United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2022 *No. 53*

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Mighty God, in turbulent times throughout our history, You have answered us. Answer us again. Save and strengthen the Ukrainian people. Lord, deliver them from their peril. Grant them the desires of their hearts, and make their plans succeed. May they shout for joy when they receive Your answers to their many prayers.

Today, continue to provide our lawmakers with the wisdom to accomplish Your purposes on Earth. May they refuse to boast about their strength but, instead, boast about Your matchless might.

And, Lord, we thank You for the life and legacy of former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2022.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

AMERICA CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MANUFACTURING, PRE-EMINENCE IN TECHNOLOGY, AND ECONOMIC STRENGTH ACT OF 2022—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 4521, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4521) to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

Pending:

Schumer amendment No. 5002, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 5003 (to amendment No. 5002), to change the enactment date.

Schumer amendment No. 5004 (to amendment No. 5003), to change the enactment date.

Schumer amendment No. 5005 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 5002), to change the enactment date.

Schumer amendment No. 5006 (to amendment No. 5005), to change the enactment date.

Schumer motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with instructions to report back forthwith, Schumer amendment No. 5007, to change the enactment date.

Schumer amendment No. 5008 (to the instructions of the motion to commit (amendment No. 5007)), to change the enactment date.

Schumer amendment No. 5009 (to amendment No. 5008), to change the enactment date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, well, it was another busy and productive evening here on the Senate floor. Yesterday, we confirmed another six judges to important positions on the Federal bench and all of them, I am happy to say, with bipartisan support. We now have confirmed 56—56—judges under this Democratic Senate majority, and I thank my colleagues for their patience and for keeping the pace moving here on the floor last night.

There are two judges I am especially proud to have confirmed. First, we confirmed Hector Gonzalez to serve as a district judge for the Eastern District of New York. Mr. Gonzalez is a most deserving, most qualified, and most inspiring individual to serve as a judge. Born in Cuba, raised in Queens, he is the embodiment of the American dream.

We also finally confirmed a judge who has inspired me for more than a decade—Ali Nathan, now confirmed as circuit judge for the Second Circuit. When I first met her, I thought, ''Here is someone who is truly special,'' and I still believe that to this day. And, to boot, she increases the diversity of the court as only the second-ever openly

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

lesbian to sit on the Second Circuit—open lesbian on the Second Circuit. I believe that is in the whole Federal judiciary. We will check that.

The Second Circuit is one of the most consequential courts in the entire country, calling for only the best of the best to sit on the bench, and Ali Nathan fits the bill.

I am glad both of these nominees were confirmed with bipartisan support.

On the legislative front, the Senate is pressing ahead on bipartisan competition legislation to lower costs, boost American manufacturing, and fuel another generation of American scientific ingenuity.

For the information of all Senators, last night, I moved to file cloture on both the substitute amendment and the underlying legislation for our competitiveness legislation. As I have said previously, our plan has been to take up the House-passed version of this legislation and amend it with the exact same language the Senate approved last summer with bipartisan support, the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act.

Once we pass this amended bill, it will go back to the House, and they will be able to request a conference committee. As convoluted as the Senate process often is, the bottom line is that the train is moving forward when it comes to this bill.

A lot of Senators from both parties have worked for years to see legislation like this reach the President's desk. If the United States is to thrive in the 21st century, we need to keep our competitive edge in science and innovation, and this bill would do just that. We must continue growing American jobs. We must continue to lower the price of critical technologies like semiconductors, and this bill would do just that as well.

We have a few more steps to take before we reach a conference, but support of this bill is strong and bipartisan, and the process is moving forward.

RUSSIA

Madam President, on PNTR, negotiations are continuing on passing bipartisan legislation to strip Russia of permanent normal trade relations with the United States. This legislation is greatly needed and timely as President Biden continues meeting with European allies regarding Putin's despicable war on Ukraine.

The House passed PNTR by 424 to 8—424 to 8—and the Senate absolutely should pass it with equally strong bipartisan support. There is no justification to delay a popular policy that would deal a heavy, heavy blow on Putin's Russia, especially given that it got such strong Republican support, including from Leader MCCARTHY in the House.

Yesterday, I am happy to say, my team and I had a productive series of talks with Senators CRAPO, WYDEN, MANCHIN, and the White House. We reached an agreement with Senator CRAPO to move forward on PNTR as soon as we can, while addressing oil ban legislation separately. That way, the PNTR legislation can go right to the President's desk.

I hope the rest of my colleagues will get with the program quickly so we can send PNTR legislation to the President's desk as soon as possible. We need a little more work, but we are close to passing this urgent legislation.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Madam President, finally, on SCOTUS, after 3 marathon days of speeches and questions and answers, Judge Jackson's public testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee has concluded.

After watching the judge weather 3 long days before the Senate Judiciary Committee, my respect and my admiration for her have never been higher. There is not a shred of doubt in my mind that she merits confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Once again, a handful of Members on the other side—not all, just a handful—tried to smear the judge with misleading and downright false accusations. Once again, the judge remained poised, thoughtful, and strong in her answers.

As Senator BOOKER said yesterday, no amount of cynicism and nastiness could overshadow that Judge Jackson's nomination is a cause for celebration. She is not only a historic nominee; she is one of the most qualified nominees to ever come before the Judiciary Committee.

Yesterday, Chairman DURBIN announced that the Judiciary Committee will meet on Monday afternoon to begin the process of reporting Judge Jackson's nomination out of committee. There is nothing in Judge Jackson's record suggesting that the committee should have difficulty reporting her nomination out. Once the committee concludes its work, I will move to have her nomination come to the floor in short order. The Senate is on track to have Judge Jackson confirmed as Justice Jackson by the end of this work period.

I commend Judge Jackson for her excellent testimony over the course of this week. It is not easy to endure 3 days of testimony with the entire Nation watching, but Judge Jackson has erased any doubt that she is brilliant, she is beloved, and she belongs—unquestionably belongs—on the U.S. Supreme Court.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, I said I hoped the second day of Judge Jackson's responses would provide more clarity on some vital questions. Unfortunately, the nominee's answers trended the other way. Regarding the Court as an institution, the nominee continued to reject the examples of Justices Ginsburg and Breyer. She refused to denounce partisan Court packing. On judicial philosophy, the judge continued to deflect actually basic questions.

The lack of candor is especially troubling since the President sent us a nominee with no meaningful written record on constitutional matters. For more than 8 of Judge Jackson's 9 years on the Federal bench, she was a trial judge on the district court. As the nominee herself explained on Tuesday, that role neither requires a particular talent for constitutional interpretation nor gives judges much of a chance to exhibit one. She deflected a question about judicial philosophy by explaining that such questions do not often occur to her on the lower court.

District court records alone shed little light on what kind of Supreme Court Justice someone might be.

Now, Judge Jackson's current post on the DC Circuit is a much closer analog. The problem is, she has held that position for less than a year and has only published two opinions. Justice Gorsuch had authored 212 circuit court opinions before he was nominated to the Supreme Court. Justice Kavanaugh had written 306. Senators had an unbelievable wealth of writings to examine. As to Justice Barrett, in just 3 years on the Seventh Circuit, she had already written 91 appellate opinions, not to mention her many academic writings on constitutional law. Judge Jackson has written a total of two circuit court opinions—just two.

The only real body of evidence before the Senate is her record as a trial judge. Like I mentioned, those rulings communicate very little about the judge's approach to big-picture questions of interpretation. But to make matters worse, Judge Jackson declined to answer basic questions about those rulings. Senators asked about clear patterns in the judge's criminal sentencing decisions. The nominee deflected by saying every case is unique. So Senators tried to examine one case at a time. Then the nominee said she couldn't recall details. So Senators tried to supply the details. Then the nominee stonewalled and said no one case can fully capture a judge's record.

This made up an endless circle of evasion. Judge Jackson wouldn't address broad patterns in her rulings because she said it was unfair—unfair—for Senators to zoom out, and she wouldn't discuss specific cases because she said it was unfair for Senators to zoom in.

Since the only real body of evidence before the Senate is Judge Jackson's trial records, Senators asked why she consistently opposed weak sentences for certain crimes.

The nominee then ducked the question over and over. She blamed Congress for giving her that discretion in the first place. Both the nominee and then Chairman DURBIN kept repeating that if Senators wanted to guarantee harsher penalties, we could mandate them.

That is true, but it is a non sequitur.

Senators wanted to know why Judge Jackson used the discretion she actually did have in the specific ways she chose to use it. The Senators were trying to understand what this nominee does with discretion when she has it.

But, again, the nominee would not answer. She kept blaming the mere existence of her discretion for her decisions to go soft on criminals, when she could have just as easily used that discretion to be tough. We basically had a nominee saying that: If Senators want me to be tough on crime, you will have to change the laws to force me—force me—to do it.

