



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2022

No. 125

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SHERROD BROWN, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Lord of our lives, hear our prayers. Fill us with Your spirit so that we may please You.

As we seek Your divine approval, empower our lawmakers to do Your will. Lord, help them not to have an excessive focus on the temporary things while neglecting the eternal. May our Senators live lives that bring glory and honor to Your Name, receiving Your approbation for their faithfulness. Create in them humble and contrite hearts that will refuse to deviate from the path of integrity.

And, Lord, we continue to pray for Ukraine.

We pray in Your merciful and powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable SHERROD BROWN, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

CHIPS ACT OF 2022—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 4346, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 4346, a bill making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Schumer amendment No. 5135 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), relating to the CHIPS Act of 2022.

Schumer amendment No. 5136 (to amendment No. 5135), to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for the last century—the whole last century—America's prosperity was anchored on our country's unmatched

commitment to science research, technological growth, innovation, and advanced manufacturing.

The question before the Senate, then, is simple: Will that prosperity live on in the century to come? Are we on the brink of another generation of American ingenuity, of American discovery, of American leadership? By passing our CHIPS and Science bill today, the Senate says: Yes, we are, and in a loud, bipartisan voice.

Today, by approving one of the largest investments in science, technology, and manufacturing in decades—in decades—we say that America's best years are yet to come.

This is a very good day for the American people and for American innovation. The legislation is going to create good-paying jobs. It will alleviate supply chains; it will help lower costs; and it will protect America's national security interests.

I am confident that future generations will look back on the passage of this bill as a turning point for American leadership in the 21st century.

I admit that some of the policies—not all, but some are esoteric, but they are vital. All too often we are told government and business think short term. This is one of the most significant pieces of long-term effect and thinking legislation that we have seen in this body in a very long time.

I believe that our grandchildren and our grandchildren's grandchildren will work in jobs we cannot yet imagine because of the investments we are making here today.

Like the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the recent gun safety law, the CHIPS and Science bill is one of the major bipartisan achievements of this Congress. But reaching this point was anything but easy.

On the contrary, the legislation has been several years in the making, and it took a lot of twists and turns before reaching the finish line. It brought together industry, labor, universities,

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3707

Governors, mayors from both parties and from every region. And I thank my colleagues and their staff for pushing it over the line.

In 2019, I approached my Republican colleague TODD YOUNG. We had talked in the gym that he was interested in the same types of investments that I was. And I said: Let's work together on legislation to revive America's commitment to science and innovation. Together, we drafted the first version of the Endless Frontier Act, a bill whose policies shaped today's legislation.

A year later, we joined with Senators CORNYN and WARNER to begin addressing our Nation's chip crisis by pushing for an authorization of new Federal chips as an incentive as part of the NDAA. And Senator KELLY of Arizona has been a major advocate for getting these chip programs done.

So even before this Congress began, Members on both sides knew that we had to work together if we were to keep America competitive in the 21st century. We also knew that if we didn't get there first, our rivals—chief among them the Chinese Communist Party—would likely beat us to the punch and reshape the world in their authoritarian image, a frightening, frightening process.

A month after I became majority leader, I directed the chairs and members of our relevant committees to start drafting a legislative package to outcompete China and create new American jobs, with the Endless Frontier Act serving as the core of this effort.

I also instructed them to draft legislation to plug the dangerous holes in America's semiconductor industry. I said to everyone, to people on both sides of the aisle, that if both sides work together, I would put a bill on the floor of the Senate later that spring, and that is what happened when we overwhelmingly passed the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act in June 2021. It took 3 weeks, lots of debate, amendments, just as the Senate ought to work, even on major and difficult legislation, as this has been.

Senators CANTWELL and WICKER were tremendous leaders in this effort and skillfully managed the floor process. They deserve a great deal of praise not only for passing last year's bill but for their efforts this year as well.

A year later, the legislation we are passing today contains many of the critical investments in that bill. Both bills make historic investments in science and innovation—the original Endless Frontier and USICA bill and the bill we are passing today, CHIPS plus Science. Both bills make those investments.

We will plant the seeds for developing the tech hubs of tomorrow in places with great potential but which have been overshadowed by cities like San Francisco or Boston or Austin or New York City. The bill will help turn cities like Buffalo and Indianapolis into new centers for innovation, and

the result will be countless new, good-paying jobs and a bright future for those areas for years to come.

Both bills will help end the chips crisis by offering tens of billions of dollars to encourage American chip manufacturing and R&D. And, if anything, this year's version is stronger because of the ITC provisions. It will create tens of thousands of high-tech manufacturing and Davis-Bacon construction jobs from Albany, NY, to New Albany, OH, and beyond. It is going to lower costs for cars, washing machines, and so much more in the long run because our chip shortage will be alleviated.

Both bills establish the National Foundation tech directorate and provide funding to the Department of Energy to achieve new breakthroughs in the technologies like AI, quantum computing, cyber security, renewable energy, 5G, biotech, and other discoveries yet unknown. And both bills provide funding to build wireless communication supply chain to counter Huawei. This was a top priority for my colleague MARK WARNER, and I thank him for his efforts in this regard.

The bottom line is this: Today's legislation is one of the largest investments in science, technology, and advanced manufacturing in decades.

Now, of course, while this bill contains many critical investments in chips and scientific research, there are other major proposals from both sides that are still in the works within the conference committee. That important work must continue. It will. And it is my intention to put the conference committee on the floor in September after the work is complete.

So let me be clear. Today is a very good day for the American people and for the future of our country. I believe firmly that, when signed into law, this bill will reawaken the spirit of discovery, innovation, and optimism that made America the envy of the world and will continue to do so. Because of the investments we are approving today, America will be the place where the next transformational breakthroughs in industry and science occur.

Nearly 80 years ago, Dr. Vannevar Bush, the head of the U.S. Office of Scientific Research, wrote in a report to President Truman that "without scientific progress, no amount of achievement in other directions can ensure our health, prosperity, and security in the modern world." The name of that report? It was called "Science: The Endless Frontier." It is the inspiration for much of the work we have dedicated to passing this bill today.

In the wake of Dr. Bush's report, we created the National Science Foundation, funded the National Energy Laboratories, split the atom, spliced the gene, landed a man on the Moon, and unleashed the internet. We generated decades of American prosperity and fostered an innate sense of optimism in the American spirit.

Today, we face the great task of renewing and strengthening that legacy

in a world of fierce competition. It is no longer a situation where we can just leave it up to corporate America because we didn't have competition. Now there are nation-states funding and aiding their corporations, and authoritarian governments around the world are doing that and cheering for us to fail—cheering for us, hoping that we will sit on our hands and not adapt to the changes in the 21st century. They believe that squabbling democracies like ours can't unite around national priorities like this one. They believe that democracy itself is a relic of the past and that, by beating us to emerging technologies, autocracies around the world hope to reshape the world in their own image.

Well, let me tell you something: I believe in America. I believe in our system. I believe that they will not succeed. I believe that this legislation will enable the United States to outinnovate, outproduce, and outcompete the world in the industries of the future, and I believe that the strongly bipartisan work on this bill revealed that, in this Chamber, we all believe—all of us, Democrats and Republicans—that another American century lies on the horizon.

For this, these many worthy reasons, let us pass the CHIPS and Science bill today.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER.

The Republican leader is recognized.

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, here is how Washington Democrats are describing the American economy. From the White House last month: "robust economic progress under President Biden's leadership." According to President Biden himself, our economy has "unique strengths that we can build on," that it was "providing important breathing room for American families," and that it was "strong as can be but for inflation, but for gas and food." The economy is as strong as it can be except that pesky thing: the worst inflation in more than 40 years. You almost have to laugh at that analysis.

Contrast the Democrats' spin with how working Americans are describing our economy. From a grocery store manager in Tennessee: "It's just not a good situation." From a grandmother in Georgia: "The food, the gas, the bills, and the mortgage, everything. . . . It's a lot on a family." Overall, a majority of Americans are concerned their paycheck can't cover the essentials amidst inflation, and a majority

disapprove of what President Biden is doing about it.

Clearly, something isn't adding up, but that isn't a new feature of Washington Democrats' one-party control of government. In fact, missing the mark on economic policy has been a hallmark of the Biden administration. Last spring, they misread what it needed after a once-in-a-century pandemic and flooded the engine with trillions in liberal spending. Then, they missed the warning signs of the runaway inflation that that mistake brought on. Now, they are mounting a panicked campaign to redefine the word "recession" before the next quarterly GDP comes out tomorrow.

So Washington Democrats seem to think the real-world effects of their policies—the pain Americans are feeling as they try to balance household budgets—can just be spun away—spun away—with talking points. Well, I can tell you there are millions of working families who wish it were, in fact, that simple, but you know full well that it isn't.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, now on a different matter, yesterday, I met with members of the Kentucky Narcotics Officers Association to discuss the ongoing substance abuse crisis in my home State. These frontline professionals have watched Kentucky pass some grim milestones in recent years. This is one of the most horrifying consequences of the ongoing breakdown of law and order in our country.

In 2020, overdose deaths in the Commonwealth increased nearly 50 percent from the year prior, reaching an all-time high of 1,964. Then, last year, we broke that record again, recording 2,250 overdose deaths—14.5 percent higher than in 2020.

Remember, as of this past January, 2 years into the pandemic, fentanyl alone had killed more Americans aged 18 to 45 than the coronavirus. That is not even all overdoses; that is just fentanyl alone.

The Kentucky law enforcement officers with whom I got to visit work every day to try to reverse these heart-wrenching trends. They have had some success. Earlier this month, in Louisville, law enforcement seized a full kilogram of fentanyl in Louisville. The experts say that is enough to kill half a million people in Louisville alone. But they are struggling to stem the cascade of narcotics pouring into our streets. The reason for this, they told me, is pretty clear: our unsecured borders.

Already this year, our overwhelmed Customs and Border Patrol agents encountered more than 1.6 million illegal crossers down at the border. That is close to the total number of encounters for the entirety of last year. Some of these individuals were promptly detained and deported, but many of them were booked briefly and then released into the American heartland. Presumably, we will never hear from most of

them ever again. These are just the known encounters, to say nothing of the 900,000 "got-aways" that DHS officials think have taken place since the beginning of the last fiscal year. Put another way, a group of people larger than the entire population in my hometown broke into our country without interacting with border agents at all.

Alongside this human tide is an ever-increasing flood of illicit drugs, most notably fentanyl. That drug played a role in 72 percent of overdoses in Kentucky last year. CBP officials have seized 5,722 pounds of the stuff this year alone. Imagine how much slipped through their fingers and onto our streets.

Are Democrats admitting this is an emergency? Are they working overtime to put a tourniquet on this crisis? Just the opposite. Secretary Mayorkas jetted to a summit in Aspen earlier this month and pronounced that "the border is secure." That is our Secretary of Homeland Security. Maybe that kind of talk plays well at a ritzy ski resort packed with liberals. It doesn't play very well with law enforcement and first responders in States like Kentucky who have to deal with crime and fatal drug overdoses every single day. The far left throws our borders open for ideological reasons, and it is the most vulnerable communities that end up paying the deadly price.

The president of the National Border Patrol Council has directly contradicted the Biden administration's insistence that our southern border is in great shape. Here is what he had to say. This is the president of the National Border Patrol Council:

[T]he cartels use illegal border crossers to facilitate their higher value contraband, including . . . fentanyl.

In other words, more illegal immigration means more of this illegal poison. But President Biden and Washington Democrats simply won't admit it. Their response to the border crisis has been to issue new internal guidance encouraging border personnel to use more politically correct language when they are referring to criminal aliens. They would rather police language than police the border.

Remember, the Biden administration spent taxpayer dollars going to court, arguing they have a right to end the "Remain in Mexico" policy and throw our borders open even wider. President Biden tried to cut funding for ICE in his most recent budget.

Washington liberals say the compassionate policy is to lure desperate people into inhumane conditions, let the drug cartels have open season, and let Americans die as a result. That is not compassion; that is cruelty—an abdication of duty with deadly consequences for the American people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Biden border crisis continues to rage. Last month, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 207,416 individuals attempting to cross our southern border illegally, the highest June number ever recorded. And April and May successively set records for the highest numbers for any month ever.

During the 2021 fiscal year, Customs and Border Protection encountered a record number of individuals attempting to cross our southern border illegally—1,734,686, to be precise—a record. We still have 3 months to go for this fiscal year, but we have already exceeded last year's number by more than 11,000. That is right. In just 9 months, we have already exceeded last year's record number of apprehensions.

The situation on our southern border is out of control, although you would never know it to hear the President and his administration. "The border is secure" the President's Homeland Security Secretary said just a few days ago. Again, The border is secure. My only question is how he said that with a straight face.

Our southern border is the opposite of secure. It is in crisis. The flood of illegal immigration is so great that huge numbers of Customs and Border Protection officers have been pulled off the border to process migrants. A May article from the Economist reported that:

Around 60 percent of CBP agents have been assigned to process migrants, taking them away from field work.

That, of course, leaves our borders wide open to illegal activity, including the drug trafficking that is flooding our country with fentanyl.

It also means even with all the apprehensions the Border Patrol has made, many more individuals are getting through unstopped. One source reports that so far this fiscal year, there have been more than half a million got-aways—in other words, individuals the Border Patrol saw but was unable to apprehend.

The Economist article I mentioned also noted:

One border expert estimates that less than 20 percent of people trying to cross the border undetected are stopped.

Less than 20 percent—that is a security nightmare.

Our Customs and Border Protection agents are giving this job their all, but there is no way for them to keep up with the flood of illegal immigration, especially when they are being pulled off the border to process migrants.

It is President Biden's job to help stop this border crisis, but when he is not pretending this crisis doesn't exist, he is taking actions that are contributing to this disaster. On his very first day in office, President Biden rescinded

the declaration of a national emergency at our southern border. He halted construction of the border wall. He revoked a Trump administration order that called for the government to faithfully execute our immigration laws. And his Department of Homeland Security issued guidelines pausing deportations, except under certain circumstances. That was all, again, on his first day in office.

Needless to say, the effect of all this was to declare to the world that the U.S. borders were effectively open. And even as huge numbers of illegal immigrants pour across our southern border, he has continued to build on those actions. The President sought to significantly limit the ability of Immigration and Customs Enforcement to enforce immigration laws.

Deportations dropped precipitously during fiscal year 2021, as did arrests in the interior of the country. In March of this year, the administration rescinded a 2019 rule expanding expedited removal for individuals here illegally. And, of course, the administration is still attempting to remove title 42 COVID-19 restrictions, with no viable plan to control the resulting surge in illegal immigration.

Illegal immigration, especially the kind of out-of-control illegal immigration we are currently experiencing, has serious consequences. I have already mentioned some of the security risks it presents. With Customs and Border Protection overstretched, it is easier for bad actors to cross the border into our country—gang members, drug traffickers, human smugglers, and the list goes on.

Our country is currently in the midst of a fentanyl crisis. In fact, right now, fentanyl overdose is the leading cause of death for American adults between the ages of 18 and 45. And where is all this fentanyl coming from? Most of it is being trafficked across our southern border. The current border situation is undoubtedly facilitating that trafficking.

Illegal immigration is financially costly, as well. Immigration and Customs Enforcement is currently running out of money for this year, thanks, in part, to the out-of-control situation at our southern border.

President Biden has talked about wanting to build a “fair, orderly, and humane” immigration system. There is nothing—nothing—humane about our current situation. Encouraging illegal immigration, as the President’s policies have done, has contributed to a humanitarian crisis that saw 557 migrants die attempting to cross the southern border during fiscal year 2021. Just last month, in an incredibly tragic, horrific story, 53 migrants died in an unair-conditioned tractor-trailer after being smuggled across the border. It was a sober reminder of the human costs of policies that enable illegal immigration.

The President may think that his border policies are compassionate, but,

again, he would be wrong. Policies that encourage illegal immigration, that encourage individuals to undertake the often dangerous journey across our southern border often at the mercy of human smugglers are the very opposite of compassionate. I would like to think that the President would wake up to the dangerous situation we are in and take action to help stem the flood of illegal immigration at our southern border, but after a year and a half of his administration’s neglecting this crisis, I am not getting my hopes up. I am afraid that, like inflation, out-of-control illegal immigration has become a fact of life in the Biden Presidency. As with inflation, Americans and those vulnerable individuals who are attempting to enter our country, will be left to suffer the consequences.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

H.R. 4346

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, when it comes to America, I am an optimist—always. You see, I can’t help but approach the future with great hope. After all, as Americans, we have never let obstacles stand in our way or accepted that problems can’t be solved.

Our citizens are the world’s most ingenious; our military, its mightiest; our economy, the strongest; and our innovators, the most creative. The last century was defined by our accomplishments and our ideals and I believe this one will be, too. But I have to say, this path is not guaranteed.

Now as then, America’s success depends on unleashing the potential of our people and outcompeting and out-innovating global rivals who don’t share our values or our economic interests.

Right now, we are in the middle of a great power competition with an authoritarian regime in Beijing that seeks global primacy and rejects democracy. The Chinese Communist Party is currently investing \$1.4 trillion in frontier technologies that will dominate the 21st century—artificial intelligence, quantum computing, hypersonics, among other key technologies. Its innovators are earning patents and publishing research in AI at greater rates than our own. Its schools are producing four times the STEM graduates as America’s. The Chinese Communist Party’s computer and science universities are regularly outranking ours.

Its military is making advances in cyber warfare and the development of hypersonic weapons, autonomous vehicles, electronic and cyber warfare, and orbital bombardment systems.

These are the technologies that will dominate the 21st century, economically and militarily.

China’s Government is planning on winning the AI race, winning future wars, and winning the future. The truth is, if we are being honest with ourselves, Beijing is well on its way to accomplishing these goals. America is

at risk of falling behind economically and technologically to a world power that doesn’t value liberty or even human life.

So how should we respond?

For too long, when it comes to Chinese aggression, America has relied on a strategy of deterrence, taking steps like blocking Huawei from doing business in the U.S., tightening export controls, and improving foreign investment rules.

Now, these are important measures, but they are no longer enough. You see, it is time to go on the offensive. And that is exactly what this legislation—which has gone by many names from the Endless Frontier Act to the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act to CHIPS+—will do: unleash private sector innovation while significantly boosting Federal national security investments.

Let me highlight a few specifics. First, this bill greatly encourages domestic investment in semiconductor production. Right now, the USA is almost entirely reliant on other nations for high-tech computer chips that power our smartphones, automobiles, household appliances, and military platforms. In fact, the recent shortage of these chips has hobbled our economy; it has hit our pocketbooks.

For example, a shortage of computer chips forced General Motors to idle its assembly plant in Fort Wayne, IN, twice already this year. U.S. semiconductor production, once accounting for nearly 40 percent of the world’s supply, has dropped to just 12 percent, while China’s production share is increasing rapidly. Ninety percent of the chips used in our military technology are made overseas. Let me say that again. Ninety percent of the chips used in our military technology are made overseas. Most are made in South Korea and Taiwan, but an increasing number are produced in China. This is a very real economic and national security vulnerability.

And this bill will reassert America’s place in this industry and take a giant leap towards ensuring that our supply chain and national defense will never be at the mercy of technology produced overseas.

Another important aspect of this bill is critical applied research funding. This legislation reforms and invests in the National Science Foundation to partner with the private sector and universities to develop critical emerging technologies that will transform the global landscape. We know that national success and competitiveness in the 21st century economy will be built on emerging technologies like quantum computing and artificial intelligence.

Funding research crucial to keeping America safe is one of the Federal Government’s responsibilities, and this legislation will help us not just catch up with but overtake China in these critical areas.

And this bill will establish regional technology hubs across our country,

which will become centers for the research, development, entrepreneurship, and manufacturing of new key technologies.

This is incredibly important at a time when too many Americans in the heartland feel left out and too many areas overlooked, when only a handful of cities account for nearly 90 percent of job growth in these advanced sectors.

Simply put, this bill will make America stronger, safer, and more prosperous. And it is desperately needed. How do we know? Because the Chinese Communist Party has actively lobbied against this legislation. They know this bill is bad for China and good for the United States of America.

This bill is about securing our country, giving our people the tools to flourish, and ensuring America continues its global research role.

It has been a long journey to get to this point, but history will show that by passing this CHIPS+ bill, we are confronting the challenges of today and building a prosperous and secure tomorrow for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SANDERS. I have heard, time and again, my Republican colleagues and a number of Democrats voice their serious concern about the deficit and our national debt. We are told that because of the deficit that at a time when we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth, we cannot extend the child tax credit to help working parents and substantially reduce childhood poverty.

At a time when over 600,000 Americans are homeless and some 18 million families are spending half of their incomes on the high cost of housing, we are told over and over again that because of the deficit we cannot build the low-income, affordable housing we desperately need.

At a time when millions of senior citizens in this country desperately need help to go to a dentist because their teeth are rotting in their mouths, they can't afford hearing aids, they can't afford eyeglasses, we are told that we cannot afford to expand Medicare because of the deficit.

At a time when the average family in this country is spending \$15,000 a year on childcare—an unimaginable amount of money for a working family—we are told that we cannot reform a dysfunctional childcare system because of the deficit.

At a time when some 70 million Americans are uninsured or underinsured, we are told that we cannot guarantee healthcare to all Americans as a human right—like virtually every other major country does—because of the deficit.

In other words, despite the fact that half of the people in our country today

are living paycheck to paycheck, despite the fact that half of our seniors live on incomes of \$25,000 or less, despite the fact that we have more income and wealth inequality today than we have had in 100 years, where three billionaires own more wealth than the bottom half of America, despite all of that, whenever it comes to protecting the needs of low-income or working families, I hear, over and over again, we just cannot afford to do that because of the deficit.

Well, guess what? All of that profound and serious concern about the deficit fades away when it comes to providing a \$76 billion blank check to the highly profitable microchip industry with no protections at all for the American taxpayer.

Somehow the deficit is of great concern when it comes to providing help to working families, to low-income Americans, to children, to seniors, but it is not a concern when you provide massive corporate welfare for enormously profitable multinational corporations.

I guess when the semiconductor industry spends \$19 million on lobbying this year alone and when Intel spends \$100 million on lobbying and campaign contributions over the past 20 years, when that industry says: Jump, the response from Congress is: How high?

That is what a political system dominated by Big Money looks like. The people in this country who desperately need help can't get it. The corporations that are making huge profits and the CEOs who are making exorbitant compensation packages get everything they need—and more.

In other words, it appears that the deep concerns about the deficit are rather selective.

Now, after I finish my remarks, I will give my colleagues a chance to prove me wrong. I will be raising a budget point of order against this bill because it increases the deficit by over \$79 billion, with \$76 billion of that money going to the microchip industry with no strings attached.

Let me be very clear. There is no doubt that there is a global shortage of microchips and semiconductors, which is making it harder for manufacturers to produce the cars, cell phones, household appliances, and electronic equipment that we need. And that is why I fully support efforts to expand U.S. microchip production.

But the question we should be asking is this: Should American taxpayers provide the microchip industry with a blank check of over \$76 billion at a time when semiconductor companies are making tens of billions of dollars in profit right now and paying the head of Intel some \$170 million a year in compensation? And I think the answer to that question is a resounding no.

That is why, at the conclusion of my remarks, I will be asking unanimous consent to attach an amendment to this legislation.

This amendment is simple and straightforward. It would prevent

microchip companies from receiving grants under this legislation unless they agreed not to buy back their own stock—not complicated.

Now, this is rather amazing. This is really quite incredible and tells you where we are as a nation politically. Over the past decade, semiconductor companies have spent nearly \$250 billion—70 percent of their profits—not on research and development, not on building new microchip plants in America—what this bill is presumably about—but on buying back their own stock to enrich their wealthy shareholders.

Let me repeat: The industry that is asking for \$76 billion of corporate welfare today, over the past decade spent \$250 billion—70 percent of their profits—not on research and development, not on building new microchip plants in America but on buying back their own stock to enrich their wealthy stockholders.

Apparently, they just couldn't find \$76 billion of their own money to invest in new plants in America. They need the taxpayers of this country to do it for them.

Do any of my colleagues really believe we should allow microchip companies to receive \$76 billion in taxpayer assistance without a ban on stock buybacks?

Under my amendment, microchip companies would not be allowed to receive taxpayer assistance unless they agreed they would not repeal existing collective bargaining agreements and would remain neutral in any union organizing effort.

Do any of my colleagues believe that we should be handing out corporate welfare to profitable corporations who are engaged in busting unions?

Under my agreement, microchip companies would not be able to receive \$76 billion in taxpayer assistance unless they agreed not to outsource jobs overseas.

Now, I heard my colleague from Indiana speak a moment ago about the crisis in the microchip industry, how we are producing a smaller and smaller amount, but he forgot to mention—somehow forgot to mention—that over the last 20 years, the microchip industry has shut down over 780 manufacturing plants and other establishments in the United States and eliminated 150,000 American jobs while moving most of its production overseas.

In other words, what taxpayers are doing are rebuilding an industry that was destroyed by the industry itself by going abroad in search of more profit.

Under my amendment, microchip companies would be prevented from receiving taxpayer assistance unless they agree to issue warrants or equity stakes to the Federal Government.

Now, I happen to believe in industrial policy. I think it makes sense for the government and private sector to be working together when it is mutually beneficial. If private companies, however, are going to benefit from generous taxpayer subsidies—\$76 billion—

the financial gains made by these companies must be shared with the American people, not just wealthy shareholders. Does that sound really unreasonable?

If these guys are going to make huge profits based on this investment, don't you think maybe the taxpayers of this country who gave them the money might be able to get some of those benefits back?

The microchip industry today is worth about \$680 billion. By 2030, that market, the market for microchips, is expected to grow to a trillion dollars. Do any of my colleagues really believe that if microchip companies make a profit as a direct result of these Federal grants—which is extremely likely—the taxpayers in this country, taxpayers do not have a right to get a reasonable return on that investment?

And let us be clear, none of this is a radical idea. All of those provisions that I just articulated were included in the CARES Act that passed the Senate by a vote of 96 to 0. In other words, every Senator here has already voted for these provisions.

