for our legislative staff. He is our go-to person for appropriations, defense, veterans' issues, homeland security, and the budget.

He has had a hand in passing countless initiatives for our office, from supporting community development financial institutions to shoring up supply chains and expanding senior housing, to inserting provisions in the PACT Act—that is how we got him here, telling him that is what we were going to talk about—that addresses the needs of veterans suffering from Gulf war illness.

Keith has had a hand in far too many legislative wins to count, but suffice to say, the legend of Keith Roachford has led to what we call "the Roachford Rule," which is simple: With every appropriations letter I sign on to, with every bill I cosponsor, for something to pass the Roachford Rule, it needs to have a tangible benefit for New Jersey families.

Much like the man it is named after, the Roachford Rule is about connecting what we do here in DC to the people whose lives it affects back home.

Long after Keith has left the Senate, his rule will live on, a testament to his relentless pursuit of good government,

a trademark for a public servant devoted to the common good, a namesake that all of us in this Chamber would do well to emulate.

I will end with this: Last March, I came to this floor to rebuke the words that a colleague used in reference to the January 6 attack. I won't use the time to rehash what I said; instead, I will use this time to once again lift up the bravery and the courage of the man who compelled me to act.

Late one night, Keith sent me an email that outlined the pain and the outrage he felt after reading our colleague's comments. In personal terms, he relayed how his entire life he has had to endure—in overt and covert ways—the harmful legacy of racism and the stain of White supremacy.

Knowing Keith, it could not have been easy to type that message to his boss, a sitting U.S. Senator.

But as I said in that speech, there comes a time when you either ruffle some feathers and speak the truth or you fail to do justice to the values you hold dear.

The U.S. Senate is a better institution, and I am certainly a better Senator, for having Keith Roachford work in these Halls. He is man of principle, a man of God, a man who has put every ounce of his being into the work that New Jerseyans have sent us here to do.

He is the first person to tell you that he is not perfect, the first to say that he has certainly seen it all over 36 long years of service, but, by God, I cannot help but feel so thankful, so grateful that we have been blessed with his presence. He is a calm and steady hand that has helped guide our office since 2006.

He is the quiet one, the one who keeps his powder dry and plays the long game; the one who never loses sight of the ultimate goal, which is to improve the lives of hard-working American families.

John Madison, one of the Framers of our Constitution, once said:

If men were angels, no government would be needed.

I have never met an angel, but I have worked alongside Keith Roachford for 16 of those 36 years. He has served with me longer than any other of the U.S. Senators he has worked with. And it is why I can truthfully say without pause or equivocation that Keith Roachford is truly doing God's work here on Earth.

When Keith first mentioned to me that he was thinking of leaving, he said the most incredible thing. He said:

You know, Senator, it's just that with the pandemic and with work from home, I've just gotten to spend more time with Sandy and the kids.

We don't want to wait any longer to get started.

We make breakfast and we take walks. . . .

I just don't want to wait any longer to do that.

That is Keith in a nutshell. That is who he is. So I want to congratulate Keith on an incredible 36 years of Sen-

ate service. We are going to miss you, certainly so. But to you, to Sandy, and to your three children, we wish you all the best on a well-deserved retirement.

Thank you, Keith.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 967, 994, 1094, 1095, 1104, 1126, 1127, 1128, 891, 892, 893, 1114, 1123, and 1069 through 1077; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified 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 Nasser H. Paydar, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education; David Applegate, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey; Susie Feliz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Donald R. Cravins, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Minority Business Development (New Position); Jaime Areizaga-Soto, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals for a term of six years; Kathryn Wheelbarger, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years; Michael K. Singh, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years; Jonathan Wingate Burks, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years; Edward Gabriel, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years; Nathalie Rayes, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years; Mary Green Swig, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years; Yohannes Abraham, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Shirley Sachi Sagawa, of Maryland, to be a

Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2024; Carlos Felipe Uriarte, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General; Carlton W. Reeves, of Mississippi, to be Chair of the United States Sentencing Commission; Carlton W. Reeves, of Mississippi, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2027; Laura E. Mate, of Iowa, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2027; Claire McCusker Murray, of Maryland, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2025; Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2025; Claria Horn Boom, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2023; John Gleeson, of New York, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2023; and Candice C. Wong, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2027 en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 984, 1052, 1061, 1062, 1064, 1111, 1115, 1116, 1117, and 1118; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Michael C. Gonzales, 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 Zambia; Timmy T. Davis, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Qatar; Dean R. Thompson, 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 Nepal; Richard Lee Buangan, 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 Mongolia; Marie C.

Damour, of Virginia, 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 Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu; Robert F. Godec, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand; Jonathan Henick, of Virginia, 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 Uzbekistan; Angela Price Aggeler, of the District of Columbia, 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 North Macedonia; Gautam A. Rana, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Slovak Republic; and Daniel N. Rosenblum, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kazakhstan, en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, introduced earlier today: S. Res. 744, S. Res. 745, and S. Res. 746.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AMENDING TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO ELIMINATE THE REQUIREMENT TO SPECIFY AN EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF A TRANSFER OF POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO A DEPENDENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3606 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3606) to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement to specify an effective period of a transfer of Post-9/11 educational assistance to a dependent, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

The bill (S. 3606) was passed as follows:

S. 3006

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT TO SPECIFY AN EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF A TRANSFER OF POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO A DEPENDENT.

Section 3319(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "and" and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (3).

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

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

ENSURING THE BEST SCHOOLS FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of

S. 4458 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4458) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the process by which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines whether an educational institution meets requirements relating to the percentage of students who receive educational assistance furnished by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

The bill (S. 4458) was passed as follows:

S. 4458

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ensuring the Best Schools for Veterans Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION WHO RECEIVE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 3680A of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(d)(1) The Secretary shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any course for any period during which the Secretary finds that more than 85 percent of the students enrolled in the course are having all or part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or by the Department of Veterans Affairs under this title or under chapter 1606 of title 10, except with respect to tuition, fees, or other charges that are paid under a payment plan at an educational institution that the Secretary determines has a history of offering payment plans that are completed not later than 180 days after the end of the applicable term, quarter, or semester.

“(2) The Secretary may waive the requirements of paragraph (1), in whole or in part, if the Secretary determines, pursuant to regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe, it to be in the interest of the eligible veteran and the Federal Government.

“(3)(A) The Secretary shall establish a process by which an educational institution may request a review of a determination that the educational institution does not meet the requirements of paragraph (1).

“(B) An educational institution that requests a review under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall request the review not later than 30 days after the start of the term, quarter, or semester for which the determination described in subparagraph (A) applies; and

“(ii) may include any information that the educational institution believes the Depart-

ment should have taken into account when making the determination, including with respect to any mitigating circumstances.

“(C) The Under Secretary of Benefits shall issue an initial decision for each review requested under subparagraph (A) by not later than 30 days after the date of the request, to the extent feasible.

“(D) An educational institution may request the Secretary to review the decision by the Under Secretary under subparagraph (C). The Secretary shall review each decision so requested and, pursuant to such review, shall issue a final decision sustaining, modifying, or overturning the decision by the Under Secretary.

“(E) The Secretary shall carry out this paragraph without regard to any review process carried out by the Secretary under chapter 51 of this title.

“(4) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any course offered by an educational institution if—

“(A) the majority of courses offered by the educational institution are approved under section 3672 or 3675 of this title; and

“(B) the total number of veterans and persons receiving assistance under this title or under chapter 1606 of title 10 who are enrolled in such institution equals 35 percent or less of the total student enrollment at such institution (computed separately for the main campus and any branch or extension of such institution).

“(5)(A) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any course offered by an educational institution if—

“(i) the majority of courses offered by the educational institution are approved under section 3676 of this title; and

“(ii) the total number of veterans and persons receiving assistance under this title or under chapter 1606 of title 10 who are enrolled in such institution equals 35 percent or less of the total student enrollment at such institution (computed separately for the main campus and any branch or extension of such institution).

“(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), on a case by case basis, the Secretary may apply paragraph (1) with respect to any course otherwise covered by such subparagraph if the Secretary has reason to believe that the enrollment of veterans and persons described in clause (ii) of such subparagraph may be in excess of 85 percent of the total student enrollment in such course.

“(6) The Secretary shall ensure that an educational institution that meets the requirements of paragraph (4) or (5) submits information to the Secretary on a biennial basis to verify meeting such requirements. During such biennial period in which an educational institution is covered by such verification, the Secretary may not require the educational institution to submit information with respect to meeting the requirements of paragraph (1).

“(7) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the enrollment of a veteran—

“(A) in a program of education for which fewer than 10 students are having all or part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or by the Department of Veterans Affairs under this title or under chapter 1606 of title 10;

“(B) in a course offered pursuant to section 3019, 3034(a)(3), 3234, or 3241(a)(2) of this title;

“(C) in a farm cooperative training course; or

“(D) in a course described in subsection (g).”

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, commencing on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letter in the RECORD.

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

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN2189, the nomination of Rachel Bloomekatz, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, having been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee, with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

(1) on the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed, 10 ayes to 10 noes; and

In accordance with section 3, paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote, and ask that this notice be printed in the RECORD pursuant to the resolution.

DICK DURBIN.

THRIFTY FLOOD PLAN

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letter from the Government Accountability Office, GAO, be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY
OFFICE,
Washington, DC.

DECISION

Matter of: United States Department of Agriculture—Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to the 2021 Updates to the Thrifty Food Plan

File: B-33732

Date: July 28, 2022

DIGEST

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) issued a document entitled Thrifty Food Plan, 2021 (2021 TFP). The 2021 TFP updates the market baskets used to determine the value of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits to purchase food from retail stores.

The Congressional Review Act (CRA) requires that before a rule can take effect, an agency must submit the rule to both the House of Representatives and the Senate as well as the Comptroller General, and provides procedures for congressional review where Congress may disapprove of rules. We conclude the 2021 TFP meets the definition of a rule under the CRA and no CRA exception applies. Therefore, the 2021 TFP is subject to the requirement that it be submitted to Congress.

