



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2023

No. 184

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, source of our strength, we come before You today remembering that Your presence, power, and purpose sustain us during life's dangerous days. It is comforting to know that in every situation, You are always present to empower us with Your love and wisdom.

Today, use our lawmakers as instruments of Your peace and love. Examine their hearts and minds, providing them with the courage to walk continually in Your truth. Look favorably upon their efforts to bring peace to a war-torn world.

And, Lord, bless our Nation, bring healing to this land we love until all our strivings cease.

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 (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, November 7, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Monica M. Bertagnolli, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the National Institutes of Health.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in the next 2 weeks, Congress must work together to avoid another pointless, damaging, unnecessary government shut-

down. We also must work together to defend America's national security around the world by standing with Israel, standing with Ukraine, and increasing our defenses in the Indo-Pacific. And we must provide critical humanitarian assistance, including to civilians in Gaza, who have nothing to do with Hamas, who need food and water and shelter.

None of this will be easy to do. None of this is guaranteed to happen. The outcome of the next 2 weeks will hang on the same thing I have emphasized all year long—bipartisan cooperation.

If Republicans are willing to work with Democrats in good faith on issues where there is real overlap—and there are many—then we can move forward on the things we must accomplish. But if Republicans inject partisanship into otherwise bipartisan priorities, that is only going to make it harder to avoid a shutdown, pass Israel aid, pass Ukraine aid, pass humanitarian aid for Gaza, and all our other priorities.

Yesterday, a group of Senate Republicans released a proposal for border security that they want in exchange for Ukraine funding, and they know full well what they came up with is a total nonstarter. Instead of putting together commonsense border policies that can pass in divided government, Senate Republicans basically copied and pasted large chunks of the House's radical H.R. 2 bill, and that is their asking price for helping Ukraine.

Making Ukraine funding conditional on the hard-right border policies that can't ever pass Congress is a huge mistake by our Republican colleagues. By tying Ukraine to the border, Republicans are sadly making it harder—much harder—for us to help Ukraine in their fight against Putin. It sends a terrible signal to both our friends and adversaries. It will be a moment that history will remember, if Ukraine aid is tied to this.

Large segments of both parties in the Senate support Ukraine. Large segments of both parties in the Senate

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5371

support Ukraine. So why on Earth do some Republicans want to torpedo it by tying this H.R. 2 anchor to Ukraine funding? This move is only going to endanger Ukraine assistance in the long run.

If Senate Republicans' open bid for border is an amalgamation of hard right policies, then, sadly, the two parties are far apart, and we have a lot of work to do to bridge the divide.

Now, I want to be clear, I would like to bridge the divide. Our caucus would like to see some kind of commonsense border policies done, and the President would like to get something done, as his supplemental proposal shows. If we can come together in a bipartisan fashion to stop the flow of fentanyl and give our frontline officers the resources and tools they need to do their jobs and stop fentanyl, all while staying true to our values, that is what we should be doing.

So, today, we are going to keep working with our Republican colleagues to see if there is a chance for compromise, but Republicans need to actually work with us on realistic border policies, even if it is not everything they want. You can't get just a few Republicans who are pretty much on the hard-right side of their party to say: Here is what we want. Take it or leave it.

That won't work. Senate Republicans should not repeat the mistake of the House GOP when they tried to push H.R. 2. Their H.R. 2 bill is going nowhere, and this Senate GOP proposal is very close to H.R. 2.

I have always been clear that I am ready to have open, good-faith, bipartisan negotiations. I was one of the authors of the Senate's comprehensive immigration bill from 2013. It was led by John McCain and me. I know what it is like to have a hard conversation about these issues. I know through firsthand experience this topic is not easy, but, nevertheless, I am willing to have conversations about the border again if Republicans are willing to meet us halfway.

We have so many shared bipartisan priorities to protect our Nation, our national security. I hope partisanship doesn't tarnish our shared purpose. I hope we can work in the coming days to bridge the gap.

Again, when Republicans willingly inject partisanship into issues that could have some bipartisan overlap, they make it extremely hard to get anything done. I urge my Republican colleagues to stop using the same approach again and again of taking bipartisan issues and injecting them with corrosive partisan measures that help sink them.

NOMINATIONS

Well, Mr. President, today is going to be a very important and good day on the Senate floor. This morning we will confirm Monica Bertagnolli as the next Director of the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, and, later today, the Senate will hit a new milestone in our record of confirming President Biden's

diverse, well-qualified judicial nominees when we confirm two more district judges—Kenly Kato to serve in the Central District of California and Julia Kobick to serve in the District of Massachusetts. With the confirmations today, the Senate will hit two exciting milestones: 150 total judges confirmed under President Biden and 100 female judges confirmed under President Biden.

Two-thirds—two-thirds—of the judges we have confirmed are women, redressing the imbalance that has existed for centuries.

We have 150 judges now who have brought integrity and impartiality to the bench. We have 150 judges who have expanded the diversity and dynamism of our courts. We have 150 judges who are restoring America's trust in the Federal judiciary.

Finally, after that, we will advance the nomination of Ramon Reyes to be a district judge in the Eastern District of New York, setting up his confirmation tomorrow.

Last night, we filed cloture on additional judicial nominees. I am extremely proud of the work we have done to confirm these 150 judges, including 100 women to the Federal Bench. I am extremely proud of the work we have done, again, to confirm these 150 judges.

And let me put it in perspective. As of tonight, the Senate will have confirmed 100 women to the Federal bench, nearly double that of President Trump's entire first term and more than the full first term of any recent President.

These nominees are all historic, taken together, and many are historic in their own right. We have confirmed the first Black woman to the Supreme Court, the first Muslim woman to the Federal bench, and much more. This Senate has now confirmed more women of color to the bench than any Senate under any previous President, and we aren't done. We aren't done. We will continue to advance judicial nominations on the floor of this Congress, and I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 44 years ago last week, shock troops chanting "Death to America" and "Death to Israel" led Iranian revolutionaries across Tehran, overran the U.S. Embassy, and took 66 Americans hostage for 444 days. Iran's war against

America, the "Great Satan," and Israel, the "Little Satan," has continued ever since. The regime has supported Shia terrorists, Sunni terrorists, and secular terrorists. It has underwritten violence across the world, from the 1983 marine barracks bombing in Beirut, to the 1992 Israeli Embassy bombing in Buenos Aires, to the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia, to hundreds of attacks, masterminded by Qasem Soleimani, on U.S. forces in Iraq.

Tehran has invested its time and resources into cultivating the terrorists of Hezbollah, Hamas, and Palestinian Islamic jihad. The Iranian regime bears responsibility for their savagery. It is also responsible for more than 100 attacks on U.S. personnel and interests in Iraq and Syria just since President Biden took office. These attacks have spiked since October 7.

Two weeks ago, an Iranian-made suicide drone hit a U.S. military barracks in Iraq. Thankfully, the drone's explosive payload failed to detonate. But the message it sent about the state of President Biden's deterrence of the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism was as clear as day.

In recent weeks, U.S. forces in Iraq and Syria have been targeted at least another 38 times with lethal force, and more than 40 servicemembers have been injured. Let me say that again. Iran-backed terrorists have attacked U.S. forces at least 38 times since October 7.

U.S. personnel are, of course, not the only targets of the Iranian war on Western influence in the Middle East. America's Arab allies have endured repeated attacks as well. This ongoing siege is not the behavior of an adversary that is being effectively deterred.

How we got here is no mystery. When the Biden administration took office, it rushed to restore a failed nuclear agreement with an Iranian regime that had long since proven it wasn't to be trusted. When Iran-backed Houthi rebels killed three people at an airport in the UAE and aimed two ballistic missiles at its capital last year, the administration responded with silence.

In response to the latest wave of attacks on U.S. forces, the President authorized a strike on an ammunition facility. His Secretary of State felt compelled to reiterate that "we are not looking for conflict with Iran." Clearly, Iran is looking for conflict with us. The Iranian regime is working hard to kill Americans, undermine our influence, and sow chaos among our allies, and so far, you would have to say they are succeeding.

Hamas and Palestinian Islamic jihad perpetrated the deadliest day of violence against Jews since the Holocaust. Hezbollah stands ready, at Iran's behest, to escalate this conflict into a two-front war. Years of careful progress toward normalized relations between Israel and more of its Arab neighbors has been stalled.

Demanding that Israel cease fire against Hamas would lock in these

gains for Iran. It would grant amnesty for both the terrorists and their sponsors. We have a responsibility to reject these demands not just on behalf of our ally Israel but because amnesty for terrorists would embolden the Iran-backed threats to U.S. interests in the region.

As I have said before, effective deterrence requires both capabilities and credibility. It requires that a global superpower actually act like one. In practical terms, deterring Iran and its web of terrorists means meeting attacks on U.S. personnel in Iraq and Syria with swift, lethal, and overwhelming military force. It means working with allies to deploy crippling economic sanctions and inhibit Iran's support for terror. It means finally taking the advice I offered President Biden when he took office: Set aside the failed nuclear deal; work with Republicans; and build an Iran policy that can endure long after he leaves office.

BORDER SECURITY

Now, Mr. President, on another matter, at a hearing last week, the Secretary of Homeland Security told our colleagues that "ensuring the safety of the American people is a national imperative and a government obligation." Secretary Mayorkas is absolutely right about that, but for someone who understands so clearly the duty of his office, the Biden administration's border czar is utterly failing to execute it.

After 3 straight years of record-shattering overall border apprehensions, the alarming details of the national security crisis unfolding at the southern border on this administration's watch are coming into clearer focus.

Last fiscal year didn't just set a new alltime record for border apprehensions of individuals on the Terror Watchlist; it saw arrivals from countries beyond Latin America triple. CBP personnel are now facing a human wave at the border that, according to Mexican officials, hails from 120 different countries and speaks 60 different languages.

For 3 years, policy choice by policy choice, the Biden administration has welcomed this historic flood of illegal migration and set the brave men and women of Customs and Border Protection up for failure. And it is abundantly clear that the solution to the administration's border crisis is by replacing bad policies with sensible ones. Even Secretary Mayorkas admitted last week that "policy changes are needed." But, in reality, the supplemental request he is selling on behalf of the President is much less focused on fixing policy than on throwing money at the problem. Instead of shutting off the broken asylum incentives that are driving record arrivals, the administration wants to pay for faster asylum claim processing, a shower of grant funding for overwhelmed liberal cities that once proudly declared themselves "sanctuary cities," and, as Secretary Mayorkas put it, accelerate "work authorization for eligible non-citizens."

Well, the Biden administration's border crisis has created a fork in the road. In the face of record illegal migration, Democrats are focused more on getting more people into our country faster no matter the cost. Meanwhile, Senate Republicans are focused on securing the border and putting the American people back at the forefront of our border policy. I am grateful to a group of our colleagues, led by Senators LANKFORD, GRAHAM, THUNE, and COTTON, who are working hard on proposals to do exactly that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. 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.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish this were not true—and it is true in the United States and nowhere else—but, on average, 70 women across this country are killed each month by an intimate partner, a husband or a boyfriend mostly, and most all of those murders are at the hands of a perpetrator with a firearm.

In the United States, women are 21 times more likely to be killed by a gun than women living in any other high-income nation. I get it that the numbers that we throw around when talking about the gun violence epidemic sometimes can get a little numbing and overwhelming, but that is a really damning, unconscionable statistic.

If you live in America as a woman—the most affluent, most powerful country in the world—you are not twice as likely to die as women in other countries at the hands of a firearm, you are not 5 times more likely, you are not 10 times more likely, you are 21 times more likely, living in the United States of America, to die from a gunshot wound as a woman than women living in any other high-income country.

I am not talking about comparing the United States to some war-ravaged, developing nation in the middle of civil conflict. I am talking about comparing the United States to other peer nations. That is unacceptable.

We made progress last year. We made progress last year because Republicans and Democrats came together and said you shouldn't be able to have a gun anywhere in this country if you have a judicial history, if you have a conviction related to domestic violence. So we changed the law. We limited something called the boyfriend loophole so that whether you are a spouse or an intimate partner or a dating partner, you now can't get your hands on a weapon—you can't buy one, can't have a weapon—if you have been convicted of a domestic violence charge. That was good news.

The reason that we did that, despite the fact that the gun lobby opposed it, is because the American public has just made up their mind on this question.

In general, on most questions about keeping dangerous weapons away from dangerous people, 89 percent of Americans have already decided that they just would rather we err on the side of caution.

Specifically, on this question of prohibiting abusers—domestic abusers—from owning guns, 83 percent of Americans support that. It is really hard to get 83 percent of Americans to support anything in this country. This is maybe the most popular public policy intervention in America today, stopping domestic abusers from getting firearms.

The gun lobby and the gun industry, which want to sell weapons to everybody, regardless of their criminal status, cannot win that fight here in the U.S. Senate. They lost that fight last year because the American public has made up its mind. You are likely not getting reelected to Congress from a swing State or a swing district if you are voting against measures to take guns away from domestic abusers.

But here is the problem with the state of American politics today: There are now two legislative lawmaking bodies. One of them is the U.S. Congress. The other is across the street at the Supreme Court. So over and over again, when an industry or a rightwing interest group can't move the laws of Congress in their favor because the American public is so wildly against their priority, they just shift the venue of the fight across the street to the Supreme Court. That is what is happening right now, as we speak, on this question of keeping guns away from domestic abusers.

Today, the Supreme Court is hearing the case of United States v. Rahimi. Let me tell you a little bit about Zackey Rahimi. He was a drug dealer with a history of armed violence toward intimate partners and a history of firing guns in public places.

In the winter of 2019, Rahimi had an argument with his girlfriend in a parking lot. She tried to walk away from the argument, knowing about his penchant for violence. But he grabbed her wrist. He knocked her to the ground. He then dragged her back to the car, picking her up and throwing her into the vehicle, causing her to hit her head on the side of the vehicle. Upon realizing that a person witnessed the assault, Rahimi retrieved a gun and fired a shot into the air, during which time his girlfriend escaped.

It won't surprise you that his girlfriend went and got a restraining order against him. He was vicious and violent, firing guns in public into the air as a means to threaten her. She went and got a restraining order. That restraining order required Rahimi to be noticed to the criminal background check system so that he couldn't own or buy guns. Eighty-three percent of

Americans think that is a great idea: Somebody with that kind of dangerous history, with an active restraining order against them, should not be able to buy a gun or possess guns. That was the law in Texas at the time. It worked for this woman who was being badly abused, and her life was unquestionably under threat.

Rahimi thinks that he should have the guns. He thinks that notwithstanding his long criminal history, the restraining order, that the Constitution requires him, a domestic abuser, to have weapons. So he has brought a case that has reached the Supreme Court asking to invalidate all laws that keep weapons away from domestic abusers who are the subject of restraining orders.

If this case is decided in his favor, it is not just an outrage, it is not just dangerous; it is a frontal assault on democracy because what it would say is that the Supreme Court—not the U.S. Congress, not the elected branch of government—is going to micromanage the decisions as to who can have a gun and who can't have a gun. They will decide who is dangerous and who is not dangerous. That should make you really nervous if the outcome of this case is to decide that Zackey Rahimi is a responsible individual, capable of owning and possessing more weapons.

Later in that year, Rahimi threatened another woman with a gun, which resulted, that time, in a charge of aggravated assault. Rahimi then participated in five separate shootings—five separate shootings—all of which were in public places. Rahimi was arrested and convicted of possessing a firearm. He was ultimately sentenced for these crimes for a long time in jail.

Restraining orders are designed to look at someone, assess their penchant for violence, and then take guns away from them to protect a spouse or a woman or a girlfriend. Rahimi was violent. He was wildly violent after the restraining order. This is exactly whom the law in Texas is designed to protect us from. Yet we are perhaps weeks away from the Supreme Court invalidating that law, invalidating Connecticut's law, invalidating Georgia's laws so that domestic abusers, with histories of vicious assault, can get their hands back on weapons.

But this should come as no surprise to Americans because we have won this fight, this fight to start moving the laws of this country toward common sense. We want people to have a right to own firearms. I believe in the Second Amendment. I believe the Second Amendment protects the right of private gun ownership. I do. But I think that there is a class of individuals—a pretty small class of individuals—who have demonstrated so clearly that they are so dangerous and so irresponsible with firearms that they should not have them. It is a small class of individuals. Zackey Rahimi is clearly in that class. And the idea that we are weeks away from somebody like him

being able to get guns again should shake this country to its foundation.

Maybe the Supreme Court listens to America; maybe they don't. But this country needs to understand the gravity of the decision that is being made and the wholesale shift that will occur in legislating on the question of gun safety.

If Rahimi wins this case, we are no longer in charge. The Supreme Court will now, on a case-by-case basis, decide who can have a gun and who can't. Frankly, that is bad for progressives and supporters of gun violence prevention. That is bad for conservatives as well because once the Supreme Court gets in the business of that kind of micromanaging, we are all out of jobs. We will just show up to work, punch our clock but have really nothing to do because they ultimately will pull the strings. They will substitute themselves as the new governing policy-making body in this country.

With the stakes so high for women's safety in this country, with 70 women dying every month at the hands of an intimate partner, we cannot let that happen.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we have had no shortage of reminders in the last couple of years that we continue to live in a dangerous world.

Vladimir Putin's war of aggression in Ukraine, increased Chinese belligerence, and Hamas's October 7 attack, enabled by Iran, are all powerful reminders of the fact that there will always be malign actors in this world who must be confronted. These events are also a powerful reminder of something else, and that is the need for American leadership on the global stage.

Nature abhors a vacuum, and if the United States and other free countries don't lead, other countries will fill the void—countries like Iran, Russia, and China.

I don't need to tell anyone that all three of these countries have been flexing their power in recent years and seeking to expand their footprint. Iran, as Hamas's recent attack so pointedly reminded us, is supporting terrorist organizations throughout the Middle East: Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the Houthis in Yemen, Shia militias that are attacking U.S. troops in Iraq and Syria. And the list goes on. Nor is Iran confining its sphere of activities to the Middle Eastern countries.

Iran has provided Russia with weapons to use in its war on Ukraine, and it is helping Russia to build its own drone-manufacturing facility to dramatically increase Russia's drone supply.

Russia, of course, is currently providing the world with a clear illustration of its imperial aspirations in its war of aggression in Ukraine. And

Putin has made it clear that his ambitions don't end there. He is also occupying territory in Georgia and seemingly working in asserting Russian influence in Moldova and the Balkans.

And as for China, whether it is increasingly aggressive threats against Taiwan, efforts to expand its military and economic hold over the Indo-Pacific, menacing U.S. military aircraft, or sending a spy balloon across the United States in an attempt to gather information on sensitive military sites, China has made it very clear that it is set on expanding its power—and woe to anyone who gets in its way.

And it is backing up its determination with an aggressive military buildup that has seen the Chinese military outpace the U.S. military in modern capabilities like hypersonic missiles.

So it is abundantly clear that bad actors are flexing their power. And, as I said, our response to that must be a renewed commitment to American leadership internationally.

Now, American leadership doesn't mean attempting to fix every country's problems or to get militarily involved in every conflict around the globe. We neither can nor should attempt to become the world's policeman. But that doesn't mean that we should retreat from the global stage or confine our focus to one or two areas.

There is a lot that we can do while not attempting to play global policeman or to solve every conflict. In the first place, we can and should project the kind of strength that makes bad actors unwilling to tangle with us—or with our allies. That means first, and foremost, having a strong military prepared to meet and defeat any threat, backed up by resilient supply chains. But it also means things like a strong economy and developing our energy resources so that we don't have to depend on hostile countries or hostile areas of the world for oil.

Military and economic strength is a powerful deterrent. But it is not enough. We also have to engage on the global stage. We need to build and maintain relationships with allies, support free nations, and stand against hostile actions by hostile countries.

The stronger the bonds of free nations and the more united our response to belligerent countries, the less scope these countries will have for their aggression.

The world stage is going to be dominated by someone. And when free countries abdicate a leadership role, malign actors are likely to end up controlling the playing field.

Some might suggest that the United States should only engage globally when events directly and immediately affect us. But, unfortunately, that thinking often involves underestimating just how much we are affected by world events, even those that are not a direct and immediate attack on U.S. interests.

Some, for example, would question our continued support for Ukraine.

Well, I question what will happen if we don't support Ukraine. Withdrawing American support for Ukraine could very well end up with a victorious and newly emboldened Putin on the doorstep of four former Soviet satellite states—now NATO members whom we are bound by treaty to protect.

If Putin wins in Ukraine, it is not hard to imagine him viewing incursions into one or more of these former Soviet states as a good idea. And given our treaty obligations—and the imperative to prevent a Soviet Union 2.0—it is not hard to imagine American troops being drawn into the resulting conflict.

Supporting Ukrainians' efforts to defend themselves against Putin's war of aggression is a way of preventing a conflict that would require a far greater commitment from the United States—not to mention warding off a likely catastrophic economic fallout in Europe from a wider war, which would take a heavy toll on American businesses and consumers.

Furthermore, there is little question that a Russian victory in Ukraine would embolden not just Putin but other malign actors—notably China.

If Russia is successful at taking over part or all of Ukraine, why shouldn't China think it can successfully take over Taiwan? We should be supporting Ukraine—not just because peoples fighting for freedom against tyranny are worthy of support, but because supporting Ukraine, like supporting Taiwan and Israel and other free countries, is in our national interest.

We should support Ukraine with an endgame in mind. Saying we will back Ukraine “for as long as it takes,” as the President likes to say, is noble. But not being intentional about the resources we send risks prolonging this war without advancing toward that end state.

We can't expect Ukraine to tread water indefinitely. And I am hopeful that the arrival of M1 Abrams tanks, longer-reaching ATACMS missiles, and soon—soon—F-16s, while too late to meaningfully contribute to Ukraine's summer counteroffensive, will enable Ukraine to make new battlefield gains.