Now, I have heard recently some of my colleagues who are saying: Don't worry. We have imposed "strong guardrails" to this bill.

Well, let me respectfully disagree. These so-called guardrails would do nothing to prevent microchip companies from outsourcing a single job abroad. In fact, these so-called guardrails would not even force Intel to divest all of the money they have put into semiconductor companies in China. These so-called guardrails would do nothing to protect taxpayers or to stop microchip companies from union busting.

Yes, I understand some language has been inserted in this bill that would prohibit microchip companies from using Federal grants to buy back their own stock, but let's be clear, this language is totally meaningless. Under this legislation, companies will still be able to use the enormous profits that they are making to buy back their own stocks.

Bottom line, let us rebuild the U.S. microchip industry. I believe that. But let us do it in a way that benefits all of our society, not just a handful of wealthy, profitable, and powerful corporations.

In 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said:

The problem is that we all too often have socialism for the rich and rugged free enterprise capitalism for the poor.

I am afraid that what Dr. King said 54 years ago was accurate back then. And as we can see by this legislation today—massive subsidies for the rich and the powerful, while we continue to turn our backs on working families—what King said then is even more accurate now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up amendment No. 5145, that the amendment be considered and agreed to, and

that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending measure violates section 4106 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, H. Con. Res. 71 of the 115th Congress, the Senate pay-as-you-go point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and any other applicable budget points of order for the purpose of the pending bill, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized to speak on the bill.

We will soon be moving to a vote on the so-called CHIPS legislation. It has had several names during its consideration in the Senate and in the House. I prefer to call it the CHIPS and Science Act. But it is an important bipartisan piece of legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Is my friend from Vermont seeking recognition?

Mr. SANDERS. No.

Mr. WICKER. So I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this legislation. It will expand American semiconductor production, create new opportunities for research into cutting-edge technologies, and enhance our ability to compete with China.

There is no more important competition than the one for technological supremacy between the United States and China. The outcome will shape the global balance of power for decades and will impact the security and prosperity of all Americans.

Regrettably, at this moment, we are not in the driver's seat on a range of important technologies; China is. China and other nations are increasingly dominant in tech innovation, posing a massive threat to not only our economy but to our national security.

But with today's vote, Congress has a chance to move us back in the right direction and put America back into a place to win the game.

This legislation—the CHIPS and Science Act, I will call it—will provide a historic boost to our semiconductor industry, which for too long has played on an uneven global playing field.

Increasing American chip production is absolutely vital, given the importance of chips to our economy, as well as our national defense. The pandemic taught us the hard way that we cannot be dependent on semiconductor production halfway around the globe.

But, of course, chip semiconductors are not the whole ball game. This legislation goes much further, advancing American innovation in quantum computing, advanced robotics, biotechnology, advanced materials, and artificial intelligence—the full suite of technologies that we need to outcompete China.

And instead of limiting those investments to a small handful of institutions in five wealthy States, this bill casts a wide net, enlisting the talent and expertise of STEM researchers nationwide. This legislation will guarantee that EPSCoR, a program designed to stimulate competitive research in 25 predominantly rural States, receives 20 percent of all R&D funding from the National Science Foundation, up from the current 13 percent—13 percent now, 20 percent when it is finally ramped up.

The bill will also reauthorize the National Science Foundation, the gold standard for funding basic research, and it will establish a new Directorate for Technology, Innovation, and Partnerships, called TIP, at NSF to supercharge the process of translating basic research into technology development, and then to the commercial market, enabling us to compete better with China across a vast range of technologies.

This legislation would not be complete without new safeguards against espionage—which we know is taking place right now—against intellectual property theft, for which the Chinese have become notorious. I am pleased we were able to include a number of long-overdue reforms to protect the fruits of our Nation's R&D investments. Even so, there is more work to be done to protect American research across the whole of government, and I commend my friend Senator PORTMAN from Ohio for moving forward with his initiative, which I hope can be incorporated into the statute at some point.

This moment has been a long time in the making, and I want to issue some bipartisan congratulations and words of thanks.

My dear friend and colleague from the State of Washington, the chair of the Commerce Committee, Senator CANTWELL, is on the floor, and I congratulate her and commend her and thank her for her cooperation with me on this issue.

I want to thank Leader SCHUMER and Senator YOUNG, the original cosponsors of the Endless Frontier Act, as well as Senator CORNYN, Senator SINEMA, and many other colleagues who helped make this a better bill.

And I also want to congratulate and commend officials from the previous administration—from the Trump administration—who are also telling

Americans about the importance of this legislation.

This is a bill that will be signed by President Joe Biden, but it is also endorsed by Ambassador Robert Lighthizer, President Trump's International Trade Adviser; by Mike Pompeo, President Trump's CIA Director and Secretary of State; and by Robert O'Brien, former National Security Advisor to President Trump. So three distinguished and knowledgeable national defense officials and foreign policy officials are saying this about the bill we will soon vote on.

Ambassador Lighthizer, of the Trump administration, said on Kudlow 2 days ago:

We are in this existential competition with China. The battleground of that competition is technology and chips. That is where we are going to win it or lose it.

And he goes on to point out that the bill, while not perfect, is exactly the bill that we can get done right now, and I don't know of any bill that is ever perfect.

Mike Pompeo, Secretary of State, a stalwart in the last administration on national defense, says this:

Congress must pass the CHIPS Act for both our national and economic security. We have to become less dependent on China for critical technologies—and this is how we do it. . . . A bipartisan bill, supporting R&D for semiconductor chip manufacturing, is essential to securing vital technologies for our economy and our military.

That is Mike Pompeo, President Trump's Secretary of State.

And then Robert O'Brien, former National Security Advisor to President Trump, said:

America needs this legislation without delay.

So I want to also say a note of thanks to my own staff—my personal staff and my committee staff—for their tireless efforts over the last year and a half on this issue. This is the culmination of a great deal of work by some very, very talented personnel—countless meetings, a legislative hearing in April, a markup in May, a final vote by the Senate in June after days and days of debate on the floor. All of these staff members worked nights and weekends, considering and helping to manage almost 1,000 amendments through the committee and the floor, and all of them contributed in many ways.

I will single out for recognition my policy director, James Mazol, who was absolutely vital to us in putting it all together, and his entire team.

So thank you very much, Mr. President. I urge a "yes" vote. I think the strong 64 votes we had yesterday on cloture was indicative of the support, and I anticipate its passage and look forward to its successful passage in the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks prior to the scheduled vote.

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the legislation before us and how it is an investment today for jobs tomorrow.

And I want to thank my colleague from Mississippi for his partnership on this legislation. It seems like a century ago that we had a markup in committee and passed this out—the science portion, which we are now voting on—24 to 4, more than a year ago. And yet here we are today, on the product of much negotiation, not just in our committee but in eight other committees—seven other committees.

We are here because we know that innovation is in the DNA of Americans, and we know that it helped us win the world wars; it helped us cure disease. We know it has helped create millions of jobs, and it has helped members of the business community on opposite sides of a phone call or an email connect to each other to get a product or a service.

So this bill embraces American innovation and our tradition of it, and I, too, encourage a "yes" vote.

After watching the COVID crisis mangle our supply chain and see semiconductors be a big part of inflation, the shortage of semiconductors has increased the cost of a used car by more than 40 percent, putting it out of reach of many families at a time when they just needed a car to drive to work.

So this bill is about making sure that we face our manufacturing challenges here at home and that we train and skill the scientists and the workers to get that done.

And so thanks start with Senators SCHUMER and YOUNG for their hard work in introducing this legislation more than 2 years ago. Senator SCHUMER's great work with Senator YOUNG on this was an eye-opening change in the way that we make investments in R&D. It was a concept novel then, but I think we have a lot of understanding of it now, and that is to move our R&D into faster translation into products and services. Why? Because the rest of the world is doing that and we need to hurry as well.

I also want to just point out that there are lots of contributions from Members in this bill: Senator PETERS on AI scholarships, Senator CORTEZ MASTO on national science technology strategy, Senator ROSEN on critical minerals, Senator SINEMA on our NASA authorization, Senator WARNOCK on semiconductor supply chains, Senators BROWN and COONS on Manufacturing USA Institutes, Senator OSSOFF on cyber security education grants, Senator MENENDEZ on supply chain issues. So many, many things in this legislation were contributed by many different Members through a regular order process.

But let's get specific about it. There are about five or six things in this bill that really matter to our Nation at this critical moment.

First is a new mission at the National Science Foundation. That new mission is different because the National Science Foundation has been focused on basic research. So we are creating, for the first time, in a \$20 billion investment over 5 years, the focus for that new mission at NSF to say that they have to focus on translating that science into faster discoveries in products and solutions that will help U.S. manufacturing here at home.

And while the United States has excelled at basic research, we have allowed other countries to excel at translational research, and that needs to stop now.

We need to make the investment in industries from aerospace to pharmaceuticals, to farming, to information technologies that will help increase the pace of innovation here in the United States of America.

Second, we say that NSF is not alone in its mission. We recognize that the Department of Energy also has a key role to play in translational science.

I want to thank the Presiding Officer, Senator LUJÁN, for his contribution of a \$16.9 billion DOE investment that doubles down on the current work in key technology areas that we also have to do faster translational science to scale up in cutting edge energy R&D. This was a very large portion of the energy innovation that was funded in this bill.

This legislation also includes a 5-year, \$50 billion, first-ever reauthorization of the Department of Energy Office of Science. And I want to thank Senators MANCHIN and BARRASSO for working on this and its inclusion in this.

Combining these investments will go a long way in reversing the decline in Federal R&D that has dropped threefold since 1978. We need to improve U.S. competitiveness, but we are only going to do it by investing today for those jobs tomorrow.

Third, the bill also says that we need to be smarter at how we make our investments. Now, I would say I represent a tech hub. It is already in existence. It took 30-plus years to create. There are places like Seattle, San Jose, San Francisco, Boston, and San Diego that you could say are tech hubs. They account for 90 percent of the growth in innovation sectors between the years 2005 and 2017. But is that all we are going to do in the United States of America, allow innovation to just continue to be more and more expensive because it is only produced in those areas?

I am a firm believer in distributed generation, whether that is electricity or whether that is innovation. And the more dispersed the innovation is, you never know where the next Bill Gates or Bill Boeing is going to be from and what innovation they might come up with.

So this bill also has a new mission in the Department of Commerce in technology hubs, where it will focus on trying to foster new collaboration between

universities, businesses, labor, and local government to accelerate economic growth and opportunity in innovation. These tech hubs will focus on the key technology areas that are in this bill and help us move faster at innovation.

I want to thank my colleague Senator TESTER, from Montana, who is a very big advocate in making sure that there was geographic diversity to the tech hubs. And we know that while we want to grow more technology advancement in the United States, that we also want to see it not just in Seattle, but in places like Spokane or Indianapolis or West Virginia or Wichita.

We also increase in this Act the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships. During the pandemic, we saw that many companies could not survive without supplies that were no longer available to them. And we know that with the manufacturing extension ecosystem, that we have to stay competitive by innovating. This bill delivers \$76 billion over 10 years to develop the next generation of chips and to reestablish chip manufacturing in the United States.

Now I know my colleague from Vermont and my colleague from Florida and many others have criticized this part of the legislation. I know that they think that this is somehow—I wish, trust me, I wish that—I would probably agree more with the Senator of Vermont on the prioritization within our budget on the various things that will help American families. But we can't ignore that chip production has gone overseas and that the United States has lost its share of that production to the point that we are now down to as little as 12 percent—or could go to 12 percent, at which point, who wants to manufacture when the ecosystem is somewhere else? We know that just last year alone, chip shortages cost the U.S. economy \$240 billion. That is the automobile industry that didn't have chips; that is part of the electronics industry that didn't have chips. You can say it is even in the cost of every product that you buy because we certainly didn't produce the transportation system to even move products throughout the United States in companies like PACCAR that are from the Northwest, because they too did not have chips to put into their trailers to move products across the United States. So we know that with every dollar of chip R&D investment, that increases GDP gains by \$16.50.

So I know my colleagues would like us to make other investments, but I would say that chips are just as essential as wheat is in America. People think about our farm investments and with no hesitation say: Let's make sure that we keep wheat production in the United States of America. I guarantee you, chips are no less important. And we have to have an increase in the United States, or we are going to continue to fall behind on national security issues and on economic development issues that are so critical.

We also, in this legislation, make one of the most significant investments in STEM over the last many years. It puts \$13 billion into science, technology, engineering, and mathematics workforce development. It creates \$2 billion to minority-serving institutions, including Native American institutions, to encourage their research and innovation.

And I want to thank Senator WICKER for his leadership on the F-score provision, probably one of the more hotly debated conversations between our colleagues here in the Senate and in the House. But I would say to my colleagues, this is about innovation everywhere. This is about growing opportunity everywhere. And that is exactly what we are saying with F-score. You never know what the next innovation is going to bring.

So these key provisions, from diversifying our investment in education and job training, from making investments in tech hubs, to the investment in R&D by both DOD and NSF through faster translational science, we are improving the ecosystem that we have in the United States of America. This ecosystem has been built over a long period of time. It represents competing and collaborating organizations. That is what the strength of our R&D is.

So I want to thank Senators SCHUMER and YOUNG, Senators CORNYN and KELLY, and many other people who helped introduce and move this legislation. I want to thank Senator WARNER for his contributions and thank, again, Senator WICKER and his team for the many advances in this legislation. I also would be remiss if I didn't thank retiring Chair EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and Ranking Member FRANK LUCAS who worked hard to craft the legislation before us.

I want to thank on my staff: Lila Helms, Melissa Porter, Mary Guenther, Amit Ronen, Stacy Baird, Nikki Teutschel, Christi Barnhart, Jonny Pellish, Rosemary Baize, Erica Holman, and Emma Stohman for their help; and on Senator WICKER's staff, as he already mentioned, James Mazol and many other people. I want to thank on Senator SCHUMER's staff Jon Cardinal, Mike Kuiken, and Meghan Taira for their hard work. But no one deserves more focus and attention than Richard-Duane Chambers from my staff, who literally worked on the last COMPETES bill and then worked at DARPA, so clearly knows seriously the challenges that we faced in getting this legislation done and getting it over the goal line.

So I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. We don't know exactly what innovations will come out of this, but we do know this: America will be more competitive because of it. And we do know this: that we will be able to grow our economy for the future because of the investments that we have made today.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired, and amendment No. 5136 is withdrawn.

VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 270 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Baldwin	Hagerty	Romney
Bennet	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sasse
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Burr	Kelly	Sinema
Cantwell	King	Smith
Capito	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Lujan	Sullivan
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McConnell	Tillis
Cassidy	Menendez	Van Hollen
Collins	Merkley	Warner
Coons	Moran	Warnock
Cornyn	Murphy	Warren
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Ossoff	Wicker
Durbin	Padilla	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	Young
Gillibrand	Portman	
Graham	Reed	

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Sanders
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Thune
Ernst	Lummis	Toomey
Fischer	Marshall	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—3

Leahy	Manchin	Murkowski
-------	---------	-----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 33.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative. The motion is agreed to, and the point of order falls.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is a very good day for the American people, for American leadership, and for American prosperity in the 21st century. After years of hard work, the Senate is passing the largest investment in science, technology, and advanced manufacturing in decades.

This CHIPS and Science bill is going to create millions of good-paying jobs down the road. It will alleviate supply chains, it will help lower costs, and it

will protect America's national security interests.

All too often, our government and our businesses are accused of being too short term, but this is one of the most significant long-term thinking bills we have passed in a very long time. I told our caucus yesterday that our grandchildren will hold good-paying jobs in industries we can't even imagine because of what we are doing right now.

And we did it together, both sides cooperating in good faith on some truly difficult issues. I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their superb work on this legislation: my colleague Senator YOUNG, with whom I originally authored the Endless Frontier Act, as well as Senator CANTWELL, our conference chair, and Senators WICKER and WARNER and CORNYN and KELLY. I also want to thank Senators WARNOCK, BROWN, and SINEMA for their help and Leader MCCONNELL for his support as well as all members of the conference committee and all the individual Senators—just about every one of us—who helped shape this legislation. These are moments when the Senate is at its very best.

This is going to go down as one of the major bipartisan achievements of this Congress, along with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the recent gun safety law. The American people deserve to see more examples like this, of both sides coming together to do very, very big things that will leave a lasting impact on our country.

And I am confident that future generations will look back on the passage of this bill as a turning point for American leadership in the 21st century. And we are paying attention to all of America. We are making sure tech hubs will be located not just in the big, big megalopolises like San Francisco or New York City or Boston but in places like Buffalo and Syracuse and Rochester and Indianapolis and Omaha—not just major cities.

For decades, it was America's fierce commitment to scientific research, technological growth, and advanced manufacturing that made us the envy of the world. That funding that we put into science created the greatest laboratories, split the atom, spliced the gene, landed a man on the Moon, and unleashed the internet. We generated decades of American prosperity and fostered an innate sense of optimism in the American spirit. And we made the world a safer, more hospitable place for our democratic values.

Today, we face the great task of renewing and strengthening that spirit in this century, in a world of fierce competition and hungry authoritarians. It is no longer the case where we can just leave it up to corporate America. Now there are nation-states and authoritarian governments funding and aiding these corporations to come to their shores. Authoritarian nations are cheering for us to fail, hoping we sit on our hands and fail to adapt to the changes of the 21st century.

We dare not cede the mantle of global leadership on our watch. We dare not permit America to become a middling nation in the middle of this century.

No, we mean for America to lead this century. We mean for America to prosper and grow just as we have done throughout history. It won't happen on its own, but today we are laying the foundation for a bold and thriving future. Today, by passing this CHIPS and Science bill, we are making clear that we believe America's best days are yet to come.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur with amendment No. 5135.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 271 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Hagerty	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Heinrich	Sasse
Booker	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Burr	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sinema
Capito	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Lujan	Tester
Casey	Markey	Tillis
Cassidy	McConnell	Van Hollen
Collins	Menendez	Warner
Cooms	Merkley	Warnock
Cornyn	Moran	Warren
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Whitehouse
Daines	Murray	Wicker
Duckworth	Ossoff	Wyden
Durbin	Padilla	Young
Feinstein	Peters	
Gillibrand	Portman	

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Hawley	Risch
Blackburn	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sanders
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lankford	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Ernst	Lummis	Thune
Fischer	Marshall	Toomey
Grassley	Paul	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—3

Leahy	Manchin	Murkowski
-------	---------	-----------

The motion was agreed to.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS HEATH ROBINSON HONORING OUR PROMISE TO ADDRESS COMPREHENSIVE TOXICS ACT OF 2022—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House mes-

sage to accompany S. 3373, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 3373, a bill to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant.

Pending:

Schumer motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill.

Schumer motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill, with Schumer amendment No. 5148 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5149 (to Schumer amendment No. 5148), to modify the effective date.

Schumer motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with instructions, Schumer amendment No. 5150, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5151 (to the instructions (Schumer amendment No. 5150) of the motion to refer), to modify the effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5152 (to amendment No. 5151), to modify the effective date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, just a few minutes ago, after a year and a half of work, we have finally—finally—passed our plan to boost microchip manufacturing in the United States.

Microchips go in nearly everything we use. They are in the TV or the cell phone that folks are watching this on, and they are in lifesaving medical devices, and they are in our most advanced weapons systems.

The United States invented microchips, and, once, we produced 40 percent of the world's supply. Today, we only produce about 12 percent, and we don't produce any of the most advanced microchips.

Now, that leaves us vulnerable to disruptions in the supply chain, like the current microchip shortage that has halted production lines and driven up prices.

If you have recently tried to buy a car—a new car—and waited months or paid more than you were expecting, the microchip shortage is a big reason why.

So we have worked on a plan, Republicans and Democrats, with incentives to make sure the world's leading microchip manufacturers grow their operations here in the United States instead of in China or Europe. It also boosts research so that the most advanced chips in the world are invented and produced right here in the United States. That will mean tens of thousands of new jobs in places like Arizona, which is already a microchip hub, poised to grow as Intel and the Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company expand and build new manufacturing facilities.

That is all made possible by this legislation, and it creates jobs, not just with those companies but also with the companies that supply them the tools and packaging for their products. And these are great-paying jobs, and many

of them do not require a four-year degree.

I visited Estrella Mountain Community College just several weeks ago, where they are training Arizonans to enter the semiconductor technician career track with just a 10-day course followed by a guaranteed job interview.

Now, this is an enormous opportunity to reinvent our economy for the future, and this week, we are getting it done. This bill has now passed the Senate, and I am confident that it will pass the House and be signed into law.

While this process has been long, it has also shown what we can accomplish when we work together, Republicans and Democrats.

Senators YOUNG, CORNYN, WARNER, and I first began working on this at the beginning of last year, we found agreement, and we worked to build support from our colleagues. Since then, we have had to overcome more than a few roadblocks, but what matters most is that we got this done. As a result, our country is going to once again be a leader in microchip manufacturing, creating tens of thousands of great-paying jobs, strengthening our national security, and lowering costs for everyday products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, shortly, I will ask unanimous consent on the nomination of Dimitri Kusnezov to be the Under Secretary for Science and Technology at the Department of Homeland Security.

The Department needs qualified and steady leadership to support its 240,000 employees and their critical missions to protect our homeland security and to keep Americans safe. The Directorate of Science and Technology plays a vital role in carrying out these responsibilities as the Department's research and development arm, conducting groundbreaking research to help our Nation identify vulnerabilities in our homeland security so that we can close existing gaps and increase our capacity to address both current and emerging threats.

Dr. Kusnezov is more than qualified to lead these efforts. He most recently served as the Deputy Under Secretary for Artificial Intelligence and Technology at the Department of Energy, where he led the efforts to drive artificial intelligence innovation by incorporating it into their missions and operations, including through the creation of a new Artificial Intelligence Office.

After more than a decade on the Yale faculty as a professor of theoretical physics, Dr. Kusnezov left academia to pursue public service at the Department of Energy and became a member of the Senior Executive Service. He served as a senior adviser to the U.S. Secretary of Energy and Chief Scientist for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Throughout the confirmation process, Dr. Kusnezov has demonstrated he possesses the technical and specialized expertise to serve in this role, and I urge my colleagues to confirm Dr. Kusnezov.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 727, Dimitri Kusnezov to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security; that the nomination be confirmed without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this nominee has been failed by the bureaucracy that he attempts to join.

For months, I have been working with the State Department and the Department of Homeland Security—USCIS specifically—to rectify an egregious immigration case.

A North Dakota family, an American family, is being forced to live apart from each other after one of the parents, a Canadian, inadvertently overstayed their visa after receiving poor advice during the chaos of the COVID pandemic. This forced separation has been ongoing since last year. In fact, the Canadian citizen, the Canadian mother, is barred for 10 years from returning to her home.

The family has complied with every request our government has thrown at them and, as we speak, are working on fulfilling another dilatory and unnecessary request for more information.

The review of this case could have been done a long time ago, but instead bureaucrats are expediting nothing, stringing out request after request, actually forcing my constituent to prove the hardship of being separated and even show why moving to Canada would be a problem. Think of it. Their own government is asking them to justify why they can't just move to Canada. They are past the point of exasperation, and I don't know how we can blame them.

It is wrong and unjust, especially when my constituents witness the same Agency allowing thousands of people to pour across our southern border without a scintilla of review every single day.

The government is not without fault in this case, and I could share many more frustrating details of their saga, but I will refrain for the sake of their privacy as they work through this grueling process. However, my holds on DHS nominees will remain until this case is resolved. And I will add, if there is no meaningful change soon, these holds will expand to other Agencies that are involved in this case—specifically, the State Department.

It is not a decision I make lightly and one I would rather not make at all, but I would like to state the obvious: It shouldn't take a U.S. Senator personally calling Agencies and the administration while holding up nominees to get the so-called public servants to actually serve the public.

Get this done.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I renew my above request except that I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader; that there be 10 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form on the nomination; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would be happy to have a vote on this this afternoon. But the decision isn't mine; it is the bureaucrats at DHS.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, every day, I receive messages from Michigan families who are struggling to cope with rising costs for the things they depend on. We know that it has been challenging in a global pandemic with supply chains broken down and consolidation, but we also know that from food prices to household necessities to gas, corporate price gouging is also taking a big chunk out of Michigan wallets. And perhaps no industry has been price-gouging longer—actually for decades—more deeply than the pharmaceutical industry.

Americans pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs—highest prices in the world—even though we are the ones who have invested so much partnering with the industry on new types of medications and innovations. We allow research and development tax credits to help pay for that cost. We support other efforts. The National Institutes of Health helps to pay for the basic research, hundreds of billions of dollars working with the industry. And yet we have the highest prices in the world—the highest prices in the world. And one in four Americans can't afford the medications they depend on. This is just not acceptable. It is just not acceptable.

A senior with complex medical needs pays an average of more than \$6,000 a year on prescription drugs. And the median price for a new prescription drug is \$188,000 a year. That is 90 times the median price for a new drug just

back in 2008. And that is more than most Americans earn in 3 years, not just 1 year, but in 3 years.

Christina of Center Line, MI, knows this. She was prescribed Humira for an autoimmune condition that affects her eyes. Unfortunately, even though she needs it, she can't afford it. The medication costs more than \$6,000 a month—a month. She wrote this:

Autoimmune patients . . . struggle with the cost of prescriptions being so high and some just give up and don't even bother. That should never be an option in my opinion.

James, who lives in Manistee, suffers from narcolepsy. It is a neurological condition in which patients can suddenly fall asleep during other activities, including eating or driving. I am sure we have all known someone or seen someone who has this disease.

James first started taking medication called Xyrem in 2015. Back then, it cost about \$9,000 a month. Today, that same medication costs more than \$18,000 a month—\$18,000 a month, or \$226,221.84 a year.

Who can do that? Who can do that?

Last year, James' doctor switched him to a slightly different drug with less sodium, produced by the same company, Jazz Pharmaceuticals. The new drug, XYWAV, costs even more—\$239,000—\$239,320, to be specific, per year.