DECISION

On August 16, 2021, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) issued a

document entitled Thrifty Food Plan, 2021 (2021 TFP). USDA, Thrifty Food Plan, 2021 (August 2021), available at <https://FNS.usda.gov/TFP> (last visited Jul. 12, 2022). We received a request for a decision as to whether the 2021 TFP is a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act (CRA). Letter from Senator Tillis to the Comptroller General (Oct. 27, 2021). For the reasons discussed below, we conclude that the 2021 TFP is a rule and thus subject to the submission requirement of CRA.

Our practice when rendering decisions is to contact the relevant agencies to obtain their legal views on the subject of the request. GAO, Procedures and Practices for Legal Decisions and Opinions, GAO-06-1064SP (Washington, D.C.: Sept. 2006), available at <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-06-1064sp>. Accordingly, we reached out to USDA to obtain the agency's legal views. Letter from Managing Associate General Counsel, GAO, to General Counsel, USDA (Dec. 15, 2021). We received USDA's response on February 11, 2022. Letter from Associate General Counsel, USDA, to Managing Associate General Counsel, GAO (Feb. 11, 2022) (Response Letter).

BACKGROUND

Thrifty Food Plan

The Thrifty Food Plan is defined by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 as a diet required to feed a family of four persons. See 7 U.S.C. 2012(u). The Act uses the cost of this diet as the basis for allotments to households regardless of their actual size. Id. These allotments take the form of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits to purchase food from retail stores. See 7 U.S.C. §2013. In order for a household to qualify for SNAP benefits its gross income cannot exceed the poverty line. See 7 U.S.C. §2014(c).

The 2018 Farm Bill amended the Thrifty Food Plan to require USDA to “re-evaluate and publish the market baskets of the thrifty food plan based on current food prices, food composition data, consumption patterns, and dietary guidance” by 2022 and at 5-year intervals thereafter. Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (2018 Farm Bill), Pub. L. No. 115-334, title IV, §4002, 132 Stat. 4490, 4624 (Dec. 20, 2018). On August 16, 2021, USDA published the 2021 TFP. USDA, Thrifty Food Plan, 2021 (August 2021), available at <https://FNS.usda.gov/TFP> (last visited Jul. 12, 2022). The 2021 TFP is the USDA update to the TFP market baskets required by the 2018 Farm Bill.

The 2021 TFP describes the approach and methods used in reevaluating the Thrifty Food Plan. Prior to the 2021 reevaluation, the market basket prices were last updated in 2006. 2021 TFP at 30. The result of the 2021 reevaluation is that the monthly cost of a market basket for the reference family of four is \$835.57. 2021 TFP at 34. This represents an increase of \$145.19 (in 2021 dollars) from the previous market basket price. See id. at 34-35. The changes to the maximum SNAP benefit allotments based on the 2021 TFP were effective beginning October 1, 2021. 2021 TFP at 51.

The Congressional Review Act

CRA, enacted in 1996 to strengthen congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, requires federal agencies to submit a report on each new rule to both houses of Congress and to the Comptroller General for review before a rule can take effect. 5 U.S.C. §801(a)(1)(A). The report must contain a copy of the rule, “a concise general statement relating to the rule,” and the rule's proposed effective date. Id. An agency can find for good cause that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest and the rule will then

take effect at a time the agency determines. 5 U.S.C. §808(2). Each house of Congress is to provide the report on the rule to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction. 5 U.S.C. §801(a)(1)(C). CRA allows Congress to review and disapprove rules issued by federal agencies for a period of 60 days using special procedures. See 5 U.S.C. §802. If a resolution of disapproval is enacted, then the new rule has no force or effect. 5 U.S.C. §801(b)(1).

CRA adopts the definition of rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. §551(4), which states that a rule is “the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency.” 5 U.S.C. §804(3). CRA excludes three categories of rules from coverage: (1) rules of particular applicability; (2) rules relating to agency management or personnel; and (3) rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. Id.

USDA did not submit a CRA report to Congress or the Comptroller General on the 2021 TFP. In its response to us, USDA stated the 2021 TFP was not subject to CRA because it was not a rule within the meaning of the APA or CRA. Response Letter, at 3-4. USDA also stated that it met the good cause exception under the CRA, and, thus, was not subject to the CRA's submission requirements. See id. at 7-8. For the reasons explained below, we conclude that the 2021 TFP is a rule under the CRA, does not meet any of the exceptions that would exclude the rule from coverage, and is, therefore, subject to the submission requirement of CRA.

ANALYSIS

To determine whether the 2021 TFP is a rule subject to review under CRA, we first address whether the 2021 TFP meets the APA definition of a rule. As explained below, we conclude that it does. The next step, then, is to determine whether any of the CRA exceptions apply. We conclude that they do not.

The 2021 TFP meets the APA definition of a rule upon which the CRA relies. First, the 2021 TFP is an agency statement as it was issued by USDA to update market basket prices that were last revised in 2006. See 2021 TFP at 1. Second, the 2021 TFP is of future effect, as it provides guidance for new market basket prices on which SNAP benefits will be based going forward, effective October 1, 2021. Id. at 51. See B-316048, Apr. 17, 2008 (finding that an agency action was of future effect because the action was prospective in nature since it was concerned with policy considerations for the future rather than the evaluation of past or present conduct). Finally, the 2021 TFP is designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy as it implements the new market baskets as required by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the 2018 Farm Bill. 2021 TFP at 4-6.

In its Response Letter, USDA asserts the 2021 TFP is exempt from the APA's rule making provisions because it relates to agency management and benefits, and, consequently, it is not a rule. Response Letter at 4. We disagree with this rationale. Specifically, USDA notes that the APA requires notice and comment for all rules “except to the extent that there is involved . . . a matter relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts.” [Emphasis removed.] Response Letter, at 4 (quoting 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2)). USDA argues that “evaluating market baskets based on current food prices is a matter relating to ‘agency management’ of [] SNAP

and relates to SNAP ‘benefits.’” Response Letter, at 4. However, the language USDA cites in 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2) pertains to an exception to the APA's rule making process, not to the definition of a rule. Even assuming the 2021 TFP is exempt from the APA's notice and comment requirement, that does not mean it is not a rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. 551(4). See B-323772, Sept. 4, 2012 (noting the CRA is intended to include within its purview, almost all rules that an agency issues, not only those that must be promulgated according to the APA's notice and comment requirements). It should also be noted that 7 U.S.C. §2013(c) specifically directs USDA to promulgate regulations related to SNAP “in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 553 of title 5.” As discussed, the 2021 TFP is an agency statement of future effect designed to implement policy, and, therefore, meets the definition of a rule.

USDA contends that Congress did not require the 2021 TFP to be issued as a rule because Congress did not specifically require the 2021 TFP to be subject to CRA. Response Letter, at 5. We disagree with this interpretation of CRA. We conduct our analysis under CRA which requires all rules to follow the procedures outlined in 5 U.S.C. §801. All rules are subject to the procedures required by CRA, whether or not Congress specifically requires it, before they can take effect. 5 U.S.C. §801.

USDA also argues that Congress had constructive notice that the 2021 TFP would increase SNAP benefits and, as a result, USDA was not required to provide formal CRA notice to Congress. Response Letter, at 5-7. However, constructive notice is not an exception to CRA notice procedures. As discussed above, CRA is a method of congressional oversight of agency rulemaking. CRA requires agencies to submit a report to Congress about the rule. 5 U.S.C. §801(a)(1)(A). The submission of this report initiates the congressional review process which can lead to Congress disapproving a rule. 5 U.S.C. §801(b)(1). It is the report that triggers the CRA review process. As a result, constructive notice of a rule is not the same as submitting a formal report as required by CRA. While there are exceptions for waiving a delay in the effective date of a rule, 5 U.S.C. §808, there are no exceptions for submitting a report.

Having concluded that the 2021 TFP meets the APA definition of a rule, we now turn to whether any of the three CRA exceptions apply. We also address USDA's argument that the good cause exception provides an exemption from the CRA's submission requirement. As explained below, we conclude they do not.

First, the 2021 TFP is not a rule of particular applicability. Rules of particular applicability are addressed to specific, identified entities. See Administrative Conference of the United States, Miscellaneous Statements, 39 Fed. Reg. 4846, 4849 (Feb. 7, 1974) (explaining that a rule of general applicability is one with an open class but a rule of particular applicability is limited to those named). The 2021 TFP applies to all families whose income falls below the poverty line and is not addressed to specific, identified entities. Therefore, it is a rule of general applicability and not a rule of particular applicability.

Second, this is not a rule relating to agency management or personnel. A rule relates to agency management or personnel if it applies to agency employees and not to outside parties. See e.g. B-31324, Oct. 22, 2019 (determining that 5 U.S.C. §804(3)(b) does not apply when the rule deals with actions a bank should take and not agency management or personnel). The 2021 TFP deals with the

amount of SNAP benefits for qualifying families and, the market basket costs in the 2021 TFP apply broadly to the contiguous 48 states and the District of Columbia.

Finally, the 2021 TFP substantially impacts the rights of non-agency parties because it has an effect on qualifying families by granting increased benefit allotments designed for them to obtain a more nutritious diet.

USDA contends the 2021 TFP meets the good cause exception under the CRA, and, therefore, USDA was not required to follow the CRA's submission requirements. Response Letter, at 7-8. In its response USDA stated that good cause existed to issue the 2021 TFP with an effective date in August 2021. *Id.* at 8. USDA further stated that this excepted it from carrying out formal CRA notice before the effective date. *Id.* While CRA does not provide an emergency exception from its procedural requirements to submit rules for congressional review, CRA and APA address an agency's need to take emergency action without delay. Agencies can waive the required delay in effective date requirement when an agency for "good cause" finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure are "impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." 5 U.S.C §§553(b), 808(2). Therefore, an agency can provide for a rule to take effect immediately while still complying with the agency's statutory obligation to submit the rule to Congress for review. Asserting a good cause exception does not serve to waive the CRA's submission requirements all together. Notably, the 2021 TFP did not incorporate a finding or statement of the reasons why there is good cause for an exception to the CRA's procedural rules to submit the 2021 TFP for congressional review, nor did the 2021 TFP include an immediate effective date. Therefore, USDA did not properly apply the good cause exception.