The Senate will soon take up a supplemental spending bill to address defense issues. And any such bill should promote security abroad by providing support for our allies—specifically, right now, Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan.

And after three successive years of recordbreaking illegal immigration at our southern border, we should make sure that any supplemental also focuses on building up our security here at home by tightening security at our borders, in addition to addressing military priorities like ramping up munitions production.

Senators GRAHAM, LANKFORD, and COTTON have produced a substantive plan to help secure the border and stem the historic level of illegal migration under this President's watch. And we should take up their proposal to address this essential aspect of our national security.

We can't solve every problem or bring peace to every conflict around the world. But the United States can be a powerful force for good, if we are willing to lead. And we should use our strength and influence to contain evil actors and advance peace and freedom around the globe. Failing to do so may have consequences for our national security now and long into the future.

I yield the floor.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6126

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, what if it was your family in these body bags? What if your wife, your daughter, or your mom were raped, tortured, and killed? What if videos of your baby or your grandchild being massacred were posted all over social media? What if a month had passed and there has been no meaningful action from your ally, the most powerful nation in the world?

I stand here today to right this wrong. Today, we will show the world that, once again, America will be there to do justice, to stand up for humanity, and ensure Hamas does not become more powerful.

As I stand in this Chamber, we have the opportunity to send a real message to Iran and its terrorist proxies that we will stop their hatred and evil from spreading.

This morning, I rise in support of the bipartisan, House-passed, standalone legislation to provide aid to the people of Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East, during their ongoing war with Hamas. It is hard to believe that today marks a month—a month—since the October 7 savage attacks by the Hamas army of terror on the people of Israel.

Hamas unleashed an attack that was worse than animals, killing thousands of Israelis and 36 American citizens. And, right now, there are as many as 240 people taken hostage by these savages that only know one language: death and destruction.

Right now, there are families of hostages here at the U.S. Capitol begging for their loved ones to be no longer tortured, for their loved ones to reach safety from the grips of this evil army of terror.

Time is of the essence. And it is imperative that the Senate not delay delivering this crucial aid to Israel another day. A timely military aid package with a unified voice from Congress showing support for Israel will not only add to Israel's stability, it will slow down and hopefully stop the evil plots of Hamas, Iran, and its proxies.

Our bill provides military assistance and resources to Israel at the exact spending levels the Biden administration has requested. And I want to emphasize: These are the exact spending levels President Biden put forth that he agrees Israel needs in this time of war.

You can imagine my surprise—and the surprise of many—to hear that our Commander in Chief, admitting to a

significant security crisis in the Middle East, has threatened to veto this aid package.

Now, think about this. Our President is threatening to veto the aid he requested from Congress. With this veto, he would snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. And why? “Why?” many, many people are asking. Just because it isn't being leveraged for a \$105 billion boondoggle package with another blank check to another unending war in Ukraine.

Today, we plan on calling the President's bluff and delivering this critical standalone measure in a bipartisan victory for the White House. We must fast-track this much needed assistance to one of our staunchest allies: the people of Israel.

If this military aid and our strong message of support is not delivered soon, Israel will find itself fighting a war on three fronts. We know that Iran has those capabilities; that through their proxy forces, they have the ability to send long-range missiles to Israel from Lebanon and Yemen.

Helping our ally who is fighting a war from all angles against Hamas shouldn't require a prolonged battle here in Congress. This is a no-brainer and should have been done yesterday—or the week before.

The support for this package to Israel is bipartisan and bicameral. Again, our legislation honors the spending levels outlined by the Biden administration for Israel and keeps aid to Israel separate from the other conflicts.

What I want to make perfectly clear to every American is that our standalone package is an opportunity to secure a huge, bipartisan win for all of humankind and get aid to Israel quickly. The legislation we brought to the floor today ensures that funding for Israel is not coupled with a billion dollars of additional moneys in aid to Ukraine, Taiwan, or for a mass amnesty program at the border.

By passing this standalone spending bill today, the Senate will expedite the arrival of the assistance to Israel after the House and our newly elected Speaker, MIKE JOHNSON, passed with bipartisan support.

Now, many of us have concerns about the Ukraine conflict. But until the White House answers the 12 questions posed by the House, including the need for an inspector general and a clear-cut peace strategy, many of us will continue to block sending billions more in dollars to what looks like a stalemate that has already, tragically, cost over 200,000 lives.

Here in the home front, what is even more disheartening for the American people is this White House embrace of open-border policies that has allowed almost 10 million—that is right, we are approaching 10 million illegal crossings of our border, making every State a border State and every American less safe.

And it is a poke in the eye to every Member of Congress who has been to

the border and advocated for border security. This President sends us a \$105 billion bill, gaslighting the American people with a small fraction of this money going to Israel, and funds to make our border even more porous—more open—with an asylum-assist program on steroids.

This is a slap in the face and disrespectful for the families who have lost a loved one to the fentanyl crisis, for the communities who are overwhelmed by our open borders, and for every American who feels less and less safe in their own homes every day. This package the White House has given us is the only unserious package in town, jammed with very serious topics, and each of these issues should be debated fully, completely, and individually.

But today, on this Senate floor, we have the opportunity to make a difference for the people of Israel and all mankind. The legislation we brought to the floor would provide \$14 billion to Israel, including \$3.5 billion for foreign military financing and \$200 million in diplomatic funding to help protect the U.S. Embassy and personnel.

This bill would provide funding for the Iron Dome and Iron Beam defense systems. It will allow the United States to stockpile more weapons in Israel and provide more funding to protect U.S. Embassies.

Importantly, this bill strips all aid to Gaza, which we know is frequently commandeered by Hamas.

All this will make Israel safer and help stop this war. And, yes, Israel has the right to defend itself and to defend its people.

Our legislation is a real opportunity to find common ground and unite here to help our allies. It passed with 226 bipartisan votes in the House. Let's stop playing politics and pass this stand-alone bill for Israel right now. The House moved quickly to deliver this legislation to us here in the Senate. We should do the same and get it to the President's desk today.

Today, I am pleased to be joined by one of my colleagues from the great State of Ohio, Senator VANCE, in leading this effort in the Senate and pushing for its passage today so we don't delay this critical funding for our greatest ally in the Middle East, Israel, and stop the spread of terror.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANCE. I appreciate my colleague from Kansas making a forceful case for why this package is necessary.

We have been told by the President, we have been told by our Israeli allies, and we have been told by a number of national security experts that Israel is in a fight for its life. It is in a fight for its life against not just an enemy in Israel but an enemy—radical Islamist terrorism—that very often has and is planning as we speak to come to our shores and to attack us.

This is a commonsense package. As the Senator from Kansas mentioned, it

gives the President the exact amount of money that he asked for to support our Israeli allies. What is different about our bill—what is different about the House's bill that had already passed from what the President requested is twofold.

First of all, this is ready to go. It is ready to go today. If we pass this package today, aid would flow to our Israeli allies immediately. That is reason No. 1 to support it.

The other difference from the President's \$106 billion behemoth of a supplemental is that this is about a single problem, because we should be debating single problems in this country. The world is complicated, of course. The world has intertwined complexities. But we should have enough respect for the American people to debate these issues distinctly because they raise separate questions.

Many of my colleagues may forget that a matter of weeks ago—a matter of months ago, there were people in this Chamber, there were people in the United States of America demanding that the State of Israel give money and weapons to the Ukrainians—money and weapons that the Israelis are now using this very moment to defend themselves.

The idea that these policies are not intended with one another, the idea that what happens in Russia and Ukraine is separate from what happens in Israel is not just obvious, it is common sense, and it has been borne out by the reality of the last couple of weeks.

My colleagues would like to collapse these packages. Too many of my colleagues would like to collapse these packages because they would like to use Israel as a political fig leaf for the President's Ukraine policy. But the President's Ukraine policy, just like the Israeli policy, should be debated. We should talk about it. We should discuss it. We should separate the cost and benefits and analyze them as distinct policies because that is what the American people deserve of their legislature.

There are many questions we could ask about the Ukraine policy, many issues that have gone completely unanswered.

No. 1: What is our end goal in Ukraine?

You hear commonly that the goal is to throw the Russians out of every inch of Ukrainian territory. Yet, when you talk to the President's own administration in private, they admit that is a strategic impossibility. Let me repeat that. No rational human being in the President's administration believes that it is possible to throw the Russians out of every inch of Ukrainian territory.

So why is that the public justification offered by many advocates of indefinite, unlimited Ukrainian aid? Because this debate is fundamentally dishonest. We are not telling the American people the truth because we know

that if we did tell them the truth, they would not support an indefinite flow of money to Ukraine.

What are we doing, ladies and gentlemen? How long is this supposed to go on? How much money are we expected to spend? What is the strategic objective? What are we trying to do? Are we monitoring the fact that we have spent nearly \$200 billion, if the supplemental passes—\$200 billion to one of the most corrupt countries in the world? Do we have proper assurances that all that money is being spent on the things we tell ourselves it is being spent on? The answer, of course, is no because we have not had a real debate in this Chamber. The American people, I think, should be ashamed of us for that fact.

Let me offer just one final observation here. You have heard in this Chamber—you heard even today—that the Ukraine policy was born of a spirit of bipartisan agreement; that we had this moment where Democrats and Republicans recognized that it was very, very important to help the Ukrainians push back against the Russian attack. Of course, we support and praise our Ukrainian friends. They have done a lot more than many people gave them credit for.

But let's also be honest that for 30 years, Washington, DC, has run on bipartisan foreign policy wisdom, and it has run this country to the ground with \$1.7 trillion deficits; war after war after war that has killed thousands of Americans, millions of other people, and has not led to the strategic strength of this country.

It was great bipartisan agreement after September 11 that threw Saddam out of Iraq. Of course, a lot of people celebrated it until right now we realize that Iraq is a client state of Iran. We empowered one of the worst regimes in the world with our bipartisan wisdom.

Maybe what we should have is some bipartisan wisdom that the foreign policy consensus of this country for the last three decades has been a disaster. It has been a disaster for this country. It has been a disaster for our dead marines, Army soldiers, Navy sailors, and Air Force airmen. It has been a disaster for this country's finances, and it has been a disaster for the entire world.

Let's have a real debate. We haven't had one in 30 years.

Mr. President, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, the terror and devastation unleashed on Israelis by Iran-backed Hamas terrorists have rightly horrified the world. Innocent families were murdered in their homes. Children were beheaded. Girls were raped. Whole families were burned alive. An elderly, wheelchair-bound woman, later identified as a Holocaust survivor, was brutally dragged through the streets of

Gaza. Children who witnessed the murders of their parents have been kidnapped and are being held hostage by Hamas. Hundreds were mowed down at a music festival. Thousands are dead. At least 33 Americans are dead, and reportedly 10 are held hostage. The atrocities are too numerous to fully recount, but the images we have seen will never leave our memories.

In 2019, my wife Ann and I had the opportunity to visit Kfar Aza, one of the kibbutzes that was the site of a complete massacre. As the early reports were coming out, I was really worried about the kibbutz because of its proximity to Gaza. It is about half a mile away. When I heard the news that it was the site of some of the most horrific and barbaric activities, my heart just sank. We had spent an afternoon there, and it was the most peaceful place. I keep thinking about the moms and kids who were playing outside, enjoying the warm summer weather. It is gut-wrenching to think of the fate of the families we met that day.

I spoke with Chen, the lady who led our tour of the kibbutz, who was traveling outside of Israel that day and survived. I was able to speak to her right after it happened, and she has not been able to go back home. She said it was unclear if she will ever be allowed to go back home. Can you ever imagine?

So many of us in this Chamber are so deeply connected to Israel, and I bet almost everyone here as a story like mine. We know people in the IDF who have been called to serve. We have friends all over Israel who have spent days in bomb shelters as rockets have been launched by terrorists intent on wiping Israel and Jews off the face of the Earth.

I have met with survivors and hostage families. I have placed a poster outside my office that features the faces of the hostages being held by Hamas. I am not going to take it down until they get home.

Not since the Holocaust has the world witnessed such a brutal attack on the Jewish people. We have to really let that sink in. It is 2023, and it sure feels like history is repeating itself. We also have a President who can barely even talk about the Americans who are held hostage right now in Gaza.

The first step to freeing these hostages and helping Israel destroy these terrorists is passing aid for Israel. We must send the world a clear message: Attacking the United States and our allies and partners is a bad idea, and it will only end with us winning.

In the days and weeks ahead, Israel is going to once and for all destroy Hamas and its ability to exist as a terror state on Israel's borders. The United States has to support Israel right now and ensure they have the weapons they need to completely destroy Hamas.

That is why I am proud to join Senators MARSHALL, VANCE, and our colleagues on the bill. The House took de-

cisive action by passing this bill last week. They moved quickly, and the measure is fully paid for. The Senate can follow suit right now. I am proud to colead the companion bill in the Senate.

I yield back to my colleague from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 6126, which was received from the House. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are some fundamental flaws in the arguments my colleagues are making for the Senate to do only half of its job, to say nothing of the partisan, so-called pay-for here—which is a giveaway to billionaires—that actually costs our Nation money and sets a dangerous precedent that our allies are fair game to be used as partisan bargaining chips.

First, we should not be pitting funding for Israel against funding for Ukraine and other needs. There is no need given the widespread support for providing assistance to both nations on both sides of this aisle. There is strong support for providing the assistance the President requested for Israel, and there are also bipartisan supermajorities in both the House and Senate in favor of Ukraine aid. That is because most of us on both sides of the aisle understand that while there are important differences, the challenges we and our allies are facing around the world today are connected.

Just last month, over 300 House Members voted for Ukraine aid, so pretending that this doesn't have the votes to pass the House simply doesn't pass muster. There is strong support here in Congress to address these urgent priorities in one package, and that is exactly what I am working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do right now.

Secondly, our allies in Ukraine can no more afford a delay than our allies in Israel. Ukraine is at a critical point in a brutal war to defend its sovereignty against Putin's bloody invasion. We must not give Putin a win and throw Ukraine to the wolves for political expediency. After all, what sort of message does it send about our commitment to our allies if we delay Ukraine aid further, especially after we have already missed our earlier opportunities to get this done?

For American leadership to have any weight in the world, our word has to mean something. Our commitments have to be ironclad. That means we do not abandon our allies in their time of need, period.

Failing to stand by Ukraine now will only embolden Putin and other dictators looking to trample democracies, which brings me to my last point.

While the challenges we and our partners face across the globe have different natures and nuances, we have to be strategic enough to understand that they are connected, they are urgent, and they should be addressed as part of one package.

The Chinese Government is watching how we respond to Putin's aggression in Ukraine. Putin is wanting the Hamas attack to give him an opening to distract the world from aiding Ukraine against his brutal invasion.

In fact, we know that a Hamas delegation visited Moscow recently. So let's stop pretending there is no common thread.

And, make no mistake, Hamas is hoping that we ignore the humanitarian needs in Gaza so it can drive people to despair and anger and, ultimately, extremism.

When it comes to humanitarian aid, making sure that people have food and water and medical care isn't just the right and moral thing to do. It is also very clearly in our national interest, as this promotes long-term stability and security, combatting hopelessness that can spiral into new threats.

Our adversaries are watching closely to see whether we have the vision to recognize how these crises are related and the resolve to come together and respond forcefully to them. We need to send a strong message, and the way we do that is by passing a strong security package. We are working together right now to get that done, and I urge all of our colleagues to support us in those efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, I, too, believe, with my colleague from Washington State, that we must move forward with emergency funding for our allies—all of our allies, not just the State of Israel but also Ukraine. I also think we have to move quickly to head off a closure or shutdown of our government next week, and we have to address the pressing needs of the American people in this process.

But it is very clear that this proposal before us—this unanimous consent to pass the bill including only funds for Israel—is just an attempt to deny assistance to Ukraine. It is not really about helping Israel. It is about making sure we don't continue to keep our commitments to Ukraine.

And we have had a debate about Ukraine. We have talked over 2 years about Ukraine, how dangerous Russian aggression can be, not just with respect to the people of Ukraine but to the rest of the world.

As my colleague said, China is watching. In fact, I think they are paying more attention to Ukraine than the current issue in Israel because Putin's imperialistic dreams of restoring the

Russian Empire resonate more closely to the Xi Jinping's imperialist dreams to reunite Taiwan to China.

So if we fail in Ukraine, I think that will send a very strong and unfortunate message to China that you can attack, wait the West out, and, eventually, they will concede. That is not good strategy or policy.

My colleagues argue that this will deny Israel getting the means to defend itself. Well, we have already been supporting the State of Israel. We have moved two aircraft carrier strike groups into the region. We are moving marines into the region. We are sending signals that we are strongly protecting them. Indeed, we have already engaged and shot down missiles from our naval forces. We have also suffered more than 40 injuries of American military personnel because of actions against the United States' positions in the Middle East because of our protection of Israel.

We cannot abandon Ukraine. They have lost hundreds of thousands of civilians and military personnel.

If you want to talk about horrors, October 7 was a horrible day. I was in Israel. I saw photographs—some that have not yet been released—of the tragedy. It was traumatic for the entire State of Israel.

But go to Ukraine. Go to Bucha. Dig up the graves of people shot in the back of the head while their hands were tied.

You want to talk about atrocities? Those were atrocities.

So we are fighting forces that are dark and evil, and we have to support all of those democratic nations—Israel and Ukraine—that are struggling against that darkness.

Now, this is not my opinion alone. Last week, Mike Pompeo, the former Secretary of State for Donald Trump and a former Congressman from Senator MARSHALL's home State of Kansas wrote:

Make no mistake: the outcome of this war will have a direct impact on U.S. national security.

He was speaking of Ukraine.

Should Putin prevail—whether on the battlefield or through a war of attrition that leads to ill-conceived diplomacy—the war would be felt well beyond Ukraine's borders.

Indeed, I would add, if we fail to support Ukraine with funding and equipment, then it is more likely that young American servicemembers will be called upon to fight and die and suffer in Eastern Europe, because, as so many of my colleagues have suggested and as Secretary Pompeo suggested, Putin will not be satisfied with simply taking Ukraine, and we could see ourselves engaged in defending one of our NATO allies.

I have a very simple sort of notion about American military policy. I would rather send resources to a country fighting than send American soldiers to do the fighting, and, if we don't support Ukraine, that will happen.

Now, this is a situation that calls on us to do the right thing, and we have to do the right thing. But this is not something that we can do separate one from another, because, as we have all said, there is a connectivity here, and this connectivity has to be recognized.

Now, the other point I would make, too, is that this bill is paid for. Now, this to me is one of the most startling aspects of the legislation that the Senator from Kansas is promoting because they pay for it by taking money away from the Internal Revenue Service. Some would say they are using the Israeli crisis as a way to do what so many of my Republican colleagues like to do—give tax breaks to the wealthy—because when you take money away from the IRS, you go ahead and ensure that people can feel much more comfortable about not paying their taxes.

The Wall Street Journal published an article a few days ago. In 2021, the IRS failed to collect \$688 billion that was owed to the United States of America. That is many times this supplemental that we are talking about. No financial institution would take money away from its bill collectors on the notion that, oh, that is OK. Only in Washington would we do that.

This bill is, thus, irresponsible in the way it is paid for and irresponsible in ignoring our commitment to Ukraine.

It is time to get serious. We have 10 days before our government runs out of funding. Israel needs our support. Ukraine needs our support. American families and communities are counting on us to deliver critical disaster assistance. They need support for affordable, high-quality childcare. They need many things that are also at a crisis level. And we don't have time—we don't have time—to entertain political gestures to send a signal to Israel and a signal to the rich in America that we are with you and neglect and leave out Ukrainians, who have been struggling and fighting against a foe that is determined to continue this fight in Europe. Ultimately, I feel if we don't respond appropriately, this forces us to send our men and women into the fight.

I commend Chair MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS for standing up for this country and for our allies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have come to the floor to speak about Hamas's attack on Israel. I joined with Senator REED—10 Senators, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans—to visit Israel 2 weeks ago. We saw the brutality of Hamas firsthand. We met with the families of the hostages. We made it clear that we stand with Israel's right to defend itself, and we strongly support President Biden's efforts and the supplemental appropriations to provide those funds to Israel.

So why do I have concern about the unanimous consent request that has been presented? Because it is not bipar-

tisan. If you want to look at bipartisanship, look at the work of Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS on the Appropriations Committee. They have worked to get the type of unity we need in order to pass appropriations bills and get them into law, consistent with the agreements that were reached earlier this year, recognizing the division in our Congress. We need to have a bipartisan supplemental appropriations bill on the floor as quickly as possible.

So I am extremely disappointed by the action of the House because it is urgent that we consider the supplemental appropriations bill, and, because of the action in the House, it will now be delayed. Make no mistake about that. If the House would have acted in a responsible, bipartisan way, including the package that was submitted by President Biden, we would have had an excellent opportunity to pass a supplemental appropriations bill before November 17—the date, by the way, that our continuing resolution expires.

I am now deeply concerned, as a result of what happened in the House, as to whether we are going to be able to get that supplemental appropriations bill done before November 17, and it is urgent that we do this.

So let me speak about Ukraine. Ukraine is the frontline in defense of democracy. We know that Russia's invasion of Ukraine was not just aimed at taking over Ukraine. Mr. Putin would not stop with Ukraine. The Baltic States are clearly in his vision, and Moldova, Georgia, and beyond.

And as Senator REED pointed out, it is a lot better for us to have the frontline with the use of our funds defending our democracy than having to send American soldiers to Europe.

It is urgent we get assistance to Ukraine. We missed an opportunity 2 months ago. We have got to show the world that we are committed to the defense of democracy—U.S. leadership.

Just think about the message it would send if we say: We are going to help Israel, but I am sorry, Ukraine, we don't have time for you.