James writes:

Who is profiting from these huge price hikes? Will these huge price hikes continue every year? Does Jazz Pharmaceuticals have enough oversight? Are they putting profits over people?

I think there is an answer to that. It sure seems like that to me, James.

There is no fundamental reason for these prices to be going up and up and up. Now, when I think about insulin, which has tripled in price in the last decade or so, this was a drug that was actually discovered 100 years ago by two Canadian doctors who developed this patent for lifesaving medicine, and because they felt it was unethical to actually be making a profit off of something that would help people, they gave it to the University of Toronto for the equivalent of \$1.

That was 100 years ago. It hasn't substantially changed as a product in 100 years. The company has more than recovered their research and development—their costs and so on. And yet in the last couple of years, the price has tripled—tripled. If that is not a sign of price gouging, I don't know what is.

From 2000 to 2018, big pharmaceutical companies raked in \$11.5 trillion in revenue. That is T—trillion dollars. Between 2016 and 2020, drug companies spent \$577 billion on stock buybacks—not lowering prices, but doing more for their CEOs and doing more for their stockholders. The \$577 billion on stock buybacks is about 10 times as much as they spent on research and development.

They also have significantly increased executive compensation while

Americans struggle to afford lifesaving medications. For the record, the CEO of Jazz Pharmaceuticals made more than \$16 million in total compensation last year; an awful lot of Michigan families could live a good life on that one salary.

The pharmaceutical and health products industry spent \$350 million on lobbying in 2021, nearly double the spending of the second-highest industry. In fact, at one point—I haven't done this recently, but at one point, I looked at the number of lobbyists per Senator, and it was 15 lobbyists in the drug industry for every one Senator. And so we wonder, what is going on here? And then we see what happens in elections and so on; and, unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who receive a lot of the benefits of the contributions from the pharmaceutical industry then come to the floor and try to block us from doing something on behalf of people to lower these prices. And that is going to be what is happening again next week.

So far in 2022, pharmaceutical companies have already raised the price of 1,186 drugs, and they raised the price on 100 drugs just this—right now in July, this month—100 drugs. Prices have gone up, just this year.

It is appalling. There is no other word for it. And while Republican colleagues are fighting to protect these absurd profits, Senate Democrats are fighting for people who need their medicines, in some cases just to survive, to live, or to be able to go to work, to be able to do things to support their children to get what they need.

Our commonsense plan, which we will be voting on next week, to lower drug prices will save \$288 billion over the next 10 years. First, it would empower Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices beginning with 10 of the highest costing drugs, starting next year. I can't believe it. We negotiate everything else, and we know the VA that negotiates on behalf of veterans' prescription drugs gets about 40 percent less. Common sense tells you that we should be negotiating these prices.

But, unfortunately, years ago, when the prescription drug bill, Part B, passed in Medicare, the drug companies were successful in getting specific language in that says you can't negotiate with them. Medicare cannot negotiate. Well, that needs to change, and we are going to change that.

So it would be 10 of the highest costing drugs next year that would expand to 20 drugs in each year after that by 2029. Just imagine how much money can be saved if Medicare was allowed to negotiate, and it would directly benefit people who are living with conditions including asthma, blood clots, COPD, as well as cancers as well as a whole range of things—everything you can imagine.

Secondly, our legislation caps Medicare beneficiaries' out-of-pocket costs for seniors, for people with disabilities

on Medicare. We will cap the out-of-pocket costs to \$2,000 a year and allow people to spread that out over the year so that it is easier to make that payment. So instead of \$6,000 a month or \$9,000 a month or \$10,000 a month or whatever, we are talking about a cap of \$2,000 you can spread out over the year in out-of-pocket costs for seniors and people with disabilities. Never again will a diagnosis like cancer mean \$10,000 or more for a single drug to treat it.

Medicare beneficiaries would also receive free vaccines, including vaccines for shingles. That currently costs seniors \$190 if they are not enrolled in Medicare Part B. It would increase help for low-income seniors, giving all qualifying Medicare beneficiaries the full low-income subsidy under Medicare Part B. So we would help low-income seniors even more. That would save the average senior about \$5,000. That is a lot of money. And it would keep Part B premiums in Medicare affordable for seniors and people with disabilities and ensuring that premiums won't increase because of bad actions by drug companies, and that means not faster than inflation. Speaking of bad actions by drug companies, it would penalize them for outrageous price increases. If they go above inflation, they are going to have to rebate those funds.

Today, drug companies are incentivized by keeping drug prices high by secretly negotiating with insurers and pharmacy benefit managers to increase profits at the expense of patients. Under our legislation, drug companies, not consumers, will be on the hook for drug price hikes that exceed the rate of inflation. This proposal alone is expected to save Medicare \$71 billion.

For far too long, the drug companies have been taking advantage of people like Christina and James. People should not have to go without the medicine they need in this country, in America, where we fund through our tax dollars so much of the innovation that creates these drugs. They should not be forced to skip doses or take less than what was prescribed to save money, and they should not have to choose between taking their medicine and keeping the lights on or putting food on the table.

Christina and James deserve better. Americans deserve better. And we are going to fight until that gets done. That is what next week is all about on prescription drugs. It is time. It is past time. People deserve to be able to afford the medicine they need. It is time to put people before profits, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. THOMAS E. DOBBS, III

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to express deep appreciation for Mississippi State Health Officer Dr. Thomas Dobbs, a friend and leader to all of the frontline healthcare workers in my State.

Dr. Dobbs joined the Mississippi State Department of Health as the State health officer in December 2018. After 3½ years and a global pandemic that none of us saw coming, he will soon step down from his role and return to the clinical side of medicine.

Mississippi's State health officer is responsible for directing public health activities related to the State's many health challenges, which included my State's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Dr. Dobbs' experience and his expertise made him the perfect professional to lead Mississippi through this pandemic. With a belief that each person in Mississippi was his patient, Dr. Dobbs worked tirelessly throughout his tenure to care for our nearly 3 million residents. From the start, Dr. Dobbs was steadfast in informing and advising citizens, policymakers, and healthcare providers on the best practices to combat the deadly coronavirus. He never wavered despite evolving challenges and so many tragic COVID-related deaths.

He is one of the country's most respected public health officers, having earned a stellar reputation for his clinical work in the field of infectious diseases. Dr. Thomas Dobbs proved himself to be the leader Mississippi needed during a very difficult time. I am saddened to see Dr. Dobbs leave the Mississippi State Department of Health, but I am confident he will continue to do great things.

There are not enough thanks in the world that could cover all that Dr. Dobbs has done for Mississippi, but I say from the bottom of my heart, thank you, Dr. Dobbs. Your service and sacrifice on behalf of Mississippi reflects well on you and your profession.

I am also grateful for his wife, Dr. Kim Dobbs, and their two sons, Wyn and Max, for sharing so much of their husband and father during this time.

As Dr. Dobbs departs the State department of health, I look forward to continuing to work with him and the new State health officer, Dr. Dan Edney, in making Mississippi healthier and happier.

Thank you again so much, Dr. Dobbs. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

INFLATION

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, the mountain Americans have to climb to make ends meet keeps getting steeper and steeper as a result of Bidenomics.

Since President Biden began his reckless tax-and-spending spree, prices are sky-high for gas, food, housing, and just about everything else. The admin-

istration's own statistics reveal inflation jumped nearly 10 percent in the last year, the biggest increase in over four decades.

Democrats keep telling us not to worry and that the problem is only "temporary." Yet, every month, prices keep climbing and climbing and climbing. The reason is simple: President Biden's fiscal policies are driving costs higher and higher.

You may recall I came to the Senate floor a year ago to warn my colleagues that Bidenomics was causing inflation to spin out of control. Yet Democrats have ignored the struggles being inflicted on hard-working Americans and continue to pass one trillion-dollar bill after another. As reckless spending increased, the value of the dollar declined, meaning paychecks aren't going nearly as far as they did just a year ago.

To make matters even worse, the Biden administration's ongoing effort to end domestic oil and gas production is fueling the elevated price at the pump, which reached an alltime high of more than \$5 per gallon this summer; and an internal analysis by the Biden administration's own Treasury Department forecasts that, this fall, gas prices could top \$6 a gallon.

I am already hearing from Iowans and Iowa businesses about how folks aren't even able to afford to drive to work. The problem is becoming even more difficult since Bidenomics is driving up the sticker prices on cars to record highs. The actual retail price for a new vehicle is \$48,000, and if that sounds like a lot, the cost of buying a home has also reached an alltime high of \$416,000. It is no surprise fewer people are buying homes. Then look at rent. It has also hit a record high of nearly \$1,900 a month. These unpredictable prices have everyone asking themselves if "The Price is Right."

Folks, Americans shouldn't have to play guessing games about whether or not their paychecks can be stretched far enough to avoid going over a financial cliff. Each bill the Democrats have passed as part of the Biden agenda has increased costs for working Americans while moving our Nation closer and closer to the edge of the fiscal cliff.

Consider that when Joe Biden was inaugurated as President in January 2021, the inflation rate was only 1 percent. After their so-called COVID relief bill—which cost \$1.9 trillion—was passed in March of last year, the inflation rate moved up to nearly 3 percent.

In July, President Biden claimed the quickly increasing prices were "temporary" and that his big spending plans would result in lower prices for Americans, but by the time the President signed his \$1 trillion, so-called infrastructure bill in November, inflation had climbed to almost 7 percent.

In December, President Biden said inflation had reached its "peak." He was wrong once again, and, today, inflation is more than 9 percent.

This isn't a cliffhanger, folks. We all know where this is headed. Step by

step, President Biden's reckless tax-and-spend policies are taking us closer and closer to going over the cliff, and yet the Democrats are still trying to outbid each other with another trillion-dollar, budget-busting, partisan package that would raise taxes on small businesses and increase prices for everyone.

That is right, folks. Bidenomics is driving up the costs of everything, and the Democrats' solution is to spend even more of your hard-earned money to pay for more of their pricey, partisan pet projects. Any more Bidenomics will push the economy over the fiscal cliff and into a recession.

It is time to take a step back and stop the wasteful Washington spending, which is the only way to make these prices come on down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Missouri.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I just was able to watch the administration climb the inflation rate cliff, and I want to talk more about this problem of what happens when the administration ignores the warning signs that are going to produce the kind of results that they have produced.

You know, Democrats, all by themselves, after five bipartisan bills the year before to try to fight COVID and save the economy, decided that the recovering economy needed even more help to recover and passed a \$1.9 trillion spending bill in March of last year. And that money almost immediately went out.

You know, we talk about \$1.9 trillion. I don't even know quite how we compare that in a way that people can think about it. The normal annual spending for the whole discretionary budget is \$1.47 trillion. So in one bill, in addition to the money that the government would be spending that year in the budget that we vote on—the discretionary budget we vote on—Democrats decided: We are going to spend that much and more. We are not going to spend just twice the normal discretionary spending. We are going to spend twice the normal discretionary spending plus another 25 percent or so.

You know, we spend every year about 700, and last year we spent \$780 trillion to defend the country. That is a third of the money, roughly, in the \$2 trillion American Recovery Act. We spent less than \$700 billion to do everything else that we vote on. All of the debates we have here about spending are spending that results in a little less than \$1.5 trillion of spending that is part of the normal budget.

So when you double that and then you add to the doubling of that, and you put all of that into the economy at one time, you are clearly going to create a situation where you have inflation.

That is what Democrats in previous administrations, like Clinton's Secretary of the Treasury and people in

the Obama administration, all said—that this will create runaway inflation. But if that wasn't enough, we hear that they want to spend even more.

But over the next year, after they passed that bill, inflation kept skyrocketing. Cracks kept appearing in the economy. There were plenty of warning signs, but our colleagues on the other side kept pushing to write the biggest check they possibly could and to write another one.

Their latest plan is a massive amount of government spending. This one will be really focused on the Affordable Care Act, sometimes called ObamaCare. Apparently, the Affordable Care Act wasn't all that affordable or isn't all that affordable, because if you believe the reason for this bill, almost nobody can afford it. If you don't get insurance at work, it is almost unaffordable.

In the original healthcare law, there were government subsidies for people who didn't make much money so that they could afford to be in what turned out to be an overpriced system. But that law capped how much you could earn and still get a subsidy.

The \$2 trillion I talked about earlier, the reckless tax-and-spending spree from March of last year, got rid of those income limits. Apparently, the income limits—no matter how high they were—weren't high enough. So they eliminated the income limits. Now the amount you would get from the government would be based on how big a share of your income you were spending on insurance, no matter how big that income was.

One study found that a typical family of four making \$106,000 would almost immediately—and did almost immediately—get almost \$10,000 in subsidies. Before that, they got zero in subsidies. Four hundred percent of the poverty level appeared to be enough in the original bill. That is the system that should have provided insurance that people could afford, but, apparently, it hasn't done that.

The insurance on the government exchanges is so expensive in some areas that people making half a million dollars or more could qualify for thousands of dollars from the government under this new structure. This, by the way, is the structure that the next spending bill is supposed to be trying to make permanent or at least permanent enough that people will get so used to having it that they will never want to give it back.

The bill was called the American Rescue Plan. Its supporters kept telling us it had to be big because there were still people in real need and the economy was struggling. But we now know that while there are always people in need, it is not because the economy is struggling. Now people are in need because the economy is spiraling out of control, and whether it is at the gas pump or the grocery store, you are having to make decisions you wouldn't have thought you would have to make.

The health insurance subsidies in particular were meant to be temporary—at least if you believed the reason that was given when that bill was passed—and would only last until the end of this year. Now our friends across the aisle want to make these temporary subsidies permanent.

For purposes of the law itself, they don't want to admit that. So they say: Well, we just want to extend this year for another couple of years.

And, by the way, I think we are clear that when we get to the next deadline, once you have had these subsidies for 1 year, as it turns out—let alone 2 or 3 more—the whole idea is to get people so committed to getting this money that the government will never back up and take it away.

It is just a budget gimmick—everybody knows that—a gimmick to extend the program to further redistribute taxpayer money to people who are making big incomes but have decided it is better for the government to pay for their insurance than it is to pay for their insurance themselves.

This doesn't relate to everybody. In fact, the 400 percent of poverty, which many people thought at the time, and still think, sounds like an income where you ought to be able to pay your own insurance—and, if you can't, there must be something wrong with the healthcare system. In fact, last year, my colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, said he had serious problems with another version of this bill because there wasn't a cap. He said: "What I see are shell games—budget gimmicks that make the real cost of the so-called \$1.75 trillion bill estimated to be almost twice that" much during the full time of the bill.

So the Congressional Budget Office looked into this health insurance study plan or subsidy plan. They found that when it actually gets extended, this extension over 10 years costs another \$250 billion. If we have people who are making more than 400 percent of poverty—in fact, if we have people who are unlimited in their income—who somehow need to have government help to buy insurance, we ought to figure out what happened with the insurance marketplace that ObamaCare created.

The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, figured that \$36 million of that \$250 million would go to people who make more than 400 percent of poverty, which works out to be about \$140,000 for a family of 4. They also say that 48 percent of the new people entering the program would be making more income than that \$140,000 level.

Even if you think someone who makes \$140,000 is low income—as maybe our friends on the other side of the aisle do—and deserves a handout from taxpayers to buy their insurance, again, I would say there must be something wrong with the insurance plan. If we have an affordable healthcare plan that nobody can afford, that should be our focus instead of focusing on making other taxpayers pay for the

unaffordable healthcare plan rates that we have.

The Congressional Budget Office expects 2.3 million fewer people, by the way, to get their insurance on their job if the subsidies become permanent. Why should your employer pay for your insurance if the government will pay for it instead? Why would you pay some portion of the cost of your insurance if the government will pay 100 percent of the cost of your insurance? Another 200,000 people, because of this, would end up in Medicaid and the CHIP Program, or the Children's Health Insurance Program.

This is a plan to get people committed to something that just simply doesn't work. All it does is prove what President Reagan said, which he once said:

Nothing lasts longer than a temporary government program.

So we are going to be discussing, in the next few days, about how we want this 1-year program to become another 2- or 3-year program, which clearly would become a permanent program.

Temporary assistance in March of 2021 and the other things in that bill that were spent immediately—that \$1.9 trillion bill—fed the fuel to the fire of inflation that we see right now. Combine that with terrible energy policies, and American families feel it every single day.

We don't need to do more of the same. We need to figure out what we did that created this problem and stop doing it.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

OFFICER ELLA GRACE FRENCH TASK FORCE
SUPPORT ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday, during a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I had a chance to share the story of this fallen hero from Chicago, IL. Her name is Ella French.

Officer French joined the Chicago Police Department in 2018. A true public servant, she was always eager to help. She loved people, loved her family, and loved animals, particularly stray dogs. She would often pick them up in her squad car and ferry them to safety at the end of the day.

Last year, tragically, Officer French was shot down during a traffic stop. She was 29 years old. Her partner, Carlos Yanez, Jr., was seriously wounded. The gun that was used to shoot both of them had been straw-purchased in Indiana, a State adjoining Illinois. A straw purchase takes place when someone without a criminal record, who can pass a background check, buys a gun for someone who cannot. In this case, the purchaser was turning the gun over to a convicted felon who used the gun to kill Ella and seriously wound her partner.

During yesterday's hearing, which focused on law enforcement officer safety, we were joined by Officer French's mother, Elizabeth. She is a wonderful

person. I want to take this opportunity to thank Elizabeth French for her bravery and her commitment to honoring her daughter's legacy.

I want to thank our witnesses, including Chief Angel Novalez of the Chicago Police Department, who himself was shot in the line of duty, for participating yesterday in the hearing.

Every time law enforcement officers put on their uniforms and badges, they put their lives on the line, especially in a country that is now awash in guns, America, the country of 350 million people and 400 million firearms. In fact, guns are not only the No. 1 cause of death for America's children, they are the leading cause of death for officers in the line of duty, second only to COVID.

We have made some progress in recent months in reducing the risk of gun violence for police officers and our families. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act included a provision I have long supported, cracking down on straw purchases, like the gun that was used to kill this amazing young woman.

We still have a lot of work to do. Yesterday, I introduced legislation—and I have named it in Officer French's honor—that would provide funding to multijurisdictional task forces to combat straw purchasing: the Officer Ella Grace French Task Force Support Act. I am glad her mother was there to hear that.

I hope every Senator who prides himself on supporting law enforcement will join me in this legislation. I can think of no better way to honor the service and sacrifice of our officers, to protect our families and our children, and to demonstrate to America that this Senate is serious about stemming the tide of gun violence in our country.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Madam President, in the United States of America, nearly all women—99 percent—use some form of contraception in their lifetime to prevent unplanned pregnancy. They use birth control pills, IUDs, condoms, and other devices. Many women who are not sexually active still use birth control to manage medical conditions.

Further, almost every woman who identifies as religious has used a contraceptive method in her lifetime—99 percent of mainline Protestants, evangelical Protestants, and Catholics—and 96 percent of people with other religious affiliations.

In short, women in all stages of life in America and of all religious backgrounds rely on birth control. It is their constitutional right. It is their decision. But this right, this decision, is now under attack.

Over a month ago, in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, revoking for the first time ever an established constitutional right: the right to reproductive healthcare. And I fear that the Court's assault on our fundamental freedoms is just beginning.

In his concurrence in the *Dobbs* opinion, Justice Clarence Thomas urged the Supreme Court to "reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including *Griswold*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell*." He made reference in that statement to three Supreme Court decisions which have been on the books for over 50 years. That is an explicit threat by Justice Thomas against the very right to same-sex marriage, the right to consensual relationships between LGBTQ people, and the right to contraception, which has been protected by the Court's decision in *Griswold v. Connecticut* for 55 years.

In that case, *Griswold*, a supermajority of seven Supreme Court Justices ruled that married couples have a right to access contraception. They based it on a word which you will not find in the Constitution: "privacy." Now, more than half a century later, we are living in an America where women are no longer guaranteed this right to privacy, this right to reproductive healthcare, and where their very right to contraception is now in doubt and in jeopardy.

This is not some alarmist rant. At this very moment, women in America are being denied their constitutional right to contraception. How could that possibly be in this country? Well, look no further than your local pharmacy.

This past weekend, USA TODAY reported on the story of Abigail Martin, a young woman who has been taking birth control pills for the past 6 years. She went to a Walgreens pharmacy to refill her birth control prescription, which had been prescribed by her doctor. She was turned away by a pharmacist at Walgreens. It took 4 days before she was finally able to access her medication by going to a different pharmacist. That is a dangerous delay in healthcare. Apparently, Walgreens allows its pharmacists to refuse to fill a prescription for which they have "a moral or religious conviction . . . [and] to refer the customer to another employee or manager on duty who will complete the transaction."

Since Abigail's story went viral, other Walgreens customers have come forward to say that cashiers refused to ring up their condoms because they announced it violated their faith.

A pharmacist should not be able to unilaterally decide that their personal moral or religious beliefs can delay or interfere with the medical needs of a patient standing at the cash register, buying a legal medication, which is why this week I sent a letter to the CEO of Walgreens, an Illinois corporation, for an explanation of their policy.

If Walgreens is going to allow its individual employees to dictate what legal medical products customers can purchase, then the company should make this policy known to the public. They should be required to display signs at their cash registers alerting customers and the public that they may not be able to fill their prescriptions or buy healthcare products in a

timely manner. Given this information, customers may decide to take their business elsewhere—to a pharmacy that does not allow individual staff members to restrict or interfere with their customers' legal purchasing decisions.

A woman's right to essential healthcare should not differ based on which pharmacy she chooses, who fills her prescription, or who rings it up. Her right to this personal decision in her life is fundamental—fundamental. That is why Congress must pass the Right to Contraception Act introduced by Senators MARKEY and MURRAY. This is a commonsense proposal, and I have cosponsored it. It would codify the right to contraception in America nationwide—a right that has been undisputed for 55 years.

We need this legislation because now women in America are living with the consequences of six unelected Justices erasing the constitutional right to reproductive healthcare, and pharmacies, like Walgreens, are allowing their employees to dictate what healthcare products consumers are able to purchase. Walgreens says they want to be respectful of the moral judgment of their employees and staff. Should they not also be respectful of their customers?

Politicians and pharmacists have no business standing between a woman and healthcare. If protecting this right sounds like common sense to you, then join us in supporting the Right to Contraception Act.

If the Supreme Court will not respect this fundamental personal right, you have the right to demand that your Member of Congress will.

CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Madam President, across America, tens of thousands of cars are lined up bumper to bumper in a total standstill. This is not an ordinary traffic jam. You see, these cars are brand new. They were assembled by some of the finest names in American manufacturing. But they are missing something, a key, essential component: microchips.

If you are in the market for a new car or even a fridge or a smartphone, there is a good chance you have felt the semiconductor shortage. These tiny pieces of silicon power nearly everything around us. But with the coronavirus epidemic, supply chains have been snarled and foreign factories have been shut down, which has led to a global shortage of microchips.

This has had a devastating impact on American consumers, businesses, and workers. Over the past 2 years, the price of a new car has skyrocketed by 20 percent—40 percent for used cars. We have seen the repercussions of this firsthand in my home State of Illinois, which is one of the leaders in the auto industry. Companies like Stellantis, which runs an assembly plant in Belvidere, have been forced to shut down production several times this year because of these shortages.

Today, the Senate did something remarkable: We passed a bill, a bipartisan bill. How about that. And it is important. We came to the rescue of job creators like Stellantis and to the rescue of American consumers. We voted on this legislation to invest billions of dollars into making microchips right here in America.

This bill is critical for the future of our economy. It is even critical for our national security. And we need it desperately for more scientific breakthroughs. But in the near term, the CHIPS Act is imperative for shoring up our Nation's supply chain and strengthening our defense system. Why? Because microchips are essential not just for cars and refrigerators and smartphones but for guided missile systems and fighter jets.

Right now, America has to rely on foreign suppliers like China to supply the chips that power the next generation of defense in America. That wasn't always the case. In 1990, America produced almost 40 percent of the world's supply of microchips. Today, make that 12 percent. Somewhere along the way, we settled for outsourcing semiconductor production to Asia. That is just unacceptable, and it is unsustainable. Imagine our turning to the Chinese Communist Party to determine whether or not we can buy the microchips that fuel our economy and protect our Nation. That is a dangerous scenario.

I have heard a few colleagues voice concern about the subsidies in this bill, but—let's be clear—this is no reckless corporate giveaway. The CHIPS Act will bring American factories back to life, creating good jobs in our country.

The fact is, our competitors in Asia and even Europe are already investing billions of dollars in luring chipmakers away from America. We need to fight fire with fire. The CHIPS Act will. It will incentivize the biggest names in technology to manufacture right here in America, and if any company breaks their commitment to make it in America, we reclaim all of the funding that we give them under this bill.

But beyond this economic and national security imperative, the CHIPS Act is important for another reason, one that really strikes at the heart of America: pioneering innovation. The CHIPS Act includes historic funding authorization for groundbreaking scientific research at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy's Office of Science.

This has been a particularly important issue to me personally as a Member of the Senate for many years. It was 7 or 8 years ago when I decided to try to push for increasing medical research funds at the Federal level. I concentrated on the National Institutes of Health, with Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri, who was just on the floor before me, joining me in a bipartisan effort with PATTY MURRAY in an effort to make this bipartisan and effective. It worked. We dramatically increased the

investment in the NIH. But I knew that wasn't enough. We needed the Department of Energy's Office of Science, as well as the National Science Foundation, to have the same increase in funding. Today, with the passage of the CHIPS and Science bill, we are finally moving in that direction.

We know how important scientific research is. We have learned it over and over. For instance, finding that vaccine for COVID-19 in recordbreaking time was a result of investing in science and medical research years and years before.

We also know that we have launched some things which are going to change the world. The James Webb Space Telescope is one of those things. The deepest and sharpest photos of our universe are finally coming home to the United States and the rest of the world.