In several egregious instances, from child exploitation to fentanyl trafficking, the nominee used especially unusual and creative legal moves that stretched the bounds of the judicial role. In the nominee's own words, she simply has a ''policy disagreement'' with parts of the sentencing law.

Evidently, the judge's personal policy views change how she applies the law.

Finally, I understand some Democratic Senators held a press conference yesterday to complain that Republicans' questions were too tough.

Of course, nobody could have less credibility to police the fine details of confirmation hearings than our Democratic colleagues on the Judiciary Committee. The last 48 hours were a dry and friendly legal seminar compared to the circus that Democrats inflicted on the country just a few years back.

The American people know it is not asking too much to ask a Federal judge legal questions about her record. I just wish the Senate had gotten more answers.

UKRAINE

Madam President, now on a different matter, today, President Biden is overseas meeting with America's closest European allies as Vladimir Putin's war in Ukraine enters its second month.

He is engaging with a Europe that has been profoundly changed. NATO allies have watched a neighbor invaded by an aggressive Russia. Some, like Germany, are ending 30 years—30 years—of post-Cold War neglect for military modernization and energy security.

I am glad that, as I urged last week, the President's itinerary will include not just Western Europe, but also Poland. His presence on the eastern flank will send an important message. Of course, the most concrete way to support Ukraine is with greater commitments of lethal aid. Ukrainian forces can win this fight.

Let me say that again. Ukrainian forces can win this fight. But they need more weapons, more ammunition, more fuel, and they need it all as fast as possible.

The allies and partners who are helping equip Ukraine also need replenishing their own arsenals. But the fight has highlighted shortcomings in both our current stockpiles of critical weapons and munitions and our industrial capacity to produce more quickly.

As other NATO members wake up to the importance of long-term investments in defense, America should lead by example. We have to meet the military requirements that come from being a superpower facing growing threats to our global interests: sustained increases in defense spending, deeper inventories of critical weapons systems and munitions, less redtape, work with industry to make our development and production systems more nimble.

This will not only help us meet the growing requirements of our military but also ensure we can be a reliable supplier of weapons and munitions to our allies and our partners.

As the Washington Post reported just yesterday, recent events have caught our defense industrial base napping.

Here is the quote from the Post:

[W]eapons manufacturers weren't geared up to make antitank and antiaircraft arms at a wartime pace. While the United States had 13,000 Stingers in its stockpile before the invasion, there were no plans to produce more en masse . . . Militaries in Europe that have given their Stingers and antitank missiles to Ukraine now want to refill depleted stocks, creating competition for new units rolling off the assembly line.

So President Biden already has real power to address this himself. The Defense Production Act was created during a period of tense competition with Russia to bolster production of critical military supplies. The exact circumstance we are in right now.

Ironically, the far left has demanded the President invoke the Defense Production Act for everything but—everything but—its central purpose. They don't want to use the Defense Production Act to bolster defenses, but, rather, to force taxpayer money into renewable energy schemes that are not ready for prime time. Democrats should be using the Defense Production Act to literally produce more defenses, but they want, instead, to use it to spin up some more Solyndras.

Of course, the real solution for global energy concerns is not throwing money into finicky technologies that themselves rely on Russian and Chinese supply chains. It is to unshackle U.S. energy producers. We can help meet Europe's needs by increasing American crude and LNG exports, but our European friends will have to make necessary sacrifices to wean themselves off of reliance on Russia.

Putin's war of aggression reminds us the so-called international order is not self-enforcing. The relative Pax Americana that has lasted for the better part of a century does not—not—sustain itself automatically. American leadership remains in very high demand.

Putin's unprovoked war has further discredited the small pockets in both of our political parties who want America to pull back from the world stage, who excuse the behavior of tyrants, who think it would be prudent and sensible to cede vast spheres of influence to Russia and China. There is nothing remotely prudent or sensible about handing over entire regions of the world to these thugs.

The national security interests of the United States have never stopped at our own borders, and they certainly do not today. We are a superpower with worldwide interests requiring a worldwide presence and a worldwide network of allies and partners. American power will not preserve itself. American security will not protect itself. American interests will not uphold themselves. And America's partners will not lead themselves.

This awesome responsibility falls on the shoulders of the President of the United States, the leader of the free world. President Biden has an opportunity as soon as he returns from Europe to begin charting the right course for America and the West.

On Monday, his administration will submit his budget request for the next fiscal year. We will see if the President finally commits to investing in a future of strong American leadership.

Our global challenges are not partisan issues; they are American issues. I sincerely hope that the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces submits a defense budget request that reflects this reality.

The world is dangerous and getting smaller. America must not shrink from the challenge, but rise and meet it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the Biden border crisis continues.

In February, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 164,973 individuals attempting to cross our southern border illegally—a 63-percent increase from a year ago and the highest February number in more than 20 years. Border encounters in February over the past decade or so have generally been low, with numbers far under 100,000—but not since President Biden was inaugurated. Almost from the day the President took office, our Nation has been experiencing an unprecedented border surge.

In fiscal year 2021, the Border Patrol encountered more than 1.7 million individuals attempting to cross our southern border—the highest number ever recorded. We have had 12 straight months of border encounters in excess

of 150,000. And these numbers only reflect individuals the Border Patrol has succeeded in apprehending. There is no question that many other illegal immigrants have crossed the border in the past year without being apprehended and have disappeared into the United States.

The situation at our southern border is out of control—it is a security crisis, it is a humanitarian crisis, and it is an enforcement crisis. Our Border Patrol officers have done heroic work this past year, but they are stretched incredibly thin and are having to spend too much time caring for migrants and not enough time patrolling the border.

This sharply increases the risk that dangerous individuals—from terrorists to drug smugglers to human traffickers—will slip across our southern border and into the country unnoticed.

And apart from the serious security concerns that go along with not knowing who is entering our country, allowing this border crisis to continue also presents serious humanitarian concerns. There is nothing compassionate about encouraging individuals to undertake the dangerous journey to our southern border, to run the risk of exploitation and disease and exposure. Unfortunately, neither humanitarian nor security concerns have moved President Biden to meaningfully address this border crisis.

Every month, we see massive numbers of individuals attempting to cross our southern border, and every month, the White House just doesn't seem to care. The President travels regularly, including regular weekends away from the White House, but he can't seem to bring himself to visit the border and see the situation firsthand.

It is a disturbing abdication of responsibility from the man charged with defending our Nation's security. And let's remember, the President isn't just ignoring this border crisis; he is partly, if not largely, responsible for it. Immediately upon taking office, the President took steps that weakened our Nation's border security.

On his first day in office—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. And he revoked a Trump administration order that called for the government to faithfully execute our immigration laws—all on the first day.

And the President's Department of Homeland Security also issued guidelines that same day pausing deportations except under certain conditions.

The effect of all this was to declare to the world that the United States borders were effectively open. And Border Patrol numbers ticked up accordingly, not surprisingly.

And the President's anti-border security efforts didn't end there. The President has significantly limited the ability of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection to enforce immigration laws. Deportations dropped precipitously during fiscal year 2021, as did arrests in the interior of the country. And earlier this week, the administration rescinded a 2019 rule expanding expedited removal for individuals here illegally.

The administration is also, reportedly, expected to end its title 42 COVID–19 restrictions, which have provided for the immediate deportation of those who have crossed the border illegally. The result is almost guaranteed to be an even larger surge at our southern border, taking the situation from disaster to utter catastrophe.

One media outlet reports that ''Department of Homeland Security intelligence estimates that perhaps 25,000 migrants already are waiting in Mexican shelters just south of the border for Title 42 to end.''

And there is no sign—no sign—that the administration has any substantive plan for how to deal with the resulting surge or how to deal with the enhanced criminal activity from drug smuggling to human trafficking that would likely accompany this influx.

I get that President Biden would prefer to pretend that this crisis at our southern border does not exist, but it does exist, and as President, he has the responsibility to address it. He needs to get serious about fulfilling that duty for the sake of our Nation's security and for the sake of all those who are being encouraged by his lax immigration policies to undertake the dangerous journey to our southern border.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Luger nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew M. Luger, of Minnesota, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota for the term of four years.

VOTE ON LUGER NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Rounds
Brown	Kelly	Sanders
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Luján	Stabenow
Cornyn	Markey	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Tillis
Durbin	Murkowski	Toomey
Ernst	Murphy	Van Hollen
Feinstein	Murray	Warner
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warnock
Graham	Padilla	Warren
Grassley	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Portman	Wyden

NAYS—36

Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Marshall	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Casey	Manchin
Cassidy	Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. WARNOCK assumed the Chair.)

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

The Senator from Kansas.

UKRAINE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I have lent my voice with my colleagues here in the U.S. Senate many times, here on the Senate floor, and elsewhere back home in Kansas in condemnation of Vladimir Putin's attack, invasion, the death and destruction that his actions—his sole actions—have taken on the people of Ukraine. But those actions have consequences broader than just within the borders of the independent country of Ukraine. I want today to bring awareness to a pressing consequence coming out of this invasion, and that is hunger.