That is giving Mr. Putin a gift. We can't do that.

U.S. leadership is critically important. We need to make sure that we provide the leadership, and, quite frankly, our allies around the world are joining us, providing in total more assistance than we are. But it is absolutely essential that America lead, and we must get this Ukrainian aid moving forward. We need to do it in a bipartisan way.

It is a good investment. It is a good investment in protecting our democracy in Ukraine. It is a good investment in degrading Russia's military.

So let me try to connect the dots here, if I might, because Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine is very much related to Hamas's attack in Israel. Two of the most dangerous and brutal dictatorships in the world, Iran and

North Korea, have joined forces with Putin to support Russia's war efforts. Make no mistake about it. It was Russia that invaded Ukraine. Iran's proxy, Hamas, attacked Israel. Connect the dots.

We can't ignore Russia and think we are going to be safe in the Middle East. We need to provide the type of security that will help us with our own national security.

Iran is building factories in Russia to pump out new drones. North Korea is sending munitions to help Putin rearm his forces. We need a supplemental appropriations package that counters all of these threats, and we need to do it now.

So for the sake of our national security, we can't waste time. That is exactly what the House is doing by sending us this supplemental appropriation. We need to come together and show the leadership—the bipartisan leadership—in the Senate. Keep the package together. Let's put America's security first, and let's get to work immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, our colleague has come to the floor and asked for unanimous consent for a bill of some major significance. This bill deliberately throws the Republic of Ukraine under the bus by ripping Ukraine out of the emergency supplemental. This bill would have a very powerful, consequential impact. It will allow Ukraine to be torn apart by Putin's savage invasion.

In the process, it will shatter the Atlantic alliance; it will fracture NATO; it will destroy American leadership in defending democracies; and it will empower dictators around the world, dictators who conclude that they can outlast the coalition of democratic republics when a dictator seeks to conquer a democratic neighbor.

The last time our world saw such complicity placating a vicious conqueror was when Chamberlain went to Munich. In Munich, Chamberlain told Hitler he could take a big slice of Czechoslovakia, and England would look the other way.

Chamberlain declared peace in our time, but his appeasement did not produce peace in our time. Instead, it stoked Hitler's appetite for conquering adjacent land and set the stage for the Second World War, with a massive loss of life and treasure of Americans and life and treasure of many nations around the world.

I tell you this: Appeasing Putin today is as wrong and mistaken as appeasing Hitler was 85 years ago. We must stand with the freedom-loving, fierce-fighting, democracy-defending people of the Republic of Ukraine.

If you love Putin, then by all means, support this bill. If you love China and want to stoke China's appetite to invade Taiwan, then by all means, support this bill.

But if you love freedom, if you love democracy, if you respect the courage and the fortitude of the freedom-loving people of Ukraine, if you oppose democracy-crushing authoritarians wherever they are found, then oppose this bill.

There must be no Putin appeasement on the floor of the Senate. There must be no complicity in creating a Munich moment. And so I join my colleagues in preparing to object to this bill.

I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, at this moment of danger and peril around the world, we, the United States, must support our friends and democracies that are under attack from brutal adversaries. That means ensuring that Israel has the right to defend itself in the aftermath of the brutal October 7 attack of Hamas. It also means ensuring that the people of Ukraine can defend themselves against Putin's rank aggression.

This proposal on the floor today is tantamount to surrendering to Putin's aggression. This is waving the white flag.

All of us were gathered in the Old Senate Chamber—most of us—recently when President Zelenskyy addressed the U.S. Senate. President Zelenskyy was very clear that the Ukrainians would continue to fight on no matter what. But he was equally clear that without the support of the United States and our allies, Putin has the upper hand, and it becomes a matter of time.

As we speak here, the Ukrainians are shedding blood. They are giving their lives. For God's sake, the least we could do is continue to provide them with the military and other assistance they need to fight off aggression, and time is of the essence in Ukraine.

And as my colleagues have said, this is not only about defending democracy and sovereignty in Ukraine; it is about the credibility of the NATO alliance and our other European partners who have come together to say to Putin: We stand together against your aggression.

The United States takes a walk, it sends a terrible signal not just to Ukraine but to all our NATO partners with whom we also say we have shared security interest. They see the United States walk away, it undermines the credibility of the entire alliance, not just with respect to Ukraine but with respect to any further aggression by Putin or others.

And it is not just about the NATO alliance. As my colleagues have said, this is also about other autocrats around the world who are watching very closely what happens in Ukraine, including what happens with respect to U.S. support in Ukraine.

President Xi is watching very closely as he keeps one eye on Taiwan. So

make no mistake about it, you can't get out here on the Senate floor and say you want to help protect Taiwan, say that you want to be tough on China when you are weak on Ukraine because what happens in Ukraine has a direct bearing on what happens to Taiwan and a direct bearing on Xi's aggression in the Indo-Pacific region. You can't have it both ways. That has been very clear from our allies in East Asia.

Talk to the leaders of Japan. Talk to the leaders in the Republic of Korea. Talk to other leaders in the Indo-Pacific. They say, if the United States walks on assistance to Ukraine, that our credibility will be totally undermined with respect to our allies in the Indo-Pacific region and that President Xi will have the upper hand there. So let's not pretend we are tough on China when you are weak on Ukraine.

Finally, as the chair of Appropriations pointed out, embedded in this proposal is also what appears to be a very cynical effort to actually use the claim of supporting Israel in order to secure relief for very rich taxpayers in the United States. This cuts funding from the IRS that the IRS will use to enforce current law against very wealthy Americans who are not paying the taxes that are already due and owing.

So under the cover of this bill, our Republican friends apparently want to help out very wealthy taxpayers who aren't paying their fair share, which is why the Congressional Budget Office has said that even when you cut the moneys to the IRS, it is going to actually increase the deficit.

The provision that the House had to cut funding for the IRS, which I guess they thought they were going to fool people that it was going to cover the cost of helping Israel—it doesn't do that. It actually adds to the deficit. Why? Because the IRS will not be able to enforce current tax law against very wealthy Americans who refuse to pay their fair share.

I know Republicans are always looking for a way to give the very wealthy and the very rich a free ride, but this takes cynicism to a new level. So I propose that we come back to the Senate floor with a proposal that does the right thing to support and defend Israel and its attacks from Hamas but also does the right thing for Ukraine, for the credibility of the NATO alliance, for the credibility of our alliances in the Indo-Pacific, for the people of Taiwan, and makes sure that this isn't used as a cover to give very wealthy people here in the United States a free ride on the taxes that already are due and owing.

So, with that, I yield the floor to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I join my colleagues in opposition to Senator MARSHALL's proposal and in support of a supplemental funding request that

recognizes the breadth of our national security interests, which should include Ukraine, Israel, and the emerging challenges in the Indo-Pacific region.

In Ukraine, as we know, Russia's brutal campaign of aggression is threatening the country's freedom and sovereignty, and the horrific events of October 7—1 month ago today—have forced Israel to defend itself in response to the worst terrorist attack that they have encountered. Both nations—both nations—face a similar threat against adversaries that seek to destroy them: Hamas wants to wipe Israel off the map. Putin wants to absorb Ukraine into Russia to recreate the Soviet Union.

Now, our allies and partners have already contributed a total of \$94.1 billion to support Ukraine's war and recovery effort. And we, alongside our international partners, recognize that the Ukrainian people are not only defending their land and freedom, they are fighting for the preservation of liberal democracies around the world.

What some of my colleagues overlook in their singular campaign in support of Israel is just how closely the fate of Ukraine and Israel are tied together, and there is one country which links both of those countries together. That country is Iran. Iran has been complicit in Russia's actions in Ukraine, exporting weapons and drones which inflict further bloodshed and harm on the Ukrainian people, and Iran is backing Hamas, which is waging war on the State of Israel.

And what is especially egregious is the blatant display of their malign partnership. Last week, Putin hosted Hamas and Iranian leadership, and Hamas expressed appreciation for Russia's criticism of Israeli sanctions.

This bill that Senator MARSHALL is proposing would also cost the Federal government \$27 billion—almost double what it provides to support Israel—and Senator VAN HOLLEN has been very eloquent in the reasons why that seems to be in the bill.

But it also strips out essential funding we need to address: the pacing threat from China in the Indo-Pacific. It ignores the humanitarian needs for both Ukraine and Israel. But most important, we can't pick and choose when the United States stands on the side of freedom and democracy. Do we really want to give a green light to Vladimir Putin to continue his revisionist crusade across Europe? Do we really want to give the impression to the allies and adversaries that the United States can't be depended on as a trusted partner? Do we really want to sow doubt in President Xi's mind that the United States will stand up for a free and open Indo-Pacific?

Our adversaries want the United States to fall short in standing up for our allies. They want us to be divided. We need to show them that we are united, and I am very pleased that Leader MCCONNELL and Appropriations Vice Chair COLLINS and so many of our

Republican colleagues are in full support of a holistic supplemental funding package. It is important that we fund this holistic response to address both Israel and Ukraine's needs, which includes humanitarian support for both Israel and Ukraine. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise today to implore my colleagues to pass a national security supplemental in line with what Senator SHAHEEN, the great Senator from New Hampshire, just outlined: yes, to stand up to the Hamas terrorists but also to stand up for an open and free Indo-Pacific, to stand up for humanitarian aid, and to stand up to Vladimir Putin and his barbaric invasion of our ally Ukraine.

That is what I am going to focus on today because I have seen many of our colleagues on both side of the aisle standing proudly with President Zelenskyy. The rhetoric of standing up for democracy has to be matched by what happens in this bill. Just as Putin has shown his true colors—intentionally bombing apartment buildings, capturing cities, and slaughtering innocents, abducting Ukrainian children—the Ukrainian people have shown theirs in bright blue and yellow against all odds.

Since the invasion last February, Ukraine has reclaimed 50 percent of the territory that Russia unlawfully seized from them.

As the Ukrainians advance, Putin—what has happened? He tried to capture Kyiv, but he failed. He tried to wipe Ukraine off the map, but he failed. He tried to drive a wedge between the United States and our allies, but he failed. He tried to topple the Ukrainian Government, but he failed.

Putin tried to break the Ukrainian spirit, but he has made it stronger. He tried to break NATO, but NATO added member states.

Our Ukrainian allies have persevered against all odds. When Putin tried to weaponize winter, Ukraine kept the lights on. When he tried to stop them from producing and selling grain, Ukraine found a way forward.

In his visit to Washington, DC, in September, President Zelenskyy made it clear: Ukraine as we know it depends on the support of its allies—not just the United States but countries in Europe, countries like South Korea, countries like Japan. To abandon our allies now would be a dereliction of duty.

We will not abandon our allies. As Americans, we believe in government based on the principles of democracy and decency at home and abroad. After World War II, we made it clear that big countries can't invade little countries. Our fight is not only a fight for Ukraine; it is a fight for protecting democracy across the globe.

As President Zelenskyy said at the U.N. earlier this year, if we allow Ukraine to be carved up, is the independence of any nation secure?

We know what Putin has done—bombed hospitals, schools, apartment buildings; continues to weaponize food and energy. We cannot let our Ukrainian allies succumb because the United States just decided, eh, we said we were going to do this before, but now, we don't think so. That is not standing up for democracy. As my colleagues have so well pointed out, other tyrants in the world are watching. They are watching to see if we keep our covenants. They are watching to see if we keep our word.

We know what is happening in Ukraine—ballerinas putting on camo and going to the frontlines; exhausted workers at the biggest nuclear powerplant in Europe trying to protect not only Ukraine but all of Europe from a nuclear disaster; the cellist playing melodies in the bombed-out remnants of a town square to remind people that despite Vladimir Putin's worst efforts, culture and humanity are there in Ukraine and are not going away—as we saw the head of the museum in Odesa remind us this week—despite the bombing.

As President Zelenskyy has said, "There is not a soul in Ukraine that does not feel gratitude to you, America."

When Rob Portman and I visited Kyiv this last August, what did we hear a year ago? We heard "Thank you for the HIMARS" on a bag of takeout food to the U.S. Embassy. We heard that was a name they were naming their kids—"Himar." They know what we have done. They need us now.

As Congress continues to negotiate the budget, we must find a way forward on Ukraine. As Senator MCCONNELL reaffirmed, "Think of it as an axis of evil: China, Russia and Iran. So this is not just a test for Ukraine," I say to my colleagues who are focused on national security. "It is a test for the United States and for the free world"—yes, an opportunity to secure our own borders but also an opportunity to secure the borders of our allies' democracies.

Remember the three words that Zelenskyy uttered on that first day when everyone had counted him out? He went to the street corner—just a few people around him—when everyone thought Russia was just going to take them out, and he said three words: "We are here."

"We are here."

That is what we have to do right now in this Chamber. We cannot send the message "We are not here" or "We were there before, but we are not here right now." We are here.

I yield the floor, and I turn it over to my colleague from the great State of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I join my colleagues in standing to speak against a proposal brought to the floor by my

colleague from Kansas—a proposal that would move aid to Israel swiftly but ignore the urgency and the importance of humanitarian aid to countries around the world, of investments to secure our own border, of critical aid to Ukraine.

As my colleague has just spoken eloquently, we have all been inspired by the tens of thousands of Ukrainians who, hearing the urgency of the call to fight for their nation, to fight for their freedom, have laid down their lives, have worked to restructure their society and to aim towards freedom.

I have a hard time countenancing the idea that we today, on this floor, in this Senate, would walk away from this moment of challenge. As many colleagues have said and as I will briefly point out, the proposal that has come over from the House is not serious. It uses the tragedy, the horror of Hamas and its attack on innocent civilians in Israel, killing dozens of Americans, 1,400 in all—the brutality of that and the urgency of this moment—to advance a pay-for under the cloak of fiscal responsibility that would add \$27 billion to our national deficit.

Many of us have already dismissed this proposal as not serious, but this is a serious moment. As my colleague from Ohio has said, we need a serious debate about our path forward, about where we are going and why.

I want to speak briefly to two components of this bill and then close.

Our President's supplemental proposal includes \$13.6 billion to secure our border. The last serious, bipartisan proposal on border security, which was the King-Rounds bill we took up in 2018, invested \$25 billion over 10 years, \$2.5 billion a year. This supplemental would put \$13 billion in 1 year into hiring thousands of new border agents—CBP and Border Patrol; thousands of new staff—attorneys, folks who can move the asylum process quickly; money for detention and deportation; and nearly a billion-dollar investment in scanning everything coming across our border to end human trafficking and the importation of fentanyl. This is a serious proposal that deserves serious support.

Last, the humanitarian piece of this overall supplement would not just help ease the suffering in Ukraine, in Gaza, but in dozens of countries around the world facing a collapse due to a global calamity of hunger.

Let me conclude. It is right now—right now—twilight, dusk in Kyiv. It is right now as we debate on this floor twilight, dusk in Jerusalem. I am confident there are members of the Ukrainian Government, there are members of the leadership of Ukrainian forces, there are individuals on the frontline in Ukraine listening to this debate, urgently wondering: Will we stand? Will this Senate that invited President Zelenskyy to address us in the Old Senate Chamber just 6 weeks ago keep our word? Will we stand or will we fall? This is a moment that will

test our Nation. This is a moment that tests this body. Will we allow ourselves to be distracted by moments of comfort or ease or will we take up the hard work with the leadership of this talented and capable pair, the chair and vice chair of our Appropriations Committee? Will we negotiate? Will we compromise? Will we take up the challenge laid before us to be the indispensable Nation that will care for those in need, that will secure our own border, that will defend Israel, that will defend Ukraine, that will look and face this moment and say: We are the indispensable Nation.

Will we stand, Mr. President?

It is my prayer that we have, we must, and we will.

With that, I yield the floor to my colleague from the State of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, for all of these well-stated reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, this has certainly been one of the most substantive debates we have had up here—very meaningful and very important to myself—because it exposes what our priorities are as Senators to everybody across the Nation.

Today, I heard lots of arguments on why we should combine funding. People essentially want to leverage support for Israel for their own priorities. Again, there were lots of arguments on why we should combine the funding, but I didn't hear one meaningful argument that describes why we should not fund Israel singularly. Why shouldn't we just do it by itself? There is near unanimous agreement up here. This is a great opportunity to say, indeed, this is the time to support Israel. No one is abandoning Ukraine today. We are not abandoning Taiwan today.

But it is interesting to me that no one talked about the concern of the corruption in Ukraine, talked about their federal government nationalizing communications companies, the fact that Poland and Hungary and other countries are leaving them and saying that they don't support the war anymore.

No one is talking about peace. No one is talking about the 200,000 people who have already died in Ukraine. Are those bodies—are those people not important as well? Why isn't America leading a peace agreement?

Time is of the essence. Time is of the essence. But, as we can tell today, we can debate each and every one of these topics until the Sun sets here, until the Sun rises in Israel, but there is not unanimous—not near unanimous support for Ukraine without some certain questions being answered. Lots of questions need to be answered. Is there a plan?

Look at the schedules this week. Why are we talking about some type of supplemental bill on the floor? Why

don't we have it on the floor yet? If we were serious up here, if my leaders across the aisle and at the White House were serious, they would have had something on the floor last week. This is the administration that takes a week to decide to send an aircraft carrier when our allies are in need. The schedule this week is embarrassing, what we are spending time on up here.

I want to go back to priorities. I think so often all these causes are important, and we all agree that we need to address each and every one of them, but if I listen to my friends across the aisle, they would describe Ukraine as the priority.

I don't think anyone back home can really take the President's supplemental bill as serious when he actually makes the border more open. Ten million people have crossed the border illegally under his watch, and what he throws into this supplemental package is actually going to increase the number of people crossing the border illegally. The priority should be to fix a broken immigration system and to secure the border; that at the end of the day, there are less people crossing the border illegally, not more; that we need a policy that turns off this magnet of asking people to come here.

At the end of the day, what it looks like to me is my friends across the aisle want to take this opportunity of support for Israel and leverage it to pass their votes for their own agenda—an agenda of an open border, endless funding for an endless war in Ukraine.

Every day I wake up, I pray that I would do justice, that I would love mercy, and I would like to think that would be true of every Member of the Senate.

The argument today is not about the IRS. It is not about what is happening in the House. It is about what we are saying. It is about what we are doing and our willingness to stand up and fight in this case for the people of Israel. But this is a battle that goes way beyond just a battle between the people of Israel and the Hamas army of terror; this is a battle for the future of humankind.

We have encountered 179 known terrorists on the watch list, 60,000 aliens of interest have crossed our border, and the numbers go on. Just this week, they caught a terrorist who was released at the border, caught in New York as well.

This is about doing what is fair, what is right, and what is just. We may disagree on Ukraine. We may disagree on what we should do in Taiwan. We definitely disagree on what we should do at the border. And I will admit to you, I could be wrong on Ukraine. It will take history 50 or 100 or 200 years to find out who was right or wrong on Ukraine. But I am telling you this. You can take this to the bank: I am right on securing the border, and I am right on supporting Israel.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am going to ask unanimous consent, but before I do, I just want to respond to the Senator and say we have a proposal that covers Israel, humanitarian aid, Ukraine, and the border. We are working to get that done, and I welcome the input from our Republican colleagues so that we can be a strong United States of America and address the issues we all need to address.

NOMINATION OF MONICA M. BERTAGNOLLI

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for Dr. Monica M. Bertagnolli, whom President Biden nominated to serve as the next Director of the National Institutes of Health—NIH. As current director of the National Cancer Institute—NCI—and a distinguished professor and surgeon, Dr. Bertagnolli certainly possesses the experience that will make her an effective leader for our Nation's preeminent research center.

The NIH serves as the pinnacle of biomedical and behavioral research in the United States and provides valuable insights that are used around the world for saving lives and improving people's health. Whether we know it or not, the NIH and the research done there has touched all of our lives by giving our healthcare professionals the resources they need for success. We in Maryland are proud to have the NIH headquartered in Bethesda, with so many in our State contributing to its important mission.

Thanks to Dr. Bertagnolli's decades of experience as a physician-scientist, she has obtained a well-rounded view of medical research that I am confident will properly inform her decisions as NIH Director. Her work to better understand the development and treatment of various types of cancer highlights the diligence and effectiveness that qualify Dr. Bertagnolli for this position.

As NCI Director, Dr. Bertagnolli has demonstrated her leadership capabilities alongside her efficacy as a researcher, working with the Biden Administration to reignite the Cancer Moonshot, which aims to reduce cancer mortality by 50 percent over the next 25 years. This ambitious goal reflects the determination of our cancer research professionals and President Biden's continued commitment to investing in programs, consortia, and research projects that aim to end cancer as we know it. The NCI, along with spearheading the Cancer Moonshot initiative, has also partnered with the Biden Administration to address disparities in cancer outcomes for Americans living in low-income areas, working to implement community-based programs in locations facing persistent poverty.

Just a few weeks into her tenure as director of NCI, Dr. Bertagnolli's work became much more personal as she was diagnosed with early-stage breast cancer following a routine mammogram. She was forced to balance her new role as our Nation's leading cancer re-

searcher with her own personal battle with the disease. I cannot commend Dr. Bertagnolli enough for the strength she has shown to continue her service to Americans in the face of such a daunting challenge.

If the Senate confirms Dr. Bertagnolli today, I would encourage her to take aim at some of the most pressing healthcare issues facing our country. As things stand, significant health disparities exist in the United States, with many Americans not receiving equitable access to care. Dr. Bertagnolli's confirmation provides her with the chance to utilize the NIH's National Institute for Minority Health and Health Disparities to work towards solutions for underserved populations that aren't receiving the care they need. Her new role would also empower her to build a stronger, more diverse healthcare workforce, one that would be well-equipped to face the challenges of today.

As a Marylander, I would be proud to welcome Dr. Bertagnolli to our State. She will be tasked with addressing many crucial and complex issues as Director of the NIH, but I am confident that she is up to the challenge.