What is NASA doing with this trove of data being collected by this telescope now? Well, since NASA is funded by taxpayers, they are sharing it with researchers throughout the country. One professor at the University of Chicago, Jacob Bean, says that he is planning on using this data to learn more about exoplanets orbiting faraway stars, whatever the possibilities may be that they can host a life.

This one image of our universe has unleashed a flood of new ideas and just countless questions for researchers around the world. It shows how funding and scientific research can really change the place we live in.

When we support scientists and researchers, we are paving the way for new discoveries. NASA was critical for developing so many products. Imagine, if you will, that they had a lot to do with developing athletic shoes, CAT scans, and smartphone cameras. These staples of American life and more were unintended discoveries pioneered in NASA's labs.

With the CHIPS Act, we can kickstart a new generation of discovery. I am happy to say that, in Illinois, in the Chicagoland area, we have two of the best research operations in our country: the Argonne Lab and Fermilab.

With this funding, these facilities will break new ground in researching emerging technology, like AI and quantum computing. In fact, Argonne and Fermilab already partnered together with the University of Chicago to launch the most advanced quantum network in the world. They are planning to expand it to other parts of the country, bringing more research into this cutting-edge research technology.

And much like space exploration 50 years ago, quantum computing is the new frontier in science. We have only begun to explore techniques like teleporting qubits, which may sound like a line from Star Trek, but it has profound implications.

Quantum computing could revolutionize the way we design electric batteries for cars, even solar technology, to maximize energy efficiency. These are the possibilities that lie before us.

The passage of the CHIPS and Science Act today on the floor of the U.S. Senate is a vindication of our commitment to this Nation's future and an investment that generations will thank us for.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, in a moment, I am going to propound a unanimous consent request. Before I do, I want to make some brief remarks. Right now, we have an administration that is killing oil pipelines, slow-walking natural gas licensing, illegally halting lease sales, and writing rules that Congress never gave the executive branch the authority to write.

This is how President Biden regulates our energy industry. In the morning, he complains that gas prices are too high, and he chastises oil and gas companies to produce more. Then he takes a nap, wakes up, and says the very existence of oil and gas companies offends him, and it is our duty to put them out of business. It is absurd.

But today I want to focus on the Biden administration's reckless release of our emergency crude oil stockpile, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The President's energy policy has been a failure so much so that today the United States produces 1½ million fewer barrels a day of oil than it did in November 2019.

That is why oil and gas prices are high. It is no mystery, and it is not principally because of the war in Ukraine, as much as Joe Biden and the Democrats want to blame it on that.

At the same time that President Biden has tried to strangle U.S. energy production, he has simultaneously groveled to Saudi Arabia and to Venezuela, asking them to increase their production. And he has attacked small business gas stations around the country and told them: Just lower your prices. Then he has taken the unprecedented step of releasing an arbitrary amount of our emergency crude oil stockpile in order to try to lower gas prices before the midterm elections.

The Biden administration has even sold at least 2 million barrels of oil to the Chinese Communist Party's state-owned oil and gas company, Sinopec. One million barrels in April of this year, another million barrels in July sold to communist China. China, at this very moment, has created the world's largest stockpile of crude oil, which according to Bloomberg totals 926 million barrels.

In comparison, under Joe Biden, our own reserves have fallen to 492 million

barrels of oil. That is the lowest level since December of 1985, according to the U.S. Department of Energy.

Of course, no mention of China and the administration would be complete without noting that Hunter Biden's private equity firm, BHR, has a major stake in Sinopec.

But there is something we can do. I am calling on this body to pass the No Emergency Crude Oil For Foreign Adversaries Act, which is cosponsored by 11 of my colleagues.

This bill takes the commonsense step of prohibiting the Secretary of Energy from selling our emergency crude oil stockpile—there to protect the national security of the United States—to communist China and also to other foreign adversaries, including Iran, North Korea, and Russia.

It would also require a full accounting of where our crude oil has been sent for refining since the Biden administration began releasing the oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve last November.

It is important to note we have no issue with exports in general. In fact, we want to continue to help our European allies remove themselves from their reliance on Russian oil.

A recent study found that since 2015, U.S. oil exports increased oil and natural gas development in the United States, reduced global oil prices by \$1.93 per barrel over a 6-year period, added \$161 billion to our GDP, and added nearly 50,000 jobs here in America.

But under no circumstances should we be giving our emergency stockpile to our enemies, particularly at a time when they are benefiting from stockpiling cheap Russian oil and gas. This poses a direct threat to American national security, and the Biden administration shows zero interest in stopping it. That is why Congress needs to act.

This should be a simple and easy bipartisan measure to say we are not going to sell our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to communist China to use it against America.

Therefore, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 4515, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

I appreciate the Senator's interest in trying to make sure that American energy resources don't go to benefit communist China. And it is interesting because I don't think a lot of Americans know that prior to 2015, the United States didn't allow for the export of American oil. We saw it prior to 2015 as

a strategic asset, all of the oil produced in the United States.

Prior to 2015, we decided that the oil produced in the United States would stay in the United States; that it should benefit U.S. consumers.

And I have heard my Republican colleagues come down to the floor over and over again calling the Biden administration to do more drilling, to do more exploration, to authorize more permits under the belief that drilling in the United States will produce results for American consumers.

But the reality is we have done more drilling in the United States, but much of that drilling and exploration has benefited—you guessed it—China. Prior to 2015, the United States didn't export oil to China. In 2013, we exported .3 million barrels, the next year .4 million barrels, the next year 8 million barrels, the next year 80 million, then 84 million, dipped down to 50, then back up to 176. In 2021, 91 million barrels of oil shipped from the United States to China.

And so if we are sincere about trying to make sure that American-produced oil benefits American consumers, rather than the Chinese Communist Party, well, then let's make that our policy. Let's not limit the policy to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; let's just make the decision that American oil is going to benefit American consumers.

Now, that change was made in 2013 as part of a compromise. Republicans wanted the ban on oil exports lifted. Democrats wanted the extension of some tax incentives for renewables. It was a bipartisan compromise. But now that we seem to have greater consensus around stopping American exports of fuel benefiting China, then let's not just do this halfway; let's make it a clear policy.

And so I just learned of the Senator's unanimous consent request this morning, and I will commit to him to learn more about the more targeted approach that he is making, but I am going to plan to object to it today unless we can modify it to make this policy universal.

Senator MARKEY has a piece of legislation that would reimpose that ban on the export of oil. It seems like a pretty important time to do that. If we have oil in the United States, why don't we keep it here to benefit the people of the United States instead of shipping it to China? Senator MARKEY's bill has language in it that would allow for national interest exemptions so that if we needed to get oil to Ukraine, for instance, we could still do that. But 91 million barrels of oil, that is a lot of oil to be sending to China every year.

And so I am going to ask that the Senator modify his request to pass Senator MARKEY's legislation instead, which would, frankly, get at the concern that Senator CRUZ is articulating but do it in a much more comprehensive way. I expect he may object to that modification, and if he does, I will object to his original request but com-

mit to him to spend some time looking at his more targeted approach given a little bit more of a window.

So I am going to make this request right now, which is that the Senator modify his request and instead that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1415 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. I do not. Reserving the right to object.

Debates on the Senate floor sometimes can be clarifying. Over the course of the day, my office and I engaged in good-faith negotiations with a number of Democratic Senators. We engaged in extensive negotiation with Senator MANCHIN, the chair of the relevant committee. Senator MANCHIN proposed minor alterations to this bill and agreed to support it if we made those alterations. I agreed to accept Senator MANCHIN's alterations, and we then had what was going to be a bipartisan bill.

Senator CANTWELL, likewise, we negotiated with her office today and had reached what we thought was an agreement.

And then at the last moment, the Senator from Connecticut raised this objection. And I think what he is asking this body to pass really clarifies where the extreme left wing of the Democratic Party is, which is the Green New Deal Democrats want to destroy American energy jobs. They want to destroy the American oil and gas industry. They want to destroy our own production, and, bizarrely, they simultaneously want to benefit energy jobs of our enemies.

There is some irony that the Senator from Connecticut is leading this objection because it was earlier this year when the Senator from Connecticut led the effort in this body to block sanctions on Russia and Vladimir Putin on the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline, sanctions that I had authored and passed into law, not once but twice; sanctions that had stopped that pipeline; sanctions that had prevented Putin from invading Ukraine; sanctions that hurt Russia and hurt Putin until Joe Biden became President and decided to waive the sanctions on Russia and Putin to capitulate to Russia and Putin.

When Biden did so, when Biden waived those sanctions, the Government of Ukraine, President Zelenskyy, said: If you waive these sanctions, Russia will invade Ukraine. The Government of Poland said: If you waive these sanctions, Russia will invade Ukraine.

And in January of this year, I forced a vote on imposing the sanctions. At the time, the Government of Ukraine begged us—there were tanks on the border of Ukraine, the invasion hadn't

happened—and the government of Ukraine begged us: Please pass these sanctions.

Now, every Democrat in this body had voted for my sanctions not once but twice. They had supported it when the President's name was Donald J. Trump.

But then they had a Democrat in the White House, and a Democrat, Joe Biden, who, on the day of the vote, came to Capitol Hill—it is the only time I know of that he has done this—to personally lobby Democrats to vote against sanctions on Russia, against sanctions on Putin, to vote to greenlight a natural gas pipeline for Putin and Russia.

And the Senator from Connecticut led the fight on the Senate floor, urging his Democratic colleagues: Flip your votes. Give an enormous present to Russia and Putin, and sacrifice Ukraine in the process.

I stood on this floor and said: If you do this—the 44 Democrats who cast the vote—we will see Russian tanks in the streets of Kyiv.

I wish that prediction had proven wrong, but it did not.

What the Senator from Connecticut just came back with is: We should prohibit all energy exports from America.

And, in fact, I will read from the bill he called up. It is:

The President . . . may restrict exports of . . . coal, petroleum products, natural gas, or petrochemical feedstocks.

Shut down all exports.

So I want you to understand the difference between my bill and the bill the Senator from Connecticut is asking us to pass.

My bill says: Don't sell our oil to our enemies. Communist China is our enemy. Russia is our enemy. Iran is our enemy. North Korea is our enemy. Let's not sell our oil to our enemies.

This is a reasonable, commonsense proposition. I am confident any one of us at home with our constituents, if you asked your constituents, "Should the President of the United States be selling oil that the American taxpayer has paid for, that is kept as a strategic reserve to keep America safe, should we be selling it to communist China," the overwhelming majority of your constituents and mine, whether Democrat or Republican, would say: Absolutely not. That is idiotic.

My bill says: Don't sell our oil to our enemies.

The Senator from Connecticut has responded with: Don't sell our oil to anybody. Don't sell our natural gas to anybody. Don't sell it to our friends.

Now, let's be clear. There have been a lot of Democrats in this Chamber who, once the war in Ukraine started, stood up and said the key to defeating Putin is exporting our liquid natural gas to Europe so they can get off of dependency on Russian oil and gas.

I can't count how many Democrat speeches I have heard saying what is absolutely true: We want our friends and allies purchasing energy produced

here in America and not purchasing energy from our enemy.

And what the Senator from Connecticut has just said is that we should abandon our friends in Europe. We should abandon our friends that want our energy. We should tell them: You know what. You are better off buying oil from Russia. You are better off buying oil from Iran. You are better off buying oil from Venezuela, which I guess makes sense because Joe Biden's State Department was asking Venezuela, led by an illegitimate Nicolas Maduro, an enemy of America—the Biden administration is asking our enemies to produce more oil.

So the effect of the Senator from Connecticut's proposition would be to hurt jobs in America, hurt energy prices in America. By the way, it would drive up gasoline prices. If the extremes in the Democratic Party have their way, we won't just see \$5-, \$6-, \$7-a-gallon gasoline, we are going to see \$10-a-gallon gasoline. That is where they want to go.

And, by the way, the Transportation Secretary, Pete Buttigieg, said publicly: This is the cost of transition. We have got to make gasoline expensive.

In politics, that is called saying the quiet part out loud—that for too many of the extreme Democrats, they want working men and women to pay 100 bucks, 150 bucks at the gas pump. Why? Because they don't like that some moms choose to drive minivans. They don't like that some Americans choose to drive a pickup truck or an SUV, and they want to force you to sell your Suburban and buy a Prius. And their strategy is: We are going to make it so expensive, so miserable that you can't afford your bills until you comply with what they want.

It is cynical, and it is misguided, but it does at least make transparent that the little stickers on the gas pump with Joe Biden pointing at the price saying "I did this"—that is what they intend.

We should not be selling oil to communist China. Everyone in this body knows this. But that doesn't mean it is a good idea to abandon our friends and send our friends and allies to become customers of Vladimir Putin. That is spectacularly ill conceived.

And, therefore, I decline to accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, here is what the Senator from Texas is saying: It is fine to sell to China so long as you are a big American oil company and profiting off of it.

That is the bottom line.

The Senator had the chance to endorse the policy that would have stopped all American exports to China. If the priority is to not enrich the Chi-

nese Government, then let's enact that policy.

What Senator CRUZ is essentially saying is that if the end result is massive profits for the oil company, then we are just going to look the other way. Then we are just going to look the other way.

The strategic petroleum reserve? No, we are going to keep that oil here. That can't go to China. That would be an immoral abomination if the Chinese got their hands on that oil.

But if the end result is that oil companies get to pad their profits by selling oil to the Chinese, well, then that is fine. Well, then, that is fine.

So let's be 100 percent clear in what is happening here. If your priority is not selling oil to China, then let's make that the policy. Let's make that the policy.

But that is not the priority. The priority is to make sure the oil companies can make as much money as possible.

ExxonMobil expects to make \$10 billion in profit—not revenue, in profit—in the second quarter of this year. So I don't apologize for a second for making my priority the people of this country, not the profits of the oil companies.

Yes, I want to keep American oil here because I want it to benefit American consumers, not the oil companies' bottom line.

And spare me the rewrite of history on Nord Stream 2. Those sanctions that we passed were ready to go for Donald Trump. What I objected to was the Senator being silent when Donald Trump sat on the sidelines and refused to implement those sanctions, and then taking a hard line when a Democrat was in the White House.

Senator CRUZ held up every State Department nominee that President Biden offered, as hostage in order to get a change on Nord Stream 2 policy. The Senator did not do that when Donald Trump was in office, during a period of time in which the pipeline was being built.

By the time that Donald Trump left office, that pipeline was 95 percent built, and had Senator CRUZ taken the same policy during the Trump administration, arguably, we could have been in a different place by the end of 2019.

So I don't apologize for saying: You know what. The oil companies are making too much money. Our prices, our constituents, our consumers should come first. And if we are serious about not exporting oil to China, then let's be serious about it and make the policy universal.

And so for that reason, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, you know, John Adams famously said: "Facts are stubborn things." So let's clarify a couple of facts.

No. 1, the bill that the Senator from Connecticut was pushing is a bill that is entitled the BAN Oil Exports Act. In

his remarks a moment ago, he suggested it was about China. This bill is not about China. This bill is about banning oil exports, natural gas exports, coal exports—energy exports across the board to anybody.

By the way, the bill is authored by Senator MARKEY. It is cosponsored by Senators WYDEN, MERKLEY, SANDERS, and WARREN. The Senator from Connecticut is not a cosponsor of the bill. This is an extreme bill.

As I pointed out in my remarks, what the Senator from Connecticut was asking is: Let's refuse to sell oil or natural gas to our friends, and let's make our friends buy them from Russia instead.

In response to that, he said precisely nothing, nada. He said: ExxonMobil is bad. He said: Don't sell to China.

My bill says: Don't sell to China.

His bill says: Don't sell to anybody.

And as for his revisionist history on Nord Stream 2, he is right that the pipeline was over 90 percent completed by the time the Senate and the House took up my sanctions legislation, and the Russian disinformation that was put out was: It is over 90 percent completed; so there is no way to stop it.

Putin stopped building Nord Stream 2 the day that President Trump signed my sanctions legislation into law. Literally, that day they halted construction. A 90-percent complete pipeline is zero percent complete. It is a hunk of metal on the bottom of the ocean. The pipeline lay dormant—it was dead—for over a year.

He complains that I didn't hold Donald Trump's nominations? I didn't need to. The sanctions worked. We had stopped the pipeline.

Then Joe Biden became President. He immediately began signaling weakness to Russia. He began foreshadowing what he actually did in May, which is to waive the sanctions.

Joe Biden was sworn into office on January 20, 2021. Putin recommenced building Nord Stream 2 on January 24, 2021, 4 days after Joe Biden put his hands on the Bible.

I find it very curious that Democrats, No. 1, ignored the pleas from our allies and stood with Russia and Putin to help Putin build a pipeline to generate billions for his war machine but at the same time are willing to stand up and say: We like Russian oil and gas jobs, but we don't like American oil and gas jobs.

We should not be selling oil or natural gas to our enemies. This is an obvious proposition. It ought to be bipartisan. It was bipartisan until this last-minute objection.

But the fact that we shouldn't sell to our enemies doesn't mean we shouldn't supply energy to our friends. Our friends are desperately asking for it, and sending them to buy from Russia is spectacularly foolish.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4612

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, a group of us will be speaking and

then asking for unanimous consent on a measure called the Right to Contraception Act. It is called the Right to Contraception Act because it guarantees the right to contraception.

If you had asked me a year ago, 6 months ago, would we need a Right to Contraception Act, I would have thought not in my lifetime. But the fact is we live now in the post-Roe era. It is a unique moment in our Nation's history, not just because the Supreme Court has overturned *Roe v. Wade* in the recent *Dobbs* decision but because, for the first time in our history, we are rolling back rights.

The history of our great country, the greatest in the history of the world, is that we advance and expand rights. From the time of our founding, the ethos and tradition of America is that we increase rights and liberties that are protected from governmental interference.

And now with *Dobbs*, one of the core freedoms—the right to decide when and whether to have children—has been stripped from women and given to government officials. But it isn't only reproductive rights under *Roe*, because the U.S. Supreme Court has very carefully, deliberately sent signals about where it is going in this rollback of rights and liberties. And it isn't just Clarence Thomas's concurring opinion, which now has become infamous for its signals. It is the opinion of the Court itself that clearly shows that this Court threatens not only abortion rights, but also contraception rights. And in addition to mentioning *Griswold v. Connecticut*, Clarence Thomas also—or I should say Justice Thomas, with all due respect—mentioned *Loving, Lawrence, Obergefell*—all of them on the chopping block, all those rights on this Supreme Court's hit list. And perhaps the most deeply rooted of them all in *Griswold v. Connecticut* is the right to contraception.

Now, let's be clear. The right to contraception wasn't stated in the Constitution, but the right to privacy is at its core. "Don't tread on me." The right to be left alone—that is the reason that we have the Bill of Rights. That is the reason why the Founders rebelled against England—undue, unjustified interference in their personal lives. And so the right to privacy is referred to often as a conundrum; but, actually, it is at the core of the Constitution. It is so fundamental to the mindset and the mantra of those constitutional guarantees from the very founding of our Republic, and the respect for the right of privacy should be bipartisan and, indeed, has been bipartisan throughout our history.

The simple fact is that the most important decision any of us make, at least in my view, is whether to become a parent. And it ought to be a decision—not something that just happens. It should be a decision that is made deliberately. Every American should have that right to decide when and whether to have children. And politi-

cians shouldn't be the ones to make it. They shouldn't be allowed to infringe or interfere on that decision.

And women can't be truly equal if they don't control their lives, their reproductive lives. If they don't control their bodies, if they lose that right, they simply cannot be equal. So it is not just privacy; it is equality that is at stake here.

My Republican colleagues are adamant in dragging this country back to a time when women had little or no autonomy over these choices. And I am shocked—and I think many of my colleagues are, the American people are as well—that American women today will have fewer rights than their mothers and even their grandmothers. We are living through a world where healthcare providers can't do their jobs and save lives without risking criminal penalties, and much of our Nation will be at risk of losing these fundamental liberties.

Let me be clear. This should not be controversial. This issue should not be one that provokes verbal jousts on the floor of the U.S. Senate. *Griswold v. Connecticut*—yes, it is *Griswold v. Connecticut*—has held for decades. It is enshrined in case law, reaffirmed by the Supreme Court that individuals have a right to use contraceptives. But we have seen after assurances by three of the members now sitting on the Supreme Court that respect for precedent really is no longer deeply felt—in fact, may not be felt at all.

What one nominee, Justice Kavanaugh, referred to as "precedent on precedent" and, therefore, it is well-established law, that was *Roe v. Wade*. Now it is gone. It was, in Justice Alito's words, "egregiously wrong." But none of those three nominees expressed any feelings whatsoever that it might be wrong, let alone egregiously wrong. So to all my colleagues who say that the right to contraceptives is unnecessary, I would simply say, Look at *Dobbs*.

When I introduced, along with the Presiding Officer, the Women's Health Protection Act in 2013, the idea that *Roe* might be overruled was unthinkable. Our goal was to prevent the growing restrictions on that right that imposed excessive burdens. What was unthinkable then is reality now. The Court overruling *Griswold* might have been thought unthinkable, but that danger is our present reality in the post-*Roe* world.

So I urge my colleagues to join in approving the Right to Contraception Act today to provide certainty and reassurance to women across the United States that they will have those rights. They can be sure of them; they can rely on them; they will know that having children will be a decision they make—not somebody else telling them when and whether to start a family.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, as we focus on contraception rights this

afternoon, listen to some of the comments made by my Republican male colleagues:

They are not going to change the law on contraception.

There is zero threat of contraception being taken away.

Pure hysteria.

I have no reason to believe these precedents are going to fall.

These are some of the statements made by my Republican colleagues—all of them male, by the way—have made regarding contraception. “Pure hysteria,” they say. This is not pure hysteria to the millions of women across the country who woke up one morning in June and no longer had a constitutional right.

When it comes to this far-right, agenda-driven Supreme Court, nothing is off the table and nothing is “pure hysteria.”

Last month, the far-right majority of the Supreme Court overturned nearly 50 years of precedent and took away the constitutional right to get an abortion. This decision was the result of a decades-long effort by far-right Republicans and rightwing groups to pack the courts with politicians in Roe.

And they are just getting started. For this MAGA majority, controlling women's bodies doesn't stop at forcing women to give birth. They actually want to ban contraception. We know this because, in this concurring opinion to overturn Roe, Justice Thomas wrote that the Supreme Court should reconsider—reconsider—the rulings that protect same-sex relationships, marriage equality, and, yes, contraception.

This kind of signaling by a Justice of a Supreme Court should be taken seriously.

So my Republican colleagues saying they have no reason to believe precedent will be overturned is resorting to magical thinking that no one should believe. After all, the Supreme Court just overturned a nearly 50-year precedent that women in this country relied on for nearly half a century—half a century. That is two generations. In fact, radical MAGA Republicans in State legislatures across the country are gearing up in Ohio.

House Republicans introduced a bill that would effectively ban all abortions from the moment of conception and, potentially, other forms of birth control, like IUDs.

Other Republicans have refused to rule out banning certain forms of contraception. We are living in a post-Roe world where our rights are on the chopping block. So, no, this is not “pure hysteria.” The American public knows this. Democrats know this.

So I say to my Republican colleagues, if any of you object to this bill, come down to the Senate floor and tell the American people the truth. Just be honest that you do not support guaranteeing the right to contraception because, in this post-Roe world, any suggestion that this Court won't overturn precedent is no longer some-

thing to hide behind. But if my Republican colleagues do support the right to contraception, then they should have no problem with supporting our bill, which would create a statutory right for individuals to access contraception, protect the right to healthcare providers to provide contraception to their patients, and empower individuals by extending a private right of action against any State or government official that hinders these rights.

Today, my Republican colleagues have a choice. Do they support the right to contraception and an individual's right to make decisions about our bodies and our healthcare? Or will they allow the government to tell millions and millions of women what to do?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, an illegitimate, stolen, and radicalized U.S. Supreme Court is putting the fundamental rights of Americans in jeopardy. Last month, the extremist Court took away the right to abortion, a right on which millions of Americans have relied for almost 50 years, undermining their health, their safety, their freedom.

The rightwing majority that overturned Roe v. Wade owns its control of the High Court to then-Leader MCCONNELL's and Donald Trump's and Senate Republicans' theft of two seats on the Supreme Court. The Justices used their ill-gotten power to cast aside decades of precedent—precedent, which during their confirmation hearings they promised to honor, respect, and follow.

If anyone thinks this newly empowered Court's decision to strip Americans of a longstanding constitutional right won't be shamelessly repeated, they are wrong. What the Supreme Court just did with Roe is a preview of coming atrocities from this Supreme Court.

Justice Clarence Thomas wrote a concurring opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, the decision overturning Roe v. Wade. And that concurrence is like a movie trailer for an upcoming horror film that Americans are forced to watch written, produced, and directed by a captured illegitimate Supreme Court. In his opinion, Justice Thomas made clear that he believes Americans have too many privacy rights under the U.S. Constitution, that the Supreme Court had erred in recognizing those rights, and that the Court should take them away as well—just as it did with the right to abortion.

This bears repeating.

A sitting Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States is arguing that Americans have too many rights.

What mistakes was Justice Thomas talking about?

Well, Justice Thomas urged the Court to correct the error the Court committed when it recognized this right to same-sex marriage in its 2015 decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges*.

He told the Court to fix the mistake it made when it recognized the right of Americans to engage in private, consensual sexual activity in its 2003 decision in *Lawrence v. Texas*.

Then he said the Court got it wrong when it recognized the right of Americans to use contraception in its 1965 decision in *Griswold v. Connecticut*.

But it is Justice Thomas who is in error, who is wrong, who has made a mistake. These are all fundamental, privacy-based rights which the Supreme Court correctly recognized. They should all remain the law of the land.

Today, I want to talk about the right to contraception that this extremist and out-of-touch Supreme Court and legislators in red States are taking aim at.

The Supreme Court has recognized the constitutional right to contraception for more than half a century, since its decision in the *Griswold* case in 1965. Over time, the Court has affirmed and expanded that right: in its 1972 decision, a Massachusetts case, *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, recognizing the right of all people to access contraceptives regardless of marital status; and in its 1977 decision in *Carey v. Population Services International*, which held that a State could not constitutionally prohibit the distribution of contraceptives to minors.