Thus, we conclude that none of the three exceptions that would exclude the rule from CRA coverage, or the good cause exception apply, and the 2021 TFP is subject to the submission requirement of CRA.

CONCLUSION

The 2021 TFP is a rule for purposes of CRA because it meets the APA definition of a rule and no CRA exception applies. Therefore, even if exempt from the APA notice-and-comment requirements, the 2021 TFP is subject to the CRA requirement that it be submitted to Congress before it can take effect.

EDDA EMMANUELLI PEREZ,

General Counsel.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES BOLLICH

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, James Bollich was born on April 15, 1921, in Mowata, LA. As a young man, he joined the U.S. Army Air Corps and participated in Louisiana maneuvers in 1941.

In 1942, he was deployed to the Philippines, and 18 days after his arrival, Congress voted to enter World War II. Mr. Bollich served as an infantryman on the island of Luzon and fought valiantly during the Battle of Bataan. He was captured by Imperial Japanese forces and was forced to endure the Bataan Death March. Mr. Bollich later spent more than 3 years as a prisoner of war in Mukden, Manchuria. On August 15, 1945, his 24th birthday, Mr. Bollich and his fellow survivors were freed by the Russian Army.

After the war, Mr. Bollich transitioned into civilian life, and attended college at the University of Southwest Louisiana. He and his wife Celia raised their family in Lafayette, LA, and worked as an exploration geologist until his retirement in 1986. He was the author of several books including "A Soldier's Story," where he detailed his time as a serviceman and a prisoner of war.

Mr. Bollich received many commendations during his military service including the Purple Heart, Bronze Star medal, Prisoner of War medal, WWII Victory medal, Presidential Unit citation with two oakleaf clusters, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific medal with 2 bronze stars, Army Good Conduct medal, American Defense medal with one bronze star, Philippine Presidents badge, Philippine Defense medal, Philippine Liberation medal, and the Philippine Independence medal.

In one of our Nation's darkest times, James Bollich answered the call and served this country with esteem and dignity. Mr. Bollich was an American hero and should be honored as such.

TRIBUTE TO DREW TROJANOWSKI

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the service and career of Mr. Drew Trojanowski, an Army veteran of Phoenix, AZ. He, with honor and courage, has dedicated his life to service to our great Nation and continues to work to ensure veterans are connected with their communities and needed resources.

Drew had many accomplishments while serving in the U.S. Army from 2006 to 2015. He was a sniper, achieved the rank of staff sergeant, and deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan to support the Global War on Terrorism. He also served as a combat adviser to foreign militaries while coaching them on operations, tactics, intelligence, and civil affairs. Drew concluded his military career serving in the Arizona Army National Guard, where he aided in developing long-range plans for the Joint Counter Narco-Terrorism Task Force.

In 2015, while searching for a way to continue service after returning from Afghanistan, Drew became active in the veteran space and the Mesa Chamber of Commerce. After identifying a void between the business and veteran communities, he established the Mesa Veterans Program and Mesa Industry and Defense Council. This consortium has grown to more than 70 aerospace and defense companies.

In 2016, Mr. Trojanowski started working with U.S. Senator John McCain as a military and veteran advocate. As an advocate, he traveled throughout Arizona, learning about veterans and their service and the challenges they face post-service. He was also the primary contact for Department of Defense installations, personnel, and industry throughout Arizona.

In December 2016, Senator McCain asked Mr. Trojanowski to be his military legislative assistant and senior policy adviser. In that role, he was at the forefront of advocating for reform, resources, funding, and benefits that our military and veterans earned and deserve.

During his time with Senator McCain, Mr. Trojanowski helped author and champion the passage of significant legislation impacting American servicemembers, their families, and veterans. Drew worked on the VA MISSION Act, numerous National Defense Authorization Acts, the VA Appeals Modernization Act, the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act—also known as the Forever G.I. Bill—and the Veteran Overmedication and Prevention Act. These bipartisan bills, all of which were signed into law, serve as examples of Drew's dedication and leadership in the military and veteran community.

In 2018, Mr. Trojanowski joined the White House as a Presidential Commissioned Officer and Special Assistant to the President on the Domestic Policy Council. In this role, he oversaw the Departments of Veteran Affairs, Defense, NASA, and Labor. During his tenure, Mr. Trojanowski was the policy lead on three Executive orders and 56 regulations, including the implementation of the MISSION Act that strengthened the nationwide VA healthcare system by empowering veterans with more healthcare options and the PREVENTS initiative, a national strategy for preventing veteran suicide.

I am honored to recognize Mr. Drew Trojanowski's outstanding military service and continued service to our military, veterans, and their families. As Mr. Trojanowski begins a new chapter, I do not doubt that he will continue to be a voice for all those who serve.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE EL DORADO HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize and congratulate the El Dorado Historic District Commission on being named the 2022 Commission of the Year by the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions.

Described as an oil "boom-town" of the 1920s, the city of El Dorado is a community transformed by historic preservation. The El Dorado Historic District Commission, established in 1984, works to protect, enhance and improve districts of distinctive character, historic interest, and value to promote the health, prosperity, safety, and welfare of the city.

In 2020, the city of El Dorado and its Historic District Commission released a citywide historic preservation plan drafted by the Lakota Group, an Illinois-based urban planning and design

firm. Upon working with the community of El Dorado and seeing the commission's efforts to preserve the city's history and heritage, the Lakota Group nominated the city's commission for the Commission of the Year award.

The commission received the award in July 2022, recognizing its outstanding achievement, hard work, and diligence in preserving this historic city in south Arkansas.

I congratulate the El Dorado Historic District Commission on this notable award, and I am excited to see how it continues working to preserve the neighborhoods, businesses, landmarks, and other establishments that embody the rich history of the community.●

RECOGNIZING LARRY'S MINI MART

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize Larry's Mini Mart of Whitley City, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

When Larry Sumner founded Larry's Somerset Oil in 1973, he had no idea it would grow into the family business that it is today. Larry got his start in business when he opened his service station in Whitley City. It was there in McCreary County that Larry's children watched their father run a business that bolstered their home-town community. As the Sumner children grew older, they learned firsthand what it meant to devote one's energy to their customers, so it was only natural that they inherited their father's entrepreneurial nature. Thus, Larry Sumner's business continues operating today in the exact location he moved to in 1976, with the Sumner children at the helm of operations.

Today Larry's Mini Mart, as it is now called, is Whitley City's one stop shop for full-service gas, kerosene, and diesel. Unlike the days of old, most people nowadays pump their own gas and rarely interact with the folks working at their local gas stations. That is not the case for Larry's Mini Mart, as they carry on the tradition of pumping gas for their customers, always doing it with a smile. Larry's is also the local stop where folks can drop in to pick up cold drinks, snacks, ice, and anything else they might need whether in a hurry or just for an afternoon excursion. Larry's Mini Mart even goes beyond what a typical service station offers by renting out their extra storage space to their loyal customers.

When the late Larry Sumner first opened his business back in the 1970's, he wanted to create a place that was more than the average filling station. He understood that offering quality service and a wide variety of conveniences would make his store a success, but his dream went beyond those of profits. Larry Sumner's goal was to

create a place that would foster community within the town of Whitley City.

When Larry Sumner's son Mark and daughter Marlo took over the business in 1998 following their father's death, they stayed true to his mission. Today, as it has always been, Larry's Mini Mart is a place where locals can come to catch up on the latest news in the county, whether that news travels through the local paper or word-of-mouth. As is often the case with small towns, sometimes it takes a trip down to Larry's just to hear about the goings-on about town, and the late Larry Sumner would not have it any other way.

Larry's has often been recognized for the quality service they provide to their community. Most recently in 2020, Larry's Mini Mart received McCreary County Chamber of Commerce Business of the Month. They have also won McCreary County Business of the Year numerous times due to the charitable spirit of the owners and staff. Throughout their years of operation, Larry's Mini Mart has supported local school systems and all their various sporting activities. Larry's has become a well-known for hosting car wash fundraisers for various causes within their community. Larry's Mini Mart has also contributed to the Banquet of Blessings, a McCreary County tradition that provides a free Christmas meal to anyone in need. Larry's has also contributed to the local chapter of Relay for Life, a cancer awareness nonprofit. Moreover, the public library, the local chapter of Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the McCreary County Chamber of Commerce, right down to the McCreary County Little League baseball team, have all seen support from the fine folks at Larry's Mini Mart.