I ask the Senate colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Bertagnolli for the outstanding work she has done as a researcher and surgeon, to support her confirmation, and to wish her well in her new role should she be confirmed.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes prior to the vote, followed by Senator SANDERS, who will speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have always strongly advocated for the NIH because I know the work that they do—as so many world-class institutions, including several in Washington State—isn't just cutting edge; it is lifesaving. This Agency, the NIH, holds the hope and future of patients across the country in its hands. So it is of the utmost importance to me to make sure we have an experienced leader at the helm of NIH, and Dr. Bertagnolli is an excellent choice to lead the Agency at this critical moment. You need a steady hand to be a cancer surgeon after all.

Her credentials go far beyond her record of accomplishment as an oncologist. She is a respected researcher and a proven leader. She has served on the board of directors of the American Society of Clinical Oncology, the American Cancer Society, and the Prevent Cancer Foundation. She was the CEO of Alliance Foundation Trials, LLC, a not-for-profit focused on making sure rural communities are included in clinical studies. Of course, now she is the head of the National Cancer Institute, where she has led the research strategy and goals for President Biden's Cancer Moonshot Initiative.

In addition to that which she brings to this role, she also brings a strong

personal connection, which she spoke about at our HELP Committee hearing. She brings the personal experience of growing up in a rural community, where she watched her uncle travel across the State to provide care to patients and where she watched her father fight cancer while care was far from home. And she brings the most recent personal experience of receiving a cancer diagnosis and then of receiving care that was made possible by NIH research.

It is clear that those experiences will inform how she approaches her new role at the NIH, and I know patients will be better for it.

I also want to take a moment to recognize that, in the field of biomedical research, where women have long been severely underrepresented both in clinical trials and in the workforce, it will be truly meaningful to have such an accomplished woman serving in a role that has real power to tackle issues like improving diversity in clinical trials, fighting sexual harassment that has pushed too many women out of the field, and tearing down other barriers to achievement and equal representation for women in medical research.

Dr. Bertagnolli is the right person to ensure the NIH stays on the cutting edge of innovation and research and fulfills its critical mission to promote health, improve equity, keep our Nation competitive, and give patients across the world real hope for the future. She has the experience in medicine, research, and management needed for this role. Most importantly, she has a deep understanding of what the NIH's work means for families in this country who are counting on medical breakthroughs.

I am proud to be voting yes. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the American people understand—whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or Independents—that our healthcare system is broken; it is dysfunctional; it is failing.

We spend almost twice as much per person on healthcare—an unsustainable \$13,000 for every man, woman, and child—than any other country on Earth, and yet the results of all of that spending are abysmal. While the insurance companies and the drug companies make hundreds of billions of dollars in profit, we have 85 million Americans who are uninsured or underinsured and over 60,000 people who die every single year because they can't get to a doctor when they need to.

In this country, despite our huge expenditures, we don't have enough doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, or mental health specialists; and our life expectancy is far lower than in most other countries, especially for working class and lower income Americans. In my view—and I think it is the view of

most Americans—healthcare is a human right, not a privilege, and we need major reforms to our current system so that every man, woman, and child in this country gets the quality healthcare they need regardless of their financial status.

The responsibility for reforming our broken healthcare system rests with the administration, and it rests with many Agencies of government, including the HHS; the CMS; the FDA; and the National Institutes of Health, the NIH, which plays a very important role in the development of new prescription drugs.

While the 10 largest drug companies made over \$112 billion in profits last year and while they pay their CEOs exorbitant compensation packages, 1 out of 4 Americans cannot afford to pay for the medicine they need, and thousands of families face financial ruin as they pay outrageously high prices for the prescription drugs that keep them alive.

Let's think about that for just 1 second. Millions of people in this country, every year, get sick. They go to the doctor, and the doctor writes out a prescription. Yet, because of the exorbitant price of prescription drugs in America, one out of four of those people cannot afford to fill that prescription. So what happens to those people? Well, they get sicker. Maybe they end up in an emergency room. Maybe they end up in a hospital. Maybe they die.

How crazy is it that, in the richest country in the history of the world, 25 percent of our people cannot afford to fill the prescriptions that their doctors prescribe?

But it is not just the high cost of prescription drugs that impacts individuals. In the largest hospital in my State, the State of Vermont—and I don't think it is terribly different elsewhere—the high cost of prescription drugs accounts for 20 percent of the overall budget of that hospital, and that drives insurance policies up. What we pay in the hospital impacts greatly the prices we pay for insurance.

In other words, the outrageously high cost of prescription drugs in America is a crisis situation that must be addressed. It impacts everybody.

Adding insult to injury, not only has the Federal Government not effectively regulated the price of prescription drugs, but the taxpayers of this country have, over the years, provided hundreds of billions of dollars in research and development into new prescription drugs that have provided enormous financial benefits to some of the most profitable drug companies in America.

For example, in America today, the median cost of new cancer drugs has gone up by more than 300 percent over the past decade even though 85 percent of the initial foundational cancer research is funded by U.S. taxpayers.

In June, the HELP Committee, which I chair, released a report that found that the average price of new treat-

ments that NIH scientists helped to develop over the past 20 years is over \$111,000.

In other words, we are spending a fortune in developing new drugs, but our people cannot afford the treatments that they pay for.

In virtually every case, American taxpayers are paying far more than people in other countries for the exact same medicine that the NIH helped to develop. Now, that may make sense to somebody, but it does not make sense to me.

Here are just a few examples from the report:

Astellas and Pfizer charge Americans with prostate cancer over \$165,000 for Xtandi while the exact same drug can be purchased in Japan for just \$20,000. Guess who developed that drug: American taxpayers.

Johnson & Johnson charges Americans with HIV \$56,000 for Symtuza while the exact same treatment can be purchased in the UK for just \$10,000. Guess who developed that treatment: American taxpayers.

Millennium Pharmaceuticals charges Americans with cancer \$54,000 for Velcade while the exact same drug can be purchased in France for just \$11,000. Guess who did the research and paid for that drug: the NIH and American taxpayers.

In other words, here is the insane situation: The American taxpayers fund the research for these drugs, but they can't afford the product that they helped create. Does anybody really think that makes sense? If American taxpayers help develop a drug, we should be paying the lowest price in the world for that product, not the highest. That has got to change. No prescription drug, no matter how effective and lifesaving it may be, is worth anything to the patient who cannot afford it.

In my view, at this crisis moment for American healthcare, we need an NIH Director who is prepared to take on the greed of the pharmaceutical industry and use every tool at their disposal to substantially lower the extraordinarily high cost of medicine in this country.

The 1,800 well-paid lobbyists from the pharmaceutical industry here in DC—it is almost 4 lobbyists for every Member of Congress—may not like it, but that is precisely what the American people want, and it is what they need. The status quo is not working. We need fundamental changes in the way that the NIH addresses the crisis of high prescription drug costs.

Dr. Monica Bertagnolli is an intelligent and caring person, but she has not convinced me that she is prepared to take on the greed and power of the drug companies and the healthcare industry in general nor is she prepared, in my view, to fight for the transformative changes the NIH needs at this critical moment. That is why I will be voting no on her confirmation.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON BERTAGNOLLI NOMINATION

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 293 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Barrasso	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Rounds
Boozman	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Butler	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lujan	Sinema
Capito	Lummis	Smith
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	Marshall	Tillis
Cassidy	Menendez	Van Hollen
Collins	Merkley	Warner
Coons	Moran	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Welch
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	

NAYS—36

Blackburn	Grassley	Ricketts
Braun	Hagerty	Risch
Budd	Hawley	Rubio
Cornyn	Hoeven	Sanders
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Vance
Fetterman	Mullin C	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Britt
Scott (SC)

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 28, Kenly Kiya Kato, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin,
Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret

Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Luján, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kenly Kiya Kato, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 294 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Butler	King	Sinema
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Luján	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Welch
Fetterman	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Budd	Hoeben	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Britt	Sanders	Scott (SC)
-------	---------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 50, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenly Kiya Kato, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

NOMINATION OF KENLY KIYA KATO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Judge

Kenly Kato to the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

Born in Los Angeles, CA, Judge Kato received her B.A. from the University of California, Los Angeles and her J.D. from Harvard Law School. She then clerked for Judge Robert M. Takasugi on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. Judge Kato began her legal career at the Federal Public Defender's Office for the Central District of California, where she served for 6 years. She then entered private practice and spent 10 years as a solo practitioner, representing clients in both civil and criminal cases. During this time, she tried approximately 15 cases to verdict. In 2014, she was appointed to serve as a magistrate judge on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. Judge Kato currently handles both a civil and criminal docket, and she has presided over several cases that have gone to verdict. In addition, she is heavily involved with diversionary programs within the Central District of California that focus on treatment, rehabilitation, and reentry issues for justice-involved individuals.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Kato "well qualified" to serve on the district court. The late Senator Feinstein strongly supported her nomination, and Senator PADILLA does as well. Judge Kato has the experience, temperament, and qualifications to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. I will be supporting this outstanding nominee, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

VOTE ON KATO NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 295 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	King
Bennet	Duckworth	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Durbin	Luján
Booker	Fetterman	Manchin
Brown	Gillibrand	Markey
Butler	Hassan	Menendez
Cantwell	Heinrich	Merkley
Cardin	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Carper	Hirono	Murray
Casey	Kaine	Ossoff
Coons	Kelly	Padilla

Peters
Reed
Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer

Shaheen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Van Hollen

Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Budd	Hoeben	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Tuberville
Crapo	Marshall	Vance
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Mullin	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Britt	Scott (FL)	Scott (SC)
-------	------------	------------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 36, Julia E. Kobick, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Luján, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Julia E. Kobick, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 296 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Butler

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—2

Britt Scott (SC)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

And the motion to invoke cloture is passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

ISRAEL

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on October 7, Hamas brutally assaulted Israel, killing over 1,000 people—Israelis—and taking 240 hostages. On October 22, I was in Israel with 10 Senators—5 Democrats, 5 Republicans. We were there to see firsthand what Hamas had done.

To tell you that it was beyond description—it hit each one of us extremely hard. We saw the anguish in the country. The most difficult meeting we had was not with the war cabinet—and we met with the war cabinet, the major members of the war cabinet—but it was meeting with the families of the hostages.

It broke our heart. The hostage families told us: You are not going to see tears because there are no tears left in our body.

Unspeakable things happened, and the horror was beyond description.

I know my colleague Senator COLLINS has put up a photo of Abigail, a 3-year-old—a 3-year-old—who was taken hostage by Hamas.

We expressed to the Israelis our commitment to stand with Israel, Israel's right and obligation to defend itself, the need to take out Hamas, and our commitment to do everything we possibly can to bring the hostages home safely.

I want to start by thanking President Biden for his extraordinary leadership on behalf of our Nation in that mission. He has held meetings with the hostage families, with government leaders from Israel and other countries, and so have we.

We have had numerous meetings here in Washington and in our States with families of the hostages. We have had personal meetings and calls with leaders of other countries that we think could play a constructive role in bringing the hostages home.

We are committed to always putting a spotlight on the hostages until they are brought home safely. We stand ready to do anything we possibly can.

So let me just give you an example of my weekend. On Friday night, the Jewish community in Baltimore hosted a Shabbat dinner with 240 empty seats at a table. My wife Myrna represented me at that gathering, reading a letter that I had written in solidarity with the community.

On Saturday, I attended religious services at B'nai Israel in Montgomery County, and I was proud of what that congregation did to put a spotlight on the hostages and demanding their safe return. Cantor Perlman rendered a beautiful rendition in honor of our continued commitment to bring the hostages home.

And then, on Sunday, on which we normally have morning prayers at our congregation at Beth Tfiloh—normally, there might be 15 or 20 who might show up for morning prayers on a Sunday morning—we had in excess of 240 representing every hostage, remembering their plight in our prayers, and making it clear that we are committed to doing everything we can to bring them home.

So that is why I am on the floor, speaking to my colleagues and expressing my views as a Senator, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and as a human, that we will not forget the hostages, and we will continue to do everything we can to bring them home.

On October 7, for many, the last they heard from their loved ones was the moments before the attack began, or, worse, just as they were being taken hostage. One woman was texting with her family as Hamas terrorists approached. She wrote:

If I don't live, stay happy in your life and take care of mom and dad all your life.

Then:

They're here.

One man's wife and children were missing after the attack. The soldiers could not identify them among the dead. But then they learned that someone had seen them being led off away alive, being taken hostage. The person said: Well, it sort of felt like winning the lottery.

Winning the lottery because your loved one was abducted and not murdered? Such painful combinations of hope and dread, but this is the unspeakable shock and grief being felt by so many since October 7, because, for every hostage, there are family members and loved ones praying that they are still alive, who cannot sleep at night as they imagine the pain and danger the hostages are facing in the tunnels of Gaza right now, who have

been enduring a nightmare since October 7.

On my trip to Israel we met with the families of the hostages, like the family of Hersh Goldberg-Polin, who was last seen loaded into a truck by Hamas after losing his arm in a grenade attack.

I am on the floor today because I want to tell just a few of the stories of those Hamas abducted and represent all the families of the hostages, families whose young children are being held by terrorists. Their stories are moving not only because of their suffering but because of their bravery.

I heard about a family that Hamas captured at gunpoint. In a moment of incredible heroism, the mother handed her toddler to her husband because he was a faster runner. He ran with bullets flying overhead so their daughter could be safe.

Yarden, the mother, is still in captivity. The families of the hostages will not give up. Their grace and bravery in the face of such horror is an inspiration.

The father of Itay, the father of Edan, the parents of Omer—all three of whom are from the New York area and even live near each other—they didn't know one another until this terrible tragedy unfolded and which now has brought them together.

Many of the families are communicating with each other, working together through WhatsApp groups. Within hours of the attack, they have created a website called "Bring Them Home Now." They are making sure the world hears their pleas. I want to make one thing crystal clear: We hear you. We stand with you in your effort to return your family members home safely. And I can assure you the Biden administration is working around the clock to help bring them home. They are working with governments who have the ability to negotiate using all the leverage they have to release them.

American personnel from the FBI and the Pentagon are working to support Israeli special operators. U.S. Special Forces are offering their expertise on hostage situations. Secretary Blinken said that "the entire United States Government will work every minute of every day" to bring them home. "Working as though these family members are our own," as I am.

President Biden has spoken repeatedly with Prime Minister Netanyahu. They have discussed efforts to locate and secure the release of hostages, including American citizens. On behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I want to assure you that we in the United States Senate stand with you as well. We must keep up the effort for the sake of those being held in Gaza. Don't forget they can come home safely. I am not naive. It will be tough, but it can happen.

One of the hostages that has already been released is an 85-year-old woman from a kibbutz in southern Israel, whose husband remains in Hamas captivity. She described her experience in

Gaza, being beaten while lying on a motorcycle and going through tunnels. Like many of the hostages, she lived near the Palestinians in the kibbutzim outside of Gaza. They would regularly drive Palestinian patients from Gaza to the hospitals in Israel for treatment.

Like Lilach, a woman that Hamas murdered, who actually worked in the field of trauma relief focusing mainly on children, she was a longtime activist of Women in Black, an anti-war movement that was established by Israeli women after the first intifada. Seven of her family are still being held hostage, including a 3-year-old.

The cruel irony of the Hamas terrorist attack is that those who face the worst of October 7 believe the most in peace. They cared for their Palestinian neighbors. They believed in the two-state solution. This attack has changed their community and all of Israel forever.

I know that the kind of sheer evil we saw in the attack on October 7 is shocking and horrible. I was 15 months old when the Auschwitz-Birkenau and other concentration camps were liberated. I was too young to understand the headlines. But when I grew up, I heard the stories of life and death from survivors firsthand.

This experience of the Holocaust was imprinted on me and on an entire generation of Jews. It shaped our values in how we work, how we enact policy, and how we live with our families. It guides me today here on the floor of the Senate. It tells me that, despite this being the darkest days for Jews since the Holocaust, we must have faith. Despite bearing witness to some of the most horrific evil acts ever committed, we must find a way to reserve hope.

So, in closing, to the families of loved ones who are being held by Hamas: Do not lose hope. We will never stop standing with you. To the hostages themselves, you are not alone. We will not stop working for your safe return. I pray that you will be back home soon playing soccer, practicing piano, celebrating your birthdays, living life in Israel that is safe and secure and at peace.

That is our prayer, but it is also our mission. We will not rest until we do everything we can for the safe return of the hostages.

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. DURBIN. 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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julia E.

Kobick, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, you are aware of the fact that I announced last week in the committee that we would vote to authorize subpoenas to Harlan Crow, Robin Arkley, and Leonard Leo as part of the Judiciary Committee's continuing investigation into the ethical situation at the U.S. Supreme Court.

I do not make this decision lightly. Seeking authorization to issue subpoenas is a relatively rare occurrence in the committee. So today I come to the floor for a few minutes to explain why we have taken this significant step.

Over the last several months, it has become clear that the Supreme Court is in desperate need of a binding code of ethics as we learned of lavish gifts and luxury travel that certain Supreme Court Justices have accepted from a gaggle of fawning billionaires.

Let's start with Justice Clarence Thomas. The sheer number and value of gifts accepted by Justice Thomas is staggering, and the shamelessness with which he accepted them is stunning. For decades, Justice Thomas has accepted lavish gifts from Harlan Crow, a conservative billionaire with business before the Supreme Court. These gifts have ranged from a \$19,000 Bible once owned by Frederick Douglass to a \$15,000 bust of Abraham Lincoln. Justice Thomas also accepted private jet trips and free lodging at Bohemian Grove, an exclusive all-male, invitation-only retreat in the redwoods of California. And these are only examples of what Justice Thomas disclosed.

After the Los Angeles Times reported on these disclosures, Justice Thomas, in 2004, 19 years ago, promptly stopped disclosing gifts as required by law.

We learned this year that he continued to accept expensive gifts for the past 19 years and that these billionaire benefactors have been part of a growing list.

There isn't time to detail all of the undisclosed gifts, which the press has discovered, and luxury travel that Justice Thomas has accepted, but for the sake of a record, I am going to give a few examples.

In 2019, Justice Thomas and his wife flew to Indonesia on Harlan Crow's private jet and boarded Crow's 162-foot superyacht, the Michaela Rose, to island hop with Harlan Crow and his wife.

The total cost of that trip alone could have exceeded half a million dollars if Justice Thomas had chartered the jet and yacht. Lucky for him, Harlan Crow was happy to cover the costs.

Justice Thomas also continued to join Crow on trips to Bohemian Grove in California. He visited Crow's ranch in East Texas, spent summers at

Crow's private resort in the Adirondacks.

But there is more. Crow paid thousands of dollars to cover tuition for Justice Thomas's grandnephew. He purchased real estate owned by Thomas and his relatives, including Thomas's mother's home, where she continues to live rent-free. And Crow donated half a million dollars to a conservative advocacy group founded by Justice Thomas's wife.

I could go on and on and on because the list of gifts Justice Thomas has chosen to accept and failed to disclose goes on and on and on.

Justice Thomas is not the only Supreme Court Justice who has accepted lavish gifts from billionaires and refused to disclose them. In 2008, Justice Samuel Alito boarded a private jet bound for Alaska to enjoy a luxury fishing trip, a trip that should have cost him over \$100,000, but it didn't cost him one penny because of the man who organized the flight and joined Alito on the luxury fishing trip, Leonard Leo.

Mr. Leo arranged Justice Alito's free flight to Alaska and his free lodging once he arrived. Their host at the luxury fishing lodge was a gentleman named Robin Arkley. Over the next few days, Justice Alito and his travel companions enjoyed guided fishing trips, flights on bush planes, meals of Alaskan king crab and Kobe beef, and wines costing upward of \$1,000 a bottle.

Justice Alito did not disclose any of this, and when challenged, for example, on the jet ride—why that should be disclosed—he said he didn't view it as a gift because if he didn't go, the seat on the plane would have gone empty.

That is an interesting analysis of a gift from a strict constructionist.

This kind of scandalous behavior cannot continue. One former Federal judge who served for years on the judicial committee that reviews the Justices' financial disclosures had this to say about the gifts to Justice Thomas:

In my career, I don't remember ever seeing this degree of largesse given to anybody.

When referring to the cascade of gifts from Harlan Crow to Justice Thomas, the former chief White House ethics lawyer for Republican President George W. Bush said:

This is way outside the norm. This is way in excess of anything I've seen.

And renowned conservative jurist, Judge J. Michael Luttig, stated in testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

The Supreme Court should want to lead by the example that only it can set. It should want to conduct itself in its non-judicial activities in all ways such that it is beyond reproach.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court has not lived up to this expectation. That is why our Senate Judiciary Committee is exercising its constitutional authority to investigate. Months ago, I, along with my Democratic colleagues on the committee, sent letters to Crow, Arkley, and Leo, among others, seeking details about what exactly

has been provided to Supreme Court Justices. Our goal has been to understand how specific individuals and groups with business before the Court have used undisclosed gifts to gain private access to Justices—access not afforded to others.

For months, Crow has refused to fully comply with the committee's requests, and Leo has completely stonewalled the committee. Only now, under threat of subpoena, Mr. Arkley has stepped forward, and we are looking forward to continuing our conversation with him this week.

The fact that we have to go to this length is unacceptable but necessary. The Senate and the American people deserve to know the full extent of how billionaires with interests before the Court use their immense wealth to buy private access to our Supreme Court.

That is why, on Thursday, the Judiciary Committee will vote to authorize subpoenas for these individuals. The vote is a critical step in the committee's exercise of its constitutional right and duty to conduct oversight of the Federal judiciary. It is critical to the committee's effort to restore the Court's reputation. The highest Court in the land should not have the lowest standard of ethics.

This is not a fight I wanted, but now that it has come to this, the Judiciary Committee will not back down.