A month ago, Russia, the world's largest supplier of wheat, invaded Ukraine. Ukraine is the fifth largest

supplier of wheat. Together, they account for about 30 percent of global exports. This has exacerbated—tremendously exacerbated—the already existing global food crisis, and it will only get worse.

Coming from a State like Kansas, coming from Kansas, America's largest supplier of wheat, I can tell you the effects this invasion will have on the stability of our ag markets here in the United States, and it should be alarming and could prove to be a catastrophic outcome for our global food supply.

When there is a shortage of food, one of the things we can do is produce more. I would tell you that while the prices of agricultural commodities we grow in Kansas and across the United States have increased, I also would tell you that the input cost—the things that a farmer or a rancher has to purchase in order to produce that crop, to produce that outcome—has increased even more dramatically.

I would encourage the administration and this Congress to do more in regard to the cost of everything. The increasing cost of food for the American consumer and the absence of food for many around the world can be alleviated by increasing the supply—can be addressed at least in part by increasing the supply.

To help do that, we need to make certain that we increase our own production of oil and natural gas and of fertilizer. The cost of fertilizer is a huge input cost for the Kansas farmer, and we still have tariffs on phosphates coming from Morocco. The Department of Commerce is contemplating tariffs on nutrients for fertilizer coming from Trinidad and Tobago.

Increasing the cost of the inputs of producing food is a very damaging thing to occur and should stop. We need to reduce the price—slow the increase in the price of diesel fuel and fertilizer. Natural gas is a major component of producing fertilizer, and diesel fuel is hugely important.

Again, we need to increase the supplies of our fossil fuels to help the farmers survive during these times.

Today, I wear on behalf of Kansans the sunflower pin. It is the State flower of our State, but it also is an important symbol in Ukraine. It is a symbol of the resistance to Putin's invasion.

Just as Kansas is the breadbasket of America, Ukraine is the breadbasket of Europe. Ukraine, as I said earlier, is a large grain-producing country, not just in wheat but a top 10 global exporter of corn, sunflower oil, and other commodities. It provides produce to markets not just in Europe but to some of the most vulnerable countries throughout the Middle East.

According to the magazine The Economist, ''The last time Egypt raised bread prices, the Soviet Union was still intact.''

Food stability is essential to political stability. We may recall that it was an increase in food prices that sparked mass protests throughout the Arab world a decade ago.

As we have seen in the humanitarian disaster unfolding in Afghanistan and the developing crisis caused by the invasion of Ukraine, it is critical to utilize every tool at our disposal to meet these challenges. And it extends much further than the countries we see in the news each day. Currently, 45 million people across 43 countries are on the brink of famine. Hunger isn't an isolated issue; it affects each and every one of us.

Prior to this assault, Afghanistan was facing a dire food shortage, with 23 million people going hungry. This will worsen as Putin's assault continues.

In Sudan, 87 percent of the country's wheat comes from Russia and Ukraine. By the end of this year, an expected 20 million people will be food insecure, one in two Sudanese.

In Bangladesh, despite progress in recent years, 11 million people are still suffering from acute hunger.

In Ethiopia, 20 million people currently require food support, and this will worsen as Putin's assault continues.

According to the U.N. agency chiefs, Yemen is teetering on the edge of an outright catastrophe.

The No. 1 driver of hunger on the planet is manmade conflict, according to the World Food Programme. As Russia's tyranny continues—this Putin-made war—countries around the globe will teeter on the edge, falling further into widespread hunger.

As the cochair of the Senate Hunger Caucus and a member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds Food for Peace and the McGovern-Dole Program—what I like to call Food for Peace and the Dole-McGovern Program—combatting any threat of hunger is not only the smart thing to do, it is the morally right thing to do to save the lives of not only those living in Ukraine but around the world.

In January and, again, earlier this month, I called on USDA Secretary Vilsack and USAID Administrator Power to release the resources within the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, an emergency international food assistance program to combat global hunger in times of ''exceptional need.'' The Emerson Trust was created in 1980 for a moment just like this: when existing global hunger programs cannot—cannot—adequately address the prospects of multiple looming famines.

As both the immediate and long-term effects on Ukraine's agriculture sector become clearer, the United States should work—the United States, with the rest of the world, should work to quickly provide the necessary commodities through sale or donation to meet countries' unsatisfied food and commodity needs. Doing so will help alleviate a greater humanitarian crisis than has already been caused by the unprovoked invasion and will help foster political stability in food-insecure countries.

We are seeing the worst of evil—Putin's invasion of Ukraine—and the tremendous cost—humanitarian cost, loss-of-freedom cost—by that invasion. We can also see the best in humanity: helping a starving world to be fed.

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.

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

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

RECOGNIZING WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY VIKINGS WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about supply chain issues, but before I do, I wanted to say a word about March Madness.

I am pretty sure that most of my colleagues who know me think the next words out of my mouth are going to be something about a small Jesuit school in the eastern part of our State, but it is not. What I am going to talk about is congratulating the Western Washington University Vikings Women's Basketball team Division II final championship game players.

The Vikings will be playing in the NCAA Division II Championship after defeating North Georgia last night with a score of 74 to 68. It was an outstanding performance by Brooke Walling, Emma Duff, and the entire team that represents people from all over our State—Everson, Tumwater, Monroe, Vancouver, Arlington, Marysville, Napavine, Ferndale, and various other places.

I also want to congratulate Head Coach Carmen Dolfo, who is in, I think, her 31st season leading the Vikings, and the fact that this is such a great accomplishment for the women of Western Washington.

I hope that we will continue to figure out ways to promote women's basketball in the NCAA tournament. I watched this game last night and saw a few people from our State who had made it there to cheer on the Vikings, but the actual pavilion looked pretty empty. Yet I guarantee you it was great basketball.

We need to continue to encourage the NCAA to figure out ways to promote women's NCAA March Madness. They are great players, they are great teams, and they deserve to have the same kind of attention. So we look forward to cheering them on in that final NCAA tournament Division II game.

H.R. 4521

Now, Mr. President, I would like to come to the floor and talk about a continuation of our supply chain challenges that we are facing in the United States of America, particularly around the issues facing us in the high cost of cars, electronics, and appliances. Actually, you can say that our chip supply chain issues actually impact just about

everything because, yesterday, we had a hearing with major producers of chip semiconductors in the United States and also talked with one of the witnesses who happens to be in the freight business, because they produce trucks that are moving freight throughout the United States of America.

They said the fact that they can't get these new generation trucks out the door because of the semiconductor shortage means that it is even impacting the cost of freight of every product.

So I implore my colleagues to come to the floor and support sending the bill back to the House, telling them that we want to go to conference, and get into conference as soon as possible.

Those who want to delay this are just delaying the United States in our competition with the world in producing and manufacturing great product. If you don't have the best chips, if you don't have the manufacturing, you are not going to lead.

We already know that in 2021, we needed 1.2 trillion chips per year. In 2031, that is going to be 2 trillion chips per year. So we know that this shortage is going to continue far into the future unless we act.

Why is this so important? Obviously, there are sectors like energy, transportation, high-tech, communications, national security—they all depend on us acting. But believe it or not, there are companies all throughout the United States right now that are looking at this issue on supply chain and saying: Are we going to make moves to take the supply chain back into the United States right now?

I am saying, they are making these decisions this month. They are making these decisions next month. But there are some here who think that we can dillydally along and maybe take months and months and months to reconcile these two bills. They are absolutely wrong.

I guarantee you, the Europeans are not waiting. The Europeans have decided they are going to fund this investment. They are going to continue to move faster than the United States of America to decide to do the next level of investment in semiconductors.

So are we just basically saying to those U.S. manufacturers and other companies that have products: Well, if you want the next generation chips, maybe you should locate in Europe?

Do not think this is an idle issue; it is not. There is great competition for the demand for these semiconductors, but some here want to wait months and months and months before we get to the resolution of this issue.

We need to send a signal to the market that the United States is determined to be a leader in this area, that we are determined for our national security and manufacturing competitiveness, and that we are going to build the best chips in the world. And for the supply chain, we want that supply chain here in the United States of America.

But, again, some of our colleagues here would like to wait months and months and months to have that debate. We have already waited 286 days since the Senate passed, in a bipartisan measure, this particular proposal. And now, again, people want to hold up this process because they don't quite understand the pain at the pump.

This is the demand increase that we are going to see in semiconductors, as I said, by 2030. There is a demand increase of 200 percent. There is a demand increase in the wireless sector, 60 percent by 2030; consumer electronics, 80 percent by 2030. What are we waiting for? What are we waiting for?