Larry's Mini Mart is known not only for their quality service and charitable spirit, but they also maintain their reputation for being a fantastic place to work. Currently, Mark Sumner and his wife Stephanie operate Larry's with the help of their daughter Taylor and their son Tyler. This family affair fosters a friendly environment, so much so that two of Larry's Mini Mart employees have worked for the business for over 40 years. That type of longevity clearly shows that Larry's is not your average service station. Larry's Mini Mart is a community institution that goes above and beyond to support their friends and neighbors, whether it be during or outside of their regular business hours. Congratulations to the Sumner family and entire team at Larry's Mini Mart. I look forward to seeing your continued growth and success in Kentucky.●

TRIBUTE TO CHLOE GRACE CRISSMAN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Chloe Grace Crissman, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for

all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Chloe is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending Southern Methodist University in Dallas, TX, where she is pursuing degrees in French and political science. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Chloe for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH HJELM

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Elizabeth Hjelm, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Elizabeth is a graduate of Viborg-Hurley High School in Viborg, SD. Currently, she is attending Wayne State College in Wayne, NE, where she is pursuing a degree in communications studies. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Elizabeth for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BAILEY LAMB

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Bailey Lamb, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Bailey is a graduate of South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, having earned a degree in global studies. Currently, she is attending Georgetown University Walsh School of Foreign Service in Washington, DC, where she is pursuing her master's in German and European studies. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Bailey for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET MEIERHENRY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Margaret Meierhenry, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Margaret is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of South Dakota in Vermillion, SD, where she is pursuing degrees in political science and musical arts. She is a

hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Margaret for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5093. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land in the State of Washington to Skamania County, Washington.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 1094(c)(5)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117-81), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker and Majority Leader of the Senate jointly appoint the following individual to the Afghanistan War Commission as co-chair: Ms. Shamila Chaudhary of Washington, DC.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 5093. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land in the State of Washington to Skamania County, Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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-4755. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Conforming Amendments Related to Temporary Entry of Business Persons Under the Agreement Between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada" (RIN1651-AB42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4756. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Annual Report for fiscal year 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4757. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Medford, OR" (MB Docket No. 21-155) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4758. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Petition for Rule-making—Railroad Consolidation Procedures—Exemption for Emergency Temporary Trackage Rights" ((RIN2140-AB54) (Docket No. EP 282)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4759. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA517) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4760. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA431) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4761. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA485) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4762. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA430) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4763. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Blackspotted and Rougheye Rockfish in the Central Aleutian Islands and Western Aleutian Islands Districts of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA415) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4764. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fishery by Non-Rockfish Program Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western and Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA913) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4765. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA414) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4766. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA529) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4767. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA528) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4768. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA601) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4769. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA586) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4770. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA553) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4771. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XA530) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4772. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason

Adjustment to the 2021 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts” (RIN0648-XA725) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4773. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XA676) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4774. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Arrowtooth Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XA669) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4775. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XA664) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4776. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pacific Island Fisheries; 2020 U.S. Territorial Longline Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; Correction” (RIN0648-XA647) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4777. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA602) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4778. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA774) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4779. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA759) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4780. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Ma-

rine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment of Groundfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands” (RIN0648-XA727) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4781. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA787) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4782. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA780) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4783. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA805) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4784. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA987) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4785. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XA999) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4786. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, nine legislative proposals relative to helping agencies recruit and retain a highly skilled federal workforce; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-175. A resolution from the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico expressing its firm support to congressional bill H.R. 7409, known as the “Territorial Relief Under Sustainable Tran-

sitions for Puerto Rico Act of 2022” (Trust for Puerto Rico Act of 2022), introduced by Congressman Ritchie Torres, that would amend the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) in order to facilitate the termination of the Financial Oversight Board after certification of a balanced budget for two consecutive fiscal years; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 764

Ove the past decades, Puerto Rico’s economic growth has experienced a deceleration that has resulted in the loss of competition in the private sector and a severe financial crisis in the governmental sector.

The Island’s economic recession began in 2006. However, it should be noted that the financial crisis precedes it, because previous government administrations issued debt amounting to billions of dollars to finance budget deficits, thus presenting to the Island the illusion of a balanced budget, as provided by our Constitution. It is worth noting that a \$45 billion debt was issued between 2000 and 2012. Approximately half of the money was used to finance budget deficits and to defray the government’s payroll expense and spending.

We must remember that the financial crisis broke that started during the first decade of the 21st century led to the subsequent enactment of the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) and the creation of the Financial Oversight Board, hereinafter the “Board,” for the purpose of managing Puerto Rico’s finances.

Ever since PROMESA and the Board became effective in 2016, the government of Puerto Rico has maneuvered to meet the financial requirements imposed within this new reality. Under PROMESA, the territorial government must approve a balanced budget for four (4) consecutive fiscal years in order to require the termination of the Board. Given this scenario, it must be noted that, since the Board began operations, the first balanced budget was approved by the current Legislative Assembly for fiscal year 2021-2022.

In view of this context, and given the imposition of an antidemocratic body such as the Financial Oversight Board, Congressman Ritchie Torres started this initiative to amend PROMESA in order to reduce the required number of balanced budgets from four (4) to just two (2). Furthermore, this measure establishes that the Board shall be terminated 90 days after the certification of the second balanced budget. Thus, any ambiguity within the statute in effect regarding the Board’s termination is eliminated.

This House of Representatives believes that the bill introduced by Congressman Ritchie Torres (H.R. 7409, better known as “Trust for Puerto Rico Act of 2022”) provides a mechanism to restore power to the people of Puerto Rico, and consequently, to its democratically elected officials. Liberty and democracy are two pillars of our government and our goal must be to strengthen them; therefore, we are duty-bound to promote and support policies aimed at its attainment. It is time to raise our voices and join in any effort that seeks to restore the people of Puerto Rico’s control and power over its finances as soon as possible.

For all of the foregoing, this House of Representatives expresses its firm support to congressional bill H.R. 7409, known as the “Territorial Relief Under Sustainable Transitions for Puerto Rico Act of 2022” (Trust for Puerto Rico Act of 2022), introduced by Congressman Ritchie Torres. This bill would amend the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act

(PROMESA) in order to facilitate the termination of the Financial Oversight Board after the certification of a balanced budget for two consecutive fiscal years.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico hereby expresses its firm support to congressional bill H.R. 7409, known as the “Territorial Relief Under Sustainable Transitions for Puerto Rico Act of 2022” (Trust for Puerto Rico Act of 2022), introduced by Congressman Ritchie Torres, that would amend the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) in order to facilitate the termination of the Financial Oversight Board after the certification of a balanced budget for two consecutive fiscal years.

Section 2.—A copy of this Resolution shall be translated into the English language and delivered to the President of the United States of America, Joseph R. Biden and the leadership of the United States Congress.

Section 3.—This Resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

POM-176. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the adoption of policies that will help lead to energy independence and lower energy costs in the United States, including ending the state's efforts to shut down Line 5; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 114

Whereas, Plentiful affordable energy is essential for the well-being of the American people. The lack of an adequate energy supply leads to higher prices, fewer jobs, and threats to public health and safety. It should be the policy of the government at every level to ensure that energy is available, accessible, reliable and as affordable as possible; and

Whereas, For decades, the United States has too greatly relied on sources of energy produced on the other side of the world. While the United States has enjoyed a higher degree of energy independence in the last decade due to an increase in domestic oil production, we still import tens of millions of barrels of foreign crude oil from overseas each month; and

Whereas, As a direct result of both federal and state policies and foreseeable world events, gas prices in the United States are rising at the fastest pace recorded since 2000. Not only are rising gas prices eating away at recent wage growth and increasing the risk of a recession, they also could have sweeping impacts for U.S. consumers as higher diesel prices raise the cost of shipping goods through already stressed supply chains, disproportionately affecting low-income families and citizens; and

Whereas, Enacting policies that will lead to energy independence is necessary for the safety and prosperity of the American people. Reliance on overseas oil has the potential to maximize the leverage of foreign producers. While the Biden Administration's efforts to isolate and weaken Vladimir Putin have been welcome and necessary, our reliance on sources of energy originating on other continents creates a potential risk that those sources could be jeopardized by United States' actions abroad, which limit our ability to preserve and protect American values. Ensuring that the United States' economy can support itself without relying on supply chains that span the globe and without risk of foreign political disruptions is critical to job growth and competition in the United States; and

Whereas, President Biden, United States Secretary of Energy Jennifer Granholm,

Governor Whitmer, Michigan Attorney General Nessel, and other elected officials have pursued policies that have harmed our ability to achieve energy independence, including the President's decision to halt the Keystone XL pipeline and the Governor's and Michigan Attorney General's attempts to shut down the Line 5 pipeline, a crucial source of energy for millions of Michiganders; and

Whereas, Protecting our environment is better accomplished with domestically produced fossil fuels, which are believed to be significantly cleaner than those found in other parts of the world; and

Whereas, The United States must focus on policies that increase the production of energy here at home, such as ensuring the continued safe operation of the Line 5 pipeline in Michigan, increasing domestic oil and gas drilling, increasing investments in renewable energy, and abandoning policies that limit domestic energy production and raise the capital costs associated with fossil fuel development; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the adoption of policies that will help lead to energy independence and lower energy costs in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Governor Whitmer and Michigan Attorney General Nessel to immediately cease their efforts to shut down the Line 5 pipeline and instead work proactively to lower energy costs for the residents of this state; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the Michigan Attorney General, the commissioners of the Michigan Public Service Commission, the commissioners of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy, the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the entire Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-177. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the adoption of policies that will help lead to energy independence and lower energy costs in the United States, including ending the state's efforts to shut down Line 5; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 250

Whereas, Plentiful affordable energy is essential for the well-being of the American people. The lack of an adequate energy supply leads to higher prices, fewer jobs, and threats to public health and safety. It should be the policy of the government at every level to ensure that energy is available, accessible, reliable and as affordable as possible; and

Whereas, For decades, the United States has too greatly relied on sources of energy produced on the other side of the world. While the United States has enjoyed a higher degree of energy independence in the last decade due to an increase in domestic oil production, we still import tens of millions of barrels of foreign crude oil from overseas each month; and

Whereas, As a direct result of both federal and state policies and foreseeable world events, gas prices in the United States are rising at the fastest pace recorded since 2000. Not only are rising gas prices eating away at recent wage growth and increasing the risk of a recession, they also could have sweeping impacts for U.S. consumers as higher diesel prices raise the cost of shipping goods through already stressed supply chains, disproportionately affecting low-income families and citizens; and

Whereas, Enacting policies that will lead to energy independence is necessary for the safety and prosperity of the American people. Reliance on overseas oil has the potential to maximize the leverage of foreign producers. While the Biden Administration's efforts to isolate and weaken Vladimir Putin have been welcome and necessary, our reliance on sources of energy originating on other continents creates a potential risk that those sources could be jeopardized by United States' actions abroad, which limit our ability to preserve and protect American values. Ensuring that the United States' economy can support itself without relying on supply chains that span the globe and without risk of foreign political disruptions is critical to job growth and competition in the United States; and