Most Americans are shocked to know or to learn that the nine Justices on the Supreme Court are the only high-ranking Federal officials in the United States of America who are beyond the reach of a code of ethics. How do you explain that?

How can you explain that every Federal judge in America is bound by a code of ethics except for the nine Supreme Court Justices?

What is so special about them? The Constitution makes it clear that we don't have royalty in this country. They are acting like they belong to some legal fraternity or sorority. That has got to come to an end.

When you look at the situation, Members of Congress are held to standards—and I am not complaining. I knew what I was getting into when I signed up for this job—held to standards of disclosure and limitation on gifts.

I cannot tell you how many times I have said to a person: Is this worth more than 50 bucks? If they answer: Well, maybe, it might be, I say: Well, keep it and thanks for thinking of me.

That is the kind of thing that just becomes a routine part of public service. These lavish gifts, particularly from individuals who have business before the Court, are just unacceptable and inexplicable.

It is important for us to have a response when people ask: What are you doing to clean up things at the Supreme Court?

The first thing we did, I think, was the responsible and respectable thing to do. We invited the Chief Justice of

the Supreme Court to appear before our committee and tell us his thoughts on the subject and what he believes should be done to deal with this bad publicity and these disclosures. He declined the invitation. I don't hold it against him. He explained, in my presence, a few weeks ago why he did. I understand it. I disagree with it, but I understand it.

But 11 years ago, was the first time I contacted the Chief Justice and said: This has got to come to an end. Tell us what you are going to do about establishing a code of ethics on the Supreme Court. Eleven years ago and nothing—nothing—has happened since.

I want to salute and commend my colleague Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of the State of Rhode Island. He has been a leader on this topic in the subcommittee which he chairs on the Judiciary Committee, and we have cooperated in this effort.

We will meet this week. This is not the first time the Judiciary Committee will be asked to issue subpoenas. They happened before under Republican leadership as well in a much different type of case. But the fact of the matter is, we have tried carefully and studiously to come up with this information the right way, and, unfortunately, we have not gotten the kind of results we wanted. A subpoena, we hope, will jar loose the information to explain exactly what happened with the gift-giving by several individuals.

ISRAEL

Mr. President, one of my extraordinary friends in Chicago is Dr. Sahloul. Dr. Sahloul is a Syrian American. He is an exceptional man, and his wife Suzanne is also an extraordinary person. He has created an organization called MedGlobal. The best way to summarize what it does is to think of doctors without frontiers and how they travel across the world and go to some of the most dangerous places and volunteer medical assistance. Dr. Sahloul, through MedGlobal, has done the same thing.

Many of the doctors who volunteer for MedGlobal are Muslim and from the Middle East themselves, but they can be found in any spot in the world. He calls me from places, and I have run into him in places and seen him. I just can't believe what this man does. He risks his life to go to war zones to treat people who have been injured. I think so highly of him.

He has a friend in Gaza—a friend, a doctor—who was highlighted in the New York Times several days ago, Dr. Hussam Abu Safiyya, the director of the pediatric ward at Kamal Adwan Hospital. Many of the casualties from the Jabalia strikes were taken to that hospital. I read this article, and I have reread it many times. I try to understand what is happening on the ground in Gaza. Let me start at the beginning.

What the terrorist group Hamas did to Israel was an atrocity. The attack on October 7 cannot be rationalized, explained, or, for that matter, forgiven

for what they did to the innocent victims in Israel. The fact that Israel is defending itself is perfectly right in my eyes. They have a right to do that. Of course, Hamas continues to be a terrorist threat to them, and to try to stop Hamas and this activity is understood.

At the same time, it is important that they accept the standards which civilized nations accept even in the conduct of warfare. That is the message that has been delivered by President Biden and again by Antony Blinken, our Secretary of State, over and over: Be careful that your ultimate reaction is consistent with the threat and used to the basic standards of civilization. That has been a request over and over again.

The reason I come to the floor is because I got a call this morning from Dr. Sahloul, and he spoke this morning to Dr. Hussam again about the situation at this hospital. What the doctor had to say is basically what was in the article in The New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

GAZA DOCTOR WITNESSING NIGHTMARISH SITUATION

(By Hiba Yazbek and Karen Zraick)

The Jabaliya neighborhood north of Gaza City was pummeled with Israeli airstrikes for a third consecutive day on Thursday, while doctors treating the victims described nightmarish scenes of operating without basic supplies or anesthesia.

Dr. Hussam Abu Safiyya, director of the pediatric ward at Kamal Adwan Hospital, where many of the casualties from the Jabaliya strikes were taken, said the majority of the people arriving were children. Many were severely burned or were missing limbs.

On Tuesday, after the first strike in Jabaliya, the hospital received about 40 people who did not survive, and 250 others who were wounded, he said. The numbers were nearly the same on Wednesday, when another strike hit. On Thursday, a strike damaged a United Nations school being used as a shelter and sent in another wave of patients: 10 dead and 80 others wounded.

"I've never in my life seen injuries this bad," Dr. Abu Safiyya said on Thursday by phone, adding, "We saw children without heads."

The U.N. agency for Palestinian refugees, UNRWA, which runs the school, said that the school had been among four of its shelters—housing nearly 20,000 people total—that had been damaged in the previous 24 hours. Twenty people were reported to have been killed at the Jabaliya shelter, the agency said, along with three people in other strikes at the Shati and Bureij camps.

The Israeli military said that in its strikes on Jabaliya, it had been targeting Hamas commanders who played key roles in the attacks on Oct. 7, which Israeli officials said killed more than 1,400 people. The military also said that Hamas had an extensive tunnel network in Jabaliya.

On Wednesday, Dr. Abu Safiyya said, he was working with a colleague in the hospital's neonatal intensive-care unit—one of two units that still had power amid a severe fuel shortage—when casualties from Jabaliya started arriving.

When they rushed down to the emergency room to help, he said, his colleague was stunned to see that two of her own children were among the dead. Her 9-year-old and 7-year-old had been killed in their home, he said, along with several of her siblings and relatives.

"We are working at a place where at any moment we expect our children, spouses, siblings or friends to come in in pieces," he said.

Some children could not be identified because of the severity of their injuries, he said. The hospital's morgue was so full that people were stacking bodies on top of one another.

"We wish for death," said Dr. Abu Safyia. "It is easier than seeing the horrific scenes we're witnessing."

He later added: "Live images are being broadcast to the whole world of people blown up into pieces, of women and children who are being murdered, for what? What did they do wrong?"

The hospital, which is in the city of Beit Lahia, just north of Jabaliya, was running extremely low on medical supplies, like all others in the Gaza Strip, he said. With no anesthesia, doctors were operating on people with severe injuries using over-the-counter painkillers like paracetamol to help ease the pain. They had a limited supply of antibiotics and were using vinegar and chlorine to disinfect wounds, the doctor added.

"The children's screams during surgeries can be heard from outside," Dr. Abu Safyia said. "We are operating on people's skulls without anesthesia."

Doctors and nurses were using the flashlights on their phones to operate in the dark because a severe shortage of fuel had left the hospital's generators able to power only two departments—the neonatal intensive-care unit and the pediatric emergency room, where 12 children are on ventilators, he said. If the fuel runs out, he added, "the hospital will turn into a mass grave."

Hours earlier, Dr. Ashraf Al-Qudra, a spokesman for the Hamas-run Gazan Health Ministry, had held up the body of a dead child wrapped in a shroud at a news conference at Al-Shifa Hospital as he described the growing death toll.

The ministry said that more than 9,000 people had been killed since the start of Israel's relentless bombardment of Gaza, including more than 3,000 children. Many others remain missing or buried under the rubble.

Dr. Ghassan Abu-Sittah, a British-Palestinian plastic surgeon volunteering at Shifa's burn treatment unit, said the hospital—the largest in Gaza—had received about 70 patients from the strikes on Jabaliya since Tuesday, and many had no homes to return to.

Medical workers were being stretched to the breaking point, and normally preventable deaths had begun to soar, he said. Each surgery was turning into a grueling exercise of trying to use the fewest resources possible, he said.

The Gazan Health Ministry said 16 of the 35 hospitals in the Strip were already out of service from damage or lack of power. The maternity ward at Shifa was being used to treat the wounded, and expectant mothers had been moved to Al-Hilo Hospital, which the ministry said was damaged by bombardment on Wednesday night.

Communications with Gaza City remained spotty to nonexistent on Thursday, after a blackout for much of Wednesday left ambulances and rescue workers unable to find the injured, the U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs said.

Ahmad Sardah, a Jabaliya resident who said his home had been damaged by the

strike on Wednesday, was able to send a quick message during a fleeting moment of internet connection before contact was lost again.

He said in a Facebook post he managed to write on Thursday: "If only friends and relatives who are outside could tell us what is going on around us instead of asking us how we are doing, because without internet and phone lines, all we hear is airstrikes and bombs. Where, how, why, and who? None of us know."

Dr. Ghassan Khatib, a political scientist at Birzeit University in the occupied West Bank, said that Jabaliya—both the name of a town and a refugee camp next to it—had a reputation as a stronghold of resistance to Israeli occupation for years.

The first intifada, an uprising that lasted from 1987 to 1993, started there after camp residents were run over by an Israeli vehicle, he said. Their funerals became demonstrations that spread to the Balata refugee camp in the West Bank city of Nablus and elsewhere, he said.

Tamara Alrifai, an official with UNRWA, said in an online briefing Thursday that the agency believed that about 30,000 of the Jabaliya camp's 116,000 residents had remained after Israel's order to evacuate under threat of bombardment last month. It was unclear whether they had all gone to the south, as directed, or to other areas of northern Gaza.

People displaced throughout Gaza have flocked to hospitals, hoping for a greater chance at safety. The Kamal Adwan Hospital is also housing more than 3,000 displaced people. Dr. Abu Safyia is among them, and barely sleeping. He said he sometimes goes into an empty room, shuts the door and sobs.

"These are people who had dreams, they had lives, they had a future," he said. "It all ended."

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, here is the situation reported from the hospital in Gaza: They will be out of fuel and electricity in 24 hours. Dr. Hussam told Dr. Sahloul that at this point, five children will die. The ventilators that are keeping them alive will be turned off. They cannot be transported to a better or a safer place. Turning off the electricity in some areas of the hospital will cause great hardship and pain. There is no fuel at the other hospitals either. In the north, they have basically been cut off from any assistance. It is impossible to transfer to the south because they don't have transportation, and they don't have the wherewithal—the ambulances and such—to do so. The desperate situation they have reached includes performing amputations with no anesthesia—performing amputations with no anesthesia.

I asked Dr. Sahloul: What do they use?

He said: Tylenol.

Can you imagine? Tylenol? They use vinegar because they don't have any access to iodine to be able to clean the wounds before the operations. Vinegar.

Every day, 200 people show up at their hospital, sick from the contaminated water which they are forced to drink. They are begging for help. They are asking for a pause so that basics can be provided: food, electricity, fuel, medicines—the basics. I don't think that is an unreasonable request, and I am sorry that they have been turned

down in their efforts to get this kind of help. There are 150 patients in this hospital—twice the number as usual—with many of them sleeping on the floor. And surgeries are performed on the floor.

I read this article last Friday and kept a copy of it. Now I will enter it into the RECORD for others to read as well.

At one point, Dr. Abu Safyia said:

We wish for death. It is easier than seeing the horrific scenes we're witnessing.

Twice now, this refugee camp, Jabalia, has been attacked by the Israelis as a site of Hamas terrorism. Unfortunately, on the first day of the attack, 40 people did not survive and 250 others were brought to the hospital. Then the attack took a second day but, basically, was the same as the last.

The doctor said: I've never in my life seen injuries this bad. He added: We saw children decapitated as a result of these attacks.

Asking for a pause in the war for the purpose of humanitarian relief is not unreasonable; it is humane and civilized. The United States is begging both sides to take that step. I will join that effort. I hope that this ends well and soon.

In the meantime, these innocent, helpless victims need to have a helping hand from the rest of the world. We need to provide the basics so they can survive. I will do my best to follow this closely. I encourage the United States to continue its efforts to ask for this pause in the actions for relief of the victims. This sort of situation in any part of the world cannot be ignored.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.)

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

NOMINATION OF JULIA E. KOBICK

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of the nomination of Ms. Julia Kobick to the United States Court for the District of Massachusetts.

Today, the Senate voted to invoke cloture on Ms. Kobick's nomination, and, soon, we will vote on her confirmation. With a successful vote, Ms. Kobick will become the 150th Biden nominee to be confirmed as a judge.

Julia Kobick is a rising star in Massachusetts legal circles. A Massachusetts native, she earned her bachelor's degree in government, with honors, from Harvard College. She began her career as a public schoolteacher to New York City's second and third graders. While teaching, she earned a master's in elementary education at Pace University. She went on to obtain her law degree, magna cum laude, at Harvard Law School.

Ms. Kobick then clerked at every level of the Federal judiciary—first, with Judge Dennis Saylor on the District Court of Massachusetts, then for Chief Judge Michael Chagares on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and, finally, for the great Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg on the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 2013, following her clerkships, Ms. Kobick joined the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office. She worked there until 2021 as an assistant attorney general in the constitutional and administrative law division. Her practice spanned a range of substantive areas, including healthcare, child welfare, administrative law, and constitutional issues. Since the summer of 2021, Ms. Kobick has served as deputy State solicitor, where she has primarily handled civil and criminal appellate litigation.

Ms. Kobick has received support from a number of groups, including from Massachusetts trial and appellate judges, former Massachusetts attorneys general, and her clerk colleagues at the U.S. Supreme Court—clerks who worked for Justices nominated by Presidents of both parties. Many of Ms. Kobick's supporters cite her dedication and character, alongside her superior skill and judgment. Unsurprisingly, the American Bar Association has given her its highest rating of "well qualified."

Perhaps the best evidence of Ms. Kobick's fitness to serve on the district court is the enthusiastic support her nomination has received from her own opposing counsel. A cadre of attorneys who has litigated cases against parties Ms. Kobick represented has praised her "meticulous advocacy" across a variety of legal proceedings.

From oral arguments before State and Federal trial court judges to appellate arguments before the First Circuit Court of Appeals and the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, the very lawyers who faced off against her in court have said that "her legal abilities and intellect are first-rate as shown through the clarity and persuasiveness of her written and oral advocacy." They have lauded her preparedness and performance under pressure, her thoughtfulness as a colleague, and her skill in diffusing "any contentious situation."

Over the course of her career, Ms. Kobick has embodied the highest standards of the legal profession. True to her roots as a public schoolteacher, Ms. Kobick has mentored public interest-oriented law students at my alma mater, Boston College Law School, and has served as a mentor with The Appellate Project, an organization that matches attorneys with law students of color who are interested in appellate advocacy.

Senator WARREN and I are proud to have recommended Julie Kobick's nomination to President Biden, and we proudly speak in favor of her nomination before the full Senate today. She is a dedicated public servant of the highest caliber, and she will bring a rare level of legal talent to the bench. Her unquestionable integrity, her impeccable reputation, and her depth in both humility and skill make her uniquely suited for service as a Federal district court judge.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on cloture and then on confirma-

tion. This will be a judge all of you will be proud you have voted for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I think we are all aware that parts of our world are on fire. The world is on fire in Ukraine and in Eastern Europe, and the world is on fire in the Middle East. I wouldn't describe the world as being on fire in the Indo-Pacific, but there are certainly embers, and they are smoldering.

I think it is clear to most Americans that President Xi in China, that President Putin in Russia, and that the Ayatollah in Iran are working together, and their objective is to have Russia dominate Central and Eastern Europe and to have the Ayatollah in Iran dominate the Middle East. The Ayatollah, of course, is funding and supports Hamas.

There is no cause in the world—none—that can justify what Hamas did to the innocent people of Israel. The people of Hamas are so evil they will kill you and drink your blood out of a boot. And President Xi and President Putin and the Ayatollah in Iran are just fine with that.

The third objective of China, Russia, and Iran is to allow China to dominate the Indo-Pacific and be free to make moves in Sub-Saharan Africa and in South America.

Parts of the world are on fire. America is about to find out what it is made of because the world I just described is not a world safe for America.

But as we meet these challenges, Mr. President—and by God, we will meet them. We will meet them. While we are doing that, I don't want us to forget about our homeland. We have a lot of problems domestically, and I don't want us to lose sight of them. I think about them every day. I know you do, too, Mr. President.

We still have millions of Americans who are too poor to be sick despite the fact that we have the best quality of healthcare in America in all of human history. Notice I didn't say that we have the best way of delivering that healthcare. But we have the best quality of healthcare in all of human history, but we have people in this country—many of them are middle class—who are too poor to be sick. Since the Affordable Care Act passed, we were told that it was going to make our lives better, that it was going to make health insurance more accessible and cheaper. Since the Affordable Care Act was passed, health insurance premiums have tripled.

We also know domestically that our border is an open, bleeding wound. It is an open, bleeding wound, and it is within the power of this Congress to fix that.

But none of those domestic problems that I just described—and I could continue with others, as I know you could, too, Mr. President—is hurting the

American people as much as President Biden's inflation. Not a single one. President Biden's inflation is gutting the American people like a fish. It is a cancer—a cancer—on the American dream.

In my State alone, in Louisiana—we are not a wealthy State. My people are pretty middle class. They get up every day. They go to work. They obey the law. They try to do the right things by their kids, try to save a little for retirement. The median household income for a family of four in my State is \$55,000 a year. A lot of States are above us; some are below us.

President Biden's inflation, which is manmade—and that man's name is Joe Biden—is costing my people, the average Louisiana family, \$806—not a year, a month, \$806 a month. That is \$9,700 a year. Now, imagine if you were making \$55,000 a year, and you have to come out of pocket with an extra \$9,700 a year. You blow through your savings. You max out your credit card. You borrow from your children's college education plan. You borrow from relatives. And then what do you do?

I know what some of my colleagues are thinking: But, KENNEDY, we are doing better on inflation.

We are, and I am so thankful. A year ago, inflation in this country was 8.2 percent. Today, it is 3.7 percent. I am so happy, and I hope it continues to go down, but it is important for us to remember what that means.

A reduction of inflation from 8.2 percent to 3.7 percent—which is still, of course, too high—just means that inflation is rising less rapidly. We still have inflation. Prices are still high, and they continue to go up; they just are not going up as quickly as they were. That is a good thing, but it doesn't solve the problem. That is what we call disinflation. When inflation is rising and we stop it from rising so quickly, that is called disinflation. But that is not what most Americans care about, although that is important to them. What they care about is prices going down, and that is deflation. We do not have deflation.

The point I am trying to make is, we are stuck with these high prices. If they get inflation down to zero, those prices are not going down; they are going to remain the same. They are just not going to rise as quickly. We are stuck. The American people are stuck with these high prices because of the Biden administration.

I could cite you all the sterile statistics you would like, but I want to try to describe in specific terms what it is like for my people to go to the grocery store, to have to—this is an exaggeration but not by much—to have to think about, well, do I have to sell blood plasma today in order to go to the grocery store? Do I have to draw down on the second mortgage on my home in order to go to the grocery store?

Since President Biden has been in office, consumer goods in the United States of America are up 17 percent,

electricity is up 25 percent, eggs are up 29 percent. They are not going down, folks. Even if inflation goes to zero, those prices aren't going down. Potato chips, up 30 percent; bread, up 28 percent; coffee, 30 percent; rice, 26 percent. Flour is up 28 percent; milk, 18 percent; half a gallon of ice cream, 21 percent; chicken, 20 percent.

When you look at larger categories, this is what is happening to the American people. Since President Biden took office—since President Biden took office—all goods and many services in the wealthiest country in all of human history are up 17 percent. Food is up 20 percent. Housing is up 17 percent. Clothing is up 12 percent. Used cars and trucks are up 25 percent. New cars and trucks are up 20 percent. Mortgage rates are up 174 percent—174 percent.

Some may be saying: Well, but wages are going up too.

Thank goodness. In some cases, wages have gone up. But the average wage of the average American has gone down after inflation. The appropriate way to look at wage increases is not to look at the raw aggregate increase; it is looking at the increase after inflation. If you take all of the average wage increases in the United States of America and you looked at the average inflation in the United States of America, workers have actually lost ground. Workers today, in November of 2023, are actually making less per hour after inflation than they were in February of 2021. So don't let anybody tell you that wages have made up for this. They haven't kept up with inflation.

Don't let anybody tell you we are winning the war on high prices. We are getting inflation down, no thanks—no thanks—to the Biden administration and, quite frankly, the U.S. Congress. That is thanks to the Federal Reserve. They have tightened interest rates, which has hurt a lot of people, but they have gotten inflation down. They had to do it with one arm tied behind their backs because the other way you attack inflation and the only way we have ever successfully gotten it down is to have Congress do its part and reduce the rate of growth and spending and debt accumulation. But we haven't done that. We haven't done that. In fact, since 2019, the population of the United States of America is up 1.9 percent. Our country has grown 2 percent since 2019. Do you know how much our budget has grown? Fifty-five percent.

This inflation is manmade, and the man's name is Joe Biden, and we need to address it.

So as we fight a hostile world which day by day is becoming less safe for the American people, I don't want us to lose sight of another problem—an equally important problem—that is stealing the American dream, and it is called President Biden's inflation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled rollcall votes: Myself for up to 15 minutes, Senator GILLIBRAND for up to 5 minutes, Senator COTTON for up to 5 minutes, and Leader SCHUMER for up to 5 minutes.

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

ISRAEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, 1 month ago today, Hamas launched its unprovoked attack on the State of Israel, on innocent men, women, and children, civilians all. Hamas entered the country by land, air, and sea, and they brutally murdered more than 1,400 Israelis. They also took hundreds of hostages, some of whom were American citizens. They abused and assaulted innocent civilians and left a trail of devastation in their wake.