We know there is demand. We know that we can make these chips. We know, as one of my colleagues said, if something happened with Taiwan, where they are making a lot of the leading-edge chips, the table is going to be turned on the United States. What would we do then? It is not like a little situation, like we are talking about now with shortages and huge price increases. What would we do if the major supply coming out of Taiwan was affected?

We have to get busy here and work on this legislation and start focusing on the fact that it is affecting our consumers right now.

The price increase for our consumers is a 41-percent increase in the cost of a car, for a used car today. If you think about it, we estimated that a used car or truck that cost $5,000 a year ago now costs $7,000—so a 41-percent increase. That is $2,000 that a young family that could be going on a vacation or taking care of something in the house or maybe making a downpayment on a home or buying groceries or taking care of rent, now, they have an extra $2,000 if they just want to get a car to get them to and from work.

That is what we are talking about. We are talking about real impacts that are happening in real people's lives today, and some here are cavalier about these costs. They think this is all about how long are they going to wait until they give the President of the United States another victory, and that is a wrong approach. The approach should be: What are we going to do to deal with the high cost of products that we now don't have because of supply chain disruptions, and what are we going to do to resolve these issues?

I will debate anybody on either side of the aisle who does not want to move forward on this bill because they don't like the approach. Maybe they don't like the concept of the United States making an investment here. But I will tell you, it is very clear that the United States has fallen behind. It is very clear that we went from 36 percent of the market down to 12. And if we do nothing, we are going to fall even worse, and we won't have any of the supply chain here. It will be located in other places.

I know the American people get this in an intuitive fashion. The information age is run by semiconductors that increase their capacity to translate more, to translate in the automobile the voice-activated commands, to do the intricacies of communications, as I know the Presiding Officer knows, on the issues of communication and national security. We have to depend on these for our national security.

We need to quit wasting our time here. These issues are, and my colleagues know well—come and make your vote. Make your vote, but quit holding up a bipartisan discussion by both Houses on facing a supply chain shortage that is affecting Americans every single day.

If you do nothing, this demand is going to continue to increase, and we are going to continually be falling behind.

So I plead with my colleagues: Put this aside and vote the way you want to vote, but let's get to conference.

Let's show the American people that we can collaborate on solving our supply chain problems, on trying to be serious about sending signals to the automotive industry, to the communications sector, to the national security sector. Bring the supply chain back, put it here in the United States of America, and let's get busy doing what we know how to do best, and that is innovate and make America competitive.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6968 AND H.R. 7108

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as I have said all week long, there has been an imperative for the Senate to unite and quickly pass legislation stripping Russia of normal trade relation status with the United States. The House has acted; the White House supports it.

As the President meets with our allies in Europe, it is very important we send a message to the world that we are united in making sure Putin pays a heavy price for his war on Ukraine. After the House passed PNTR last week by 424 to 8, including the support from Leader MCCARTHY, it is unreasonable and deadly wrong for the Senate not to do the same, especially while the President is abroad. So we are seeking consent to move this legislation forward ASAP.

After a day of long negotiations yesterday, I reached an agreement with Senator CRAPO, with concurrence from Senators WYDEN and MANCHIN, to move forward on PNTR while also taking action on oil ban legislation separately.

Now, I understand that Senator PAUL has further objection and is demanding we amend this agreement with a major change to the legislation. Senator PAUL appears to be the lone Senator demanding this. I believe that all other 99 Senators are in agreement to proceed.

Look, all of us want to see this bill move quickly because it is so very much needed and it is so bipartisan. I

am willing to include, as part of our unanimous consent right now, that Senator PAUL be entitled to have his amendment with a majority vote threshold.

The question before Senator PAUL is, even though the vote was 424 to 8 in the House and is very bipartisan here in the Senate, is he going to tank PNTR because his arcane interpretation is not forced into the bill? Can Senator PAUL take yes for an answer? Can he let us move forward today to hold Putin accountable?

Every Senator would like his proposal or her proposal put in the bill, but in the Senate, we vote; and we are willing to give the Senator a vote, even though we greatly disagree with his interpretation of the law that is here.

I truly, I earnestly, and I strongly hope that my Republican colleague does not object to bipartisan legislation that would deal a heavy, heavy blow on Putin's Russia, especially after the House of Representatives acted with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Many of our Republican colleagues have criticized the Biden administration for supposedly not acting quickly enough on Putin, but now, one Republican Senator is holding up this overwhelmingly bipartisan bill. I strongly hope some of my other Republican colleagues can persuade Senator PAUL to accept our agreement here so that we can move forward. Let us be equally resolute in standing with Ukraine and fighting back against Putin's brutal war by passing PNTR in the Senate right away.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of H.R. 6968, the Russian Oil Ban, and H.R. 7108, Russia PNTR, both of which are at the desk; that there be 2 hours for debate on the bills en bloc equally divided between the two leaders or designees; that it be in order for Senator CRAPO, or a designee, to offer the Crapo-Wyden amendment at the desk to H.R. 6968; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided prior to the vote on the amendment; that it be in order for Senator PAUL to offer the amendment at the desk to H.R. 7108; that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to a vote on the Paul amendment, and that these be the only amendments in order to either bill; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bills be considered read a third time en bloc and the Senate vote on passage of H.R. 7108, as amended, if amended, and H.R. 6968, as amended, if amended; finally, that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I think it is incredibly important that we read bills before we vote on them, that we have adequate debate, and that we really understand what we are doing.

The Magnitsky Act was originally an act that sought to sanction people in Russia—still does—but was expanded beyond Russia, and now, this bill would expand it further.

When you are going to sanction people, there has to be an argument about whom you are going to sanction, so the original Magnitsky Act has in law that you would sanction people who have gross violations of internationally recognized human rights. Well, that sounds good, but the Magnitsky Act goes a step further and defines what these are. Gross violations of human rights include torture; cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment; punishment or long detention without charges and trial; causing the disappearance of persons by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons—a lot of this applies to, really, what happened to Magnitsky; this was named after him because of what happened to him—other flagrant denials of the right to life, liberty, and the security of the person.

What we are having happen right now is sort of—they are trying to pull a fast one, basically. We are going to get rid of all definitions of gross human rights, and we are going to replace them with not a list of things like torture and murder, indefinite detention; we are going to replace it with the words ''serious human rights abuse.''

Well, it still sounds pretty good, but it is like, what does that mean? The problem is that many different people have different definitions of rights. The left, including the U.N., believes you have a right to an abortion, to a house, to the internet, to healthcare. So you can see how, if you have wide-open, vague, vastly ambiguous language, someone could be President and say: The leader of that country is denying the human right to abortion, so therefore, we must sanction them. Without any sort of tribunal, without any sort of due process, they would just simply sanction them. Or what if they are not providing the internet?

So the thing is, words are important. You can't have vacuous sort of definitions. Where did this definition—it came from the Trump administration. So basically, what they are trying to do is mirror the Trump administration, which gave unlimited authority to the President. It is kind of surprising, for all the superficial rhetoric and opposition to President Trump, that they are trying to adopt his language now. But this language also comes from the Biden administration because the one thing Presidents have in common is they like unlimited power without checks and balances.

If this language goes through, it will remove any checks and balances or any definitions as to what human rights abuses are. It is a terrible mistake. It is rash, and we shouldn't do it.

I have offered an amendment, and I will offer it here in a moment. My amendment simply includes the definition that I just read. Gross violation of human rights—torture, cruel and inhumane treatment, indefinite detention. That is what we would put in the bill, is the actual definition. These aren't my words; these are the words of the mostly Democrats who wrote the bill, the Magnitsky Act.

What they are trying to do is take the Magnitsky Act and drive an enormous hole in it that you can push anything through and do sanctions on anybody, anywhere in the world, based on a vague, ambiguous, and vast definition that is not specific.

All I am asking is that you keep the Magnitsky Act. The irony here is the very authors of the Magnitsky Act are on the floor saying: We don't want the Magnitsky Act anymore. We want a big, enormous hole, that the President can sanction anybody in the world anytime.

It is a terrible idea. It is ripe for abuse from a President.

Many on the other side had arguments with the previous President, and they worried about him having unlimited power. So they want to give unlimited power to their President because they like him better. Well, guess what? I am an equal opportunity, ecumenical kind of guy who says: No President should have vast powers. All Presidents' powers should be circumspect. All Presidents' powers should be controlled.

All I am asking for is that we pass the original Magnitsky Act. So this is going to be forever. This isn't a year or 2. When we first started into the Magnitsky Act, we were going to do it for just a year or 2 and see how it is going. This is forever. It will never come back up again. And we are doing it with 5 minutes' worth of debate, not going through a committee, and we are just simply going to say: Do whatever you want. Sanction anybody in the entire world.

It is a huge mistake, it is a huge expansion of government power, of Presidential power, and it will lead to abuse. And I promise you, the moment there is a Republican President back in the White House, the other side will be squawking, saying: Why is he doing this? Why is he doing this?