The right to contraception is therefore a fundamental right that the Court has repeatedly recognized and reaffirmed. It is a right that is central to a person's health, to their well-being, to their life, liberty, equality, and economic and social freedom in our country. It is a right grounded in the need and ability to make decisions about one's own body, one's own family, and one's own future. It is a right that is woven into the fabric of a free, pluralistic, and modern society. And it is a right that we must codify and make part of our law so that far-right, extremist judges and elected officials cannot take it away in order to advance their own blatantly political agendas.

That is why I have proudly introduced the Right to Contraception Act with my colleagues Senators MAZIE HIRONO and TAMMY DUCKWORTH, with Senator BLUMENTHAL and Chair PATTY MURRAY of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and have been joined by more than half of the Democratic Senate caucus.

The Right to Contraception Act would codify the Supreme Court's decision in *Griswold*, recognizing the right to obtain and use contraception. The Right to Contraception Act would enshrine that right in Federal law, and it would guarantee a healthcare provider's right to prescribe contraceptive products and services and information related to them.

The bill would also protect a range of contraceptives that are legally marketed under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The Right to Contraception Act would authorize the

U.S. Attorney General, as well as individuals and healthcare providers harmed by unlawful restrictions, to go to court to enforce the rights the bill establishes.

In short, the Right to Contraception Act would safeguard the rights established by more than 50 years of Supreme Court precedent and would protect access to contraception even if *Griswold* were overturned.

The concerns that have led to the introduction of this bill are not merely hypothetical. Justice Thomas's concurring opinion was a call to action that some Republicans and red States are eagerly heeding by continuing to attack and restrict the right to contraception.

Several States have already gone after access to contraception by cutting off the public funding for it, by seeking to define abortion broadly enough to include contraception, and by allowing healthcare providers to refuse to provide services related to contraception based on their own personal beliefs.

And the harms that would flow from abolishing the right to contraception aren't merely theoretical. Attacks on healthcare, especially reproductive healthcare, fall hardest on historically marginalized communities, including Black, indigenous, and other people of color, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities, people with low incomes, those living in rural and underserved areas, and immigrants.

Last week, we all on our side proudly watched the House pass its version of the Right to Contraception Act by a vote of 220 to 195, though it is dismaying that only 8 House Republicans—only 8—voted to codify that right.

With the right to abortion stolen, the right to contraception threatened, and the need to protect and expand access to contraceptive methods and information on contraception, it makes it more imperative than ever that we pass this legislation. We can't wait for the next hammer to drop. We have an urgent obligation to take the first exit off this slippery slope that leads to the loss of our most personal freedoms—chief amongst them: the right of all Americans to make their own decisions about their bodies, their families, and their own futures.

We can't sit idly by and watch as decades of precedent, privacy rights, and progress are violated. We can't wait for the worst to come—because it is already at our doorstep.

To my anti-choice Republican colleagues, if you would deprive Americans of the choice to end a pregnancy, how can you also deprive them of the ability to prevent a pregnancy in the first place?

Unless your ultimate aim is, really, to exert control over the bodies of others, especially the bodies of women, then I expect to hear no objection to the unanimous consent request to pass the Right to Contraception Act. Other-

wise, the Republican position will be clear to everyone: no abortion but no birth control to prevent the need for one.

That is where the Republican Party is today. I urge my Republican colleagues not to object to our unanimous consent request.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 4612 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The junior Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, reserving the right to object, here we are again—another day, another sympathetically titled bill offered by my Democratic colleagues wherein the talking points don't really give you the full story—case in point, the Right to Contraception Act.

The so-called Right to Contraception Act purposefully goes far beyond the scope of contraception. It includes provisions that could guarantee the funding of abortion providers and that defines "contraceptive" in such a broad way that it could include drugs to induce an abortion weeks or months into a pregnancy. This definition also could include non-FDA-approved drugs that would actually put a woman's health at risk.

The bill also flies in the face of decades of work in providing for conscience protections. It would require organizations to administer contraceptives despite their moral or religious beliefs.

There is something insidious with this bill, but don't take it from me. Look to the bill's text itself. The "findings" section of this bill notes the work of an organization that many of my colleagues will recognize: The United Nations Population Fund. This is the same organization that contributed over \$10 million to a mass sterilization campaign in Peru in the nineties.

That campaign was rife with coercive practices: Quotas were set; cash bonuses were paid to health workers for each client sterilized; and poor women were bribed with nutritional supplements and clothes for their children.

Then let's not forget the former Population Fund executive director's high praise of China's one-child policy.

But let's be clear here. Routine-use contraceptives should be more easily available, and the fact that they aren't has the biggest impact on women in rural areas, where a doctor could be dozens of miles away. A woman in a rural area doesn't need a platitude-filled messaging bill like the one we have here. She needs over-the-counter access to routine-use birth control. Luckily, Republicans have a solution.

My bill, the Allowing Greater Access to Safe and Effective Contraception

Act, incentivizes manufacturers of contraceptives to file an application for over-the-counter access. It also allows priority review for these applications and waives the FDA filing fee. That means cheaper, quicker, and more available access for women across this Nation.

With my bill, women 18 and over can walk into their local pharmacies, whether they be in Sidney, IA, or in the deepest parts of Manhattan, and get the routine-use birth control they need.

When your doctor is 30 miles away and gas is \$6 a gallon, you don't need a messaging bill; you need access.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4638

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4638, which is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I thank the Senator from Iowa, but her bill would not ensure access to birth control, and it fails to codify the constitutional right to birth control across the United States.

In fact, her bill would actually restrict access to birth control for individuals under the age of 18—requiring a prescription even if the Food and Drug Administration has approved an over-the-counter option. And we cannot lose sight of the fact that this bill does nothing to address the reality that, for many women, true access means being able to afford birth control as well.

Last month, I cosponsored a bill that would guarantee that insurers fully cover over-the-counter birth control without any out-of-pocket costs. No one should have to jump through ridiculous hoops or pay extra just to get the birth control they need, not to mention that this bill would do nothing to prevent States from restricting or even banning access to birth control.

The reality that Republicans refuse to acknowledge is that an over-the-counter option doesn't help patients if their States are chipping away at their right to birth control.

So, with the Senator from Iowa's objection to my unanimous consent request and with her counter unanimous consent request, the Republicans have made their position crystal clear: no abortion but no birth control to prevent the need for one.

Republicans have just shown the American people where they stand on their right to contraception. While Republicans won't protect our fundamental rights as the Supreme Court and rightwing State legislatures take

them away, my Democratic colleagues and I will continue our efforts to keep in place the fundamental, privacy-based rights that Americans have had for decades and codify into Federal law the right to contraception.

As a result and for those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, it has been nearly 60 years since the Supreme Court decided *Griswold v. Connecticut* and affirmed Americans' right to privacy and, with it, their right to contraception. So you would think this would be a settled issue, and for the vast majority of Americans, it is. The right to birth control is overwhelmingly popular. It turns out that people want to be able to control their own bodies and make their own decisions about starting a family.

Yet, as we just saw, somehow, in the year 2022, this is not a settled issue for Republican politicians. We have seen some of my Republican colleagues not only block this but try to deny reality, try to say this isn't an issue or claim that Democrats are somehow wasting time.

Well, that is pretty rich because I can't help but remember how we all heard some Republicans saying the Supreme Court would not overturn *Roe* as well, how they tried to claim Democrats were "overreacting" even as they stacked our courts with anti-abortion judges and worked for decades to chip away at abortion rights.

Now we are seeing the nightmare we warned about become reality: women unable to control their own bodies and get the abortion care they need—a nightmare Republicans tried to deny and are still trying to deny even as it happens, even as 10-year-olds are having to travel across State lines for an abortion after being raped, even as women are now being left bleeding for days, waiting for treatment for their miscarriage.

So when Republicans say they support the right to birth control, my issue isn't simply that I am skeptical; it is that I know better. Let's be clear. When I say that I know better, I don't just mean in my gut; I mean I have heard Republicans' own words. I am watching their own actions.

Justice Thomas said explicitly in his concurring opinion in *Dobbs* that he wants the Court to reconsider *Griswold*, which affirmed the right to contraception. The senior Senator from Tennessee said the *Griswold* decision was unsound. That alone would be scary enough, but Republicans aren't just talking about undermining access to birth control, they are already taking action. Read the legislation from Republicans in Idaho, Missouri, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Michigan, which would, in fact, outlaw Plan B and IUDs. Talk to women who have already gone to the pharmacy, only to be denied

their birth control or Plan B. Yes, this is already happening to people. Just last week, 195 House Republicans voted against the Right to Contraception Act, and now today, they have blocked it in the Senate as well.

The evidence of where Republicans actually stand on birth control is overwhelming. They aren't standing for women. They aren't standing for families. They aren't standing for a right nearly all Americans support. They are simply standing in the way.

I want to thank the junior Senator from Massachusetts, the junior Senator from Illinois, and the junior Senator from Hawaii for their work with me on the Right to Contraception Act that Republicans just blocked. I know we are going to all keep working on this.

I do want to set the record straight because so many of the arguments we have seen from Republicans don't add up. They are trying to distract from their extreme position. We won't let them.

This bill is incredibly straightforward, so you simply cannot say you support the right to birth control and then block this bill. I hope everyone will listen closely because here is what this bill actually does. It simply codifies Americans' right to birth control into law. That is it. You don't have to take my word for it; read it yourself—it is all of 15 pages. It protects a right people depend on and makes sure no one can take that away. We are talking about a really basic and really fundamental right here.

Since that right was affirmed half a century ago, generations of Americans have used contraception to control their own future, to manage and treat their healthcare needs, and start a family when they are ready to. For them, it is not political, and it shouldn't be political here in Congress either, especially when protecting this right is supported by a majority of Democrats, a majority of Independents, and, yes, even a clear majority of Republicans.

The American people are watching closely. They were watching previously when Senate Republicans blocked us from protecting the right to travel across States to get abortion care. They were watching last week when Senate Republicans blocked expanding support for our Nation's longstanding Family Planning Program. They were watching when the vast majority of Republicans in the House voted against the right to birth control. And they are watching right now as Republicans block a bill that preserves the right to use condoms, take the pill, get IUDs, and buy Plan B, as Republicans refuse to let us protect that right and pass this bill and continue denying the threats that are already undermining that right. This is a basic, fundamental right.

Mark my words, the American people will not forget Republicans blocking us from getting this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, in 1963, Americans could be arrested in some States simply for buying birth control pills. Sixty years later, if many States have their way, Americans may face that reality once again.

The Supreme Court's overturning of *Roe v. Wade* is so sweeping, so unprecedented that it now threatens the right to contraception. IUDs, emergency contraceptives, and other birth control could well all be banned, which seems hard to imagine. We are going backward in time to when women did not have control of their own bodies, nor the freedom to decide how and when they wanted to begin their families.

Who really believes that a woman shouldn't be able to use birth control; that a woman shouldn't be able to decide whether or not she wants to get pregnant; that a couple can't decide they aren't ready for a family? How many children should each woman have? Should it be as many as possible? Are they allowed to stop reproducing or is it a lifelong duty? Politicians should not be making these decisions.

This is a bill that guarantees a woman's right to access legal contraception. That is it. There is no trick, no sleight of hand. We can pass it into law today. The House has passed it already.

Starting a family is among the most private and personal decisions a person can make. It changes your life in ways that most of us can't even imagine. Yet there are people who want to force this restriction on women.

For women everywhere but especially in rural and low-income areas, birth control is essential healthcare. If you want to prevent unintended pregnancies, well, that is where you start.

When I was Governor, Colorado made long-acting, reversible contraception, like IUDs, available at little or no cost. That reduced unintended pregnancies by 54 percent—54 percent. Yet, now in Colorado, some Republicans are campaigning to put an initiative on the ballot this November that could make contraceptives illegal. Many other States are considering similar moves with bills or amendments waiting in the wings.

I think this is far, far beyond the mainstream of what most Americans believe. In fact, 92 percent of Americans, in a recent Gallup poll, said that contraception is morally acceptable.

My mother was born in 1921, a child of the Great Depression. She scrimped and saved every penny, but she always, always made it a point to make some donation to Planned Parenthood. Some years, it might only be \$10. But she believed there were few burdens harder for a woman to bear than being compelled to start a family before she was ready. As a mother of four, she knew how important it was for women to be able to make that decision for themselves.

Who are we, as politicians, to tell American women who has children, how many, and when?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise in support of the Right to Contraception Act.

Thirty-three days ago, the Supreme Court issued a rule shredding nearly five decades of precedent protecting a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. Now women, as we have seen over the last weeks, are at the mercy—are at the mercy—of a patchwork of State laws governing their ability to access reproductive care, leaving them with fewer rights than their moms and their grandmas. So now a woman in Minnesota has different rights when it comes to her reproductive care than a woman in Missouri, and a woman in North Dakota has different rights than a woman in Indiana. That is what we are dealing with right now.

Two weeks ago, I joined several of my Democratic colleagues on the floor to push for legislation to preserve a woman's right to travel to other States to access reproductive care, led by Senator CORTEZ MASTO. Unfortunately, Republicans on the other side of the aisle blocked us from that vote.

So we came back last week to push for legislation, led by my colleague Senator TINA SMITH, to protect and expand funding for a program created under a Republican administration, a Republican Presidential administration, to fund clinics that support maternal care, conduct cancer screenings, and provide contraception, but, again, that vote failed because we were not allowed to move forward with it.

So we came back to the floor today because if the Supreme Court won't protect people's fundamental rights—that is why we have three branches of government. That was the concept of our Founding Fathers. So if the Supreme Court isn't going to protect people's fundamental rights, then everyone in this Chamber has to decide whether or not they are going to do it, and that includes making sure everyone can access contraception.

I am concerned that the worse is yet to come. Right now, State and local legislators are literally racing, along with Governors, to be the first to say: Which State can limit rights the most first? Which rights can we take away? Sadly, it is not too hard to guess.

In his concurring opinion in *Dobbs*, Justice Thomas actually laid out a roadmap with clear directions for how the Court could overturn the right to contraception. He said that the Supreme Court “should reconsider”—“should reconsider,” those two words—whether the Constitution protects the right to access contraception, as well as the right to marry whomever you love. Why? Because he talked about looking at other cases with regard to the right to privacy.

The Supreme Court has recognized the right to access contraception for more than 57 years, but the conservative Justices on the Supreme Court have shown they won't hesitate to overturn decades-old precedent no matter what they say at their Supreme Court hearings.

This threat is not hypothetical. Last year, the Missouri State Legislature tried to cut off public funding for widely used contraceptives, like IUDs and Plan B. Mississippi's Governor has refused to rule out banning contraception. A bill was introduced in Louisiana this spring that could be used to make IUDs illegal.

These radical proposals don't just hurt those in the States that implement the bans. Since the *Dobbs* decision, we have now seen how State bans create an uncertain legal environment for doctors and strain resources at clinics in States like Minnesota because the North Dakota clinic had to literally start a GoFundMe page to be able to get the costs paid for—the costs, of course, of moving the clinic from Fargo, ND, to Moorehead. That is what is happening right now in my State.

We cannot settle for a situation, as I noted, where people in my State have different rights than women in Mississippi or Missouri. And with so many extreme politicians out there racing to State capitals to be the first to take people's rights away, we need to explicitly protect the right to access contraception and information about contraception.

I will note that more than 80 percent of Americans support access to contraception. That is why I joined with Senators MARKEY, HIRONO, MURRAY, and DUCKWORTH in cosponsoring this bill to protect the right to access contraception and information about contraceptives. This bill safeguards a patient's ability to seek contraceptives and a healthcare provider's ability to provide those critical services.

The right to contraception can't just be an empty promise. That is why the bill gives the Department of Justice, as well as patients and doctors, the power to make sure that we don't infringe on the right to contraception.

I am proud to join my colleagues, and for the last 33 days I have been thinking about all the women in this country facing an unacceptably uncertain future. Today, each and every one of my colleagues had the opportunity to make clear where they stand, but, when given the opportunity, some seized the opportunity to protect the right to contraception, some did not.

I hope that some of our colleagues will change their minds and we can move forward with this and put in place these laws protecting the right to travel; protecting the right to contraception; and, of course, in the end, protecting a woman's fundamental right to make her own reproductive decisions about abortion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). 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 vote: myself for up to 15 minutes, Senator BLACKBURN for up to 10 minutes, and Senator TESTER for up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, coming to the floor and listening to some of my colleagues talk about their concern for lack of access to contraception—and some have said we need to pass a bill codifying same-sex marriage when that is currently the law of the land by virtue of a Supreme Court decision, the *Obergefell* case—reminds me of the old story about the little boy who cried wolf. He cried wolf when there wasn't any danger; and then, once there was danger, people didn't come to his aid because they thought it was another phony crying wolf.

I can understand our colleagues—given inflation, given crime, given the broken borders—wanting to change the subject to something else, but that is all this is. This is mere posturing pre-November, pre-midterm elections. This isn't about changing the law because the law already permits ready access to contraceptives. The law already permits same-sex marriage.

So this idea that we ought to spend scarce time here in the Congress, which we have in limited supply, reaffirming rights that already exist, is a clear political narrative designed to divert the American people's attention from things that really are at risk—that is, the paychecks of every American family because of inflation, because of failed energy policies.

We know that the price of gasoline and diesel and fuel to fill up your car so you can go to work or take your child to school or summer camp has increased. We know that our cities are on fire due to spiking crime waves connected to drugs that are coming across the southern border. And, of course, we know that the southern border is completely open with a big red carpet and a welcome mat out for anybody who wants to come to the United States illegally.

And the cartels that are rich and getting richer because of the flow of their human traffic are also getting rich because of the flow of illegal drugs that took the lives of 108,000 Americans last year alone.

We know where those drugs are coming from and that the Biden administration is doing absolutely nothing to stop them. I would want to change the topic too.

CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Mr. President, on a more positive note, the Senate approved funding earlier this morning to bolster domestic semiconductor manufacturing by a vote of 64 to 33. This funding will help kick-start the development of these

microprocessors, these chips that go into everything from your cell phone to the F-35, to Javelin and Stinger missiles that we send to Ukraine to defend their country from Russian aggression. This funding will help kick-start a domestic production of these semiconductors in a way that will prevent a vulnerability of our supply chain, since 90 percent of those advanced semiconductors currently come from Asia, with 60 percent coming from Taiwan alone.

One other benefit to this bill is that this bill could create roughly 185,000 jobs every year as these new facilities are constructed. Long term, it could bring another 280,000 jobs online. And once these foundries are operational, they will supply “Made in America” semiconductors that can be used on everything from smartphones to cars, to airplanes, to missile defense systems.

Semiconductors are the cornerstone of this legislation, but the bill also takes a range of other steps to help propel innovation in the competition we are currently in with the People's Republic of China. This bill authorizes investments in research that will support everything from robotics to next-generation wireless technology.

It also authorizes NASA programs that will keep America at the forefront of space exploration. It extends the authorization for the International Space Station to 2030. This is very important, especially now that Russia has said it will end its commitment to the International Space Station after 2024.

This bill also lays the groundwork for America's continued presence in space after 2030, including language I championed requiring NASA to develop a strategy to retire the International Space Station and transition to a successor platform. It also enhances existing programs that support future exploration missions. This includes the Moon to Mars Program, which is leading efforts to get an American astronaut on the surface of Mars.

Texas is the proud home to the Johnson Space Center, the home of human space flight, but also a range of other universities and companies leading the way in human space exploration. Enabling these partnerships saves money, drives innovation, and gives us a competitive edge over countries like Russia and China.

The broader bill included in the CHIPS Act will support both our economic and our national security and strengthen our efforts to lead the world in scientific innovation. The way we are going to compete with China and to beat them is to out-innovate them because no country in the world has better human capital, better brains, and a better system to encourage innovation, which will keep us ahead of the People's Republic of China.

They don't play by the rules. They certainly don't observe the rule of law. They steal all the technology they can get. But it is important for the United States to be in the game and not be left behind.

I want to thank Mr. WARNER, the senior Senator from Virginia, for launching this effort with me 2 years ago. We introduced the CHIPS for America Act in June of 2020, which demonstrates how long it takes to get important legislation passed here in the U.S. Congress. Since the time we introduced it, I have worked with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to secure the necessary funding so we could deliver the benefits for our country.

Countless colleagues have been part of the process over these last few weeks, particularly Senator YOUNG, Senator PORTMAN, Senator WICKER, Senator SINEMA, and countless others; and Senator CANTWELL and certainly Senator SCHUMER as well and numerous others have led the charge on this legislation. Their hard work and their willingness to work cooperatively together and to find common ground is the reason for our success.

This has been a long, winding road with a lot of twists and turns along the way, but the end is finally in sight. Speaker PELOSI has promised to bring this legislation up for a vote in the House, and I hope our colleagues across the Capitol do not dally and get this bill voted out of the House and to the President's desk.

Chip manufacturers are watching Congress and waiting to see if this bill passes before they decide where to build new fab manufacturing facilities. And we have been told that, unless this bill passes, these hoped-for manufacturing jobs and these semiconductor manufacturing fabs will not be built here in America but will be built in Europe and other places around the world.

Secretary Raimondo, the Secretary of Commerce, has assured our colleagues that the United States will miss out on big benefits in terms of jobs, national security, and our economy if Congress doesn't pass this bill by the start of the August recess.

Once this bipartisan legislation passes the Senate, our Democratic colleagues are reportedly planning a dramatic pivot from bipartisanship to an ultrabipartisan reconciliation process. Apparently, they are willing to work together when it is convenient, but they are also willing to abandon the notion of working together and are preparing to go on another reckless, partisan spending spree.

This isn't the first time. At the start of last year, Democrats spent nearly \$2 trillion in unnecessary spending on a party-line basis. People wonder why we have 9 percent inflation. Part of it is our Democratic colleagues are willing to shovel money out the door and chase limited goods with supply chain problems, which means that prices get driven higher and higher—as well as, as I mentioned, flawed energy policies that look for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to increase production rather than to produce more American oil and gas here at home.

Well, our Democratic colleagues succeeded in that \$2 trillion bill, and they

tried to pass another partisan bill at the end of the year which would have cost the American people nearly \$5 trillion. But, thankfully, that entire effort failed.

Now, some of our colleagues are committed—this is their last chance before the August recess—to take advantage of the rules of the Senate and to go on a partisan spending bonanza, and certainly they don't want to miss this opportunity.

We are hearing that our colleagues are frantically piecing together a bill that has not yet even been written and completed and passed the so-called Byrd bath test with the Senate Parliamentarian. So we are waiting to see whether they can meet the time deadline of the end of next week or not.

As I said, the bill is still reportedly being written, so we don't even have a good picture of everything that is in it. But we do have an understanding of the general framework, and it is not looking good for the American people. For example, our colleagues have said their proposal will implement government price controls on lifesaving drugs, a move that will stifle innovation and end up with scarcity. That is what price controls always do.

Then we have heard that they plan to expand and extend the ObamaCare tax subsidies. This all started with a partisan spending bill that became law last year. It expanded the amount of taxpayer assistance people receive, which, in short, gave more money to more people, including lifting the cap on individuals who could receive those subsidies above \$400,000.

Of course, at the time, the camel's nose under the tent was that it was designed as a temporary provision. But here we are a year and a half later, and they are already trying to extend it, indicating that there was nothing temporary intended by it.

They claim it is not a permanent extension and that it will only last 2 or 3 years, but I have no reason to believe that Democrats will give up on extending those provisions when they expire. In the words of Ronald Reagan, the closest thing to eternal life on Earth is a government program. Once created, they will not die, even if they are no longer necessary. And of course, a permanent extension will cost the American people a lot of money.

Last week, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation released a report of the true cost of a permanent expansion, and it is pretty shocking for a number of reasons. First is the financial cost. By expanding the ObamaCare premium tax credits and making them permanent, Democrats will add \$248 billion to the Federal deficit over the next decade.

Mr. President, my age and your age—we are not going to be the ones who have to pay that money back. But these young people sitting down here are going to have to pay the price for the profligate spending today, and all Americans will pay the price by adding fuel to the fire of inflation.

For whatever reason—reasons I really can't fathom—the Federal debt and the national debt are of no concern to our Democratic colleagues. They simply don't seem to care. They act as though we are playing with Monopoly money, that we can print and borrow like there is no tomorrow because none of this really matters. But we know that is not true. Every dollar we spend is paid for by taxpayers, and every ounce of debt we accrue will be carried and repaid by our children and our grandchildren. But none of this seems to matter to our friends across the aisle. They are still plowing ahead with this legislation.

Unfortunately, the irresponsible spending isn't even the worst part. Our colleagues claim this extension will allow more Americans to afford healthcare, but the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation told us that under this plan, some 2.3 million Americans will lose their current coverage provided by their employer. Some 2.3 million Americans will lose their coverage provided currently by their employer. Hard-working Americans whose health insurance is currently covered by their employers would be told: You are on your own now. And no matter what you negotiated when you negotiated your salary with your employer, presumably if you are a union member and subject to a collective bargaining agreement where your union negotiated a generous healthcare plan, all of that will be in jeopardy by this reckless expansion of the ObamaCare subsidies.

Our Democrat friends want to continue subsidizing healthcare for six-figure earners. People earning 750 percent of the Federal poverty level would be eligible for taxpayer-funded subsidies—750 percent of the poverty level, you would get cash from Uncle Sam. Our country would be essentially paying wealthy people to lose their current employer-provided healthcare so they can end up on the government subsidy.

This is simply crazy policy: driving up the deficit, kicking people off of their employer-provided health plans, and forcing taxpayers to subsidize health insurance for the rich. This isn't about helping the uninsured; it is a backdoor way to implement Medicare for All. Yes, Joe Biden may be President, but it is the BERNIE SANDERS agenda at work here.

Of course, Democrats couldn't get enough support for this radical plan, so they are trying to jam it through on party-line votes. Instead of attempting to pass a massive, unpopular bill all at once, they are trying to serve it to the American people in spoonfuls. Bit by bit, they are trying to push America closer to a single-payer health system.