In the face of Hamas's barbaric attack, Israel has done what any country would do and defended its citizens and its sovereignty, and it has every right to do so. This basic truth has somehow become a point of confusion in some circles, but we should not be confused.

Many on the far left—including at least one Member of the House of Representatives—have pointed to Israel's defense as an example of what she calls genocide. They act as though Israel was the aggressor here, not Hamas. They called on the President to speak out against the actions of the victim, not the aggressor. It is as though they think Israel is somehow the moral equivalent of the terrorist group Hamas.

It is especially disturbing to see this rhetoric spreading on social media because many people who were not familiar with the facts, the circumstances, and the history of Hamas and Israel, Iran, and Hezbollah—they may actually believe the disinformation and propaganda they see on social media. It is also very deeply disturbing to see how it is absorbed and embraced by many college campuses, and it is downright disturbing, of course, to see it repeated here in the Halls of Congress.

There should be no confusion. Hamas is the aggressor, and Hamas bears ultimate responsibility for the pain and suffering in Israel and in Gaza. Hamas's own tactics are the very reason for the loss of life in Gaza and that it has been so high, because these terrorists, who care nothing about the individuals, have a long history of using Palestinian civilians as human shields for their own benefit.

And then Hamas operates a vast network of tunnels underneath Gaza. The tunnels shield terrorists from the dangerous fighting above ground. They also store critical supplies like water, food, and fuel, which are being kept

from the Palestinian civilians. As many of us are concerned about the humanitarian disaster caused by Hamas's attack on Israel, it is Hamas itself that is exacerbating and making the humanitarian crisis worse.

It seems likely that the tunnels are also the hiding place for more than 200 hostages taken by Hamas last month. A video recently shared online of a Hamas gunman who was captured and interrogated by the Israeli officials was particularly revealing. He said that Hamas shelters in tunnels and basements under clinics, schools, and hospitals because they know the Israelis will not target those locations out of concern for the collateral damage or damage to innocent civilians. That is why Hamas deliberately places innocent Palestinians between its terrorist foot soldiers and incoming rockets.

As a result of Hamas's human shield strategy, the number of civilian casualties in Gaza is devastating. There is no denying that. It is important, though, to remember that the pain and suffering that is occurring throughout Israel and Gaza is directly attributable to Hamas, a U.S.-designated terrorist organization serving as a proxy for the No. 1 state-sponsor of terrorism, which is Iran. The blood of this war is clearly on Hamas's hands.

As the fighting continues, I am reminded of a saying that has been around for years: If Hamas laid down its weapons today, there would be no more violence. If Israel laid down its weapons, there would be no more Israel.

Hamas is not fighting for peace. It is trying to wipe Israel off the map—again, as a proxy for its sponsor, which is the Supreme Leader in Tehran. They all share a desire to wipe the Jewish State off the map entirely.

The United States cannot equivocate between good and evil. We must stand with Israel. There is no question that words are important. We have a responsibility to voice our support, speak out against Hamas, and call out dangerous anti-Semitic slander when we see it.

But words alone are not enough. America has a responsibility to come to the aid of our ally with the resources it needs not only to fight but to actually win this war. This includes air defense systems that safeguard Israeli people from rocket attacks. It includes intelligence support to stay one step ahead of the terrorists. And it includes military aid to find and eliminate the Hamas threat.

As part of that commitment, Congress has a big job to do. We need to pass a supplemental funding bill to ensure Israel has the tools it needs to defeat Hamas terrorists, and, last week, the House of Representatives did just that. They passed an Israel aid bill with bipartisan support. Their legislation would provide up to \$14.3 billion to ensure that Israel has the resources they need to defend themselves.

Our friends across the Capitol offset the spending by reallocating a portion

of the bloated IRS funding from the Democrats' massive so-called Inflation Reduction Act. I would add that that was \$14.3 billion out of an \$80 billion appropriation to the Internal Revenue Service, hardly the majority of that funding.

But if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like those pay-fors, then they are free to come up with an alternative. But the truth is, they don't believe in paying for anything. And we saw, just this last year, about \$670 billion paid by the United States to our bond holders to help finance this national debt, and that is not getting any better by the day. Certainly, if we were to pass another supplemental appropriations bill to aid Israel or Ukraine, or for any other purpose, and actually make our national debt worse, it would put us on a perilous path.

Well, President Biden, who said, "We stand with Israel; we will do anything that they need us to do," has actually threatened to veto the \$14.3 billion supplemental appropriations bill that was passed by the House. How he can reconcile his stated support for Israel and his threat to veto a supplemental appropriations bill escapes me.

Then there is the majority leader here in the Senate—the Senator from New York, Senator SCHUMER—who said that the House bill is dead on arrival in the Senate, and he took his opposition a step further, blasting this legislation as "stunningly unserious" and "a joke."

Well, I have to respectfully disagree with the majority leader. There is nothing funny about denying Israel the assistance it needs in defending itself against this terrorist threat. It is no secret that America's national debt has put us in an extremely vulnerable position.

Thirteen years ago, Admiral Michael Mullen, who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned that "the most significant threat to our national security is our debt." That actually struck me as a little unusual at the time. But, at that time, the national debt was roughly \$13.5 trillion. Since then, it has more than doubled to \$33.6 trillion and counting.

So I think that what he was getting at is that the more we end up spending money that we are borrowing from subsequent generations and the more interest we have to continue to pay to people willing to buy our debt, we are going to have a whole lot less financial resources and flexibility that we need when unexpected things occur, like the Russian invasion of Ukraine or Hamas's invasion of Israel. We simply won't have the money and the flexibility to do what we expect America to do, which is to always lead and be an agent for peace and stability.

If we continue at this pace, our children and grandchildren will have no chance of digging out from under this debt. There is an old saying that "the best time to start was yesterday; the

next best time to start is now." We have a responsibility to start chipping away at the national debt now and certainly not to make it any worse. Every single spending bill is an opportunity to make tough but necessary choices to achieve that goal.

I am disappointed that the majority of our Democratic colleagues don't seem to have any interest in addressing this threat to our national security. Over the last couple of years, they have spent, on a party-line basis, \$2.6 trillion without a single Republican vote, and now they blast an attempt to address the growing debt as "unserious."

Well, that \$2.6 trillion in spending that our Democratic colleagues did on a party-line basis was partly responsible for our 40-year high inflation rate that is eating up the standard of living of hard-working Americans across the country. I think the figure I saw indicates that, if this is broken down per capita, it is roughly worth slightly under \$1,000 in additional costs for the average family.

Our Democratic colleagues, if they didn't like the pay-for provided by the House of Representatives, they could have suggested different offsets. You can't tell me, given the amount of money the Federal Government spends, that it couldn't find offsets for \$14.3 billion. Or the majority leader could have simply put the bill on the floor and left room open for an amendment process. But, instead, he resorted to name-calling and trying to belittle the serious efforts that the House has undertaken, both to deal with the emergency in Israel and the national debt.

In the next couple of weeks, the Senate and the House are going to have to work together to address the major issues that are swirling in front of Congress right now, which include Israel, Ukraine, the border, and, yes, keeping the government funded. This is hardly the way to start off on a good foot.

Republicans and Democrats in Congress overwhelmingly support Israel. We agree that the United States needs to provide support for our ally. At the same time, we need to get serious about addressing another massive national security threat, which is our growing national debt and the crowding out of our ability to spend money on other necessary priorities instead of paying China and Japan, who own that debt.

Washington has a spending problem. That is the first thing we need to acknowledge. Unfortunately, many of my colleagues are unwilling to acknowledge it. We have to get it under control.

Today marks 1 month since Hamas attacked Israel, and I am disappointed that the Senate has yet to act on support—financial support—for our closest ally in the Middle East. I have no idea what Senator SCHUMER's plans are to actually process this supplemental appropriation. I don't know how long Israel will have to sustain the onslaught of Hamas's rockets and ter-

rorist attacks on its people before the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Government will respond, as President Biden said we would.

Under the leadership of Speaker JOHNSON, the House did its job. It passed legislation to provide \$14.3 billion for Israel with bipartisan support. So I come to the floor profoundly disappointed that Senator SCHUMER refuses to take up this emergency supplemental appropriations bill to aid Israel.

The United States has a responsibility to stand with Israel. I think that is the consensus position here in Congress on a bipartisan basis. But it takes more than just words. It takes action.

One month after the war began is too long to respond to the needs that the people of Israel have to defend their country and their way of life. I hope we can see movement on this aid package for Israel sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF JULIA E. KOBICK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Julia Kobick to the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

Ms. Kobick is an accomplished litigator whose credentials and breadth of experience make her well-suited to serve on this court. After receiving her A.B. from Harvard College, her M.S. from Pace University, and her J.D. from Harvard Law School, Ms. Kobick began her legal career with prestigious clerkships for judges appointed by Presidents of both political parties: Judge F. Dennis Saylor IV on the District of Massachusetts, Judge Michael A. Chagares on the Third Circuit, and Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg on the Supreme Court.

After her clerkships, Ms. Kobick joined the Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General, serving first as an assistant attorney general and currently as the deputy State solicitor. During her tenure in that office, Ms. Kobick has practiced in Federal and State courts—handling cases defending State laws, regulations, and Agency actions, as well as affirmative cases brought by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Over the course of her career, she has argued more than 20 dispositive motions in trial courts and delivered oral arguments in 19 appeals.

Ms. Kobick has the strong support of her home state Senators, Ms. WARREN and Mr. MARKEY. In addition, she received a rating of "well qualified" from the American Bar Association. Ms. Kobick's credentials, breadth of experience, and deep ties to the Massachusetts legal community will serve the district court well. I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last month, Iranian-backed Hamas terrorists slaughtered over 30 Americans and 1,400 Israelis. These depraved savages raped women, murdered children, and executed entire families, burning some of them alive. The dead are still being identified, and families are still grieving unbelievable heartbreak.

Yet, over the weekend, former President Barack Obama discovered complexity and ambiguity where there is none in these attacks. He said that we “have to admit nobody’s hands are clean, that all of us are complicit to some degree.”

What Barack Obama said over the weekend might pass for profound at cocktail parties on Martha’s Vineyard or on podcasts with sycophantic former staffers, but it is also delusional and morally obtuse. Put simply, it is the confession of a guilty man attempting to implicate others, because we are not all complicit with Hamas’s massacre of Jews, but Barack Obama sure is.

No American President did more to embolden and enrich Iran and its terrorist proxies than Barack Obama. Indeed, his entire Middle East policy was crafted to appease Iran. As President, he stayed quiet when Iranian protesters took to the streets in the Green Revolution. He sabotaged legislation in Congress sanctioning Iran. He cut and ran from Iraq, knowing that Iran and its proxies would fill the power vacuum. He refused to enforce a self-drawn redline and stood by as Syria disintegrated into a “geopolitical Chernobyl” because Bashar al-Assad is an Iranian puppet. He consistently undermined Benjamin Netanyahu—Iran’s chief nemesis in the region—and even refused to veto a United Nations Security Council resolution condemning Israel. And, of course, he negotiated the disastrous Iran nuclear deal, handing the ayatollahs over \$100 billion in sanctions relief. Barack Obama single-handedly saved the Iranian economy and harmed diplomatic relations with our allies in Saudi Arabia and Israel. When he left office, the Middle East was in flames, and Iran was on the march.

Tragically, Barack Obama’s coterie of Iran appeasers, apologists, and accomplices have returned to the White House. His understudy, Joe Biden, is now President. The man who helped to secretly negotiate the Iran nuclear deal, Jake Sullivan, is now National Security Advisor. His Treasury Secretary, who served as a de facto investment banker for the ayatollahs, is now Ambassador to Israel. Barack Obama’s legacy is alive and well in this administration, and it certainly shows.

Within days of taking office, the Biden administration removed the Houthis—another Iranian proxy—from

the list of terrorist organizations without any concessions. And how did the Houthis reward Joe Biden? By firing dozens of missiles and attack drones towards Israel just days after Hamas’s rampage.

In his first hundred days, the Biden administration announced that it would send hundreds of millions of dollars to Iran’s friends in Gaza, Judea, and Samaria. They claimed it would foster peace and stability in the region. How did that work out? The next month, Iranian-backed militias launched 4,000 rockets into Israel.

Since taking office, Joe Biden has enriched the ayatollahs with over \$90 billion through his lax enforcement of oil sanctions and his unfreezing of Iranian assets. Tehran has predictably used this Biden bonus to strengthen its military and arm its proxies.

Just last year, Iran doubled the budget of the Revolutionary Guard Corps—the shock troops of its terror regime—and it more than tripled its support for Hamas’s military brigades.

The very same month that Biden agreed to unfreeze \$6 billion in Iranian assets, the Revolutionary Guard Corps reportedly started to assist with the planning of the October 7 attacks that killed, I say again, over 30 Americans and more than 1,400 Israelis.

This is the nature of the regime that Barack Obama coddled for years. It is the nature of the regime that has dispatched its proxies to attack American servicemembers over 110 times since Joe Biden took office. Let me say that again. Iran’s proxies have attacked American troops in positions in the Middle East over 110 times since Joe Biden took office. What have Joe Biden and his gang of Obama acolytes done in return? They fired a few missiles at empty proxy warehouses, merely validating Iran’s proxy strategy.

The ayatollahs are laughing at Joe Biden, just like they laughed at Barack Obama.

Barack Obama is the last person who should pontificate on this issue. The only thing we should hear from him is an admission that he was wrong and an apology. Maybe he can include it in his upcoming fourth memoir due out later this year.

My message to the former President is simple: Don’t try to excuse your own failures by blaming the rest of us. The people “complicit” in the attack on Israel are the terrorists who committed it, the Iranian regime that funded it, and the Obama and Biden administrations that appeased them. The responsibility for the events of October 7 rest squarely on their shoulders and their shoulders alone.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, today, I want to tell you about a story of love, a love between two people that is beautiful and deep. It is the story of a couple known as Judy and Gad, two people in their seventies who believe in humanity and in peace.

Judy is a native New Yorker who teaches English literature and mindfulness. Gad is a chef and a jazz musician who friends describe as funny and authentic. The couple raised four children and have welcomed seven grandchildren. They inspire those around them with their big hearts and their open minds.

On the morning of October 7, they were walking near a kibbutz, Nir Oz. When rockets rained down overhead, they hid face down in nearby fields. At one point, Judy called an ambulance because the couple had been shot, but the ambulance couldn’t reach them, and now they are both missing.

Judy and Gad are just two of the hundreds of people held hostage by the terrorist organization Hamas. They are peaceful, loving people who don’t deserve to suffer. But since October 7, their family hasn’t heard from them, and as the war in Gaza grows, they are concerned about the couple’s safety and well-being.

Another family in Nir Oz was also taken by the terrorists. Their cousin, a New Yorker, has been working with my office. She says they are “six of the human beings she loves most in the entire world.” She says she won the lottery as a member of their close-knit family. According to Alana, the New Yorker we have been working with, Danielle is like her sister, a natural nurturer who gives great hugs.

Danielle was with her 5-year-old daughter when they were taken hostage by Hamas. They were visiting Danielle’s sister Sharon, her brother-in-law David, and their 3-year-old twin girls. When the attack began, the family hid in their bomb shelter as Hamas set fire to their neighbor’s house. The shelter filled with smoke and forced them out to face the terrorists. The last time they were heard from was on a phone call with a relative. Sharon said, “I don’t think we can survive this, I love you” and hung up.

While these horrors can test our resolve, the love within these families should be an inspiration to all of us. It should strengthen our commitment to keep fighting for their safety. In this darkness, we must never lose that strength. To quote from an inscription written in defiance of the Holocaust, we must “believe in the sun even when it is not shining.” We must “believe in love even when feeling it not.”

NOMINATION OF RAMON ERNESTO REYES, JR.

I would now like to speak about the vote we are about to have on the floor. I would like to stand in support of Judge Ramon Reyes, an accomplished jurist and dedicated public servant whose breadth of experience on and off the bench will make him an outstanding addition to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

On February 9, 2023, Reyes was voted out of committee by a vote of 11 to 10. All committee Democrats voted aye. Reyes was unanimously rated “well qualified” by the ABA.

This nominee was born in Brooklyn. He earned a B.S. from Cornell, a J.D. from Brooklyn Law School, and his L.L.M. from New York University Law School. In addition to an Eastern District clerkship, Reyes had a varied legal practice over the course of 13 years, representing corporate defendants in a large firm, helping draft legislation from the New York City Council, handling both civil and criminal matters, and assisting a U.S. attorney in the Southern District of New York.

Reyes was appointed in 2006 to serve as the Federal magistrate judge for the Eastern District of New York. Since taking the bench, Judge Reyes has presided over 33 trials—15 jury trials and 18 bench trials. They cover a range of cases that come before this district court, including criminal matters, employment issues, and civil rights cases.

With his significant trial experience and depth of knowledge of the district to which he has been nominated, Judge Reyes will be a tremendous asset to the Eastern District of New York, and I urge my colleagues to support him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

NOMINATION OF JULIA E. KOBICK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a few moments, the Senate will confirm Julia Kobick as district judge for the District of Massachusetts.

I have great news: The Senate is about to confirm the 100th woman and the 150th judge overall to the Federal bench since we took the majority.

One judge at a time, this Democratic majority is making the Federal bench look more like America, and that is why the confirmation of the 100th woman to the court is so important. It is not only double the amount confirmed by President Trump in all his 4 years, it is also considerably more women than any full first term of any President. In fact, two-thirds—two-thirds—of all the judges we have confirmed under President Biden are women, and we have confirmed more women of color to the bench than any other President's entire time in office.

These hundred women are historic taken together, but they also include many who are historic in their own right. They include, of course, the first Black woman confirmed to the Supreme Court, Ketanji Brown Jackson. They include the first Muslim-American woman on the Federal bench. They include the first Navajo Federal judge, and much more. We are getting the bench to look like America. It has been long overdue, but it is happening and happening in large steps under this Senate Democratic majority.

Now, I want to let America know we are proud to have reached this historic milestone, but we are not slowing down. Confirming more women on the bench is long, long overdue. The Senate, which has made strides more than any year to make that a reality, will continue to keep working to confirm more judicial nominations in the weeks and months to come.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON KOBICK NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 297 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—2

Britt Scott (SC)

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 38, Ramon Ernesto Reyes, Jr., of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Lujan, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ramon Ernesto Reyes, Jr., of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 298 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Butler	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cantwell	Luján	Smith
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Britt Hickenlooper
Cassidy Scott (SC)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ramon Ernesto

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that Senators BLUMENTHAL, HIRONO, WELCH, and myself be allowed to engage in a colloquy on the Senate floor.

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

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the subject of our colloquy is going to be the enormous, secret gifts that have recently been disclosed going into the pockets of certain Supreme Court Justices.

The first thing that is remarkable about these gifts is how magnificent they are—luxury trips on private jets, luxury trips on superyachts, paying for a Justice's mother's home, paying for private school tuition of dependents, \$500,000 donations to organizations that the spouse worked for, \$25,000 fees into a spouse's consulting firm, jet and fishing trips across the country. So it is all pretty rich stuff.

In Rhode Island, if you want to take a gift from somebody—let's say you are a municipal employee, and they want to take you to lunch across the street from city hall. It is 25 bucks. That is your limit, and you have to disclose it. You get to do that three times, and then you are all done. Then you can't even take the \$25 lunch if you disclose it. So in Rhode Island, people are really upset about these multi-hundred-thousand-dollar gifts.

It gets worse. It is not just the size of the gifts. It is the network. It is the web. The billionaires who are involved in giving these gifts overlap with an array of front groups that are involved with the billionaires and with the gifts, and there is a common "fixer" who ties many of these threads together. The trips very often involve the fixer and the Justices and the billionaires, and the whole mess is interwoven. The donations go through the front groups to the Justice from the fixer over and over. This thing is a web, and we are working hard in the Judiciary Committee to try to untangle it.

On Thursday, we will be taking up the question of subpoenas to the billionaires and the front group corporations that have participated in these different gifts to find out what really went on. How bad, really, was it? What we know already is bad enough, but there is more to discover.

With that, let me yield to my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL, and then I will wrap up after Senator HIRONO and Senator WELCH have had their chance to speak as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on this issue—persistent, consistent, constant in seeking the truth; very simply, seeking the facts.

We are here about the authorization of a subpoena to three individuals—Harlan Crow, Leonard Leo, and Robin Arkley—who have engaged in, we know for sure, a pattern of gift-giving, including lavish vacations, private jet flights, school tuition, and even a luxury RV. These wealthy political activists have given those gratuities, we know for sure, but we know very little else because the Supreme Court has no code of ethics.

The U.S. Supreme Court could defuse a lot of the degrading rumor and speculation if it were simply to do as every other branch of government, as every other judge except for the U.S. Supreme Court does and impose a code of ethics. Its refusal to adopt a code of ethics lies at the core of our reason for being here today.

But, in my view, these subpoenas are part of an effort to save the Court from its own self-inflicted ethical crisis. It is an ethical conflagration of its own making. The Supreme Court Justices are the only Federal judges who are not subject to a binding and enforceable ethical code, and that leads to the next point.

The Judicial Conference is a creation of this body, the U.S. Congress. We are looking into what the Judicial Conference should be doing and what it may know and should be held accountable for knowing. Our investigative effort directly concerns a creation legislatively of the Congress. It is perfectly proper. It raises no constitutional issues.

All this stuff about the independence of the Supreme Court—yes, it is an independent branch of government, but it is not nonaccountable. Funds for it are appropriated. Rules of evidence are created. There are numerous ways that it, in effect, is held a part of an overall and overarching Government of the United States of America.

The small circle of individuals here who have engaged in these gifts—all of them far-right, wealthy donors; some of them having cases before the Court—raises issues that are profoundly important to the credibility of the Court itself. So, again, we are seeking to save the Court, in a sense, from its own potentially self-inflicted continuing degrading and diminishing.