Whereas, President Biden, United States Secretary of Energy Jennifer Granholm, Governor Whitmer, Michigan Attorney General Nessel, and other elected officials have pursued policies that have harmed our ability to achieve energy independence, including the President's decision to halt the Keystone XL pipeline and the Governor's and Michigan Attorney General's attempts to shut down the Line 5 pipeline, a crucial source of energy for millions of Michiganders; and

Whereas, Protecting our environment is better accomplished with domestically produced fossil fuels, which are believed to be significantly cleaner than those found in other parts of the world; and

Whereas, The United States must focus on policies that increase the production of energy here at home, such as ensuring the continued safe operation of the Line 5 pipeline in Michigan, increasing domestic oil and gas drilling, increasing investments in renewable energy, and abandoning policies that limit domestic energy production and raise the capital costs associated with fossil fuel development; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the adoption of policies that will help lead to energy independence and lower energy costs in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Governor Whitmer and Michigan Attorney General Nessel to immediately cease their efforts to shut down the Line 5 pipeline and instead work proactively to lower energy costs for the residents of this state; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the Michigan Attorney General, the commissioners of the Michigan Public Service Commission, the commissioners of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy, the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the entire Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-178. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to pass the Good Samaritan Remediation of Abandoned Hardrock Mines Act to allow Good Samaritan groups to clean up abandoned mines in this country; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2008

Whereas, the United States has more than 140,000 abandoned hardrock mines, and more than 22,000 of these pose environmental hazards that threaten our land, water, fish and wildlife and the communities that depend on them; and

Whereas, the mining industry and the conservation community are highly motivated

to remedy the environmental challenges created by abandoned mines but are hindered by burdensome red tape and potential and significant liability risks; and

Whereas, numerous organizations have expressed a willingness to remediate the damage caused by these long-abandoned mines, but doing so would expose a “Good Samaritan” volunteer to legal liability for all the preexisting pollution from a mine despite having no previous involvement with it; and

Whereas, the bipartisan “Good Samaritan Remediation of Abandoned Hardrock Mines Act” has been introduced in Congress that would allow state agencies, local governments, nonprofit groups and corporations to clean up these abandoned mines, thereby helping to reduce pollution and improve water quality in and around the mining areas; and

Whereas, this important legislation creates a path forward for Good Samaritans to work unimpeded and increase the pace and scale of reclamation and, in so doing, create jobs and enhance our nation’s environment. Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring:

1. That the Members of the Legislature express their support for the United States Congress to pass the Good Samaritan Remediation of Abandoned Hardrock Mines Act to allow Good Samaritan groups to clean up abandoned mines in this country.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-179. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to expand the federal Family First Prevention Services Act by allowing flexibility in the use of Title IV-E funds to help children remain safely in their homes; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 262

Whereas, In the United States, nearly half a million children are in foster care. Michigan ranks 18th in the country for the number of children, per capita, placed in out-of-home care, with approximately 13,000 children in foster care or a residential placement on any given day; and

Whereas, Research shows that children in the foster system have the best outcomes when they are placed in a safe and stable environment that supports their long-term well-being. Instead of subjecting children to the trauma of being separated from their family and placed out of their home, more efforts are being made to provide struggling and overburdened families with the resources they need to create a stable and loving environment; and

Whereas, The Family First Prevention Services Act, signed into law in 2018, was enacted to help increase the number of children who can remain safely at home with their families. The law allows states to use federal funding available under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act to address some of the issues that contribute to family separation. Currently, the Family First Prevention Services Act allows funding for a narrow range of services, including substance use prevention and treatment, in-home parenting skills classes, and kinship navigator services. While these services are essential, there are many other areas in which families require assistance; and

Whereas, Poverty and homelessness, for example, have been shown to be associated with the separation of families, and many

studies have documented that children in families who experience homelessness frequently become separated from their parents. Poverty leads to housing instability and parents often struggle to provide for their children’s basic needs. Helping parents out of poverty and providing stable environments for children would allow more families to stay together, which would reduce the number of children that have to endure the foster care system; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the United States Congress to expand the federal Family First Prevention Services Act by allowing flexibility in the use of Title IV-E funds to help children remain safely in their homes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-180. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to enact legislation to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 129

Whereas, Children with disabilities deserve quality education to develop skills so they can fully participate in social, economic, and political life. Many of these children face significant barriers to education and are more likely to be out of school. Ensuring access to education is the best way to help children with disabilities realize their full potential; and

Whereas, Congress has established that equal access to education for students with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy by passing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In the Act, Congress states that disability is a natural part of the human experience, and the IDEA is meant to ensure equality of opportunity and economic self-sufficiency for all individuals with disabilities; and

Whereas, While the IDEA has resulted in increased access to education for millions of students, the Act remains dangerously underfunded. In the original 1975 legislation, Congress promised to cover 40 percent of the extra cost of special education services required by the Act. However, as of 2020, the federal government was covering only 14.6 percent of the cost, despite a 25 percent increase in the number of students served; and

Whereas, The IDEA Full Funding Act (S. 866) was introduced in 2019 to require that Congress fund the IDEA at the 40 percent level that was originally promised. Similar legislation needs to be introduced this session in order to ensure that the federal government is paying its fair share of the cost of special education services and to alleviate the financial burden on individual school districts; and

Whereas, Students and teachers suffer when Congress fails to live up to its funding commitment. School districts are forced to cover the costs with a scarcity of resources and must sometimes divert funds away from other programs that serve all students. In addition, schools have less funding for teacher salaries and classroom resources, making it more difficult to recruit and retain high-quality teachers; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act so children with disabilities have equal access to educational opportunity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United

States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-181. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri urging the President of the United States to designate a state funeral for the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from World War II; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 28

Whereas, World War II, the most widespread war in history, lasted from 1939 until 1945; and

Whereas, the United States entered the war in 1941, following an attack on Pearl Harbor by Japanese fighter planes; and

Whereas, over sixteen million Americans served their country and the Allied powers over the course of the war; and

Whereas, the generation of men and women who served our country in World War II has been called the “greatest generation” for their selfless sacrifice; and

Whereas, the Medal of Honor is the highest military decoration that is awarded by the United States government; and

Whereas, the Medal of Honor is presented by the President of the United States, in the name of Congress; and

Whereas, the Medal of Honor is only conferred upon members of the United States Armed Forces who distinguish themselves through conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty while engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, while engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force, or while serving with friendly forces engaged in an armed conflict against an opposing armed force in which the United States is not a belligerent party; and

Whereas, more than 3,400 Medals of Honor have been awarded to our nation’s bravest soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coast guardsmen since the creation of the award in 1861; and

Whereas, the Medal of Honor was awarded to 353 Americans during World War II; and

Whereas, only one of those 353 Americans is alive today; and

Whereas, Hershel Woodrow Williams of West Virginia served his country with conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life and therefore deserves the gratitude of the American people; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has the sole authority to designate a state funeral; and

Whereas, historically, the President of the United States has designated state funerals for former presidents, generals, and other extraordinary Americans; and

Whereas, our nation is currently divided and yearns for a unifying national event; and

Whereas, designating a state funeral when the last surviving World War II Medal of Honor recipient dies would be a wonderful way for the American people to unite and honor all sixteen million soldiers, sailors, and airmen who served in our Armed Forces from 1941 to 1945: Now therefore be it

Resolved, The members of the Missouri Senate, One Hundred First General Assembly, Second Regular Session, the House of Representatives concurring therein, hereby urge the President of the United States to designate a state funeral for the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to prepare a properly inscribed copy of this resolution for the President of the United States, the Vice President of the

United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, and all members of the Missouri congressional delegation.

POM-182. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to implement steps to forward fund the Higher Education Grant Program of the Bureau of Indian Education; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL NO. 1002

Whereas, the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) operates the Higher Education Grant Program ("Grant") as authorized by the Snyder Act (25 United States Code part 13); and

Whereas, numerous Indian tribal governments provide college financial assistance and scholarships from the Grant directly to Indian college students through Public Law 93-638 self-determination contracts (Indian Self Determination Act and Education Assistance Act) or through Public Law 103-413 self-governance compacts (Tribal Self Governance Act of 1994); and

Whereas, the federal government routinely operates under continuing resolutions and, as such, Grant funding is delayed. Consequently, college scholarship and financial assistance payments and institutional disbursements are delayed, which is problematic for many Indian college students who depend on these monies to pay for tuition, books and room and board; and

Whereas, there is precedent for forward funding federal Indian education programs, as BIE-funded schools, including Public Law 93-638 and Public Law 100-297 schools (25 United States Code section 2010) and tribally controlled colleges and universities (25 United States Code section 1810), are forward funded; and

Whereas, forward funding the BIE would make Grant monies available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year and would provide that Grant monies remain available until September 30 of the succeeding fiscal year. Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1. That the Members of the United States Congress take affirmative steps to forward fund the Higher Education Grant Program of the Bureau of Indian Education.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-183. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico expressing the support of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to S. 405, better known as the "Vieques Recovery and Redevelopment Act," introduced by the 117th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 591

Vieques is an island municipality Puerto Rico, measuring approximately twenty-one (21) miles long by four (4) miles wide, and located approximately eight (8) miles east of the main island of Puerto Rico

When discussing the history of Vieques and its difficulties, it is important to remember that the United States Navy maintained a constant presence in the eastern and western portions of Vieques for close to sixty (60) years. The United States Navy used large parts of the island and its beaches as a training range and for military exercises. Many of

these exercises were carried out using live ammunition. It is estimated that over eighty (80) million tons of ordnance and other weaponry available to the United States Armed Forces since World War II were dropped during that sixty (60)-year period.

The unintended, unknown, and unavoidable consequence of decades of military exercises was that generations of Vieques' residents, who are U.S. citizens, were exposed to the residue left and the waste produced by such weaponry and munitions, which includes heavy metals and other chemicals now known to harm human health and life.