American people do not want Medicare for All. People who have their employer-provided coverage want to keep it. And the American people don't want the Federal Government subsidizing wealthy people who can afford to pay for their own healthcare.

This is a bad idea whose time I hope has not come, and I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle will simply give up on this massive, partisan tax-and-spending spree bill that will do no good and will do a lot of harm.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, my colleague from Texas was just talking about how taxes go up and spending seems to increase. This week, we have had before us a bill that was going to be about 30 billion and then 52 billion and then 72 billion. Now it comes out, and it is almost \$300 billion.

This is a piece of legislation that has had a variety of different names, and I have found it so interesting that it has had so many different names. Let's see. It has been called CHIPS, CHIPS+, CHIPS and Science, USICA, Endless Frontier, and "China COMPETES." You know, it seems as if there was a name that was given whenever there was an occasion that you thought you could rename something and make it fit, and I know DC is just famous for having these bills with the acronyms and the fancy-sounding names. But when I talk to Tennesseans, it is so apparent they are tired of that. What they want are the facts. They want someone who is going to tell them the truth. What they know is that China is an adversary; they are not a competitor. They know that we have to work diligently to stay competitive with China and not let them get the upper hand. But when we talk about these issues, sometimes we lose sight of that big picture. I do feel that as we talked about the CHIPS bill and semiconductor supply chains, this is something we lost sight of.

You know, there are some of us who have worked on the issues of dealing with China going back into the early years of this century, looking at IP theft, looking at reverse engineering, looking at the way the Chinese Communist Party would dip in and grab up great ideas from American innovators and then off to the races they would go. We have a lot of companies that learned a lot of tough lessons trying to manufacture in China. And then we come up near the pandemic.

When I was over in the House and before that period of time, we had an issue and realized that our active pharmaceutical manufacturing was where? In China. We couldn't get penicillin. Why was that? It was because there was one factory in China that made that, and the factory had an explosion. So we had a shortage on that. Then we had an issue with Heparin, and we had some deaths that were caused by a tainted product that was coming out of a factory there.

So Senator MENENDEZ and I had a piece of legislation that would have incentivized returning active pharmaceutical ingredient manufacturing to the United States. Then we got into the issues of the pandemic, and then everyone was saying: Critical supply

chains—we need to bring them back. Indeed, that is something that is important to do. Chips are an important part of that. Our laptops, our electronics, our automobiles all need chips, and there was a shortage. People began to realize that our military aircraft, our radar systems, our major defense systems all needed the chips. But, likewise, we needed active pharmaceutical ingredients. We needed our telecommunications supply chains. We needed polysilicon. We needed ag chemicals. All of these are critical supply chains.

Personally, I was optimistic about the possibility that we were finally going to begin to unravel this relationship we have had with the Chinese Communist Party. I see it as a dangerous relationship. But, like many pieces of well-intentioned legislation, it became a victim of some of the same compulsion to squeeze money from the American taxpayer and put it into a very narrow silo.

So after more than 2 years of working on these issues and multiple failed iterations, what we have is a bill that spends about \$300 billion and is a gateway to industrial planning. I know that many of my colleagues have read some of the postmortems on this, and people realize this wasn't about chips. It wasn't 72 billion. There was authorization language in there that was going to balloon this.

There was beefing up of the National Science Foundation, and we have National Labs that do a lot of that work. There were protections for U.S. manufacturing, some anti-China provisions, security provisions, that, guess what, poof in the night, a line drawn through them. They are out.

Wasn't that to be the purpose of this legislation? Of course it was. Let's bring the manufacturing back to the United States. And that is what we should have done. We should have looked at ways that we could bring manufacturing back across the range of critical supply chains.

We all know that China's control over our active pharmaceutical ingredients and other pharmaceutical products—that is a problem. Control over our telecom equipment—yes, that is a problem. Huawei equipment that we are having to rip out and replace in this country; telecom equipment that is part of our critical supply chain; control over our supplies of minerals and chemicals—for the Chinese Communist Party to control that, that is a problem.

So many who worked on this have spent 2 years looking at and working on supply chains and competition, and now what they have is legislation that invests billions of dollars in one industry, one industrial sector, and promises hundreds of billions of dollars more to the NSF that will duplicate many of those efforts that are already in progress at our National Labs and other DOE facilities.

So we are 2 years and \$280 billion into this, and about \$80 billion of that goes

into one industry. Honestly, it does not add up. We could have spent that time and a lot less money so much more wisely. We could have used tax credits to incentivize multiple industries to come home, to set up shop in business-friendly States like Tennessee and create thousands of jobs for American workers.

This is what you call a missed opportunity. And, unfortunately, the new axis of evil—they are watching, and I think they like what they see. I think they like it. I think they like it when we don't appear to be focused, when we don't appear to take the steps to challenge them across the board. We are running out of time to truly unravel ourselves from the influence of the Chinese Communist Party.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, it seems a bit like *deja vu* all over again. We have been here before. We were here before the Fourth of July talking about the PACT Act, the toxic exposure bill, the bill that has been in the works for 15 years and that the ranking member and I have worked on very hard over the last 18 months, year and a half.

We are going to vote on it again here in a moment. This is a bill that has been talked about a lot on this floor, and just about everything has been said about this bill. It is a bill that allows us, the American people, to live up to the promises we make our Active-Duty military when they come home with an injury—in this case, toxic exposure.

We have had toxic exposures—well, in World War I, it was mustard gas; radiation in World War II; and, of course, Agent Orange in the Vietnam war. We have had toxic exposures over and over and over again. In the Middle East, it is burn pits.

Over the last year and a half, we have had many hearings on this bill. In fact, we had a gentleman testify that he had a lung disorder. He was in tough shape. And, in fact, he passed away a few months ago.

The truth is, this is a bill that we need to pass. And we passed it already with 84 votes, and I think we had a couple of Senators gone or we would have had 86. It is a bill that is bipartisan in nature, and it is a bill that I think every Senator who votes for this bill can be proud that we are supporting the men and women who have felt the wounds of battle and are now trying to get their life back to normal.

But it is more than just the folks who served in our military; it is also their families. I would encourage all the Members of the body to support this bill.

It costs \$27 billion a year, but it is a cost of war. If we are not willing to take care of our men and women when they come back from battles that we send them off to, then maybe we ought to rethink whether we are going to send them in the first place. This bill is

a bill that was pushed by every veterans service organization out there. It was their No. 1 priority. We listened to the veterans, and we ended up with a piece of legislation that is very, very good.

If we are able to pass this out of the Senate again, this time it won't be going to the House. It will be going right to the President's desk, and we will have done right by our veterans in this country; we will have done right by the next generation of fighting men and women who will become veterans; and we will have had our veterans' backs along the way.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 3373, a bill to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant.

Charles E. Schumer, Jon Tester, Ben Ray Lujan, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tina Smith, John W. Hickenlooper, Mazie Hirono, Mark R. Warner, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky Rosen, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Mark Kelly.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 3373, a bill to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 272 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	Kelly
Bennet	Duckworth	King
Blumenthal	Durbin	Klobuchar
Booker	Feinstein	Lujan
Boozman	Gillibrand	Markey
Brown	Graham	Menendez
Cantwell	Grassley	Merkley
Capito	Hassan	Moran
Cardin	Heinrich	Murphy
Carper	Hickenlooper	Murray
Casey	Hirono	Ossoff
Collins	Hoeven	Padilla
Coons	Kaine	Peters

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

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—3

Leahy	Manchin	Murkowski
-------	---------	-----------

(Ms. SMITH assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss three civilian nominees: Mr. Robert Storch, Ms. Tia Johnson, and Mr. Russell Rumbaugh, who are each nominated to hold critical positions within the Department of Defense. They have been on the Executive Calendar for months. Yet I am unaware of any objections to these nominees related to their qualifications for the positions for which they have been nominated.

I need not remind my colleagues, with Russia's invasion of Ukraine and the increasingly aggressive actions of China, how critically important it is to ensure the Defense Department has the people power it needs to do its job well.

I would also like to note that in the past, my colleagues have been very cognizant of this need for the smooth workings of the Defense Department, and nominees for the Department—both civilian and military—have been voted out of committee and off the floor quickly, typically by unanimous consent. I find it ironic now, at a time when we see unparalleled threats to our national security, that nominees for the Department of Defense would be held for months on end, with no objections on qualifications, without any path to confirmation other than a cloture vote.

There are presently eight Defense Department nominees waiting on the Executive Calendar. At the end of next week, it will be 12. Today, I would like to discuss these three individuals.

Mr. Robert Storch is nominated to be the Department of Defense inspector

general and was favorably reported out of the Armed Services Committee on March 8, 2022.

The Defense Department has not had a Senate-confirmed inspector general since January 8, 2016. I will repeat that. The Defense Department has not had a Senate-confirmed inspector general since January 2016. The last nominee, put forward by then-President Obama, was withdrawn by President Trump on February 28, 2017.

Mr. Trump designated the Honorable Sean O'Donnell as the acting DOD IG on April 6, 2020, but the GAO recently issued a decision that Mr. O'Donnell's continuing service as the acting inspector general is in violation of the Vacancies Act. As such, there is really no effective inspector general in the Department of Defense—the largest Agency in the Federal Government.

For these reasons, in addition to the fundamental importance of the IG's work, the Senate needs to confirm Mr. Storch as soon as possible. The Department has been without a Senate-confirmed IG for more than 6 years, and we cannot wait any longer.

Ms. Tia Johnson was reported out of the committee on April 5, 2022, and would become one of five judges on the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, often referred to as the "Supreme Court of military law." The court's next hearing is scheduled for October 12, 2022, where it will consider important jurisdictional and substantive issues in military criminal law.

Importantly, the FY22 NDAA implemented extensive changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, including a statute that would criminalize sexual harassment under some circumstances. Ms. Johnson will play a critical role on the Court of Appeals in reviewing challenges and issues with the recent sexual assault and sexual harassment statutes, including defendants' rights under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Without Miss Johnson, the court risks deadlock, which will further hamper the military's ability to provide good order and discipline, which is fundamental to any military force.

Mr. Russell Rumbaugh was nominated on March 21, 2022, to serve as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management and Comptroller. This nomination was privileged, so it did not require a hearing and was intended to move expeditiously. The committee sent policy questions to Mr. Rumbaugh and received his answers on April 25, 2022. The committee reported out his nomination on May 12, and pursuant to S. Res. 116, his nomination was moved 10 days later to the appropriate section of the Executive Calendar and was ready for confirmation by the full Senate. So his confirmation has been waiting for 2 months.

The Navy has not had a confirmed Assistant Secretary for Financial Management and Comptroller since July 2020. This role is critical to managing the budget and financial readiness of

the Navy and the Marine Corps, to include the Department's audit. Many will point out and criticize, with some reasonableness, the fact that the Department of Defense has not yet passed an audit. Well, it is very difficult to pass an audit if you have critical individuals who are not in place to help you prepare for and pass such an audit. That is another reason I think we need—the Navy needs a comptroller.

Each of these positions are critically important to the Department of Defense. The sooner they assume their offices, the better for the Department's ability to tackle these challenges on behalf of servicemembers and their families and the Nation. And, indeed, the sooner they are there, the more we will be able to support the men and women in uniform in the United States who are deployed across the globe. They need that kind of support here in Washington.

With that, Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: No. 843, No. 861, and No. 972; that the nominations be agreed to without intervening action or debate; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has objected, and I believe he is the only individual Member of the Senate who objects. In that case, I think I would be prepared to offer another unanimous consent that would allow debate upon these members. That, I think, should be satisfactory to the Senator, because it will give him an opportunity to express his objections to these individuals and why they are not qualified to be in office.

With that, I renew my above request, except that I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session; that there be 1 hour for debate, equally divided in the usual form on the nominations en bloc; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nominations in the order listed; and that following disposition of the nominations, the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I believe I retain the time, but if the Senator would like me to make a short statement and then object—

Mr. HAWLEY. Sure.

Mr. REED. I think the easy thing to do is let me yield such time as the Senator requires.

Mr. HAWLEY. I thank the chairman. It is always a privilege to be on the floor with the Senator from Rhode Island and to serve him on the committee, so thank you for that.

I would just say this: It has been nearly a year now since the events, the catastrophe, in Kabul that claimed the lives of 13 servicemembers, including from my home State of Missouri.

This was a catastrophe of this administration's making, and it has been now nearly 2 weeks, maybe 3, since I began to enter into the RECORD, page by painstaking page, this report undertaken by U.S. Central Command about that disaster at Abbey Gate in Kabul, about those deaths, not to mention the hundreds of American civilians who were left behind.

I am entering this report into the RECORD so the American people can see it because I cannot convince my friend from Rhode Island to hold a public hearing on this report, and I cannot convince the White House to stop their coverup of the events at Abbey Gate and the role they played in it.

This is not for lack of trying. For months on end, I have come to this floor and asked for a public hearing on this report. I have asked my colleagues. I have written to the chairman. I have spoken to members of the committee, who, by the way, say they have no objection.

And just last week, the White House reached out to me and said: What is it that you want?

I said, I want accountability for what happened in Afghanistan and Abbey Gate, and, specifically, I want a public hearing on this report, to which the White House said it is up to the chairman.

So I hope that we can make some progress on actually getting accountability for what happened, for the servicemembers whose lives were lost, and we can end this continual Vietnamesque, yearlong effort to push this crisis out into the shadows, to ignore it as if it never happened, and to deny the American people the accountability that servicemembers deserve.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I reclaim my time.

I respectfully disagree with the Senator from Missouri on this matter. The Senate Armed Services Committee conducts and has conducted extensive oversight on Afghanistan. Committee actions include seven public and closed hearings regarding the War in Afghanistan, lessons learned, and ongoing regional counterterrorism requirements

since the withdrawal last August. And Senator HAWLEY has participated in all of these.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 contained a provision, section 1092, that mandated the Department of Defense deliver quarterly briefings, in both unclassified and classified form, on the security situation in Afghanistan and ongoing counterterrorism efforts.

The classified briefings have taken place on January 20, April 14, and July 21. The unclassified briefings have taken place on February 14 and April 25. An additional unclassified briefing will be held tomorrow, coincidentally, and Senator HAWLEY has full access to all of these briefings.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 also contains a provision, section 1069, which requires a yearly assessment of our over-the-horizon counterterrorism capabilities in Afghanistan. While the first installment has not yet been delivered to the committee, Senator HAWLEY will have access to those assessments, as well as will all of my colleagues.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 further mandated the establishment of the Afghanistan War Commission, which will spend 3 years examining all aspects of the 20-year war in-depth. All the Commissioners have been appointed, and we expect the Commission to commence work in the near term. And Senator HAWLEY will have the same access to the Commission's findings as everyone else.

What I think the Senator does not understand is that the events that took place at Abbey Gate were not unique to that moment in time. They were the culmination of 20 years of actions by Presidents from both sides, by commanders on both sides. And in order to understand what truly happened at Abbey Gate, we have to look at all of those periods.

What was the effect of Donald Trump's agreement with the Taliban, excluding the legal government of Afghanistan, to essentially leave? And what other events created the situation that led directly to the situation at Abbey Gate? Without that context, this will simply be a way to vilify the administration, a way to point out shortcomings, and it won't get to what we really should be focused on: What profound lessons can we learn from 20 years in Afghanistan that will assist us in the future, that will protect our men and women in uniform?

Again, if the focus is on political retaliation and retribution, that is part of this organization. But if we want to focus on protecting today the lives of men and women who serve and their families who will grieve if they are lost, then we have to take a broader view, which we are doing in the Commission, which we are doing when we bring our experts in on a frequent basis to talk about Afghanistan—and which we must do by filling these positions in the Department of Defense.

Without the support of a functioning Department of Defense, we will be in a situation where we are putting at risk the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and guardians who protect this Nation. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

PACT ACT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to make just a brief comment about the cloture vote that just occurred shortly before the Senator from Rhode Island sought the unanimous consent agreement.

And, as you know, cloture was denied on that bill, and, as you also know very well, that doesn't mean the bill is defeated. It simply means that the opportunity to amend it isn't eliminated. There haven't been any amendments. That is unfortunate.

But I want to just stress that my concern about this bill has nothing to do with the purpose of the bill. It is not about the approximately \$280 billion of new spending that is meant to be required under this bill for the VA to cover Medicare and other—healthcare, I should say, and other benefits for veterans who are exposed to toxic burn pits. What I want to change has absolutely nothing to do with any of that.

I see the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction. I think he understands that I have no interest in modifying the purpose of this bill, all the work that he and many others have done. And, by the way, I suspect there are 85 votes for this bill, for the underlying bill, if we fix this problem.

And here is the problem. Completely unrelated to the \$280 billion of new spending, there is a mechanism created in this bill—it is a budgetary gimmick—that has the intent of making it possible to have a huge explosion in unrelated spending: \$400 billion. This budgetary gimmick is so unrelated to the actual veterans' issue that has to do with burn pits that it is not even in the House version of this bill.

So, the fact is, we can fix this tonight. This is a relatively easy fix. There might be a few technical things we would iron out, and we could get this done tonight. And I know the chairman of the committee very much wants to get this bill done. This is the path to do it. And if we fix this—which, as I say, I would recommend we fix it tonight—we could do that by a unanimous consent request. We could do it any number of ways.

But once that is done, this bill sails through this Chamber and goes to the President and gets signed into law. So I just want to urge my Democratic colleagues to join me in working this out. This is not what this bill was about. We can fix it. We can do it immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, the good Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. I want to see this bill passed. I want to

see this bill passed for all the reasons I have talked about many times in committee and on this floor.

This is about living up to the promises for our veterans. This is about making sure that when the veterans come back from exposures to burn pits or oil well fires or Agent Orange, that they don't have to go to the VA and fight for their healthcare and their benefits.

It impacts 3½ million veterans in this country. By the way, there will be a few more who die before we get this bill passed.

And I would also say that, as the Senator from Pennsylvania says, I am all for the \$278.4 billion over 10 years on this bill; I have got no problem with that—well, the fact is, he does have a problem with that. The fact is, by doing what happened today on this floor, the real issue here—and make no mistake about it—is the money that is being spent to take care of our veterans.

And I have said it before, and I will say it again. If you have the guts to send somebody to war, then you better have the guts to take care of them when they get back home—or don't send them in the first place.

Now, let's talk about the \$400 billion, OK, because, quite frankly, what this is about—this is about not even trusting the people in this body. We have an Appropriations Committee, and we vote on appropriations bills, and we set the levels in the accounts based off of appropriations. Let the process work. Let's not tie the hands of appropriators. Let's make sure we let the process work. That is what we have always done.

But the good Senator from Pennsylvania's amendment ties the hands of the appropriators. Make no mistake about this, the American people are sick and tired of the games that go on in this body. They are sick and tired of us working for Democrats or working for Republicans and not working for the American people. But this is bigger than that.

We have an All-Volunteer military in this country. If you don't think young people are watching what we are doing today who are thinking about signing up for the military, you are sadly mistaken. And when we don't take care of our veterans when they come home, they are going to say: Why should I ever sign on the dotted line because, of the promises that I made and the promises the country made, only half that deal is being respected—my half.

This is a sad day in the U.S. Senate. This is the biggest issue facing our veterans today. Make no mistake about it, if it wasn't, every veterans service organization wouldn't be out there talking to us and have been talking to me for the last 15 years.

So we can make up all sorts of excuses about how this is going to move money around, but—let me tell you something—we are the ones who decide that. If we want to move money around, we will; if we don't, we won't.

In the meantime, let's pass this bill. Let's give veterans the healthcare they have earned. If it isn't, it is political malpractice. What we are doing today with this policy, by putting this policy off, does nobody any good whatsoever. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I would briefly and simply reiterate my request that our Democratic colleagues, including the chairman, who obviously is passionate about this, just engage with us to fix this, this problem that has nothing to do with the bill that he wants to pass, this problem that wasn't in the House version of this bill.

The chairman's argument that, well, it is always ultimately subject to appropriations—well, that is really an argument that says let's not have a budget at all, let's not have any rules because—it is true—a future Congress can always do whatever it wants. So, by that logic, we should have no rules, no guidelines, no budgets, no procedures, no pay-go, no effort whatsoever to have any management of our Federal budget because—what the hell—any Congress can come along and just waive it.

I don't agree with that. I think, especially at a time when inflation is running rampant, when we have been spending money like no one has ever imagined—if we have got an important need, OK; we do that. But this gimmick—and the chairman said people are sick and tired of games. I totally agree. This is one of those games where you have got a bill that is going to pass and so let's sneak in this change in the budget rule so that it will be easy to spend money on other things in the future.

That is ridiculous. That is just not defensible. So, again, I would stress there is a very easy path to a very big vote in favor of this bill that probably could happen later tonight but could certainly happen tomorrow. And if the path is there, let's fix this problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I am going to reiterate what I said before. The concern that the Senator from Pennsylvania has is a concern that there is not a lot of trust in this body, and I agree—fair reason to be.

As far as having rules, I believe in having rules, but I don't believe we should have rules that tie the hands of our standing committees, that say: You can't do this. Appropriations, I don't care what you see, what you see, what issue comes down the road for veterans—in this case, MARTIN HEINRICH, the chair, and JOHN BOOZMAN, the ranking member—you guys can't address it.

That is what the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to do. That is not how this process should work. We should be dealing with issues as they arise. That is a fact.

And by the way, I have said for some time, programs that have outlived their lifespan, we should be cutting those programs, but we don't do that very well.

But we have been at war for 20 years. With that war—by the way, that was all put on a credit card—there was a fair amount that was funded by an OCO account. And now we are going to say: Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no; we are not going to spend the money to take care of our veterans. I am going to use this as an excuse. I am going to use as an excuse the fact that the Appropriations Committee might spend too much money.

Well, that is on us. And while that is on us, we have veterans dying of cancers and lung conditions because a bill that should have been passed before the Fourth of July is still on the floor today.

You can frame it any way you want. But in the end, this budgetary gimmick is called: How the Congress Works. Appropriators appropriate. If you don't believe me, ask Senator SHELBY. That is what we do. And if we appropriate too much, this body votes it down. Or if we don't appropriate enough, this body votes it down and amends it up. That is what appropriators do. That is how this process is supposed to work.

We should not be using that excuse to deny benefits to the men and women who have served this country in a God-awful place in the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

SENATOR JOHNNY ISAKSON VA REGIONAL OFFICE ACT OF 2022

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a giant of the great State of Georgia—which the Presiding Officer and I both have the distinct honor of serving—to recognize a true legend of the U.S. Senate, an extraordinary father, husband, and representative of our State, the late Senator Johnny Isakson.

Senator Isakson served Georgia all his life. Born in Atlanta, Senator Isakson attended the University of Georgia, then enlisted in the Georgia Air National Guard. He was a successful private businessman, growing his real estate enterprise to one of the largest in the State.

He served in both the Georgia House of Representatives and the State senate, and Governor Zell Miller, a Democrat, appointed him, a Republican, to chair the State Board of Education.

In 1999, Senator Isakson was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he worked to improve American K-12 education.

And in 2004, he was elected to this body, where he would serve for almost 15 years with courtesy, dignity, and kindness, supporting and championing bipartisan efforts to better serve our

Nation's veterans. And his service culminated in his chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and of the Senate Ethics Committee.

As we will hear from our distinguished colleagues who served alongside Senator Isakson—like Senator BLUNT—Senator Isakson, through his uncommon decency, his generosity of spirit, his commitment to integrity and service of others over service of self, won universal respect in this body; won respect in the State of Georgia that crossed party lines and earned the reputation not just nationally but around the world for statesmanship, effectiveness, and hard work.

Even more than his work as a statesman, Senator Isakson was a father and a husband. And I want to recognize Senator Isakson's extraordinary family, including his wife of more than 50 years, Dianne; his sons, John and Kevin; his daughter Julie—all of whom I have had the pleasure of speaking or corresponding with in recent months and all of whom, in their lives, carry on the Senator's legacy.

Senator Isakson had a saying that there are just two kinds of people in this world: friends and future friends. I hope we can all be inspired by that aspiration and that outlook, by his resilient desire to see the good in everyone; to see the opportunity to work with anyone; to try to find where our interests align, where we can meet eye to eye, where we can get things done together.

Senator Isakson's courtesy, collegiality, and integrity will forever serve as an example to all of us who serve in this body today and in the future. And that is why, in recognition of Senator Isakson's tremendous contributions to American veterans, to the State of Georgia, and to the United States, it has been my privilege to introduce—alongside my distinguished Republican colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT, and the Presiding Officer, Senator WARNOCK—the Senator Johnny Isakson VA Regional Office Act to rename the VA's Atlanta Regional Office after Senator Isakson as part of our Nation's ongoing recognition of his service and as an example to those who follow in his footsteps of the virtues that his representation embodied.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support of this legislation. We will hear from Senator BLUNT and Senator WARNOCK, to share their experiences working alongside and knowing Senator Isakson, in just a moment.

But now, let's get this done and take this action to demonstrate our enduring respect and admiration for this extraordinary American statesman, Johnny Isakson. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 4359 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4359) to designate the regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs in metropolitan Atlanta as the “Senator Johnny Isakson Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office”, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 4359) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 4359

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Senator Johnny Isakson VA Regional Office Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) John Hardy Isakson, known as “Johnny”, was born December 28, 1944, in Atlanta, Georgia, to Julia Isakson and Edwin Andrew Isakson.

(2) Johnny Isakson graduated from the University of Georgia in 1966 with a Bachelor’s Degree in Business Administration.

(3) In 1966, Johnny Isakson enlisted in the Georgia Air National Guard, serving until 1972 and attaining the rank of Staff Sergeant.

(4) Johnny Isakson gained success in private business, serving for 22 years as a real estate executive and growing his business into one of the largest of its kind in both Georgia and in the United States.

(5) Johnny Isakson was elected to the Georgia General Assembly in 1976, serving in the State House of Representatives until 1990.

(6) Johnny Isakson was elected to the Georgia State Senate in 1992, serving until 1996.