The fact that the polls show the Supreme Court has plummeted in public opinion is not the reason for us to investigate, but they reflect a secrecy, combined with these potentially improper gifts, that is undermining the Court as an institution.

I say it sadly because I was a law clerk on the U.S. Supreme Court to Justice Harry Blackmun—who, by the way, would not even go to dinner with someone who might at some point in the future have a case before the Court. I have argued cases before them, before the U.S. Supreme Court. I have real reverence for the Court as an institution. So I am especially sad but also particularly angry that the Court is failing—totally failing—to take action

that it owes the American people and itself, because the Supreme Court as an institution will be diminished by its continued refusal to create an ethics code and the refusal to disclose the truth about these financial relationships. These twin refusals bring us here today.

Authorizing a subpoena is not a step that I take lightly. None of my colleagues do. But the weight of the Court's ethical crisis makes it necessary.

The American people deserve a Supreme Court that is ethical, impartial, and accountable. The highest Court in the land is not higher than the law. It is not above accountability. It may be independent, but it is not unto its own, as it seems to believe it is.

We are past Halloween. All of the charades and shams that have been offered as arguments are about as valid as the costumes people were wearing the other day, October 31.

The Supreme Court has a commitment and a promise under our Constitution. It has to deliver on that promise or its credibility will be further diminished, and the Supreme Court as a pillar of justice—and it must be a pillar of justice—will be eviscerated in the eyes of the American people.

I look forward to authorizing these subpoenas and helping to restore the reputation of our United States Supreme Court.

I yield to my colleague from Hawaii, Senator HIRONO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today because I, like the majority of Americans, am increasingly concerned about the legitimacy crisis at the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Court consists of nine members who have lifetime appointments and can make decisions regarding the quality of the air we breathe; the exercise of free speech on the internet; the autonomy and control of our bodies; protection of our homes, cars, and cell phones from government intrusion. These are just a few ways the Supreme Court's decisions impact the lives of every single American every single day.

These individuals with immense power, shouldn't they be held to the highest level of ethical accountability—not because we disagree with some of the Court's decisions but because its legitimacy depends on Americans having faith that those decisions are arrived at fairly and objectively, not influenced by money or special interests. Yet, instead of having the strongest ethical rules—or any binding ethical rules, for that matter—the Supreme Court purports to follow a "collection of principles" that are both nonbinding and weaker than the rules for government workers, for Members of Congress, and for many private sector employees.

As we have seen, the Supreme Court's honor system for financial disclosures and recusals is woefully inadequate. This is not a partisan issue. Justices appointed by both Democrat and Republican Presidents have had ethical lapses.

The public is paying attention, and now it appears there are sitting Justices approved by both Democratic and Republican Presidents who are publicly supporting an official code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court could have adopted such a code decades ago and could do so today if it wanted to; however, if the Supreme Court will not adopt a code of conduct for itself, then Congress has the constitutional power and responsibility to impose a code of conduct on it.

This brings me to the topic of subpoenas. For months, my colleagues and I on the Judiciary Committee have worked in good faith to gather information about gifts of luxury travel and other gifts made to certain Justices to understand whether ethical violations occurred and how and when. We sought information from the millionaires and billionaires who made those gifts about the kinds of access they may have gained as a result.

Despite lengthy negotiations, we have hit an impasse in our efforts with two of these individuals and their related corporations. Their refusal to provide the committee with relevant information leaves us no choice but to authorize subpoenas. We need information from these individuals to understand the extent to which Supreme Court Justices have failed to disclose gifts from parties with interests before the Court.

Congress has a responsibility to craft and strengthen effective, comprehensive Supreme Court ethics legislation going forward.

Some of my Republican colleagues say that issuing subpoenas to people who paid for luxury travel and gifts for Supreme Court Justices somehow undermines democracy. Those claims are preposterous. What undermines our democracy is Justices accepting gifts and appearing to use their office for personal gain.

If the Court had done the right thing decades ago and adopted a comprehensive code of conduct, we likely would not be issuing subpoenas.

We have a responsibility to ensure that the highest Court in the land adheres to at least—at least—the same ethical standards that apply to the other two branches of government and to pass appropriate legislation if it has failed to do so. Therefore, the committee should continue to exercise its constitutional oversight authority and authorize subpoenas.

I yield to Senator WELCH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my colleagues tonight, and I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his work on this.

You know, the question that is facing, I think, all of us and is troubling Americans is an erosion of confidence in our institutions. We are seeing that with a lot of erosion of confidence in the legislature, which is here to serve the interests of the people we all represent. It is also sometimes with the Executive—huge battles there. And, of course, January 6 was an indication that the norms that have guided us throughout our history—that is, the peaceful transfer of power after the people of this country make a decision about who shall be their elected leader—have all been challenged.

And now we have the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has an incredibly important role in the preservation of our democracy because it has the capacity to make decisions about legislative actions and whether what the legislature did fits within the parameters of the Constitution, and it is an awesome responsibility.

As my colleagues have said, I have an enormous amount of reverence for the institution of the judiciary, and I have an enormous amount of reverence for the particular role of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I have immense respect for the individuals who have achieved that status of being a member of the U.S. Supreme Court. They serve an important institution. They have a very important job. But they are not more important, as individuals, than any other American. They are not. They have more responsibility. They have a special obligation as Justices of the Supreme Court, but they are not above the law.

This is not exactly about whether there are legal questions involved. It is about whether they accept the responsibility that goes with representing an institution that must maintain credibility for the American people in order to have the people whom they serve respect their decisions.

We have a situation in the Supreme Court now. Within our judiciary, we have 850 judges at all different levels. Every single one of those judges is subject to rules that are designed to try to instill public confidence. Those rules require those judges to make financial disclosures. That includes whether they have been the beneficiary of gifts. There are nine people in this country who are in the judiciary who don't adhere to those rules, who don't believe it is their burden to share and disclose with the American people what gifts they have received, and those are the nine Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. That is outrageous.

You know, when I talk to Vermonters about this and I say: Do you think that a justice of the Vermont Supreme Court or a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court should be required to let you know—let the public know—if they got private jet travel to a location to get on a private yacht to take a private vacation? They have an obligation to disclose that.

And Vermonters look at me in dismay and they say: Peter, are you serious? They can do that?

This is not about disclosure. This is astonishment that somebody in a position of authority who they know—and every Vermonter knows—is getting that offer of a free jet travel, who is getting that offer of a free yacht trip and vacation in the Indonesian islands. It has nothing to do with who they are as persons. It has to do with who they are because of their responsibility and role as U.S. Supreme Court Justices. Vermonters can't believe it.

So this question of gifts and the bare minimum of having to disclose it, how is it even a question?

You know, I served in the House, as you know, and, in 2011, I and several of my colleagues wrote a letter inquiring about these gifts and why is it that they didn't have to be disclosed. This has been going on for far too long.

There is another matter of personal respect. The Supreme Court Justices, all of them, have the highest position in the judiciary, and all of those other 850 judges under them, are they not entitled to expect that what is required of them will be accepted by those nine members?

I have to confess enormous dismay that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who is in the position to bring those other eight Justices together and say, "Hey, let's deal with this; why are we creating this problem when it does so much to undercut public confidence in what it is we are trying to do?" hasn't done it—hasn't done it.

So we have to do it. I believe that the judiciary—not just the 850 members of the judicial branch but 859 members of the judicial branch—should all be subject to the same disclosure rules. And let me tell you, if they disclose these gifts, maybe they won't take these gifts—because, actually, what is the point? I mean, really?

This is where I go back to the Vermonters I talked to who say: Peter, what is the deal? You literally can take an all-expense-paid vacation, and this person thinks it is not going to influence them? And they want to know what I have been smoking—seriously.

So what we are doing here is pretty modest, bare bones, but even if it is bare bones and modest, it is absolutely essential to the first step that we take in our effort to restore confidence to the people of this country—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—that our judiciary is all about serving them, not benefiting individually by their positions.

I yield to my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, first, let me thank my three colleagues for joining me on the floor today. A word that came up repeatedly was "reverence," and I want to start with that word because I think we all do share a reverence for the institution of

the Supreme Court. And that is what makes it so bitter, to see how badly the Supreme Court is failing us now and to see the paths that billionaire influence has led it down.

It has to correct, and if it is not going to correct itself, then Congress is going to have to correct it.

As Senator BLUMENTHAL said, the problem here is that there is no ethics process for the Supreme Court. There is a perfectly good code of ethics for all of the Justices and for all of the Federal judges, but there is no way to enforce it for the Supreme Court.

If you have a complaint about a Supreme Court Justice, there is nowhere to file it. There is not even an inbox, and if there were an inbox and complaints came through, there is nobody on the other side of the inbox to screen out the nutty ones from the legitimate ones. And once you have a pile of legitimate ones, there is no staff attorney to do the basic research into what are the facts here. At the end of the day, when you have the facts determined and the judge or Justices have their say, then you have the factual predicate to compare with the ethics standard and a neutral decider to decide whether or not it comports. That is the basic structure of U.S. due process, and the Supreme Court will not allow that for itself. That is the problem that we have.

So none of the questions that deserve to be answered about all of these secret gifts and about all of this billionaire influence—none of them—have even been asked over at the Supreme Court, let alone answered. So we have an absolute obligation to go forward with answers.

And we have tried. We have asked very nicely. We have sent lists of questions. We have gone forward with the people who would know about all of this.

And we have received two answers. One was that this is unconstitutional, and so we are not going to participate with you at all. You get nothing. You don't get a single answer.

That, as Senator BLUMENTHAL said, we believe to be a complete sham and a complete charade because the disclosure rules—right? We are talking about disclosure of gifts to Justices. They went undisclosed.

So the question is, Should they have been disclosed? And there is a rule about disclosure that just happens to be a law passed by Congress. And there is a related law passed by Congress that relates to recusal, and recusal relates to gifts because, if you take big enough gifts from someone, you then have to recuse yourself as a judge from their cases. And the recusal rule is also passed by Congress.

So you have a disclosure law passed by Congress, and you have a recusal law passed by Congress, and you have what Senator BLUMENTHAL described—the Judicial Conference, which is the administrative body that oversees the administrative side of the judicial

branch, and that body was also created by Congress.

So the argument that is being made to us is that Congress has no authority to oversee how an Agency that Congress created is implementing laws Congress passed. That argument is, on its face, preposterous, and that, in turn, suggests that there is a lot to look at when we get a chance to look under the hood of all this mischief.

And they really don't want us to see it, and they are going to manufacture completely preposterous arguments just to try to throw us off the trail.

Another recipient of our questions said: OK, it is unconstitutional, but I will offer you a few things. You know, in good faith, I will offer you a few things, but you can only go back 5 years.

Well, we happen to know, with respect to this billionaire, that they were giving gifts to Justices way more than 5 years ago. So they are not even allowing us to ask into the known gift-giving conduct between the billionaire and the Justice, which, by the way, was undisclosed at the time.

So the 5-year rule is just nonsensical, just picked out of the air—picked, actually, out of a criminal statute, as if that had a bearing on a congressional investigation.

Then they said: We will only give you documents that you already have. For everything else, we will just give our lawyers narratives about what took place.

Well, anybody who has ever tried a case knows perfectly well that if you rely on the other side's lawyer's narrative, you are getting no place.

Discovery means you see the documents. You do your real homework like lawyers do. So for one lawyer to suggest to another: No, we are not going to show you the documents; we have them, but we are not going to show them to you; we are just going to give you a narrative of them—there isn't a lawyer in this country who would accept that as a condition in discovery in a case.

The third one is that, once we have answered your first round of questions and given you our phony-baloney narrative for the 5 years that is all we will let you inquire about, no more questions. You waive your right to ask us any more questions forever.

Again, there is not a lawyer in the country who would accept that as a condition of a discovery order. You get to ask the second question. "One and done" is not a thing when you are doing an investigation.

So all of these theoretical accommodations that were offered were just completely fake. We cannot proceed that way—not with any kind of professionalism and not with any kind of ability to get to the truth, which is, at the end of the day, what we really need to do here.

I will conclude by going back to where I started. The reason that we need to follow this process of getting

subpoenas so we get answers to our questions is because of two failures: one, the failure of the Supreme Court to even ask these questions itself. If there were a viable process going forward, using the basic due process investigation standards that everybody in government has to face for ethics, except these nine Justices, we wouldn't need to do this. But the Supreme Court won't allow questions to be asked about itself. So we can't go to them for a proper investigation. They refuse to do it.

When we asked the participants in this gift scheme what they were up to, they told us, as the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I think, rather artfully summarized, to go pound sand. Well, when Congress has a legitimate inquiry into how an Agency that it created is implementing statutes that it passed, "go pound sand" is not a legitimate answer. So the next step is to move to authorize these subpoenas, and we are going to do that.

This business of the Court not answering obvious questions is really a problem. The question of whether Justice Thomas should have recused himself from the January 6 cases depends on a single fact: what he knew about his wife's involvement in insurrection activities. If he knew absolutely nothing at all, OK. Then it is probably OK for him to recuse himself—maybe a little bit of appearance of impropriety. But if he actually knew of her involvement in those matters, then he absolutely should have recused himself.

The question "Justice Thomas, what did you know, and when did you know it?" has never been asked and never been answered. That is not a tenable way for a Court that purports to represent due process and enforce due process to conduct itself with respect to a conflict of interest.

It is the same thing with these gifts. There is no Federal judge in the country who is receiving multihundred-thousand-dollar vacation gifts, who is getting huge half-million-dollar checks sent in to a spouse's small private company out of which she takes money. This behavior of free private jet travel—at beck and call, it seems—nobody else does that. It is not OK. But looking at it to find out what actually took place and why and when is a basic responsibility of the Judiciary. In any other court, these claims, these charges, these circumstances would be properly investigated. We would know the facts, and we are entitled to know the facts.

The last is that, in the context of our investigation, one of these lawyers made up what I consider to be a sham argument that we can't ask any questions because it is unconstitutional. I have addressed that. It is a congressionally established entity applying congressionally established laws. Yes, we do get to inquire about that kind of job. Because, perhaps, that argument is so weak, so sham, that lawyer actually recruited a Supreme Court Justice to

go into the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal and offer an extrajudicial opinion—not an opinion of the Court, just his own personal opinion—that we had no business investigating.

That violates a ton of stuff. That violates the rule that they are not supposed to offer opinions on matters that might come before the Court. That violates the rule that you shouldn't be engaging as a Justice in an ongoing dispute, sort of like a de facto expert witness for a party in an ongoing dispute. In this case, the dispute is over access to information.

The lawyer's client in that is one of the people involved in this scheme, Leonard Leo. Leonard Leo has a personal relationship also with Justice Alito. He is described as his friend. None of that is disclosed. He just offers his opinion on behalf of the lawyer for his friend.

At the end of the day, the inquiry looks at free gifts, undisclosed, received by Justice Alito. At the end of the day, the lawyer for Leonard Leo was able to recruit a member of the Supreme Court, Justice Alito, to offer a private—I should say a public opinion but a nonofficial opinion, a personal opinion, in the Wall Street Journal editorial page to prop up the argument that says we can't look into gifts that Leonard Leo, the client, organized for Justice Alito, the recipient. That is a tangled mess of ethics violations, and nobody can look at that. Nobody will look at that. That can't be.

So, with the Court looking at none of this scandalous behavior, it is entirely incumbent upon the Congress to do its job and get to the bottom of what went on. That is what, under the leadership and guidance of our Judiciary chairman, DICK DURBIN, we will do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR ANDREA L. MAY

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a great American and an exceptional member of the U.S. Air Force, Maj. Andrea May.

As an Air Force Senate legislative liaison officer, from June 2021 to May 2023, Andrea performed her duties with exceptional professionalism during the 117th and 118th U.S. Congresses. Andrea distinguished herself through her pro-

fessional character and dedication by serving this Nation in uniform, leading the division's collaboration with the Senate Space Force Caucus, coordinating six events critical to educating Members and their staff on the Department of Defense's newest service, and helping to advocate for Space Force priorities. Her efforts helped solidify the establishment of the U.S. Space Force, ensured the confirmation of the 26th Air Force Secretary, and secured the Department of the Air Force's support of the national defense strategy in our return to Great Power Competition.

A motivated leader and thoughtful relationship builder, Andrea expertly conveyed Department of the Air Force positions on the Air Force Future Design that included the future bomber, tanker, and fighter force. Andrea's direct support provided the U.S. Senate critical information necessary for two National Defense Authorization Acts. Additionally, Andrea served as a liaison between the Department of the Air Force and 19 U.S. Senate offices, including mine. When I had concerns, she was the airman with whom I spoke to address them. Andrea helped ensure that the airmen and guardians of North Dakota were well cared for and that their concerns and interests were known to the leadership of the Department of the Air Force.

In her role as a liaison for the Air Force, she also coordinated responses to more than 200 requests for information and led delegations for 70 Senators, Representatives, and congressional staff on visits to showcase Department equities across the United States and abroad, to include the bicameral Reagan National Defense Forum. Andrea's significant efforts led to successful engagements between this governing body and senior Department of Defense officials, including the Secretary of the Air Force. All of these engagements helped U.S. Senators understand defense equities and their impact on national security. Due to her direct involvement and stewardship, Members of Congress were able to make informed decisions and ensured the Department of the Air Force was properly resourced and funded.

Lastly, Major May was also responsible for helping prepare the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Space Operations, and other senior leaders for more than 80 engagements with Senators and their staff and three Senate Armed Services Committee hearings. After serving in this crucial role and becoming a fixture on Capitol Hill, Andrea recently moved on to serve as a pilot in the 89th Airlift Wing at Joint Base Andrews.

I am thankful for Andrea's service and her work with my office and the Senate over the past 2 years on issues of vital importance to the United States. I salute this American patriot whose selfless work has kept our country safe and strong. I join countless others in thanking her for her service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. PETER JENSEN

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Peter Jensen, an AARP 2024 Purpose Prize honoree. This national honor recognizes individuals who are using their life experience to make a positive difference.

Seeing a problem with mental health care access for children, Dr. Jensen founded the REACH Institute in 2006. This nonprofit organization ensures effective and scientifically proven care reaches children and their families. REACH trains primary care providers, therapists, and other health professionals to diagnose and treat young patients.

As a result of this innovative way to connect providers and patients, more than 6,000 pediatricians and physicians in all 50 States have been trained to be "first responders" to children with mental health needs.

Dr. Jensen's health challenges as a child shaped an interest in psychology and inspired him to pursue a career in medicine. He earned a medical degree from George Washington University School of Medicine and has served in leading research and education roles including for Child and Adolescent Research at the National Institute of Mental Health, the Mayo Clinic, and a professor at Columbia University and the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences.

Arkansas is fortunate to have an exceptional, selfless leader like Dr. Jensen who identified a problem and implemented a solution to improve patient care and outcomes. His passion and commitment offer an excellent example for others to follow.

I applaud AARP for recognizing Dr. Jensen's work to build a better future. Dr. Jensen demonstrates what it truly means to go above and beyond for others. I congratulate him on this well-deserved honor and his positive impact. His remarkable achievements offer a model of success that will help patients for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT BOB AMMONS

• Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, most servicemembers come from a military family like MSgt Bob Ammons of Ozark, AL. Born on an Air Force base to a career airman, Bob decided to follow in his dad's footsteps. He enlisted in the U.S. Air Force as an air freight specialist.

Bob did 14 assignments in 32 different countries during his 24-year-career. His skills in developing safety strategies ensured many American airmen returned home safely from their missions overseas. Bob climbed the ranks to becoming a senior munitions inspector and missile inspector, where he was in charge of ensuring all missile systems were ready for combat.

After retiring from the military in 1998, Bob decided to make Alabama his

home. Now, he uses his time volunteering across our State. He started by volunteering as a volleyball, softball, and basketball coach in Dora, AL. Now, he volunteers with veterans and faith groups in the Wiregrass. Bob and his wife are actively involved in Post Oak Baptist Church in Ozark. Bob helps fix donated appliances for the Dale County Baptist Association's thrift store. He also serves as a service officer for Chapter No. 94 of the Disabled American Veterans, where he helps veterans with benefits and medical appointments.

Bob is also very involved with Friends of Army Aviation, helping inspire future generations of aviators and supporting aviator veterans. Friends of Army Aviation President Doc Holladay says that Bob "works tirelessly and consistently on any job that he is assigned. There is no hill too high for a climber like Bob."

Alabama is fortunate that Bob chose to use his talents to make our State a better place to call home. I am proud to recognize Bob Ammons as the November Veteran of the Month.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12170 OF NOVEMBER 14, 1979, WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—PM 30

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2023.

Our relations with Iran have not yet normalized, and the process of implementing the agreements with Iran,

dated January 19, 1981, is ongoing. Therefore I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12170 with respect to Iran.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 7, 2023.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:05 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 359. An act to establish Fort San Gerónimo del Boqueron in Puerto Rico as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1318. An act to authorize the location of a monument on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the women's suffrage movement and the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1607. An act to clarify jurisdiction with respect to certain Bureau of Reclamation pumped storage development, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3448. An act to amend chapter 3081 of title 54, United States Code, to enhance the protection and preservation of America's battlefields.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:41 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 366. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to treat certain individuals who served in Vietnam as a member of the armed forces of the Republic of Korea as a veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of the provision of health care by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

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

At 6:27 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. 4821. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 359. An act to establish Fort San Gerónimo del Boquerón in Puerto Rico as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1607. An act to clarify jurisdiction with respect to certain Bureau of Reclamation pumped storage development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3448. An act to amend chapter 3081 of title 54, United States Code, to enhance the protection and preservation of America's

battlefields; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES DISCHARGED PETITION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, hereby direct that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Highway Administration relating to "Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Chargers", and, further, that the joint resolution be immediately placed upon the Legislative Calendar under General Orders.