So I would say take a step back. We could talk about this over the next several days. We could come to an agreement. I have even said we could expand the definition. The definition of ''gross violation of human rights'' from Magnitsky should not be thrown away. And we could add to it. If there are other things, such as corruption, that you don't think are included, give us some words, and we will talk about it and see if we can come to a compromise. That is what was offered, and what we get back is that, oh, everybody else agrees on the other side, so I should be quiet. I am talking about something that is arcane. This is your

language. This is the Magnitsky Act from the last 5 years, and you are calling it arcane?

This is a very reasonable request. It is a very unreasonable request to ram this down the throats of Americans, to expand Presidential power with no checks and balances, and I absolutely object to it.

I will offer as a counter, though, a unanimous consent request that is at the desk to have my amendment pass immediately, and if my amendment is passed immediately, that the remaining request from Senator SCHUMER be passed as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Before I yield to my friend from the State of Maryland, the author of the Magnitsky Act, let me just say this to my good friend from Kentucky: Every Senator would like their amendment to be easily inserted into a bill, but in the Senate, we vote. I am offering the Senator a vote on his amendment. If each Senator said ''my way or the highway,'' we would have total paralysis even on an important piece of legislation like this.

I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I reserve the right to object in regard to the Senator from Kentucky's request.

Mr. President, first, let me just correct some of the statements that were made. This bill went through the committee. It was voted on in the committee. Amendments were offered in the committee. The Senator from Kentucky was present during the markup in the committee. That is the way legislation should be considered in this body.

We are talking about how the Senate can work the way it should? Let the committees function. And that is exactly what we did in regard to the legislation that is on the floor. It went through the regular process. And the Senator's request is despite the fact that the majority leader has said he will allow a vote on the floor and let the Members of the Senate make the decision as to whether they agree or disagree with the arguments made by the author of the amendment. That is how a democracy should work. That is how the legislative process should work.

So I am somewhat shocked that the Senator would object to the majority leader's request that would allow the legislation to come to the floor and let the Senate work its will by majority vote. That is what the majority leader said.

Let me give you a little bit more history on this. The original Magnitsky bill was originally attached to the PNTR for Russia, and it was aimed solely at the tragic death of Sergei Magnitsky. We wanted to hold those responsible for his death accountable. That is why the language the Senator is referring to was included in the original act. It was aimed at one episode and one set of abusers.

It became such a successful tool for diplomacy that, working with Senator McCain, the two of us worked on making it a global bill so that it would apply beyond just Russia and that we could use this to advance American foreign policy.

And we worked—and quite frankly, we didn't have the enthusiastic support of the administration because the Senator from Kentucky is right: Administrations like to have their own authority; they don't like Congress to intercede. And on the Magnitsky, we can make recommendations as to who should be considered for sanctions. So it was a major step forward, and we were able to pass Global Magnitsky.

In the meantime, President Trump worked with us on this. He was a supporter of using this tool. And he passed an Executive order—signed an Executive order, that included provisions that we asked him to include in the Executive order because we recognized that corruption was the fuel for Mr. Putin and Russia and authoritarian regimes. So we wanted to make sure that we could include corruption. We wanted to make sure that we could include the enablers—those who enabled these human rights abusers to do what they do, and that was included in the Executive order.

And we worked with the Trump administration. And we have worked with the Biden administration. And we now have a workable standard. And better than that, as a result of our leadership, we have gotten our countries around the world to conform to our tool. The European Union has passed Global Magnitsky. The UK has passed Global Magnitsky. Canada has passed Global Magnitsky. Japan is considering it as we speak.

It is becoming the standard. So from a process point of view, what was passed out of our committee, what was passed out of the House committee, both authorizing committees have agreed on this language, which has been signed off by Treasury so they know they can use it, which has due process in it because we are dealing with property rights.

So now let's get to the substance of what the gentleman's amendment would do. The substance of it is that it would not allow us to do what we need to do in regards to Mr. Putin and Russia as a result of his invasion of Ukraine. And the sponsor of this amendment is very clear what he is trying to do. He is trying to take back the current authority under the Executive order and would, therefore, not even be useful at all in regards to going after Mr. Putin.

We would be taking a step back. It was just a few days ago that President Zelenskyy asked us to expand the individual sanctions, and that is what is on the floor right now in the majority leader's request, so we can expand it, we can give him the tools he needs, so that we can respond and help the people of Ukraine. That is what is involved here.

But with the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, we would be moving backwards. We would be doing just the opposite. It would weaken where we are today. So I am really puzzled as to why we can't trust the judgment of the Members of the Senate to make this decision. Let's argue over the 2 hours that the majority leader will give us to argue this point. I look forward to that argument on the floor of the Senate. I already had that argument in our committee. Because the two—the gentleman from Kentucky and I, along with the Presiding Officer, served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We had this argument in committee. And if I am correct, I believe, the vote was all but one supporting my position.

So we have already had this debate where it should take place among the experts. And the gentleman's not satisfied with that. I am at a loss here because I know how important it is for us to move forward to help the people of Ukraine.

Every day, we see the bodies on the ground. We see the horrific action by Mr. Putin, and we really want to do everything we can to help the people of Ukraine. The action the majority leader is asking us to take will help the people of Ukraine. And as I understand it, one Senator is going to deny us the opportunity to take a very positive step, to stand up for democracy, and for standing up for the people of Ukraine.

I object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard to the modification.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to keep my remarks short and simple. America and the world need immediately the toughest possible sanctions against the Russian oligarchs, who are working constantly to devise Byzantine schemes to get around the kind of sanctions that are in this trade bill.

We all understand what is at issue here, and that is that we need to move quickly. We need to move while the President is mobilizing the collective strength of our allies.

And I am interested in working with all of my colleagues. With the majority leader's leadership, we have been working for days on this. But what is important—and our friend from Maryland has touched on it—is that we not just relitigate what came up in one committee or another, if it is going to hold up the essential task ahead, and that is that these oligarchs who are Putin's

best allies and are working with him constantly to figure out ways to get money to fuel the Putin war machine—what they really don't want is what the sanctions will do: rein them in and limit them as they continually try to devise these schemes.

So I would just urge my colleagues—and we are here to continue to work on this—to get this done and get it done now because to do otherwise allows the oligarchs and all their lawyers and financial managers to look at what is happening in the U.S. Senate. And those oligarchs say, ''Doesn't look like there is going to be anything right now—don't have to worry immediately.''

The Senate is better than this. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill, which would impose the harshest economic consequences of a generation on the Russians, and particularly the oligarchs, who have done so much to prop Putin up against the odds.

Pass this bill. Pass it now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today's powerful new sanctions against hundreds of Putin allies are another critical step in U.S. leadership, bringing our allies together to ratchet up pressure on Russia to halt its brutal invasion of Ukraine.

I think Putin has been shocked by a couple things. Putin has been shocked that the Ukrainians have had such furious, effective, courageous resistance. He didn't see that coming.

The other thing that shocked Putin has been the skill with which President Biden assembled this coalition of countries to stand up to Putin, to provide assistance to refugees and assistance to Ukrainians in their country, to provide military assistance, and to put the squeeze on sanctions against Russia.

He has assembled this coalition skillfully, including countries like Germany and Sweden and Finland and Switzerland, even—countries that never really played here and nobody really expected. And Biden has brought them in, in a coalition, and extracted—and with the right kind of target on sanctions.

In addition to sanctioning the banks and the oil companies, in addition to sanctioning the oligarchs and Putin himself, the President is announcing now sanctioning Russian parliamentarians and the Parliament itself, the Russian Duma, a dozen more Russian arms merchants and defense firms that have enabled this war, and additional Putin cronies, including the CEO of Russia's largest bank.

I don't understand opposition to what we are trying to do. I don't know. Do we have Members of this Senate, perhaps, that, for whatever reason, side with Putin or side with the oligarchs? I don't know. But this is legislation we ought to be able to get moving quickly through this body as it did in the House.

As long as Putin's invasion goes on, we will continue to lead the world, turning up the heat and weakening Russia's war machine.

Today, I come to the floor to support the removal of permanent normal trade relations with Russia. It is not, as the Presiding Officer from Maryland knows—it is not the first time a number of us have been concerned about our government's mistakes, in large part, because of corporate lobbying on permanent normal trade relations with countries around the world.

One of worst decisions ever made in this body, or at least in recent history, and the damage it did to manufacturing in the industrial Midwest and elsewhere, was giving permanent normal trade relations to China and the advantages that gave them.

American companies, always in pursuit of cheaper labor, if going south wasn't good enough—they would go to Mexico and then they would go to China, close the plants in Ohio or Western Maryland, move to China, open up plants there with cheap labor and with pretty much nonexistent environmental regulations, and then ship those jobs back to the United States. That was permanent normal trade relations with China that we gave them some 20 years ago. It was a horrible mistake, but, today, this is about—for a different reason—permanent normal trade relations with Russia that we have granted.