(7) In 1996, Governor Zell Miller appointed Johnny Isakson to be Chairman of the Georgia State Board of Education.

(8) Johnny Isakson was elected to represent the 6th District of Georgia in the United States House of Representatives in 1999, and served until 2005.

(9) During his time in the House of Representatives, Johnny Isakson, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, worked to improve American education, and was a key advocate for the bipartisan education reforms that became the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110).

(10) Johnny Isakson was elected to the United States Senate in 2004, serving until December 31, 2019.

(11) During his time in the Senate, Johnny Isakson was an exemplar of courtesy, dignity, and kindness, beloved and respected by colleagues regardless of party.

(12) Johnny Isakson, during the 111th Congress, demonstrated a bipartisan yearning for peace, and crossed party lines to support the ratification of the 2010 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation, also known as New START.

(13) During the 114th, 115th, and 116th Congresses, Johnny Isakson served as Chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate, a position with which he tirelessly championed reform to improve the benefits and quality of service for our nation’s military veterans.

(14) During the 114th, 115th, and 116th Congresses, Johnny Isakson served as Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate.

(15) The late Congressman John Lewis once described Johnny Isakson as “A man who has strong belief but also willing to work with others to get things done.”

(16) On December 19, 2021, Johnny Isakson passed away, but his legacy of character and goodwill will endure as an example to all who serve, or will serve, in the United States Senate.

SEC. 3. SENATOR JOHNNY ISAKSON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ATLANTA REGIONAL OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office in Georgia shall, after the date of the enactment of this Act, be known and designated as the “Senator Johnny Isakson Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office” or the “Isakson VA Atlanta Regional Office”.

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Regional Office referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Senator Johnny Isakson Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office.

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am glad to join you and the other Senator from Georgia, Mr. OSSOFF, here today and join both of you in sharing some thoughts about Senator Isakson.

Senator OSSOFF has already said a lot of things that are easily said. Not that they were easy for him to say, but anybody that knew Johnny Isakson would make many of those very same points and, hopefully, make them as well. I was glad to join him as the original cosponsor of this bill.

Johnny and I served together in the House from 1999 until 2005. I was the majority whip during most of that time. And he was one of the half dozen deputies that really are key to getting things done. And Johnny Isakson liked to get things done.

In 2005, he came over here to be in the Senate and brought that same determination to get things done, to find the place—wherever that place was—where something could happen. And he was a master at making things happen.

When I joined him in the Senate in 2011, I was pleased to get a chance to serve alongside him again. He was a fast friend and a friend that you could count on. He knew how to bring people together. He did view, as Senator OSSOFF said, people as his current friends or people who—the only reason they weren’t his friend is they hadn’t become his friends yet. And that is quite a way to approach life. And Johnny did it really well. I don’t think there was anyone more respected by the other Members of the Senate than Senator Isakson was.

In September of last year, I had the opportunity to join you, Mr. President, along with Senator COONS and Senator GRAHAM, in hosting a bipartisan lunch that Johnny first started 13 years ago. I think we are going to do that again in September of this year. We have Democratic lunches, and we have Republican lunches. The Johnny Isakson lunch every year was the bipartisan lunch. And I think that is a great tradition to at least one more time do in honor of his service here and his friendship.

He understood the value of sitting down over a cup of coffee or over a meal, of talking to one another, of finding the things you agree on, and then working together.

And one thing I found here—and I think one of the ways I found it was watching what Johnny did—when a Democratic and Republican Senator find something to do together and get it done, invariably, they start looking for the next thing to do together. And their staffs start looking for the next thing their bosses can do together. And it is an infectious kind of thing that gets things done. And that was one of the great understandings of the legislative process that Johnny brought to the Senate.

I think when Johnny was in the Georgia House, there were a handful of Republicans in the Georgia House when he got there. He told me he got to be minority leader pretty quickly—maybe it was because he didn’t show up in the room that day before they could choose who their leader was going to be. But he understood what it took to bring things together. He liked to help people. He liked to get things done. He especially liked to get things done for his fellow veterans.

Now, we are going to approach this veterans issue this week. And I am sure we are going to get it done. We just had a discussion about veterans and our commitments to veterans. But as chairman of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, Johnny really led efforts particularly to increase accountability at the VA. And there was an accountability problem at the VA that Johnny was intent on making sure we got to the bottom of it, to be sure that veterans received the care that they were entitled to and the benefits they had earned.

Under his leadership, Congress also passed a MISSION Act, legislation that gave veterans real and permanent choice in their healthcare. This is something that particularly younger veterans care about. They want to go to the doctor that they want to go to. They want to go to a doctor close to home, or they want to still have the option, as they would have, to go to a veterans facility or be referred from that facility to another place where their care would be more easily available to them.

But what veterans really want was the idea of having not just a pilot project on choice, which was the case

before Johnny Isakson as chairman decided, no, we are going to have a permanent process where veterans are going to have those choices in the future. And so here we have just passed legislation designed to designate the VA facility in Decatur, GA, the Senator Johnny Isakson Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office.

I am certainly proud to join my colleagues today as we sought and received unanimous consent for this legislation to pass. I really can't think of a more fitting way today, as we talk about veterans, to honor Johnny's legacy than to have his name associated with an issue he cared deeply about.

Another issue he and I cared about and worked closely on was health research and what was happening at the CDC. There will be a building—the ground is being broken right now, as I understand it, for a building—at the CDC headquarters in Atlanta that will also be named for Johnny Isakson.

Those are two very fitting areas of focus for what he did for the people in Georgia, what he did for veterans in Georgia, what he did for healthcare in Georgia, and what he did for all of those things as it related to the entire U.S.A. I am glad to see this legislation pass.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to honor a friend, our late Senator from Georgia, my predecessor, Senator Johnny Isakson, as we work across the aisle, just as he did, to rename the Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office in his honor.

I thank my brother and fellow Senator from Georgia for leading this effort.

Without a doubt, Senator Isakson loved Georgia, and he cared deeply for our country. He was a patriot, a public servant, and I am proud to say that there are members of my staff who used to work for Johnny Isakson. They will tell you that he never hesitated to show up.

In my other job as a pastor, I talk often about the ministry of presence. Sometimes, it is not about what you say, because there are some situations, quite frankly, for which there are no adequate words. When someone has lost a loved one, and you are standing there at graveside or standing in a hospital at bedside with a patient, sometimes the issue is really showing up—the ministry of presence.

Johnny Isakson had it. He knew how to show up. Whether it was paying a visit to an ill patient or seeing a disabled veteran, he was there. Senator Isakson, the consummate public servant, dedicated his years of service to our beloved Georgia, to veterans, to our families, and to our children.

He always made it a point to show up at Ebenezer Baptist Church. Every year in January, as we celebrate Georgia's greatest son, the Reverend Dr.

Martin Luther King, Jr., Johnny Isakson, without fail, was always in the house. Now, to be sure, when the King holiday rolls around, politicians do tend to show up, but what was so impressive about Johnny Isakson is that, not only did he show up for the service, he stayed for the whole service—a service which, I will admit, is long, even by Baptist standards. He stayed there the whole time.

He was unafraid to work across ideological and political differences in our State, in our country. I shall never forget his example of public service.

We talked from time to time. In fact, it occurs to me that the first time I stood in this Chamber, I stood not as a Senator but as Chaplain of the day, and it was at Johnny Isakson's invitation. I remember his graciousness on that day and on so many occasions.

When he announced his retirement, he called me and said: Raphael, I am retiring, and I want to drop by Ebenezer and say goodbye.

When he came that Sunday, he asked the members of our church who are veterans to stand. As he looked across the audience and saw all the veterans who were in our church, he said: I want to leave a special offering for the veterans ministry in this church.

That was Johnny Isakson.

So I am thrilled that today, with great appreciation and admiration for Senator Johnny Isakson, our bipartisan legislation honors his life and his legacy by renaming the Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office in his honor, and I am thrilled that it has passed in the Senate in a bipartisan way with unanimous support.

Isn't that fitting? Johnny Isakson is doing now in death what he did in life—bringing us together. And in this moment in which we are in a debate about what to do for our veterans, isn't it appropriate that his spirit summons us to common ground—and the higher ground—so that we can do all we can for those who have our back in dangerous places all over the globe.

Senator Isakson cared deeply for Georgia's veterans and for veterans all across our country. He understood that there are some things bigger than politics. So we recognize his amazing service, his incredible legacy of life and self-sacrifice by renaming the Atlanta Regional Office of the Department of Veterans Affairs in his honor.

I am proud to sit in the seat where he sat, and it is my honor to help lead the passage of this bipartisan piece of legislation that will help preserve the legacy of our late and dear friend.

Long live the spirit of Johnny Isakson.

HARRIET TUBMAN BICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate having received H.R. 1842 the text of which is identical to S. 697, the bill is consid-

ered to have been read a third time and the question occurs on the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

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

The bill (H.R. 1842) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

GREATEST GENERATION COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate having received H.R. 1057 the text of which is identical to S. 1569, the bill is considered read a third time and the questions occur on passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

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

The bill (H.R. 1057) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The Senator from Arizona.

CALLING ON THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO DESIGNATE THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AS A STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM

Mr. KELLY. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 433, S. Res. 623.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. Res. 623) calling on the Secretary of State to designate the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic and an amendment to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic as follows:

S. RES. 623

Whereas, pursuant to section 1754(c) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (50 U.S.C. 4813(c)), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2779A), and section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371), the authority to designate a country as a state sponsor of terrorism rests with the Secretary of State;

Whereas Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran, and Syria are designated as state sponsors of terrorism;

Whereas, at the direction of President Vladimir Putin, the Government of the Russian Federation has and continues to promote acts of international terrorism against political opponents and nation states;

Whereas, under the orders of President Putin, the Government of the Russian Federation engaged in a campaign of terror, utilizing brutal

force targeting civilians during the Second Chechen War;

Whereas actions by the Government of the Russian Federation against civilian centers, such as Grozny, the capital of Chechnya, left countless innocent men, women, and children dead or wounded;

Whereas, since 2014, the Government of the Russian Federation has supported so-called separatists engaging in acts of violence against Ukrainian civilians in the Donbas region;

Whereas, since the entry of the Russian Federation into the Syrian Civil War in 2015, the Russian Federation has targeted innocent civilians in Syria with attacks on civilian markets, medical facilities, and schools;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation provides material support to Syria, a nation currently designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, that has been used to target the Syrian people;

Whereas the Russian Federation spreads terror throughout the world through private military networks of mercenaries, such as the Wagner Group, in an effort to project power cheaply and deniably;

Whereas the Wagner Group relies on the support of the Russian Federation and the Ministry of Defense to advance the foreign policy objectives of the Russian Federation;

Whereas the Department of the Treasury identifies the Wagner Group as “a designated Russian Ministry of Defense proxy force” and states that “Wagner’s activities in other countries, including Ukraine, Syria, Sudan, and Libya, have generated insecurity and incited violence against innocent civilians”;

Whereas it was reported in February 2022 that more than 400 Russian mercenaries from the Wagner Group were dispatched to Kyiv with orders from the Kremlin to assassinate President Volodymyr Zelensky and members of the Government of Ukraine;

Whereas, on March 14, 2022, Chairperson-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Zbigniew Rau stated that actions of the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine against innocent civilians and civilian infrastructure is “state terrorism”;

Whereas, on March 17, 2022, President Volodymyr Zelensky called for the world to acknowledge the Russian Federation as a terrorist state;

Whereas the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine has appealed to Congress to encourage the Department of State to recognize the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism noting that “the Russian Federation has for years supported and financed terrorist regimes and terrorist organizations, including being the main supplier of weapons to the Assad regime in Syria and supporting terrorists in the Middle East and Latin America, organizing acts of international terrorism, including the poisoning of the Skripal family in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the downing of a civilian Malaysian airliner and other acts of terrorism”;

Whereas, at the direction of President Putin, the Russian Federation has directed and authorized the indiscriminate targeting of civilian centers within Chechnya, Georgia, Syria, and Ukraine, resulting in the deaths of countless innocent men, women, and children; and

Whereas armed forces of the Russian Federation have committed numerous summary executions against innocent civilians and have attempted to cover their atrocities with mass graves across Ukraine: Now, therefore, be it

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) views the actions of the Government of the Russian Federation, at the direction of President Vladimir Putin, as sponsoring acts of terrorism; and

(2) calls on the Secretary of State to designate the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as authorizing the use of military force or the introduction of United States forces into hostilities.

Mr. KELLY. I ask unanimous consent the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. KELLY. I know of no further debate on the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 623), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. KELLY. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble as amended be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF OHIO V. HUSTON

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 725, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 725) to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in State of Ohio v. Huston.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for evidence in a criminal action pending in Ohio State court. In this action, the defendant is charged with inducing panic and aggravated menacing at a Social Security office arising out of threatening statements he allegedly made in a telephone call with an employee in Senator Portman’s Columbus, OH, office.

Trial in this case is scheduled to commence on July 28, 2022, in Ohio State court. The prosecutor is seeking testimony at trial from Aidan Gavin, an employee in the Senator’s office who received the call at issue. Senator Portman would like to cooperate with this request by providing relevant Senate employee testimony and, if necessary, documents.

This resolution would authorize the production of relevant testimony and documents from Mr. Gavin, with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. KELLY. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 725) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. HERRERA

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 726, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 726) to authorize testimony and representation in United States v. Herrera.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, another criminal trial arising out of the events of January 6, 2021, is scheduled to begin on August 15, 2022, in Federal district court in the District of Columbia. The defendant in this case is charged with five counts: obstructing the counting by Congress of the electoral ballots for President and Vice President; entering and remaining in a restricted area within the United States Capitol grounds; unlawful parading, demonstrating, and picketing; and two counts of engaging in disorderly and disruptive conduct.

The prosecution has requested trial testimony, if necessary, from Jeffrey Kent, Director of the Press Photographers’ Gallery, which operates under the authority of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, relating to the Gallery’s regulation of access to the Capitol by bona fide news photographers and heads of photographic news bureaus.

The prosecution is also seeking trial testimony, if necessary, from Nate Russell and Diego Torres, custodians of records in the Senate Recording Studio, which also operates under the authority of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to authenticate Senate Recording Studio video of that day.

Senate Sergeant at Arms Gibson would like to cooperate with these requests by providing relevant testimony in this proceeding from Messrs. Kent, Russell, and Torres, respectively.

In keeping with the rules and practices of the Senate, this resolution would authorize the production of relevant testimony from Messrs. Kent, Russell, and Torres, with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 726) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO PHYLLIS GREEN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is not often one gets to experience and celebrate a living legend. But we have a chance today to do with a member of our Senate family. On February 27, 1984, an important part of the Senate community opened: the Senate Employees Child Care Center. There for that historic opening was a very special teacher, Ms. Phyllis Green.

Over the ensuing nearly four decades, Phyllis masterfully impacted the lives of so many students that passed through center. She helped them get started in their young, tender lives with humor, warmth, devotion, skill, and of course, great patience.

She is also something of a legend among the families on my staff whose children had the privilege of being taught by her—Wren, Rayn, Alex, Leo, Oliver, Avery, and Harry—so much so that even the ones who didn't have her for a teacher knew of her class. It is hard to imagine, but students that were in her early classes are now in their 40s.

Some years ago, during her 30th anniversary at the center, a number of former students, now adults, came back to celebrate with her, and there wasn't a dry eye in the room. Think about how many of us had a teacher who made an impact in our lives and the rare opportunity to go back as an adult to offer warm thanks for those memories. What a gift to reflect upon so many lives impacted during one's career, so much so that Phyllis's colleagues said during her final week that "the Legendary, the one and only Ms. Phyllis is retiring."

In fact, one of them wrote a poem that aptly noted of Phyllis, "Your patience, knowledge and guidance opened up so much potential. For the children and the parents, your being has been essential. . . . In the eyes of many, you are a living legend, A pillar of our community, an educator, a teammate, a friend."

On the 30th anniversary of the child care center, the former Senator Tom Harkin described its teachers and administrators "as some of the unsung heroes of the Senate." I wholeheartedly agree and certainly Phyllis Green is one such hero.

I thank Phyllis for her incredible service to nearly four decades of Senate employee families and their children. You have made a real impact on our world.

REMEMBERING BUCK O'NEIL AND MINNIE MINOSO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at long last, it is official. Buck O'Neil and Minnie Minoso are finally where they deserve to be: in the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

These two remarkable men, who were friends for decades, both started their careers in baseball's storied Negro Leagues. They went on to make history again in the Major Leagues—in the city of Chicago—and they stayed involved with baseball all their lives.

And they were both known, as one writer said, "as much for their grace and spirit of generosity as for their immense achievements in the game."

I never had the good fortune to meet Buck O'Neil, but I have a baseball that he signed, and I keep it as a treasure.

I did meet Minnie Minoso. He and Satchel Paige came to a Springfield Redbirds game many years ago, and I summoned the courage to shake their hands between innings. What a thrill that was. But meeting Minnie Minoso was an honor shared by so many Chicagoans.

As his widow, Sharon Rice-Minoso, recalled at the Hall of Fame induction ceremony, "Baseball was his life. He was proud to wear his uniform and come to the ballpark every day to greet fans with a smile and sign autograph and after autograph. Some people believe that Minnie signed an autograph for every man, woman, and child in the Windy City."

"The Cuban Comet" and "Mr. White Sox." That is what the fans called him. His full name was Saturnino Orestes Armas Minoso Arrieta. He was born on a sugarcane ranch in Cuba in 1923—or maybe it was 1924 or '25. He was a little fuzzy on his age.

He was a two-time All-Star in the Negro Leagues before becoming the first Black player for the Chicago White Sox in 1951 and the first Latino star in Major League Baseball, the Jackie Robinson of Latino ballplayers.

He was one of the best hitters in the American League in the 1950s, a seven-time All-Star while with the White Sox and Cleveland Indians.

He hit over .300 eight times, led the American League in stolen bases three times, hammered double-digit home runs almost every season, and won three Gold Gloves in left field.

He retired in 1964—or so it seemed. Twelve years later, when Minnie was 50, the White Sox called him back for three games. He hit a line drive to left field, making him one of the oldest players in MLB history to score a base hit.

The White Sox retired his No. 9 in 1983, and he remained close to the organization and its players until he died in 2015.

Baseball analysts have long considered his omission from Cooperstown a glaring error. Now, finally, it has been set right.

Buck O'Neil was a two-time All-Star first baseman with the Negro Leagues Kansas City Monarchs. He went on to be a scout for the Chicago Cubs, the first Black coach in Major League Baseball, and one of the most beloved ambassadors for baseball in the sport's history.

He was born John Jordan O'Neil, Jr., in Florida in 1911, the grandson son of an enslaved man. He joined the Monarchs in 1938 and was a star player in the 1940s and '50s. As a first baseman, he was known for his smooth glove work, but he could also handle a bat. He was a three-time All-Star and became a Negro World Series champion in 1942.

In 1943, at the height of World War II, he enlisted in the Navy and served for 2 years, including time in the Pacific. He returned to the Monarchs after the war and was the Negro League's batting champ his first year out of the service. In 1948, the Monarchs promoted him to player-manager. Among the many players whose careers he helped shape was a shy young shortstop who would go on to become the first African-American player for the Chicago Cubs, "Mr. Cub," Ernie Banks.

After the Monarchs were sold in 1955, Buck found work as a scout for the Cubs. Players he signed as a scout with Chicago—and later, the Kansas City Royals—included Lou Brock, Oscar Gamble, Lee Smith, and Joe Carter. He made history when the Cubs hired him as a coach in 1962, making him the first Black coach in the American or National League.

In 1990, Buck O'Neil began what would become perhaps his greatest contribution to baseball. With a handful of others, he founded the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, just blocks from where he had played with the Monarchs and where Rube Foster had founded the Negro Leagues in 1920.

He devoted the rest of his life to baseball and especially keeping alive the memories of the Negro Leagues. He helped build the Negro Leagues Museum from one room to a 10,000-square-foot showplace. He traveled widely, using his grace and wit to tell the stories of Negro League stars such as Josh Gibson, Cool Papa Bell, Buck Leonard, Oscar Charleston, and his old Monarchs teammate, Satchel Paige.

In 1994, not long after the World Series was canceled because of a labor dispute, Ken Burns' nine-part PBS series "Baseball" introduced Buck O'Neil to an even larger audience. He became the beloved Bard of Baseball.

Also inducted into Cooperstown last weekend were: David Ortiz, "Big Papi," the slugger who led the Boston Red Sox to three World Series Championships; Gil Hodges, All-Star first baseman for the Brooklyn Dodgers and manager of the 1969 "Miracle Mets;" Tony Oliva and Jim Kaat, two teammates from the

1965 pennant-winning Minnesota Twins; and Bud Fowler, born in 1858 and often regarded as the first Black professional baseball player.

Minnie Minoso and Buck O'Neil were voted in under new rules that officially designated the Negro Leagues as a major league in 2020.

Buck had been nominated once before—in 2006—but to the surprise of nearly everyone, fell one vote short. He accepted the verdict with his usual grace, even agreeing to speak on behalf of the 17 players who made it into Cooperstown that year.

With this typical optimism, he told the crowd gathered at Cooperstown that day, "I've done a lot of things I liked doing, but I'd rather be right here, right now, representing these people who helped build a bridge across the chasm of prejudice."

Minnie Minoso and Buck O'Neil helped build that bridge, too. And now, they are finally where they deserve to be, among baseball's immortals.

TRIBUTE TO SHERIFF STEVE SPARROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the past two decades, one man has revolutionized law enforcement in Kentucky's Oldham County and built a reputation as one of the Commonwealth's best sheriffs. Steve Sparrow has served as Oldham County's sheriff since 1999 and, in his time leading the county's police force, has brought professionalism, dedication, and, above all, devotion to the rule of law to his community. This year, Sheriff Sparrow is retiring from his post. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring his career and the lasting legacy he built in Oldham County.

Sheriff Sparrow began his career in law enforcement nearly 50 years ago, at a time when Oldham County's population was less than a quarter of its current size. As this burgeoning community expanded into one of Kentucky's fastest growing counties, Sheriff Sparrow's leadership helped Oldham County maintain its reputation for safety and neighborliness. Under his purview, the area remains one of the most desirable places to live in the Commonwealth.

Sheriff Sparrow didn't achieve this high level of law enforcement efficacy by accident. As sheriff, he dedicated himself to furthering professional training for both himself and his department. He is the only sheriff in Oldham County history to have trained at a certified law enforcement academy and the only Oldham County sheriff to have graduated from the National Sheriff's Institute. He brought similar high levels of training to his department, making Oldham County Sheriff's Office the fifth in the Commonwealth to achieve accreditation standards.

In recognition of Sheriff Sparrow's hard work to improve Oldham County's police department, the Kentucky Sheriff's Association named Sheriff Spar-

row their president in both 2005 and 2012. He received additional praise and leadership roles from Kentucky's Governor, the Kentucky Law Enforcement Board of Directors, and the National Sheriff's Association Board of Directors. Oldham County voters also strongly approved of Sheriff Sparrow's performance, reelecting him to his office six times in a row.

Leaders around the Commonwealth will be sad to see Sheriff Sparrow leave his role. He has been one of my closest partners in the law enforcement community, and I have been proud to lean on his expertise to back the blue at the Federal level. Though we will all miss Sheriff Sparrow's leadership, I know he will put his retirement to good use, spending more time with his wife Dotty and their children and grandchildren. On behalf of the Senate, I share our congratulations with Sheriff Sparrow for achieving this milestone and wish him the best in this next chapter of his life.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I previously revised the allocations, aggregates, and pay-as-you-go ledger for S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, pursuant to section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the fiscal year 2022 congressional budget resolution.

As the legislation has now been signed into law and directs that its budgetary effects are not to be entered on the PAYGO scorecard, I am reversing the PAYGO adjustment I made in June.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying table, which provides details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE SENATE

(Revisions Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)
(\$ in billions)

	Balances
Current Balances:	
Fiscal Year 2022	- 8.423
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	- 81.179
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	- 144.095
Revisions:	
Fiscal Year 2022	- 0.001
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	5.719
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	5.318
Revised Balances:	
Fiscal Year 2022	- 8.424
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	- 75.460
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	- 138.777

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, had there been a recorded vote, I would have voted no on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 1058, Adair Ford Boroughs, of South Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

NOMINATION OF DAVID P. PEKOSKE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has reviewed the nomination of David P. Pekoske to be the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security. Seeing that this is Mr. Pekoske's nomination for a second consecutive term to be the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, the chairman and ranking member have reached a unanimous consent agreement to forgo a mark up for this nominee.

In the 115th Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs sought referral in June of 2017 for Mr. Pekoske's first nomination to be the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration. The committee held a hearing for this nominee on June 11, 2017, and reported the nominee out of committee favorably on June 19, 2017. In the future, this committee is likely to seek referral on this nomination. This should be considered the standard procedure for future nominations to this role.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, following my submission in a previous session of the U.S. Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the next part of an investigation directed by the U.S. Central Command concerning the Abbey Gate bombing in Afghanistan in August 2021.