Marco Rubio, Mike Braun, John Barasso, Chuck Grassley, John Thune, Rick Scott, Tommy Tuberville, Bill Hagerty, Cynthia M. Lummis, Ron Johnson, Mike Rounds, Katie Boyd Britt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, Mitt Romney, John Hoeven, Roger Marshall, Tom Cotton, Lindsey Graham, Eric Schmitt, Ted Budd, Josh Hawley, Kevin Cramer, James Lankford, Thom Tillis, J.D. Vance, John Kennedy, Mitch McConnell, Ted Cruz, John Boozman.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following joint resolution was discharged from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, by petition, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 802(c), and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Highway Administration relating to "Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Chargers".

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3774. An act to impose additional sanctions with respect to the importation or facilitation of the importation of petroleum products from Iran, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6126. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the attacks in Israel for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4821. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

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-2702. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Management, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the Freedom of Information Act"

(RIN0412-AA97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 2, 2023; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2703. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Management, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of the HAVANA Act of 2021” (RIN0412-AB11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 2, 2023; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2704. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Management, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “USAID Grant Regulations: Removing the Program Income Restriction on For-Profit Entities” (RIN0412-AB01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 2, 2023; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2705. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Israel in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23-023); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2706. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act, the report of proposed exports to Syria (Transmittal No. DDTC 23-056); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2707. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to plans to provide Ukraine up to \$125,000,000 in Department of Defense articles and services, and military education and training, under drawdowns previously directed under section 506(a) (1) of the FAA, including for self-defense and border security operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2708. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final Regulations: Financial value transparency and gainful employment” (RIN1840-AD57) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2709. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2018” and includes a report entitled “Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Performance Measurement Report”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2710. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order that takes additional steps to deal with the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber enabled activities declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2711. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Elimination of Mandatory Roth Distributions” (5 CFR Part 1650) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 3, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2712. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the agencies’ use of student loan repayments as a strategic tool for the purposes of recruitment and retention during calendar year 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2713. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2023 Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustments for Ethics in Government Act Violations” (RIN3209-AA66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2714. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-261, “District of Columbia Housing Authority Stabilization and Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2715. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-262, “Tenant Payment Plan Phasing Continuation Temporary Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2716. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-263, “Voluntary Agreement Moratorium Temporary Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2717. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-264, “Buzzard Point Park and Trails National Park Service Grant Temporary Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2718. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-288, “River East at Grandview Condominiums Assistance Tax Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2719. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-289, “Office of Administrative Hearings Jurisdiction Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2720. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-290, “Sign Regulations Temporary Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2721. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-282, “Public Health Emergency Credit Alert Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2722. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-282, “Alexander Crummell Way Designation Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2723. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-284, “William R. Spaulding

Way Designation Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2724. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-285, “Sterling A. Brown Way Designation Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2725. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-286, “Rayford Logan Way Designation Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2726. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-287, “Industrial Safety Act Clarification Amendment Act of 2023”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2727. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2728. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2729. A communication from the Marine Mammal Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Testing and Training Operations in the Eglin Gulf Test and Training Range” (RIN0648-BL77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 3, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2730. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39-22512” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1506)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 3, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2731. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace: Cedartown, GA” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1186)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 3, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2732. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, 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 Western Aleutian District in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XC379) received in the Office of the

President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2733. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, 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 Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XC393) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2734. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modification of the West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #37 Through #45” (RIN0648-XC370) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2735. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, 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 Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XC366) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2736. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, 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; Sable Fish in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XC393) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2737. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, 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 and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XC381) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2738. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, 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 Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XC380) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2739. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, 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; Atka Mackerel in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XC383) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2740. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries; 2023 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic

Surfclams and Ocean Quahogs; and Suspension of Atlantic Surfclam Minimum Size Limit” (RIN0648-XC516) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2741. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2023 Specifications” (RIN0648-XC422) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2742. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Framework Adjustment 63 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements” (RIN0648-XC472) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2743. A communication from the Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Electronic Monitoring Program Regulations for Bottom Trawl and Non-Whiting Midwater Trawl Vessels in the Pacific Coast Groundfish Trawl Catch Share Program” (RIN0648-BH70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2744. A communication from the Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 30; 2023-24 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures” (RIN0648-BL48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2745. A communication from the Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Amendment 22 to the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fishery Management Plan” (RIN0648-BL43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2746. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties” (RIN3072-AC94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2747. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Delegations to Bureau of Enforcement, Investigations, and Compliance” (RIN3072-AC97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2748. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Update of Existing

User Fees” (RIN3072-AC96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2749. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Civil Penalty Amendments to Rules of Practice and Procedure” (RIN3072-AC95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2750. A communication from the Deputy Division Chief of Competition Policy, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Numbering Policies for Modern Communications; Telephone Number Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers; Implementation of TRACED Act Section 6(A)—Knowledge of Customers by Entities with Access to Numbering Resources; Process Reform for Executive Branch Review of Certain FCC Applications and Petitions Involving Foreign Ownership” ((RIN3060-AK36) (WC Docket Nos. 13-97, 07-243, 20-67) (IB Docket No. 16-155)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 2, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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-82. A memorial adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico supporting Ukraine against Russian aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE MEMORIAL NO. 55

Whereas, the post-war international security order, led by the North Atlantic treaty organization, relied upon diplomacy, peace and communication rather than armed conflict to ensure prosperity and stability for more than seventy years; and

Whereas, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian people voted overwhelmingly to form a nation independent from Russia and built a thriving democratic country grounded in the rule of law; and

Whereas, more than thirty years ago, Ukraine declared its independence, and in 1994, the United States, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom signed an agreement whereby each country pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine's borders in return for its nuclear disarmament; and

Whereas, in 2014, the pro-western Euromaidan protest movement in Ukraine led to the resignation of authoritarian president Victor Yanukovich, a brutal ally of Russian president Vladimir Putin, and ushered in democratically elected leaders who have sought closer ties to the United States, the European Union and Great Britain; and

Whereas, Ukraine is recognized as a peaceful and honorable democratic republic that is governed by democratically elected President Volodymyr Zelenskyy and Prime Minister Denys Shmyhal; and

Whereas, in order to manufacture a pretext to invade and occupy Ukraine, Vladimir Putin and his surrogates lied to the people of Russia and the global community, falsely claiming that Ukraine posed a threat to Russians and that he was launching a crusade against “Ukrainian Nazis”; and

Whereas, on February 24, 2022, Vladimir Putin launched an unjust, unwarranted and

unprovoked full-scale war of choice and aggression upon the peaceful nation of Ukraine; and

Whereas, the Russian Federation violated international peace and security agreements that provided peaceful alternatives; and

Whereas, since February 24, 2022, Russian soldiers and surrogates have brutally inflicted violence and terror upon Ukrainian civilians of every age, including children and the elderly, and committed atrocities throughout Ukraine; and

Whereas, since February 24, 2022, Russian soldiers and surrogates have cruelly killed Ukrainian citizens' pets, domestic animals and wildlife; and

Whereas, since February 24, 2022, Russian soldiers and surrogates have attacked Ukrainian farms, environment, cultural institutions, religious sites and heritage; and

Whereas, since February 24, 2022, Russia has used targeted and indiscriminate aerial strikes to destroy residential structures, hospitals, schools, businesses and critical infrastructure that supports life including water systems and energy grids, plants and pipelines; and

Whereas, Russia has attacked and damaged nuclear power facilities in Ukraine captured and tortured workers from the facilities and subjected Ukraine and its neighbors to risks of radioactive releases; and

Whereas, as Russia's military struggled on the battlefield, Putin resorted to relying on the brutal PMC Wagner group to inflict his war of aggression and choice; and

Whereas, the PMC Wagner group is a Russian mercenary organization that was founded and is led by a Russian oligarch with close ties to Putin; and

Whereas, the PMC Wagner group has been designated as a significant transnational criminal organization pursuant to United States executive orders and by the United States department of the treasury; and

Whereas, Russian soldiers and the PMC Wagner group are credibly alleged to have committed violations of human rights and international humanitarian law by targeting children, the elderly, women and civilians through acts of cruel violence, torture, rape, abduction and forced mass displacement of Ukrainian children in Russian filtration camps to erase their Ukrainian identity and place them with Russian citizens; and

Whereas, Russia's war on Ukraine has severely disrupted Ukrainian and international economies, resources, food supplies and environments; and

Whereas, the brutality of Russia's war on Ukraine is an affront to international law, decency and humanity; and

Whereas, a threat to the sovereign borders of Ukraine is a threat to all western democracies; and

Whereas, Ukraine has been a bulwark against Russian military aggression in Europe and the world; and

Whereas, in response to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the United States and the international community have imposed sanctions on Russia and provided Ukraine with equipment and resources it needs to defend its territory and people; and

Whereas, the leaders, military and citizens of Ukraine continue to valiantly stand up and fight against Russia's unjust and heinous invasion of their country; and

Whereas, Ukraine deserves the continued support of every American and the international community as Ukraine defends itself from Russia's invasion, which is the largest attack in Europe since World War II; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico that the members of the house of representatives proudly stand in solidarity with Ukraine, its people and its

leaders, and commend them for their resiliency, courage and relentless fight to protect their right to self-determination and self-governance; and condemn, in the strongest possible terms, Vladimir Putin's attack on the people of Ukraine and endorse continued economic sanctions and export controls on Russia and continued provision of military and humanitarian resources to Ukraine; and be it further

Resolved, That members of the house of representatives wholeheartedly support the United States and international efforts to swiftly aid Ukraine in defending Ukrainian borders, end Russia's war on Ukraine and hold Russia accountable for its actions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the president of the United States, the senate of the United States, the house of representatives of the United States, members of New Mexico's congressional delegation and the Ukrainian embassy in the United States.

POM-83. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Ohio condemning the terrorist attacks against the state of Israel and expressing support for Israel's people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 214

Whereas, On October 7, 2023, Hamas terrorists carried out an unprovoked attack on the state of Israel; and

Whereas, The members of the Senate of the 135th General Assembly share Israel's grief for the hundreds of civilians who have been killed or captured in this horrific act of terrorism; and

Whereas, Ohio is home to many Israeli citizens, Ohioans of Jewish faith, and countless other Ohioans who support the people of Israel; and

Whereas, Israel is a staunch ally of the United States and is deserving of our nation's unequivocal support as they defend themselves against this unjustifiable attack; now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Senate of the 135th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, in adopting this resolution, declare our support for the Israeli people; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn the actions of Hamas and their allies, including Iran, and their attack on Israel and its people; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Israeli Embassy in Washington, D.C., for transmission to the proper authorities in the State of Israel, and the news media of Ohio.

POM-84. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio expressing Ohio's unwavering support for the people of Israel and condemning the recent attacks against the state of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 292

Whereas, Israel is the strongest ally to the United States of America in the Middle East; and

Whereas, The safety and security of Israel is of paramount importance to stability and peace in the Middle East; and

Whereas, Ohio has long been a partner in trade and civil exchange with Israel; and

Whereas, Ohio is home to many Israeli citizens, Ohioans of Jewish faith, and countless other Ohioans who support the people of Israel; and

Whereas, On October 7, 2023, Iran-backed Hamas extremists carried out heinous and

unprecedented attacks against the people of Israel and their rightful homeland; and

Whereas, The deaths of more than 700 Israeli citizens represent a terrorist attack at an unprecedented scale and have been caused by brutal, unthinkable attacks on children, families, and other defenseless civilians; and

Whereas, The inhumane actions of the Iran-backed terrorists against the children, mothers, fathers, grandparents, sons, and daughters of Israel were unprecedented and cowardly; now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the House of Representatives of the 135th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, in adopting this resolution, express our unwavering support for the people of Israel and their desire for a safe, secure, and free Israel; and be it further

Resolved, That we unequivocally condemn the cowardly actions of Hamas and their unprecedented attack on Israeli citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That we offer our prayers for peace and the protection of innocent lives during this conflict; and be it further

Resolved, That we commit to steadfastly supporting Israel and its citizens as they strive for peace and to prevent Hamas from harming Israeli citizens in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Israeli Embassy in Washington, D.C., for transmission to the proper authorities in the State of Israel, and the news media of Ohio.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BROWN for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Jennifer L. Fain, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

*Mark Toshiro Uyeda, of California, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2028.

*Claudia Slacik, of New York, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 2026.

*William Brodsky, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 2026.

*Spencer Bachus III, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2027.

*Tanya F. Otsuka, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2029.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3232. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the standards for accreditation of an institution of higher education to assess the institution's adoption of admissions practices that refrain from preferential treatment in admissions based on an applicant's relationship to alumni of, or donors to, the institution, to authorize a feasibility study on data collection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 3233. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MARKKY):

S. 3234. A bill to implement reforms relating to foreign intelligence surveillance authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3235. A bill to require a strategy to counter the role of the People's Republic of China in evasion of sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3236. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage of ambulance services that do not include transportation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 3237. A bill to amend the Camp Lejeune Justice Act of 2022 to ensure claimants are adequately informed regarding filing a Federal cause of action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 3238. A bill to make a supplemental appropriation to the Secretary of State to carry out the mission and activities of the United States Security Coordinator for Israel and the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ERNST, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LEE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VANCE, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 3239. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to fingerprint noncitizen minors entering the United States who are suspected of being victims of human trafficking, to require the Secretary to publicly disclose the number of such minors who are fingerprinted by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officials and the number of child traffickers who are apprehended by CBP, to impose criminal penalties on noncitizen adults who use unrelated minors to gain entry into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 3240. A bill to require senior Department of State officials to maintain security clear-

ances and to require the Secretary of State to notify Congress when the security clearances of such officials are suspended or revoked; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH:

S. 3241. A bill to establish the Grand Village of the Natchez Indians and Jefferson College as affiliated areas of the Natchez Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3242. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder threshold for registration under that Act for issuers that receive support through certain Federal universal service support mechanisms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS:

S. 3243. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude all military retirement and related benefits from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 3244. A bill to amend the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 to extend funding outreach and assistance for low-income programs; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 3245. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct surveys of non-retail pharmacy drug prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FETTERMAN:

S. 3246. A bill to provide for consideration of all modes of transportation and all road users in certain highway and transit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 453. A resolution celebrating the 150th anniversary of the founding of Texas Christian University; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 134

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 146

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 146, a bill to reduce the price of insulin for patients.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to make daylight saving time permanent, and for other purposes.

S. 704

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to combat illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing at its sources globally.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1300, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the late Prime Minister Golda Meir and the 75th anniversary of the United States-Israel relationship.

S. 1538

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1538, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for outdoor learning spaces and to develop living schoolyards.

S. 1542

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1542, a bill to improve services provided by pharmacy benefit managers.

S. 1800

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1800, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders Prevention and Services program, and for other purposes.

S. 1860

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1860, a bill to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish a grant program to fund youth fishing projects.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) and the Senator

from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1906, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited provisional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs and biological products, and for other purposes.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2003, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State to provide additional assistance to Ukraine using assets confiscated from the Central Bank of the Russian Federation and other sovereign assets of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 2145

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2145, a bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes.

S. 2317

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) were added as cosponsors of S. 2317, a bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 and the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to direct the Agricultural Research Service to expand organic research, and for other purposes.

S. 2337

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2337, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate certain limitations with respect to preproduction plastic pellet pollution, and for other purposes.

S. 2386

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2386, a bill to require health insurance coverage for the treatment of infertility.

S. 2477

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2477, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide pharmacy payment of certain services.

S. 2641

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2641, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership

structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 2647

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2647, a bill to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes.

S. 2695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2695, a bill to amend the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 2790

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2790, a bill to reform rural housing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2817

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2817, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employers from paying employees in the garment industry by piece rate, to require manufacturers and contractors in the garment industry to register with the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

S. 3094

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3094, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing a proposed rule with respect to emissions from vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 3187

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3187, a bill to require the Department of Homeland Security to publish various publications and reports regarding the number of aliens seeking entry along the southern border of the United States.

S. 3193

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3193, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow for the use of telehealth in substance use disorder treatment, and for other purposes.

S. 3225

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3225, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to any foreign person that the President determines engages in or has

engaged in a significant transaction or transactions, or any dealings with, or has provided material support to or for a military or intelligence facility of the People's Republic of China in Cuba, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 43

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 43, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Improving Income Driven Repayment for the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program and the Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program".

S.J. RES. 47

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 47, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Justice relating to "Office of the Attorney General; Home Confinement Under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act".

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution condemning Beijing's destruction of Hong Kong's democracy and rule of law.

S. RES. 186

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 186, a resolution seeking justice for the Japanese citizens abducted by North Korea.

S. RES. 408

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 408, a resolution condemning Hamas for its premeditated, coordinated, and brutal terrorist attacks on Israel and demanding that Hamas immediately release all hostages and return them to safety, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 434

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 434, a resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Monroe Doctrine.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 453—CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 453

Whereas, in 2023, Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Texas, is celebrating the sesquicentennial, or 150th anniversary, of the founding of the University;

Whereas Texas Christian University was established by the brothers Addison and Randolph Clark with the opening of the AddRan Male and Female College in 1873, which opened with an enrollment of 13 undergraduate students and was one of the first co-educational institutions west of the Mississippi River;

Whereas, in 1902, the college was renamed Texas Christian University, and, in 1926, a division of graduate studies was added;

Whereas, in 1910, a major fire destroyed the main building of Texas Christian University, and in the wake of that disaster the college accepted the city of Fort Worth's offer of 50 acres and \$200,000 to relocate to the city where the institution flourished on its new campus;

Whereas the end of World War II marked the beginning of a long period of significant growth for Texas Christian University, evidenced by its purchase of a 106-acre golf course adjoining campus;

Whereas, by 1965, Texas Christian University had added more than 25 buildings, expanded advanced study offerings, and approved Ph.D. programs;

Whereas Texas Christian University has award-winning academic programs, including programs in the AddRan College of Liberal Arts, the Bob Schieffer College of Communication, the College of Education, the College of Fine Arts, the College of Science and Engineering, the Harris College of Nursing & Health Sciences, the John V. Roach Honors College, and the Neely School of Business;

Whereas, in recent years, Texas Christian University inaugurated the Anne Burnett Marion School of Medicine, which serves the Fort Worth area, the State of Texas, and beyond;

Whereas Texas Christian University has distinguished itself by earning an R2 Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity designation by the Carnegie Foundation;

Whereas faculty members and students of Texas Christian University have received more than 80 Fulbright Awards and over the past 5 years have received 42 awards from the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, and National Endowment for the Humanities, totaling more than \$22,000,000;

Whereas, in 2023, Texas Christian University serves more than 12,000 students and offers 117 undergraduate, 61 master's, and 39 doctoral programs across 9 schools and colleges;

Whereas Texas Christian University's over 100,000 alumni include multiple members of the United States Congress and State legislatures, stars of theater, cinema, and music, and leaders and captains of industry, science, engineering, agriculture, and more;

Whereas Texas Christian University takes great pride in the 22 varsity sports teams that represent the University and in the University's membership in the Big 12 Conference;

Whereas, across all sports, the Texas Christian University Horned Frogs have won 12 regular season Big 12 Conference titles and 8 Big 12 Conference Tournament titles;

Whereas alumni of Texas Christian University are counted among Olympians and Super Bowl champions;

Whereas, since 2010, the Texas Christian University Horned Frogs rifle team has won 3 national championships and is the only all-female team to win a national championship in this coed sport;

Whereas the Texas Christian University Horned Frogs men's basketball team has made 3 NCAA tournament appearances in the last 6 seasons;

Whereas the Texas Christian University Horned Frogs have excelled in baseball, making 6 College World Series appearances in the past 14 years;

Whereas the 2022 Texas Christian University Horned Frogs football team became the first team in the State of Texas to earn the opportunity to compete for the national championship in the College Football Playoff;

Whereas Texas Christian University has become a world-class university with a reputation for academic excellence, strong traditions, a vibrant student experience and campus culture, and support for student-athletes; and

Whereas, since the founding of the University 150 years ago, Texas Christian University has provided generations of Texans with a strong foundation for achievement, and in so doing, the University has contributed significantly to the prosperity and vitality of the Lone Star State and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commemorates the 150th anniversary of Texas Christian University and extends to all those associated with this noteworthy institution sincere best wishes for the future.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I have six 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 Tuesday, November 7, 2023, to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 7, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a subcommittee hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 7, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 7, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 7, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 7, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of Senator HIRONO, that Sitara Kedilaya be granted floor privileges until November 30, 2023.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of Senator DURBIN, that the following law clerks of the Senate Judiciary Committee be granted floor privileges until November 16, 2023: Evan Zepeda, Durva Trivedi, Christopher Daffin, Timothy Laderach, and James Starke.

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR EN BLOC—H.R. 3774 and H.R. 6126

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3774) to impose additional sanctions with respect to the importation or facilitation of the importation of petroleum products from Iran, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 6126) making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the attacks in Israel for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2023

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, November 8; that following

the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, 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 Reyes nomination postcloture; further, that all time on the nomination be considered expired at 11:30 a.m. and that if cloture has been invoked on the Burrows nomination, all time be considered expired at 2:20 p.m. and that if cloture has been invoked on the McMillion nomination, the vote on confirmation be at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the cloture vote on the McMillion nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and pro-

ceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 238, S.J. Res. 38; that at 5:30 p.m., the joint resolution be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on the passage of the joint resolution; further, that upon disposition of the joint resolution, the Senate resume executive session and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Almadani nomination and that if cloture is invoked, the vote on confirmation be at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 9; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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 7:55 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, November 8, 2023, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 7, 2023:

THE JUDICIARY

KENLY KIYA KATO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

JULIA E. KOBICK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

MONICA M. BERTAGNOLLI, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.