The President has already committed to ending permanent normal trade relations with Russia, and the House has already passed a bill ending PNTR with Russia, so what are Senate Republicans waiting for?

Russia should not have free and unlimited access to America's economy or to the global economy. There should be no place for Putin and his cronies to hide.

We are trying to get this done in the Senate. I was on the floor yesterday hoping we could see this done then. Twenty-four hours more have passed; 24 hours more of Putin attacking, as a war criminal, people in Ukraine, people who are innocent, people who should never have to deal with this; another night in Ukraine under fire from an unprovoked Russian advance on civilian families; another day of destruction of civilian buildings in peaceful cities.

So waiting every day hurts the Ukrainian people. We need to do our part to give the President immediate legal authority he needs to work with our allies on this to shut off access to favorable tariff treatment for Russia's goods here and around the world.

Senator PAUL, one Republican Senator, needs to relent to let us pass this. I mean, I know what LIZ CHENEY, a Member of the House, the daughter of Vice President Cheney under President Bush—I know what she said some time ago, and she is a Republican. She talked about the Putin wing of the Republican Party.

I have no idea who in this body is in the Putin wing of the Republican Party, but I do know that there is resistance on the other side of the aisle to doing what we need to do to give President Biden even more tools to do even more than he has already done in this.

The bill passed the House with a nearly unanimous vote. We need to finalize it in the Senate so we can ratchet up the pressure further, cut off Russia's ability to finance its unprovoked invasion of another member country in the World Trade Organization.

Even before this war, we knew that Russia, like China, games the rules. They cheat on trade. I said it yesterday on the floor: They subsidize their industries. They pollute the environment to gain that unfair advantage. It is cheaper to make something if you don't dispose of waste or you put contaminants into the air instead of disposing of them in another way.

Ohioans know all too well about being forced to compete with countries that cheat.

Why have we let another day go by with this still on the books? If we don't remove it now, Russia will continue to use the status to position their industries in the global market, hurting American companies in the process.

It is not a partisan issue. A couple weeks ago—almost a month ago—I introduced the bicameral, bipartisan bill with Senator CASSIDY of Louisiana to remove Russia's permanent normal trade relations status. There is bipartisan support to do this quickly.

I have worked with my colleague Senator CRAPO on many Russia sanctions efforts over the years. I trust him. I know we share the same goals, but it is Senator PAUL, speaking for whomever on this, not letting this bill through.

I am hopeful there is a path forward. I hope we can work out differences quickly. The majority—an overwhelming majority of this body wants to move. We all—we should all stand together saying countries that invade a sovereign nation will not have free and unrestricted access to our economy, period.

Again, countries that invade another sovereign nation will not—should not—have free and unrestricted access to our economy. It is time to come together to end permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, Vladimir Putin has continued to wage horrific war against Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. This invasion, waged upon the profits of Russia's oil and gas empire, has caused destruction and devastation beyond measure.

We must denounce Putin's war of choice, and we must call out profiteering and the ricochet effects of that conflict that affect Americans and others across the world.

This connection to conflict is only possible as a result of the fallacy of

American energy independence from oil and gas extraction—a lie that has been sold by the American Petroleum Institute or the ''American Prevarication Institute,'' as they should be called. For years, the oil and gas industry has sold Americans more snake oil than actual oil, promising security and safety in exchange for unlimited drilling, unlimited exports, unlimited profits for Big Oil and Big Gas in the United States. And after yet another year of price spikes caused by Putin and profiteering, it is time to say enough is enough with these false promises and crocodile tears from the American Petroleum Institute, from ExxonMobil, from Chevron, from all of these companies.

President Biden was right to follow my SPIGOT Act and the bipartisan consensus in the House and Senate to ban all oil imports from Russia. The only way to end Putin's oil- and gas-funded wars is to cut off his oil- and gas-funded piggy bank, which comes, unfortunately, historically, from American consumers at the pump buying Russian oil for their cars. That has to end. And, thankfully, President Biden has now made that decision.

And it is because we have a moral moment here to provide all possible humanitarian aid to the Ukrainian people. We have a moral moment here to cut off the money pipeline that is funding the missiles and the tanks that are destroying the homes of innocent people in Ukraine. And we have a moral moment that ensures that we take the action to build a better world that is safe from the climate-change-fueled crisis. But our ability to meet this moral moment hinges on what we do next on the floor of the U.S. Senate, what action we take to respond to this obvious crisis that we have on the planet, all related to this oil- and gas-fueled military invasion of Ukraine—the tanks, the planes, the soldiers—all paid for by oil and gas money.

We could fail to meet this moral moment by accepting the bad faith arguments from Big Oil, which is using this horrifying invasion to push for more drilling and money to fossil fuel companies with more lands and waters lost to extraction, more profit for Big Oil at the expense of American pocketbooks; or we can meet the moral moment that the United States is willing to lead with innovation, moving away from global oil chaos and closer to clean, cheap, domestic renewable energy sources—sources that will not fall victim to price hikes from despots, dictators, and criminals overseas.

Now, we have all heard the Big Lie from Big Oil, FOX News, and the GOP, the Gas and Oil Party. Their message is: All you need to do is give us a few more leases, cut a few more regulations, provide us with a few more subsidies, and then we will be on our way to energy independence.

Trust the oil and gas companies, they say, and FOX News says, ''Yes, trust the oil and gas industry,'' but that argument is leakier than an old oil tanker, and it has been proven again and again.

If Big Oil wanted to make us energy independent, they would have already done it. Instead, they resort to their Big Lie.

So here are the facts:

Big Oil is sitting on 11,000 unused oil and gas leases, and 9,000 of those leases are on Federal lands in the United States. They have already been purchased by the oil and gas industry, mostly for $2 an acre, but they have got them; and 2,000 leases are offshore, in the waters of the United States, and they have all been already approved for drilling.

Big Oil also has 6,000 partially drilled wells that they can use to drill right now. In other words, they have already done the drilling, and they are still not going there right now, on an emergency basis, to produce that additional oil and gas.

Why is that?

Because rather than using the resources they already have to drill, they are using this crisis as an excuse to get more leases, more wells, more profit for themselves while sitting on, squatting on, the existing leases they already have that could produce the additional oil and gas that they say they want to produce. Of course, they don't want to produce that oil or else they would be doing it already. They just want more leases that they can sit on and profit from in the years ahead.

In terms of solving this crisis that we have right now, they can do it if they want, but they don't want to because it might actually drive down the price of oil or it might drive down the price of natural gas if they produce more here.

So this is not a problem of governmental overreach. If you don't trust me on this, how about trusting the oil executives themselves. In a recent survey, 60 percent of oil executives said that investors are keeping them from drilling. Just 10 percent pointed to regulations. These are the oil company executives. They say it is the investors—the millionaires in their companies—who don't want to drill, not Federal regulations.

Remember the Keystone Pipeline—the pipeline that the Republicans wanted so they could be energy independent?

In 2015, every single Republican on the floor of the U.S. Senate voted against my amendments to ban the exports of that oil from the Keystone Pipeline. They kept saying then it would lead to energy independence, and when I said, ''Fine. Let's have an amendment that says it cannot be exported,'' every single Republican voted no—allow it to be exported out of our country.

These crocodile tears from the Republican Party—from the GOP, Gas and Oil Party—are just so predictable, and it comes back every single time.

Big Oil has kept up their export shenanigans. In 2021, we exported 8.6 million barrels of oil a day while importing 8.4 million barrels per day. Last year, we imported, on average, 600,000 barrels of oil a day from Russia. At the same time, we exported the same amount to China. That is what the Republican Party and the gas and oil industry got in 2015 when we lifted the ban on the export of American oil. That is not energy independence; it is profit dependence of the American people on the agenda of Big Oil and Big Gas.

The Gas and Oil Party doesn't want to drill for oil here in America to protect Americans from economic harm; they want to do it for their own economic benefit. Big Oil has a need for greed. The Republican Party, as we just heard in the confirmation hearing, kept talking about crime in the streets. No. The big problem is crime in the suites—crime in the oil and gas executive suites of our country—and the Republican Party's inability to stand up to them so that we have true energy independence in our country. In 2021, while consumers sacrificed at the pump, with gas prices increasing by 50 percent, Big Oil made over—get this number—$200 billion in profits.

That is what is happening. That is why they don't want to drill—because the price of oil might come down; therefore, their profits might come down, but they have built all the leases they need right now. This isn't about energy supply for consumers; it is about Big Oil's demand for profits for their shareholders and for their executives. That is what the agenda of the oil and gas industry in America is all about, not American security, not American consumers, not American environmental and healthcare issues, but the profits of their executives.

We don't need sacrifice in our country. We need innovation. We need a way to ensure that we unleash all of the potential, which we have, in our country in order to tap into all of our rich natural resources. Instead of supporting energy independence and getting out of the way of a real domestic, clean energy boom, Big Oil would rather force consumers to sacrifice with high prices at the gas pump.