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

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS BY INVESTIGATING OFFICER

SECTION I—APPOINTMENT

Appointed by LTG Ronald Clark, Commander, Third Army/ARCENT (Appointing Authority) on 20210917

SECTION II—TIMELINE

1. The (investigation) commenced at Camp Arifjan, Kuwait at 2000 on 20210917
2. The (Investigating officer) finished gathering/hearing evidence at 1100 on 20211022 and completed findings and recommendations at 2000 on 202111022

SECTION III—CHECKLIST FOR PROCEEDINGS

A. COMPLETE IN ALL CASES

1. Enclosures

Are the following enclosed and numbered consecutively with Roman numerals: (Attached in order listed)

- a. The memorandum of appointment? YES
- b. All other written communications to or from the appointing authority? YES
- c. Privacy Act Statements (Certificate, if statement provided orally)? NA
- d. Explanation by the investigating officer of any unusual delays, difficulties, irregularities, or other problems encountered (e.g., absence of material witnesses)? NA
- e. Any other significant papers (other than evidence) relating to administrative aspects of the investigation? NA
- f. An Executive Summary, Index of Exhibits, Chronology of the Investigation and lists of all persons interviewed and evidence gathered. (Complex, serious and/or high profile cases)? YES

2. Exhibits

a. Are all items offered (whether or not received) or considered as evidence individually numbered or lettered as exhibits and attached? YES

b. Is an index of all exhibits offered to or considered by investigating officer attached before the first exhibit? YES

c. Has the testimony/statement of each witness been recorded verbatim or been reduced to written form and attached as an exhibit? YES

d. Are copies, descriptions, or depictions (if substituted for real or documentary evidence) properly authenticated and is the location of the original evidence indicated? NA

e. Are descriptions or diagrams included of locations visited by the investigating officer (Appendix C-3, AR 15-6)? NA

f. Is each written stipulation attached as an exhibit and is each oral stipulation either reduced to writing and made an exhibit or recorded? NA

FOOTNOTES: Explain all negative answers on an attached sheet.

Use of the N/A column constitutes a positive representation that the circumstances described in the question did not occur in this investigation.

SECTION IV—FINDINGS

The (investigating officer), having carefully considered the evidence, finds: SEE MEMORANDUM

SECTION V—RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the above findings, the (investigating officer) recommends: SEE MEMORANDUM

SECTION VI—AUTHENTICATION

THIS REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS IS COMPLETE AND ACCURATE.

(TEXT REDACTED)

(Investigating Officer)

SECTION VII—ACTION BY APPROVING AUTHORITY

The findings and recommendations of the (investigating officer) are:

a) Approved. (TEXT REDACTED)

b) Approved with the following modifications:

(4) The following recommendations are modified as follows:

The Mental Health Evaluation/treatment priority will apply to Service Members at ALL gates HK (TEXT REDACTED)

[Signed]—NOV102021

RONALD P. CLARK,
Lieutenant General, USA, Commanding.

UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER,
MacDill Air Force Base, FL, 22 Nov. 2021.

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Thru: Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
From: General Kenneth F. McKenzie, Jr.,
Commander, U.S. Central Command
Subject: Abbey Gate AR 15-6 Investigation

MR. SECRETARY, I have reviewed the AR 15-6 investigation completed at my direction by U.S. Army Central (ARCENT) and concur with and endorse its findings and recommendations. The investigation was exceptionally comprehensive in its scope, as appropriate to the tragic events that precipitated its initiation. The investigating team, led by BG Lance Curtis, conducted 70 separate interviews, many of which were held in a group setting to facilitate a free flow of information. A total of 139 people were interviewed at seven different locations spanning five countries. Interviews ranged from between one hour and six hours in duration, with the average interview lasting between two and three hours, and the average transcription totaling nearly 11 pages. I specifically concur that:

The task organization worked. This was in large part due to pre-existing or quickly

forged relationships among leaders at the highest echelons and adaptability at the lower echelons;

By 25 August 2021, Abbey Gate was the main effort for “walk-up” gate operations at Hamid Karzai International Airport;

There was no complex attack; it was a single suicide bomber not accompanied by enemy small arms fire;

There is no evidence that Afghans were killed by return fire from U.S. forces in the immediate aftermath of the attack;

The attack was not preventable at the tactical level without degrading the mission to maximize the number of evacuees;

The attack was not the result of any act of omission or commission by forces on the ground;

The wounds sustained by the service members Killed in Action were so catastrophic that none could be saved; and

Although not assigned as a task to ARCENT or the investigating team, it is my judgment that all injuries sustained by U.S. personnel incident to the Abbey Gate attack occurred in the line of duty and were not due to any misconduct by the killed or injured U.S. personnel.

I further concur with the recommendations detailed in the ARCENT investigation. Accordingly, I have directed the following actions:

The Findings and Recommendations will be forwarded to all USCENCOM Service Component Commanders to ensure that all U.S. servicemembers at Abbey Gate during the attack, and present in any of the blast zones detailed in the investigation, are afforded the opportunity to be evaluated for Traumatic Brain Injury (Recommendation (a));

The Findings and Recommendations will be forwarded to all USCENCOM Service Component Commanders to facilitate prioritized access to appropriate mental health evaluations for personnel involved in executing entry control point operations from 17-26 August and personnel involved in the medical response to the attack on 26 August (Recommendation (b));

The investigation will be forwarded to the Joint Staff to inform any efforts that might be undertaken to develop interagency doctrine for Noncombatant Evacuation Operations (Recommendation (c)); and

Relevant portions of the investigation will be forwarded to U.S. Marine Corps Forces Central for appropriate action regarding the potential serious injury or death of an Afghan civilian on or about 20 August 2021 resulting from the alleged improper deployment of a flash bang grenade by a U.S. Marine from 2nd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment (Recommendation (d)).

Based on the totality of the facts and circumstances detailed in the ARCENT investigation, I do not believe that any adverse administrative or disciplinary action is necessary or appropriate for any U.S. personnel involved in our operations at Abbey Gate.

The ARCENT investigating team and the ARCENT Commander, LTG Ron Clark, briefed me in person on 11 November 2021 regarding this investigation. The presentation was as comprehensive as the investigation itself, and it included detailed PowerPoint slides, embedded video, and exceptionally well scripted speaker notes that complemented the written investigation and facilitated an informative exchange of questions and answers. I highly recommend you take the brief in person, and set aside two hours to this purpose. If you concur, my headquarters will work with your staff to make the ARCENT team available.

Enclosure: AR 15-6 Investigation (Enclosures and Exhibits available via Sharepoint)

TRIBUTE TO PAT AND SHARON O'TOOLE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, at the 110th Wyoming State Fair, Senator LUMMIS and I will have the pleasure of introducing Pat and Sharon O'Toole as 2022 inductees to the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

Pat and Sharon O'Toole are ranchers who, along with their family, own and operate the Ladder Ranch. It is a large-scale cattle and sheep operation, established in 1881 by A.W. and Anna Louise Salisbury. This was 9 years before Wyoming became a State. The Ladder Ranch has been in Sharon's family for six generations. Located outside of Savery, WY, along the Little Snake River, the ranch straddles the State line with Colorado.

Pat met Sharon Salisbury while they both attended Colorado State University. Following marriage, they returned to Sharon's family ranch in 1977 where they went to work managing the ranch and raising a family. Since then, Pat and Sharon have been shining examples of resource conservation, land stewardship, and partnership development.

The conservation legacy of the Ladder Ranch will affect agriculture, wildlife, and water for generations to come. Their ranch is host to one of North America's largest elk herds. It provides habitat for mule deer, sage grouse, and fish. They participate in the Sage Grouse Initiative, the Conservation Stewardship Program, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife's Partners for Fish and Wildlife program. They also have a stretch of land along Battle Creek recognized as an Audubon Bird Area.

In addition to managing a successful cattle and sheep operation for 45 years, Pat served in the Wyoming Legislature for three terms from 1986-1992. He is the current president of the Family Farm Alliance, representing irrigators in 17 Western States. The alliance ensures the availability of reliable, affordable irrigation supplies to Western farmers and ranchers.

Pat is a strong advocate for efficient irrigation and effective management tools for agriculture. He has testified many times before committees in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. As the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I invited him to testify in June 2022. Pat spoke on solutions to extreme drought in the Western United States.

Pat gives his time to numerous organizations including AGree, which addresses international food and agriculture policies. He also serves on the boards of the Intermountain Joint Venture, Partners for Conservation, Farm Foundation, and Solutions from the Land. President Clinton appointed him to the Western Water Policy Review Advisory Commission in 1997.

In addition to full-time ranching, Sharon is a published author and writer. Her work has been featured in the Washington Post. She has a monthly

column in the Shepherd magazine. She currently blogs on western issues and life for the Western Folklife Center. She is an avid poet, having performed at the National Cowboy Poetry Gathering. She was chosen to write the poem featured at the Wyoming Stock Growers 150th anniversary celebration. Her writing includes two children's books, highlighting the connections between family and the land.

Among many prestigious awards, the O'Toole family and the Ladder Ranch were awarded the Wyoming Leopold Environmental Stewardship Award in 2014. Two years later, the ranch received the Wyoming Stock Growers Land Trust Kurt Bucholz Conservation Award.

The Ladder Ranch is truly a family endeavor. Pat and Sharon's three children all contribute to the success of the operation. Their daughter Meghan O'Toole Lally works full-time on the ranch with help from her husband Brian and their four children. The O'Toole's son, Eamon O'Toole, his wife Megan and their two sons, also reside on the ranch, working alongside the family. Their daughter, Bridget O'Toole and her husband Chris Abel help with the ranch from their home in Arizona.

Pat and Sharon O'Toole's unmatched passion for family, Wyoming agriculture, wildlife and animal conservation, and cultivating partnerships, makes them an outstanding choice for the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. It is a great honor to participate in their induction. They continue to represent Wyoming and Western interests with dedication and distinction. My wife, Bobbi, joins me in congratulating Pat and Sharon O'Toole as 2022 inductees into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE VAN BUREN LIONS CLUB'S 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize and congratulate the Van Buren Lions Club as it celebrates 100 years of service to western Arkansas.

The Van Buren Lions Club was chartered on October 10, 1922, only 5 years after the creation of Lions Club International. Since its founding, its members have committed themselves to making a difference in the lives of people in the community and around the world.

While it began as a club to support local causes and provide networking for businessmen, a larger mission came into focus after Helen Keller spoke at the Lions Club International convention in 1925. She challenged all Lions to be "Knights of the Blind" and her eloquent plea transformed the organization, making support of sight-related programs the group's primary mission.

Throughout its 100-year history, the Van Buren Lions Club has worked tire-

lessly to make a difference for this cause. It hosts annual fundraisers and works with area eye doctors to recycle glasses, donating them to people who cannot afford them. In addition, members support local eye examination programs as well as the Arkansas Eye Bank and Laboratory, Lions World Services for the Blind, Mid-South Sight and Hearing Service, Leader Dogs for the Blind, Lions Clubs International Foundation, Diabetes Education and Prevention, Sight First, and the Lions of Arkansas Foundation.

As an optometrist, I am proud of the great work done by this club and Lions chapters around the world. I congratulate the Van Buren Lions Club on its 100th anniversary and hope these Knights for the Blind continue to prosper in their mission for years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BILL MILLS

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing the retirement of one of the leaders in water policy from the great State of Montana. Mr. Bill Mills is retiring after 57 years as a giant in Montana's water industry and as a respected leader nationally.

Bill retired from the Air Force in 1965 and spent the next 12 years in the pump industry, focusing on the water business. In 1977, he formed the 2M Company in Billings, MT, with a \$10,000 loan from his aunt and an SBA loan. His goal was to provide "legendary" service and support to the water well contractors and pump installers that provide water to homes, farms, ranches, and businesses throughout Montana. From those humble beginnings, he formed a 14-branch operation that covered the Rocky Mountain States and the Pacific Northwest. Bill served on the Water System Council Board in the 1990s and was a force behind Federal investment in programs to address rural residential and agricultural water issues.

In 2006, Bill expanded his vision and focus globally by helping form Water 4 Kids, an international organization that provides permanent, safe drinking water solutions for at-risk communities. To date, Water 4 Kids International has positively impacted over 3,000,000 lives in communities in Uganda, Nepal, India, Bangladesh, Kenya, Liberia, Rwanda, and the Philippines. In 2008, Bill was recognized as Montana's Small Business Person of the Year.

In 2017, one of Bill's oldest and most trusted manufacturing partners, Franklin Electric, acquired 2M and other leading water equipment distributors around the country to form the Headwater Companies. Bill served on Headwater's board of advisers until April of this year.

Please join me in congratulating Bill on a remarkable career that has positively impacted hundreds of employees, thousands of water industry professionals and helped provide millions of

people with clean, reliable sources of water around the world.●

REMEMBERING THOMAS TRESSELT

• Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and memory of a dear friend, Thomas Tresselt, who passed away on July 12 in Hartford.

Tom was an American classic. He grew up in Indiana where he was the star of his high school's basketball team before taking his talents to Yale University. In his first year, he scored 16 points on future NBA player, U.S. Senator, and Presidential candidate Bill Bradley's Princeton team. While he was not destined for the NBA, he never lost his love of basketball. In the early 80s—before computers were commonplace—he and a friend started their law firm's March Madness pool, providing comprehensive round-by-round standings, calculated manually using brackets drawn by hand.

Tom went on to the University of Michigan Law School where he married the love of his life, Sally. Sally and Tom would be married for 57 years. Following law school, Tom was commissioned an officer in the U.S. Navy, where he served in Beachmaster Unit 2 from 1969 to 1971. After the Navy, Tom and Sally moved to San Francisco where Tom worked as a litigator for Orrick, Herrington, Rowley, and Sutcliffe.

"Tired of always arguing for a living," Tom moved back to Connecticut, the place he and his family would call home for the next nearly 50 years. From 1974 to 1977, he was assistant dean of Yale Law School before joining Shipman and Goodman, where he practiced corporate law until 2008.

A leader in every sense of the word, Tom was an extremely active member of his community. At Asylum Hill Congregation Church, he served as moderator, was cochair of the capital campaign, served on the board of Christian service, was a deacon, and performed in the Boar's Head Festival as a king, log carrier, Beefeater, and other roles for nearly 20 years. He also served on the board of Loaves and Fishes, the American School for the Deaf, and Leadership Greater Hartford—3rd Age Initiative.

I knew Tom as a great friend and co-worker of my father who, like Tom, made Shipman and Goodwin his work home for five decades. To me, Tom was a legend. Thoughtful and kind, with this big, booming, smiling personality that drew people to him. That person in your life that everyone just wants to be around. He was a man of action who led by example and was committed to his country, his family, and his community.

Tom battled Alzheimer's at the end of his life, but never lost his sense of humor, compassion, and love for his family and friends.

I only wish I could have known him better. But I knew him well enough to

know how great he was. Tom Tresselt will be missed by all.●

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP TIMOTHY J. CLARKE

● Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Bishop Timothy J. Clarke on 40 years of servant leadership to the congregation at First Church of God in Columbus, OH, as well as to the broader Columbus community and the State of Ohio.

Bishop Clarke came to Columbus in 1982 after serving as associate minister at First Church of God in his hometown of Far Rockaway, NY, and as pastor at York Avenue Church of God in Warren, OH. He has grown First Church of God into one of the largest ministries in Ohio and is known across Ohio and the Nation for his spiritual leadership and ability to help bring people together to address many of the challenges facing our communities.

Bishop Clarke is also the founder and chief prelate of the Berean Fellowship, an international assembly that partners and mentors pastors of small to mid-size churches and those who are new to the ministry.

I have had the pleasure of working with Bishop Clarke for a dozen years. I have benefited from his spiritual guidance and worked with him on efforts to battle addiction and human trafficking. He has also provided valuable counsel on our efforts to reduce recidivism and help people exiting our criminal justice system get jobs and get their lives back on track.

My wife Jane and I have had the privilege of joining Bishop Clarke and First Lady Clytemnestra Clarke at First Church of God, where we always leave inspired and rejuvenated from his powerful and practical Sunday sermons.

I thank Bishop Clarke for his friendship and counsel, congratulate him on reaching this impressive 40-year milestone, and wish him and First Church of God the best in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:08 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 310. An act to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

H.R. 1057. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1842. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth.

H.R. 3588. An act to coordinate Federal research and development efforts focused on modernizing mathematics in STEM education through mathematical and statistical modeling, including data-driven and computational thinking, problem, project, and performance-based learning and assessment, interdisciplinary exploration, and career connections, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4227. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definition of a qualifying investment to include an equity security issued by a qualifying portfolio company, whether acquired directly from the company or in a secondary acquisition, for purposes of the exemption from registration for venture capital fund advisers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4586. An act to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations.

H.R. 4590. An act to require the Federal banking regulators to jointly conduct a study and develop a strategic plan to address challenges faced by proposed depository institutions seeking de novo depository institution charters, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5128. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6528. An act to require owners of covered federally assisted rental dwelling units to install temperature sensors in such units, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6552. An act to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6845. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems.

H.R. 7180. An act to authorize the Director of the National Science Foundation to award grants to support research on the disruption of regular cognitive processes associated with COVID-19 infection, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7289. An act to provide for the National Academies to study and report on a Federal research agenda to advance the understanding of PFAS, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7734. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the timely production of reports to Congress under the Bank Secrecy Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8454. An act to expand research on cannabidiol and marijuana, 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. 310. An act to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively,

to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3588. An act to coordinate Federal research and development efforts focused on modernizing mathematics in STEM education through mathematical and statistical modeling, including data-driven and computational thinking, problem, project, and performance-based learning and assessment, interdisciplinary exploration, and career connections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 4227. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definition of a qualifying investment to include an equity security issued by a qualifying portfolio company, whether acquired directly from the company or in a secondary acquisition, for purposes of the exemption from registration for venture capital fund advisers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4586. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4590. An act to require the Federal banking regulators to jointly conduct a study and develop a strategic plan to address challenges faced by proposed depository institutions seeking de novo depository institution charters; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5128. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 6528. An act to require owners of covered federally assisted rental dwelling units to install temperature sensors in such units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 6552. An act to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 6845. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 7180. An act to authorize the Director of the National Science Foundation to award grants to support research on the disruption of regular cognitive processes associated with COVID-19 infection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 7289. An act to provide for the National Academies to study and report on a Federal research agenda to advance the understanding of PFAS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 7734. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the timely production of reports to Congress under the Bank Secrecy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 27, 2022, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 144. An act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Indian Health Service, to acquire private land to facilitate access to the Desert Sage Youth Wellness Center in Hemet, California, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Susie Feliz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

*Donald R. Cravins, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Minority Business Development.

*David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration for a term of five years.

*Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Annie Caputo, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2026.

*Bradley R. Crowell, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2027.

*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.

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. RUBIO:

S. 4626. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide loans to manufacturers of energy grid products and components; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 4627. A bill to include smoke in the definition of disaster in the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASSE, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 4628. A bill to improve certain criminal provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4629. A bill to amend the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to modify requirements relating to data centers of certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 4630. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, to authorize appro-

priate disclosure of classified information, to appropriately limit the scope of the offense of disclosing classified information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4631. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the Deerfield River for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 4632. A bill to promote economic and commercial opportunities internationally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 4633. A bill to improve outcomes for Medicaid beneficiaries with major depressive disorder or other mental health conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 4634. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to administer polygraph examinations to certain foreign nationals with access to nonpublic areas or information of the National Laboratories; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 4635. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish an optional State-administered program to provide fully integrated, comprehensive, coordinated care for full-benefit dual eligible individuals under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRUZ, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 4636. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permanently bar aliens who are ordered removed after failing to appear at a removal proceeding, absent exceptional circumstances, from becoming permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 4637. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify the meaning of the term "frivolous application" with respect to asylum claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4638. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective oral contraceptive drugs intended for routine use; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4639. A bill to establish a North American Grasslands Conservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 4640. A bill to promote a 21st century energy workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 4641. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the use of funds for comprehensive reproductive health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 4642. A bill to require a comprehensive southern border strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 4643. A bill to conduct a study of the collection of biometric information by State law enforcement agencies, to establish a grant program to assist State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies to implement best practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4644. A bill to reestablish the Victims of Immigrant Crime Engagement Office to provide proactive, timely, adequate, and professional services to victims of crimes committed by removable aliens and the family members of such victims; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 4645. A bill to restrict the flow of illicit drugs into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 4646. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to shorten the timeframe for claims by beneficiaries and the payment of benefits under Department of Veterans Affairs life insurance programs, to improve the management of undisbursed life insurance benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4647. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to repeal a provision relating to an advanced impaired driving technology motor vehicle safety standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 4648. A bill to provide for the establishment of United States embassies in the Republic of Vanuatu, the Republic of Kiribati, and the Kingdom of Tonga, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 4649. A bill to amend the Global Food Security Act of 2016 to improve the comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. Res. 724. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the historic definition of a recession is 2 negative quarters of gross domestic product growth; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL):

S. Res. 725. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in State of Ohio v. Huston; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL):

S. Res. 726. A resolution to authorize testimony and representation in United States v. Herrera; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 190

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 190, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 744

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 744, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing incidents, and for other purposes.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1408, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1625, a bill to authorize notaries public to perform, and to establish minimum standards for, electronic notarizations and remote notarizations that occur in or affect interstate commerce, to require any Federal court to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any State, to require any State to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any other State when the notarization was performed under or relates to a public Act, record, or judicial proceeding of the notarial officer's State or when the notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food and vitamins and individual amino acids for digestive and inherited metabolic disorder under Federal health programs and private health insurance, to ensure State and Federal protection for existing coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 2403

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2403, a bill to assist those subject to politically motivated charges in Turkey, and for other purposes.

S. 2409

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2409, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2702, a bill to protect the voting rights of Native American and Alaska Native voters.

S. 3021

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3021, a bill to provide non-medical counseling services for military families.

S. 3483

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3483, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend in-

creased dependency and indemnity compensation paid to surviving spouses of veterans who die from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, regardless of how long the veterans had such disease prior to death, and for other purposes.

S. 3601

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3601, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to include breast pumps and other lactation supplies and equipment in disaster relief and emergency response.

S. 3605

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3605, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide formula grants to States to improve higher education opportunities for foster youth and homeless youth, and for other purposes.

S. 3797

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3797, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to support stillbirth prevention and research, and for other purposes.

S. 4003

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4003, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises.

S. 4061

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4061, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to modify the definition of water heater under energy conservation standards, and for other purposes.

S. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4105, a bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 4181

At the request of Mr. TESTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 4181, a bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to allow coronavirus State and local fiscal recovery funds to be used for low-income housing credit projects.

S. 4182

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 4182, a bill to direct

the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 4188

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4188, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 4203

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

S. 4260

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4260, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 4293

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4293, a bill to prevent unfair and deceptive acts or practices and the dissemination of false information related to pharmacy benefit management services for prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 4311

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4311, a bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to provide certain benefits to noncitizens, and for other purposes.

S. 4429

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4429, a bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to support workers who are subject to an employment loss, and for other purposes.

S. 4474

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4474, a bill to prohibit the declaration of a Federal emergency relating to abortion.

S. 4504

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Mary-

land (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4504, a bill to protect freedom of travel and reproductive rights.

S. 4514

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4514, a bill to grant certain authorities to the President to combat economic coercion by foreign adversaries, and for other purposes.

S. 4579

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4579, a bill to amend the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015, to extend certain deadlines applicable to pilot projects to increase Colorado River System water to address effects of historic drought conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 4608

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4608, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income de minimis gains from certain sales or exchanges of virtual currency, and for other purposes.

S. 4612

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4612, a bill to protect a person's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 724—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE HISTORIC DEFINITION OF A RECESSION IS 2 NEGATIVE QUARTERS OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT GROWTH

Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Ms. LUMMIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 724

Whereas, globally, the most commonly used and widely accepted definition of recession is 2 negative quarters of gross domestic product growth;

Whereas most of the recessions in the United States identified by the National Bureau of Economic Research have consisted of 2 negative quarters of gross domestic product growth and in each of the last 10 instances in which there have been 2 or more such quarters, a recession was officially declared;

Whereas use of the historic definition of a recession by the Federal Government has been important for purposes of economic

study and analysis, historic comparisons, and policy making: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should continue to use the historic definition of a recession.

SENATE RESOLUTION 725—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF OHIO V. HUSTON

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 725

Whereas, in the case of *State of Ohio v. Huston*, 22-CR-B01061, pending in Licking County Municipal Court in Newark, Ohio, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony, and, if necessary, documents from Aidan Gavin, an employee in Senator Rob Portman's office;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current and former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or documents relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Aidan Gavin, and any other current or former employee of Senator Portman's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *State of Ohio v. Huston*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Mr. Gavin and any current or former employee of Senator Portman's office in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 726—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. HERRERA

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 726

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. Herrera*, Cr. No. 21-619, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony from Jeffrey Kent, Director of the Press Photographers' Gallery, and from Nate Russell and Diego Torres, custodians of records in the Senate Recording Studio;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent

current or former officers and employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for evidence relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Jeffrey Kent, Director of the Press Photographers' Gallery, and Nate Russell and Diego Torres, custodians of records in the Senate Recording Studio, are authorized to provide relevant testimony in the case of *United States v. Herrera*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Messrs. Kent, Russell, and Torres, and any current or former officer or employee of their offices, in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 11:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

The Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 27, 2022, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until August 5, 2022: Emma Bozeman, Jake Tipton, Cameron Hall, Olivia Hardwick, Preston Dubberly, and Anna Pittman.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until July 28, 2022: Alex Vogel and Katelyn Wall.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2022

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 28, and that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 922, the nomination of Constance Milstein to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malta, as under the previous order; further, that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on confirmation of the Milstein nomination, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KELLY. 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 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 28, 2022, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF SPACE OPERATIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 9082:

To be general

LT. GEN. BRADLEY C. SALTZMAN

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be major

BENJAMIN C. MAY

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

To be major

WILLIAM P. COLEY

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

To be major

DAWNIE R. RAMIE

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

To be major

BRIAN A. HARRIS

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

To be major

DAVID E. ROBINSON

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

To be major

BRITTANY M. BAVER

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

To be major

LAUREN A. Z. OTT

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

To be major

DUSTIN L. CROWE

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

To be major

PRESTON T. CORRIGAN

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

To be major

MAYREM MORALES

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

To be major

RONALD J. GRIMLEY

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

To be major

TROY E. MENO

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

To be major

JEREMY T. MOSELLE

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

To be major

CHARLES J. HOWELL

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

To be major

SAMUEL P. LOCKHART

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

To be major

KATIE E. GRIMLEY

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

To be major

KIM E. WINTER

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

To be major

KATHRYN J. LYNN

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

To be major

JEFFREY F. BOOHER

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

To be major

ANTHONY K. ONITSUKA

IN THE ARMY

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

To be colonel

DUKE G. YIM

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

To be major

SEAN P. HUTCHISON