As a result of the aforementioned and according to Government and independent documentation, the lands and waters of the island of Vieques contain high levels of heavy metals and have been exposed to chemical weapons and other toxic chemicals. Ever since the military exercises began in Vieques sixty-two (62) years ago, the island residents have suffered the effects of the long-term exposure to the contamination created by such exercises. In comparison to other Puerto Ricans, the residents of Vieques have experienced higher rates of certain diseases including cancer, cirrhosis, hypertension, diabetes, heavy metal diseases, as well as many unnamed and uncategorized illnesses. The continuous exposure to these toxic residues has resulted in the development of these particular illnesses in the U.S. citizens who reside in Vieques.

Prior to the passage of hurricane María in 2017, the Susana Centeno Family Health Center managed the health emergencies of the residents of Vieques. However, those residing or visiting Vieques would have to travel outside of the Island Municipality for most cases that required urgent medical care. This is due to the fact that the facility in Vieques lacked, among others, X-ray, CT scan, EKG, ultrasound, and PT scan equipment.

Maritime transport has been and remains the predominant means of transporting passengers between Vieques and the island of Puerto Rico. However, this service has been plagued by problems and interruptions which makes it unreliable for visitors and residents, and, for example, those who are cancer patients that require continuous treatment outside of Vieques, also known as the *Isla Nena*. It is worth noting that cancer patients who travel from Vieques to the Municipality of Ceiba have to pay between one hundred twenty dollars (\$120.00) and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) per trip.

Vieques, like all of Puerto Rico, suffered the onslaught of hurricane María in 2017. This was a particularly destructive hurricane that devastated Puerto Rico and Vieques and intensified the humanitarian crisis by destroying many of the existing medical-hospital facilities. In the case of Vieques, the previous medical system was already unable to properly handle the crisis that existed due to the toxic residue left on the island's soil and waters as a result of the military's activities. The Susana Centeno Family Health Center was closed after the passage of hurricane María due to the damage it suffered and was thus unable to render the few services it previously provided.

Consistent with the foregoing, it is worth stressing Vieques' need to have a medical facility with the capability of providing the critical and urgent care to its residents. It is a matter of quality of life and basic human rights. Due to legal restrictions, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is unable to provide a hospital where its capabilities exceed those of the previous facility, to wit, the facility that existed prior to the passage of hurricane María. Therefore, Vieques needs additional assistance and support to properly address and manage the vast health needs of its residents.

In 2012, the residents of Vieques were denied the ability to address their needs before the United States Courts due to the sovereign immunity of the Government of the United States. *Sánchez v. United States*, No. 3:09-cv-01260-DRD (D.P.R.). However, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit referred the issue to the United States Congress and urged it to address this humanitarian crisis. U.S. senators Robert Menendez (D-NJ) and Roger Wicker (R-Mississippi) have introduced S.405, popularly known as the "Vieques Recovery and Redevelopment Act." This Bill creates a compensation fund for the residents of Vieques or their heirs to claim compensation for the damages caused or resulting from the use of the island of Vieques for military training or exercises and for other related purposes. The compensation for individuals or their heirs shall fluctuate between fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) and one hundred ten thousand dollars (\$110,000) with the possibility for additional awards for special circumstances. The awards shall be determined by a Special Master to be appointed by the United States Attorney General pursuant to the qualifications and requirements established in the Act. Likewise, the Vieques Recovery and Redevelopment Act would authorize the municipal government of Vieques to file certain claims with the Special Master for the establishment or improvement of the health infrastructure or facilities on the island.

The Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico hereby requests to the Senate and the House Representatives of the United States the prompt approval of S.B. 405, the Vieques Recovery and Redevelopment Act. We appeal to the sense of responsibility of the Congresspersons and members of the United States Senate in order to do justice to the residents of Vieques and their heirs by providing a mechanism to help relieve a burden on their lives and compensate them for the damages caused by six (6) decades of military exercises in Vieques. Likewise, this legislation shall help future generations of Vieques' residents by streamlining the process so that the municipal government can procure enough resources for appropriate medical facilities and infrastructure.

The Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, on behalf of the residents of Vieques and the People of Puerto Rico appeals to the leadership of the United States Senate and the United States House Representatives and both parties to work together to ensure the approval of the Vieques Recovery and Redevelopment Act before the end of the 117th Congress.

Be it resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—We hereby express the support of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to S.B. 405, better known as the "Vieques Recovery and Redevelopment Act," introduced by the 117th Congress, to the Senate and the House Representatives of the United States.

Section 2.—We hereby urge the Senate and the House Representatives of the United States to promptly approve S.B. 405, better known as the "Vieques Recovery and Redevelopment Act," introduced by the 117th Congress.

Section 3.—A certified copy of this Resolution, translated into the English language, shall be delivered by the Secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to the President of the United States of America, to all members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, as well as to communications media for its effective dissemination.

Section 4.—This Resolution shall take effect upon its approval

POM-184. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia applying to the United States Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 31

Whereas, Executive orders by the President of the United States have become a vehicle through which the President may overstep the limits of his or her constitutional authority; and

Whereas, The concentration of power at the federal level has had the effect of making federal officials less responsive to the will of the people and more readily influenced by lobbyists, wealthy corporations and special interests in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas, Much of federal law is now enacted by federal bureaucrats who were never chosen by the people and have no accountability to the people whatsoever; and

Whereas, Policy decisions made at the state level tend to be more responsive to the needs and desires of the people; and

Whereas, The federal government has created a crushing national debt through improper and imprudent spending; and

Whereas, The federal government has invaded the legitimate roles of the states through the manipulative process of federal mandates, many of which are unfunded to a great extent; and

Whereas, The states have the ability to restore the responsiveness of government to the people and to restrain abuses of federal power by proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States through a limited convention of the states under Article V; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That the Legislature hereby applies to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates forward a copy of this resolution, legislative call and application to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate and to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and copies to the members of the said Senate and House of Delegates from this state; also to transmit copies hereof to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states, requesting their cooperation; and, be it further

Resolved, That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislature, of at least two thirds of the several states have made applications on the same subject; and, be it further

Resolved, The West Virginia Legislature adopts this application expressly subject to the following reservations, understandings, and declarations:

(1) An application to the Congress of the United States to call an amendment convention of the states pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution confers no power to Congress other than the power to

call such a convention. The power of Congress to exercise this ministerial duty consists solely of the authority to name a reasonable time and place for the initial meeting of a convention;

(2) Congress shall perform its ministerial duty of calling an amendment convention of the states only upon the receipt of applications for an amendment convention for the substantially same purpose as this application from two thirds of the legislatures of the several states;

(3) Congress does not have the power or authority to determine any rules for the governing of an amendment convention of the states called pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution. Congress does not have the power to set the number of delegates to be sent by any state to such a convention, nor does it have the power to name delegates to such a convention. The power to name delegates remains exclusively within the authority of the legislatures of the several states;

(4) By definition, an amendment convention of the states means that states shall vote on the basis of one state, one vote;

(5) A convention of the states convened pursuant to this application shall in limited to consideration of the topics specified herein and no other. This application is made with the express understanding that an amendment that in any way seeks to amend, modify, or repeal any provision of the Bill of Rights shall not be authorized for consideration at any stage. This application shall be void ab initio if ever used at any stage to consider any change to any provision of the Bill of Rights;

(6) Pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, Congress may determine whether proposed amendments shall be ratified by the legislatures of the several states or by special state ratification conventions. The West Virginia Legislature recommends that Congress select ratification by the legislatures of the several states; and

(7) The West Virginia Legislature may provide further instructions to its delegates and may recall its delegates at any time for a breach of a duty or a violation of the instructions provided; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House forward a copy of this resolution to the representatives and senators elected by the citizens of West Virginia serving the citizens of West Virginia in the Congress of the United States in Washington D.C.

POM-185. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri applying to the United States Congress, as provided by Article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, to call a convention limited to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States House of Representatives and to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 25

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States requires a convention to be called by the Congress of the United States for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution upon application of two-thirds of the Legislatures of the several states; and

Whereas, The Legislature of the State of Missouri favors a proposal and ratification of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which shall set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States House of Rep-

resentatives and as a member of the United States Senate; and

Whereas, the Ninety-ninth General Assembly of Missouri, Second Regular Session, adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, which contained an application for an Article V Convention to propose an amendment identical to that proposed in this resolution, but provided that the application would expire five years after the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 40: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the members of the Missouri Senate, One Hundred First General Assembly, Second Regular Session, the House of Representatives concurring therein, hereby make an application to Congress, as provided by Article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, to call a convention limited to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States House of Representatives and to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That this application shall be considered as covering the same subject matter as the applications from other states to Congress to call a convention to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and the Senate of the United States; and this application shall be aggregated with same for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds of states necessary to require Congress to call a limited convention on this subject, but shall not be aggregated with any other applications on any other subject; and be it further

Resolved, That this application hereby repeals, rescinds, cancels, renders null and void, and supercedes the application to the Congress of the United States for a convention under Article V of the Constitution of the United States by this state in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 40 as adopted by the Ninety-ninth General Assembly, Second Regular Session; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to prepare a properly inscribed copy of this resolution for the President and Secretary of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker, Clerk, and Judiciary Committee Chairman of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and copies to each member of the Missouri Congressional delegation, and the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states, requesting their cooperation.