We don't need Americans to sacrifice by paying high gas prices. Instead, we need to innovate and install clean energy solutions. This is our short-term and our long-term solution to price disruptions, climate chaos, environmental injustice, and wars paid for with oil and gas profits—much of it war profiteering.

Here are some more facts:

An additional 16 million electric vehicles on the road would replace all of the oil that we currently import from Russia. Let me say that again. If we would just deploy 16 million all-electric vehicles, we would back out all the oil from Russia. The next 16 million all-electric vehicles would back out all the Saudi oil that we import into the United States. ''EVs'' just doesn't stand for ''electric vehicles''; it also

stands for ''ending violence''—getting the United States tied up into situations around the world because of all of the money that these wealthy oil states get from the United States.

Here is another way to break it down:

We can put 5 million electric vehicles on the road, 5 million heat pumps in homes, and replace 75 percent of our public bus fleet with electric buses and still back out all the oil we import from Russia. In the time it would take to implement these measures, we can release the already congressionally mandated sales of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to give consumers relief at the gas pump.

We can accomplish all of this by passing my SAVE Consumers Act with Senator HEINRICH, which would grant the President additional authority to implement energy efficiency standards and release another 265 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve by the end of 2023.

We can do this. We can deploy the Strategic Petroleum right now, invest in a renewable, clean energy agenda, and actually produce enough energy that substitutes for all the Russian oil and do so in a very brief period of time; but we have to commit to destroying the demand by Putin's dirty energy business model by powering our own country with clean, American-made renewable energy. We can power our way to peace. We can power our way to stopping the most dangerous effects of greenhouse gases that are creating climate change on our planet.

Putin banks on divisions in the West. What he found instead was our complete solidarity with the people of Ukraine. Imagine if we were to channel that same spirit of unity to unlock a safe, healthy future and untether ourselves from Putin's dirty profits. We should agree that no country continues to have a veto on our energy security or of our friends and allies.

The future lies not in the extracted fossil fuels of the Industrial Revolution but in technologies that will power the clean energy revolution.

It is in our interest to build a well-trained, well-paid battalion of American union workers to lead countries to look to their energy needs from the red, white, and blue of the United States instead of Putin's cronies who finance Russia's repression at home and adventurism abroad.

By passing a $555-billion investment in clean energy and climate justice, we can build a made-in-America clean economy that delivers real energy independence for our country, and we can export those technologies around the world. With tax credits and rebates in wind and solar, all-electric vehicles, offshore wind, battery storage technologies, heat pumps, and advanced domestic manufacturing, we can cut costs at home while cutting off Putin's money line from oil and natural gas. These investments would reduce our dependence on global oil markets and, instead, power our country through localized clean energy.

The solar from our deserts, the solar power from those States that have near year-round Sun, the wind off of our coast from Massachusetts down to Maryland, which the Presiding Officer represents, the wind off of the west coast, the hydropower from our Southeast, the geothermal from our Northwest—all of it can be tapped, and we can end an era wherein our country is held hostage by the need to import more oil.

Our Federal climate policies are exactly what we need—this national security moment, this environmental moment, this healthcare moment, this moral moment for our country and for the planet. There is no quick solution to this quagmire that Big Oil has drilled the United States into. There are only better and worse solutions, moral and immoral solutions. We can innovate and install clean energy that produces all of the energy which we need and that protects us, protects our allies, and protects our planet at the very same time or we can continue down the pathway of false promises and profiteering.

It is our moral moment. Let's stand in solidarity with those affected by oil and gas wars and seize this chance for a cleaner, safer, more affordable future for Americans, for our allies, and for the world.

There are doubters that we can make this transition, people who say: Well, wind and solar and all-electric vehicles and battery and storage technology—that sounds fine, but it just won't solve the problem. They are the same people who said that we could not deploy the spectrum.

I was the author of the bill that accomplished and that made it possible for everyone, by 1995, to have a flip phone in their pockets at 10 cents a minute. Then, in using that very same spectrum 10 years later, a young guy, Steve Jobs, invented a phone which is a computer that has the same power as the computers on the Apollo mission to the Moon. We innovated; we moved; and we can actually see the people, in their fleeing Ukraine, all holding smartphones invented in the United States because we put together the policies that changed us from black rotary dial phones to these powerful computers in everyone's pockets.

We can do the same thing with energy. We can create a revolution. We just have to get Big Oil and Big Gas out of the way and allow our young people to innovate, allow our entrepreneurs to innovate, allow for the deployment of all of these technologies, and then children will have to look to the history books to find if there ever was such a crisis that we are living through today.

So my hope is that the Senate will respond and that they will understand how much of this conflict is created by the globe's dependence upon oil and gas. Putin is proving that to us once again, and if we look at the Middle East, we can see that hole that we have dug for ourselves and our dependence upon that region.

We have the solution. It is innovation; it is optimism; it is unleashing the entrepreneurial spirit in our country. That will be the challenge of the U.S. Senate over the next 2 months.

Will we have the same courage to respond, to take on those energy titans, in the same way that the Ukrainian people, every day, are giving us the example that we should be following?

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4521

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motions on amendment No. 5002 and H.R. 4521 ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, March 28; that if cloture is invoked on the substitute, all postcloture time be considered expired; the remaining pending amendments be withdrawn; no further amendments be in order; the substitute amendment be agreed to; the cloture motion on the bill be withdrawn; the bill, H.R. 4521, be considered read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage, all without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I am requesting votes on two very important issues regarding this competition bill: No. 1 to put the Senate on record in opposition to providing $53 billion in corporate welfare to the highly profitable microchip industry, with no protections for the American taxpayer; and two, to eliminate the $10 million bailout included in this bill for Blue Origin, a space company owned by Jeff Bezos, the second wealthiest person in this country who is now worth over $180 billion.

So, Mr. President, I ask the majority leader: Will you now give me your commitment to receive two rollcall votes next week on each of these motions to instruct at a simple majority threshold?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yes, I give the Senator from Vermont my firm commitment to do whatever I can to get an agreement to have votes on his two motions to instruct when the message comes back from the House on this measure.

Having made that commitment, I ask the Senator from Vermont whether he might allow the Senate to agree to my original unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I appreciate the commitment of the majority leader to ensure that I will receive rollcall votes on these two issues. Having received the majority leader's firm commitment, I will not object.

I ask unanimous consent to address the body for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there an objection to the original request?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Without objection, the Senator from Vermont is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank the majority leader for his willingness to put my two motions to instruct on the floor next week for a vote. And I want to take a minute to explain to my colleagues and the American people what these amendments are about.

As I think most Americans understand, half of the people in our country are living paycheck to paycheck. They cannot afford the high cost of healthcare. They are often spending more than they can afford for housing. If they are fortunate enough to be able to have gotten a higher education, it is more likely than not that they are struggling with significant student debt. If they are young parents, they are probably finding it hard to locate quality, affordable childcare or pre-K. If they are older Americans, it is likely they are having a hard time paying for the dental care, the hearing aids, the eyeglasses, or the home healthcare that they desperately need.

Meanwhile, as many middle-class and working-class Americans fall further and further behind, there is another economic reality taking place in our country. We don't talk about it enough—but we should—and that is that the people on top, the very wealthiest people in our country, are doing phenomenally well and, in fact, have never had it so good.

Today in America, we have more income and wealth inequality than ever before. We talk a lot about Russian oligarchy—and that is certainly true—but anybody who thinks that we don't have an oligarchy in this country is surely mistaken.

In our country today, we have two people who own more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American population, and the top 1 percent own more wealth than the bottom 92 percent.

And, unbelievably, during this terrible pandemic—which has cost us almost 1 million lives—when thousands of essential workers died, they died because they had to go to their jobs, and going to their jobs, they contracted the virus. During that same period of time, the billionaire class became much, much wealthier. In fact, over 700 billionaires in America became nearly $2 trillion richer during the pandemic. In other words, for the people on top, the pandemic has been a very, very good time economically.

But it is not just the increased wealth of the very rich that we are seeing. Corporate profits are at an alltime high, and CEOs have seen huge increases in their compensation packages. And a lot of this is happening because of the unprecedented level of corporate greed—corporate greed that we are seeing.

Let me just give you a few examples of the corporate greed that is taking place right now. Everybody knows that the price of gas is soaring. Last I saw, it is averaging about $4.25 a gallon. Meanwhile, ExxonMobil, Chevron, BP, and Shell made nearly $30 billion in profit last quarter alone. The price of gas is soaring and major oil companies are making huge, huge profits. Amazon recently raised the price of its Prime membership by 16.8 percent. Meanwhile, it increased its profits by 75 percent to a record-breaking $35 billion.