POM-186. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to reconcile the United States Innovation and Competition Act and the American COMPETES Act to expedite funding for semiconductor production and innovation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 141

Whereas, A semiconductor is a material that conducts electricity in variable ways, is used in computer chips, and is vital to the operation of thousands of electrical products, such as automobiles, computers, smartphones, gaming systems, and medical equipment; and

Whereas, The Semiconductor Industry Association asserts that the share of modern semiconductor manufacturing capacity located in the United States has decreased from 37 percent in 1990 to 12 percent today and that this decline is largely due to substantial manufacturing incentives offered by

foreign governments, which places the United States at a competitive disadvantage in attracting new construction of semiconductor manufacturing facilities; and

Whereas, In recent years, global semiconductor supply chain vulnerabilities have emerged, leading to market shortages of automobiles and other electronic devices; and

Whereas, These supply chain vulnerabilities have revealed our reliance on foreign manufacturing of essential technology and should be eliminated through government investment in semiconductor production and innovation, which would strengthen our market security; and

Whereas, On January 1, 2021, the federal Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors for America Act (CHIPS Act) was enacted as part of the FY 2021 National Defense Authorization Act; and

Whereas, The CHIPS Act creates federal incentives for investment in facilities and equipment used for semiconductor fabrication, assembly, testing, advanced packaging, and research and development for the purpose of protecting supply chains, ensuring long-term national security, and bolstering international economic competitiveness; and

Whereas, The effectiveness of the CHIPS Act relies on Congress fully funding the provisions of the law, including enacting an investment tax credit, to support semiconductor production and innovation in this country; and

Whereas, On July 8, 2021, the United States Senate passed the United States Innovation and Competition Act of 2021 (USICA), which included \$52 billion in federal investments for the CHIPS Act; and

Whereas, On February 4, 2022, the United States House of Representatives passed the America COMPETES Act of 2022 (COMPETES Act), which, like USICA, included \$52 billion in federal investments for the CHIPS Act; and

Whereas, The Senate, upon receiving the COMPETES Act from the House, substituted the bill with the USICA, and passed it on March 28, 2022; and

Whereas, Although the USICA substitute was sent back to the House of Representatives for a final vote, Congress intends to convene a conference committee to reconcile the differences between the COMPETES Act and the USICA in order to finalize the version of the bill that will be sent to the President for enactment; and

Whereas, Governor Murphy has voiced his support of the USICA and has encouraged Congress to expedite the reconciliation of the bill; and

Whereas, United States Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo specifically mentioned that the New Jersey Innovation and Technology Hub in New Brunswick, which will provide 550,000 square feet of space for medical learning, research, and innovation, would be a suitable potential site for semiconductor manufacturing; and

Whereas, New Jersey's Congressional delegation, who are integral in directing federal funds to this State, has also voiced support of the intent behind the COMPETES Act and the USICA; and

Whereas, New Jersey's economy would greatly benefit from federal investments in semiconductor manufacturing in this State and would strengthen the State's historical reputation as a leader in science and innovation; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House respectfully urges Congress to expedite the reconciliation of the COMPETES Act and the USICA to secure the country's supply chain, increase the country's global competitiveness, and establish

this State as a leader in semiconductor production and innovation through the resulting federal investments.

2. Copies of the resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of the Congressional delegation from the State of New Jersey.

POM-187. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of North Miami Beach, Florida calling on the Federal Government to reverse the decision to deport Haitian asylum seekers under Title 42 and immediately halt the deportation of Haitian immigrants, thereby allowing them to seek due process through our legal system to make claims for legal status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 91. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 810 South Pendleton Street in Easley, South Carolina, as the "Private First Class Barrett Lyle Austin Post Office Building".

H.R. 92. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 Johnson Street in Pickens, South Carolina, as the "Specialist Four Charles Johnson Post Office".

H.R. 700. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 303 East Mississippi Avenue in Elwood, Illinois, as the "Lawrence M. 'Larry' Walsh Sr. Post Office".

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1198. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and expand the Solid Start program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3508. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 West Main Street, in Honeoye Falls, New York, as the "CW4 Christian J. Koch Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 5271. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2245 Rosa L Parks Boulevard in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Thelma Harper Post Office Building".

H.R. 5809. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1801 Town and Country Drive in Norco, California, as the "Lance Corporal Kareem Nikoui Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 5900. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2016 East 1st Street in Los Angeles, California, as the "Marine Corps Reserve PVT Jacob Cruz Post Office".

H.R. 6386. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 West Schaumburg Road in Schaumburg, Illinois, as the "Veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 6614. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4744 Grand River Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Rosa Louise McCauley Parks Post Office Building".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Doris L. Pryor, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Maria del R. Antongiorgi-Jordan, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Gina R. Mendez-Miro, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Ana C. Reyes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Camille L. Velez-Rive, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Natalie K. Wight, of Oregon, to be United States Attorney for the District of Oregon 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 Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 4766. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the rules for approval by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of commercial driver education programs for purposes of veterans educational assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

S. 4767. A bill to close the digital divide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 4768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to tax excess profits of large oil and gas companies, to impose a tax on the repurchase of stock by large oil and gas companies, to end the use of the LIFO method of accounting by large oil and gas trades or businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 4769. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize and modernize the registered traveler program of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4770. A bill to prohibit any employee or contractor of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or the Department of Health and Human Services from transporting any alien across State lines for the purpose of procuring an abortion for such alien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 4771. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to provide for direct loans to Indian tribes and tribal energy development organizations for energy development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 4772. A bill to require institutions of higher education participating in Federal financial aid programs to pay a percentage of the cost of attendance for each enrolled full-time student, based on the endowment fund of the institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4773. A bill to combat illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing at its sources globally; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4774. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the ethanol waiver for Reid vapor pressure limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 4775. A bill to establish and authorize funding for a Border Patrol Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 4776. A bill to transfer funds for Energy Efficiency Improvements and Renewable Energy Improvements at Public School Facilities to the Attorney General to award grants to States to promote safety and security in schools; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 4777. A bill to permit the Miami Nation of Indiana to apply for acknowledgement as a federally recognized Indian tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 4778. A bill to require limitations on research on potential pandemic pathogens of concern; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4779. A bill to extend the use of, and set forth priorities for, the International Space Station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4780. A bill to amend the definition of marine highway transportation to include the carriage by a documented vessel of cargo that is bulk, liquid, or loose cargo loaded in tanks, holds, hoppers, or on deck; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4781. A bill to require the designation of certain airports as ports of entry; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 4782. A bill to combat the fentanyl crisis; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 4783. A bill to require the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to carry out a pilot program on providing training to, validating, and deploying grief companions to facilitate bereavement care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 4784. A bill to modify the boundary of the Katahdin Woods and Waters National

Monument in the State of Maine, to improve public access to the National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

S.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services; 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. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. DAINES, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 744. A resolution recognizing the sailors and marines who gave their lives for ship and shipmates while fighting the devastating 1967 fire onboard the USS Forrestal and commemorating, during the week of the 55th anniversary of the tragic event, the efforts of the sailors and marines who survived the fire; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KING, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. KELLY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 745. A resolution designating August 16, 2022, as "National Airborne Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 746. A resolution designating August 2022 as "National Catfish Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. Res. 747. A resolution expressing the Senate's support for taking interim steps to strengthen the military interoperability and resiliency of the militaries of Finland and Sweden with respect to their anticipated accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 445

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend section 303(g) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)) to eliminate the separate registration requirement for dispensing narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V,

such as buprenorphine, for maintenance or detoxification treatment, and for other purposes.

S. 602

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1408, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 1472

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1472, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to update the Memorandum of Understanding on Spectrum Coordination, and for other purposes.

S. 1578

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a loan repayment program for mental health professionals to relieve workforce shortages, and for other purposes.

S. 2607

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2607, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the former hostages of the Iran Hostage Crisis of 1979–1981, highlighting their resilience throughout the unprecedented ordeal that they lived through and the national unity it produced, marking 4 decades since their 444 days in captivity, and recognizing their sacrifice to the United States.

S. 2720

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2720, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national clinical pathway for prostate cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 3845

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Georgia

(Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3845, a bill to require the United States Fire Administration to conduct on-site investigations of major fires, and for other purposes.

S. 3854

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3854, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for home and community based services for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, *supra*.

S. 3972

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 3972, a bill to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes.

S. 4069

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4069, a bill to amend the National Firearms Act to provide an exception for stabilizing braces, and for other purposes.

S. 4081

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4081, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a grant program to assist with the purchase, installation, and maintenance of point-of-entry and point-of-use drinking water quality improvement products, and for other purposes.

S. 4168

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4168, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to reauthorize the National Park Foundation.

S. 4203

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

S. 4293

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4293, a bill to prevent unfair and deceptive acts or practices and the dissemination of false information related to pharmacy benefit manage-

ment services for prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 4325

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4325, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 4429

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4429, a bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to support workers who are subject to an employment loss, and for other purposes.

S. 4477

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4477, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require agencies to include a list of outdated or duplicative reporting requirements in annual budget justifications, and for other purposes.

S. 4587

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4587, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Benjamin Berell Ferencz, in recognition of his service to the United States and international community during the post-World War II Nuremberg trials and life-long advocacy for international criminal justice and rule of law.

S. 4612

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4612, a bill to protect a person's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

S. 4723

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4723, a bill to ensure the right to provide reproductive health care services, and for other purposes.

S. 4741

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4741, a bill to encourage increased trade and investment between the United States and the countries in the Western Balkans, and for other purposes.

S. 4753

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 4753, a bill to allow the use of unspent educational funds under the American

Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to address pandemic learning loss through Child Opportunity Scholarships.

S. 4760

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4760, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide the Commodity Futures Trading Commission jurisdiction to oversee the spot digital commodity market, and for other purposes.

S. 4764

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4764, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve reproductive health care of individuals with disabilities.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 716

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 716, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Brittney Griner, a citizen of the United States, who was wrongfully detained by the Government of the Russian Federation in February 2022.

S. RES. 731

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 731, a resolution expressing support for the recognition of July 2022 as "Muslim-American Heritage Month" and celebrating the heritage and culture of Muslim Americans in the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 744—RECOGNIZING THE SAILORS AND MARINES WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES FOR SHIP AND SHIPMATES WHILE FIGHTING THE DEVASTATING 1967 FIRE ONBOARD THE USS FORRESTAL AND COMMEMORATING, DURING THE WEEK OF THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRAGIC EVENT, THE EFFORTS OF THE SAILORS AND MARINES WHO SURVIVED THE FIRE

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARREN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WICKER, and Ms.

BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 744

Whereas, in 1967, the ongoing naval bombing campaign against North Vietnam from Yankee Station in the Gulf of Tonkin was one of the most intense and sustained air attack operations in the history of the Navy;

Whereas, on June 6, 1967, the USS *Forrestal* and Carrier Air Wing 17 departed Norfolk, Virginia, for duty in the Western Pacific;

Whereas, on July 28, 1967, during an underway replenishment, the crew of the USS *Forrestal* were required to unload deteriorated bombs, which were more vulnerable to exploding at high temperatures;

Whereas, on July 29, 1967, the older ordnance were used to avoid canceling a planned strike mission over North Vietnam;

Whereas, despite safety precautions taken by the crew, on July 29, 1967, a devastating fire erupted on the USS *Forrestal* after—

(1) a malfunction in a parked aircraft caused the aircraft to fire a Zuni rocket that ruptured a fuel tank on another aircraft; and
(2) the burning fuel ignited a chain reaction of 9 bomb explosions on the flight deck;

Whereas the explosions destroyed multiple aircraft and tore massive holes in the armored flight deck of the USS *Forrestal*, and burning fuel dripped into the living quarters of the crew and the aircraft hangar below deck;

Whereas, for 18 hours, sailors and marines on the USS *Forrestal*, assisted by helicopters and crews from 8 other ships, fought to bring the fire under control while hospital corpsmen navigated the mangled flight deck and tended to the wounded; and

Whereas the fire onboard the USS *Forrestal* ultimately—

(1) left 134 men dead and 161 men injured;
(2) destroyed 21 aircraft; and
(3) caused the USS *Forrestal* to terminate its support to the fight in Vietnam and return to Norfolk, Virginia, for repairs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 55th anniversary of the fire onboard the USS *Forrestal*;

(2) recognizes the sailors and marines who gave their lives for ship and shipmates while fighting the devastating fire and commemorates the efforts of the sailors and marines who survived the fire;

(3) recognizes that—

(A) if not for the heroic actions of the crew of the USS *Forrestal*, the consequences of the fire would have been far more devastating to the sailors and marines onboard and the USS *Forrestal*; and

(B) the selfless sacrifices of the sailors and marines who came to the rescue of fellow shipmates and the USS *Forrestal* represent, and are consistent with, the highest traditions of the Navy; and

(4) expresses gratitude to the sailors and marines who served aboard the USS *Forrestal* for their faithful service.

SENATE RESOLUTION 745—DESIGNATING AUGUST 16, 2022, AS “NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY”

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KING, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. KELLY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 745

Whereas the members of the airborne forces of the Armed Forces of the United States have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas, on June 25, 1940, experiments with airborne operations by the United States began after the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War;

Whereas, in July 1940, 48 volunteers began training for the Army Parachute Test Platoon;

Whereas the first official Army parachute jump took place on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon, before the entry of the United States into World War II, validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations that included the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas included in those divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities during World War II;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne units during World War II prompted the evolution of those units into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas, since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the members of the United States airborne forces, including members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th Ranger Regiment, special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, and other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other theaters in the Global War on Terrorism;

Whereas the continued evolution of United States Army airborne units allowed for the reactivation of the 11th Airborne Division on June 6, 2022, to lead the Armed Forces of the United States in Arctic warfighting capabilities, support United States Indo-Pacific Command operations, and continue the storied legacy of the 11th Airborne Division that dates back to World War II;

Whereas the modern airborne forces also include other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance Battalions, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and pararescue teams;

Whereas, of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with the special skills and achievements of those members, distinguishes the members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in the past, glider infantry;

Whereas individuals from every State of the United States have served gallantly in the airborne forces, and each State is proud of the contributions of its paratrooper veterans during the many conflicts faced by the United States;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas, since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2022, as “National Airborne Day”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 746—DESIGNATING AUGUST 2022 AS “NATIONAL CATFISH MONTH”

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Whereas the Catfish Institute recognizes August to be National Catfish Month;

Whereas the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas recognize August to be National Catfish Month;

Whereas the States of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Tennessee embody the Channel Catfish as their State Fish;

Whereas the farm-raised catfish industry in the United States employs nearly 10,000 people and contributes more than \$400,000,000 to the economy of the United States;

Whereas the United States has 67,640 surface water acres used for catfish production in 2022, and catfish growers in the United States had \$421,161,000 in sales during 2021;

Whereas the average catfish farmer produces 5,000 pounds of catfish per acre;

Whereas 99 percent of all United States farm-raised catfish are grown in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Texas;

Whereas catfish is the largest farm-raised seafood product, by weight, in the United States, representing more than 50 percent of the United States aquaculture industry;

Whereas United States farm-raised catfish are consistently high quality and, unlike ocean-caught fish, are available all year long;

Whereas United States farm-raised catfish are a sustainable and environmentally friendly seafood product;

Whereas catfish is a lean fish and an excellent source of protein; and

Whereas catfish is a versatile fish in cuisine of the United States, with a myriad of regional and national recipes to be enjoyed by all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 2022 as “National Catfish Month”;

(2) recognizes the contributions of all workers, past and present, that produce, process, and provide catfish for the people of the United States; and

(3) recognizes that purchasing United States farm-raised catfish supports farmers, jobs, and the economy of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 747—EXPRESSING THE SENATE'S SUPPORT FOR TAKING INTERIM STEPS TO STRENGTHEN THE MILITARY INTEROPERABILITY AND RESILIENCY OF THE MILITARIES OF FINLAND AND SWEDEN WITH RESPECT TO THEIR ANTICIPATED ACCESSION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION ALLIANCE

Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 747

Whereas North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) ambassadors signed the Accession Protocols for Finland and Sweden on July 5, 2022;

Whereas the Senate agreed to the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden (Treaty Doc. 117-3) on August 3, 2022;

Whereas the accession of Finland and Sweden to NATO will strengthen the capabilities, geostrategic position, and deterrence posture of the alliance in the Baltic Sea region and the North Atlantic from that day forward; and

Whereas the accession of Finland and Sweden to NATO will reduce each current member nation's respective burden share as a percentage of the total alliance's deterrence and defense posture; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate, in accordance with its support for NATO's collective security commitment and for maximizing the combined defense capabilities of United States allies and partners through NATO coordination and cooperation, and with anticipation for the accession of Finland and Sweden to the alliance—

(1) recognizes the steps taken by the United States to build upon years of joint and multilateral engagement, training, and exercises; and

(2) encourages the President to further advance the efforts of the United States with respect to—

(A) enhancing the interoperability of the militaries of Finland and Sweden with the United States, including via—

(i) exercises and training across all domains, including a focus on critical capabilities such as—

(I) command, control, and communications;

(II) logistics;

(III) planning; and

(IV) integrated and resilient operations across Northern Europe and the Arctic;

(ii) bomber task forces;

(iii) freedom of navigation operations in the territorial waters of these nations and of NATO allies in the Baltic Sea;

(iv) personnel and professional military education program exchanges;

(v) United States foreign military sales;

(vi) joint development of emerging technologies, including cybersecurity and telecommunications components; and

(vii) coordination on critical infrastructure, including dual-use infrastructure such as telecommunications infrastructure and port facilities;

(B) trilateral cooperation between Finland and Sweden with the United States, including the military activities described in clauses (i) through (vii) of subparagraph (A) and through the trilateral statement of intent signed by all three nations in 2018;

(C) multilateral interoperability between Finland, Sweden, and all NATO partners, including military activities described in clauses (i) through (vii) of subparagraph (A); and

(D) countering disinformation campaigns that seek to diminish the relevancy and cohesion of NATO or otherwise undermine or delay the collective accession process of NATO members; and

(3) calls on all NATO members to take similar, respective actions as provided in paragraph (2) to further advance the interoperability of the militaries of Finland and Sweden with NATO forces and bolster European security, in conjunction with the rapid completion of their respective ratification processes.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BROWN. 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, August 4, 2022, at 10 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, August 4, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 4, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EAST, SOUTH ASIA, CENTRAL ASIA, AND COUNTERTERRORISM

The Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 4, 2022, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Saturday, August

6; 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 to resume consideration of the motion to discharge the Uhlmann nomination.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. For the information of the Senators, Members should expect rollcall votes starting at 12:30 p.m. on Saturday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 2022

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:52 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, August 6, 2022, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 4, 2022:

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

EDWARD GABRIEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

NATHALIE RAYES, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MARY GREEN SWIG, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NASSER H. PAYDAR, OF INDIANA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL C. GONZALES, 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 ZAMBIA.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DAVID APPELGATE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TIMMY T. DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE STATE OF QATAR.

DEAN R. THOMPSON, 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 NEPAL.

RICHARD LEE BUANGAN, 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 MONGOLIA.

MARIE C. DAMOUR, OF VIRGINIA, 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 FIJI, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI, THE REPUBLIC OF NAURU, THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, AND TUVALU.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CARLOS FELIPE URIARTE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

CARLTON W. REEVES, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE CHAIR OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.

CARLTON W. REEVES, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2027.

LAURA E. MATE, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2027.

CLAIRE MCCUSKER MURRAY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2025.

LUIS FELIPE RESTREPO, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2025.

CLARIA HORN BOOM, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2023.

JOHN GLEESON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2023.

CANDICE C. WONG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2027.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SUSIE FELIZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

DONALD R. CRAVINS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT.

THE JUDICIARY

ROOPALI H. DESAI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

JAIME AREIZAGA-SOTO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT F. GODEC, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND.

YOHANNES ABRAHAM, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

JONATHAN HENICK, OF VIRGINIA, 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 UZBEKISTAN.

ANGELA PRICE AGGELER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 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 NORTH MACEDONIA.

GAUTAM A. RANA, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND

PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC.

DANIEL N. ROSENBLUM, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

SHIRLEY SACHI SAGAWA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2024.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

KATHRYN WHEELBARGER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MICHAEL K. SINGH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JONATHAN WINGATE BURKS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.