In terms of food, everybody knows food prices are going up. The price of beef is up 32 percent, price of chicken is up 20 percent, price of pork is up 13 percent. Meanwhile, Tyson Foods, a major producer of chicken, beef, and hot dogs, increased its profits by 140 percent last quarter to $1.1 billion. The price of food is soaring, and food companies are enjoying huge profits.

While Americans are finding it harder and harder to pay for the outrageous costs of prescription drugs—we pay the highest prices in the world for our medicine—last year Pfizer, Johnson & Johnson, and AbbVie, three major pharmaceutical companies—increased their profits by over 90 percent to $54 billion. People can't afford the price of prescription drugs, but pharmaceutical industry profits are soaring. Again, all of which kind of takes me to the legislation that is on the floor right now, the so-called Competitiveness Act.

Do we need to increase computer chip production in the United States? Yes, we do. But we need to do it in a way that does not provide massive amounts of corporate welfare to an already enormously profitable industry.

In my view, it makes zero sense to provide $53 billion in corporate welfare. That is a blank check: Here it is, microchip industry, no strings attached, no protections for the American taxpayer to the microchip industry.

And as part of this legislation, in addition—I don't know how many people know this—some may think I am actually kidding when I say this—but this legislation provides $10 billion in bailout to Jeff Bezos—the second wealthiest person in America who is worth over $180 billion—so that his company, Blue Origin, can launch a rocket ship to the Moon.

A word about the microchip industry. We are talking about an industry that has shut down over 780 manufacturing plants in the United States and eliminated 150,000 American jobs over the last 20 years, while moving most of its production overseas. Got that? So this is an industry that said: Hey, we are making money, but we can make even more money by going to low-wage countries. Let's do that. Let's throw 150,000 American workers out on the street. We are going to go abroad.

Now, in terms of this $53 billion bailout, nobody knows exactly who will be receiving that money. My guess is that the bulk of that money will go to five major semiconductor companies, and that is Intel, Texas Instruments, Micron Technology, Global Foundries, and Samsung. These five companies in line for tens of billions of dollars of corporate welfare made over $75 trillion in profit last year.

The American people are sick and tired of our government working for wealthy campaign contributors and for the Big Money interests. I know it is a radical concept to suggest, but maybe—just maybe—we might want to be working for ordinary working-class and middle-class Americans.

Let me talk a little bit about what our amendments would do. Our amendments are very simple.

The first amendment, obviously, would prevent microchip companies from receiving taxpayer assistance unless they agree to issue warrants or equity stakes to the Federal Government. If private companies are going to benefit from over $53 billion in taxpayer subsidies, the financial gains made by these companies must be shared with the American people, not just wealthy shareholders. In other words, all this amendment says is that if these companies want taxpayer assistance, we are not going to socialize all of the risks and privatize all of the profits. If these investments turn out to be profitable as a direct result of these Federal grants, the taxpayers of this country have a right to get a return on this investment.

This is not a radical idea. These are exact conditions that were imposed on corporations that received taxpayer assistance in the bipartisan CARES Act, which passed the Senate 96 to 0. It is not a radical idea.

I believe in industrial policy. That means the government works with the private sector. It does not mean that the government simply gives the private sector everything they want with no protection to the taxpayer. So if the result of these $53 billion in grants is these companies make money, that is good—that is good—but the taxpayers who helped invest in these new production facilities should be able to enjoy some of those profits as well and get some of that money returned to them.

The second amendment is really a very, very simple one. It asks: Why in God's name would we be giving $10 billion to a company owned by the second wealthiest person in this country, Jeff Bezos? If Mr. Bezos wants to go to the

Moon, if he wants to go to Mars, he wants to go to Saturn, that is his business. He has every right in the world to do that, but he does not have a right to ask the taxpayers of this country for $10 billion to help him make his trip to outer space. This second amendment simply eliminates that $10 billion grant that goes to Mr. Bezos.

I look forward to winning the support for these two important amendments, which I think are strongly supported by the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 725.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 725, Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Angus S. King, Jr., Jon Ossoff, Tim Kaine, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Raphael G. Warnock, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Ron Wyden, Gary C. Peters, Mazie K. Hirono, Christopher Murphy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 791.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of C.S. Eliot Kang, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Security and Non-Proliferation).

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 791, C.S. Eliot Kang, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Security and Non-Proliferation).

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, March 24, be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

NOMINATION OF ERIC M. GARCETTI

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I introduced a statement into the RECORD which indicated my intent to object to any unanimous consent request relating to the nomination of Mayor Eric Garcetti to be U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of India. I did so because I had received multiple whistleblower complaints that Mayor Garcetti witnessed and was aware that his deputy chief of staff, Rick Jacobs, sexually harassed city employees. In my statement, which I have copied below, I made clear that I needed to investigate the allegations being made by whistleblowers and that I needed to review the investigation that the city of Los Angeles had commissioned which supposedly cleared Mayor Garcetti of any wrongdoing.

At the time, I instructed my staff to complete this investigation in no more than 2 weeks, since it is not my intent to drag this out. My staff spoke with additional whistleblowers and subsequently made three separate requests to representatives of the mayor to send us the city's investigative report—on March 11, 18, and 21. The mayor's staff provided me with a copy of the report on March 21. However, we were just notified last night, March 23, that there was also an updated report, along with a summary that was completed several months after the original report that my office received on March 21.

While I am still reviewing this report, my staff informs me that the report is focused exclusively on allegations made that Mr. Jacobs sexually harassed an LAPD officer. It does not address other allegations made, including allegations that Mr. Jacobs had sexually harassed the mayor's senior staff and made racist comments toward staff in front of the mayor.

Due to the extremely narrow scope of this report, the fact that many of the allegations brought to my office were not investigated in that report, and the fact that we only received the updated report last night, I have instructed my staff to continue investigating these allegations.

As I said earlier, it is not my intent to drag this out and I anticipate that my investigation will be concluded in the near future.

[Prior Statement]

Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of Mayor Eric Garcetti, of California, to be the U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of India.

I will object because I have received numerous credible allegations from multiple whistleblowers alleging that Mr. Garcetti, while Mayor of Los Angeles, had knowledge of sexual harassment and assaults allegedly committed against multiple city employees and their associates by his close advisor, and that he ignored the misconduct. The allegations involving the mayor's office have been the subject of public reporting and a purportedly independent investigation. However, serious questions remain regarding the alleged misconduct, as well as the mayor's knowledge of that misconduct.

First, whistleblowers who have spoken with my office have not previously spoken to the Foreign Relations Committee, and are presenting new allegations that must be fully investigated.

Second, the investigation of the Los Angeles mayor's office reportedly found no wrongdoing by the mayor or his staff. However, information provided by multiple whistleblowers strongly suggests that this investigation was incomplete at best. The extent to which the investigation was truly independent is also not clear, and the report has not been made public.

The United States owes it to the Republic of India to send them a qualified Ambassador that will represent the values of the United States. Mayor Garcetti may very well be fully qualified, but at this time, the Senate needs to look into these allegations further.

So until my staff and I have conducted a thorough investigation and are able to speak with everyone involved I cannot vote to confirm Mr. Garcetti.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 22–04 concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Bahrain for defense articles and services estimated to cost $175.98 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Bahrain.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $0 million.
Other $175.98 million.
Total $175.98 million.
Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: Upgrade nine (9) M270 Multiple Launch Rocket Systems (MLRS) to M270 A1 minimum configuration. The upgrade will include: the Common Fire Control System (CFCS); Improved Launcher Mechanical System (ILMS); 600h Engine and associated engine compartment modifications; Improved Electronics Distribution Box (IEDB); fan speed control valve; cables and mounting hardware, Power Take Off (PTO) and BOO series transmission; the Digital Communication Systems (DCOMMS); and Vehicular Intercom System (AN/VIC–3). In addition, the effort will include two (2) years spare parts; Operator and Maintenance Training Course' Contractor Logistics Support; U.S. Government engineering support; support and test equipment; integration and test support, software delivery and support; publications and technical documentation; technical and logistics support services; storage; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (BA–B–ULJ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: BA–B–JAH, BA–B–UEP, BA–B–UIW.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 24, 2022.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Bahrain—M270 Multiple Launch Rocket Systems (MLRS) Upgrade.

The Government of Bahrain has requested to buy upgrades to nine (9) M270 Multiple Launch Rocket Systems (MLRS) to a M270 A1 minimum configuration. The upgrade will include: the Common Fire Control System (CFCS); Improved Launcher Mechanical System (ILMS); 600h Engine and associated engine compartment modifications; Improved Electronics Distribution Box (IEDB); fan speed control valve; cables and mounting hardware, Power Take Off (PTO) and BOO series transmission; the Digital Communication Systems (DCOMMS); and Vehicular Intercom System (AN/VIC–3). In addition, the effort will include two (2) years spare parts; Operator and Maintenance Training Course' Contractor Logistics Support; U.S. Government engineering support; support and test equipment; integration and test support, software delivery and support; publications and technical documentation; technical and logistics support services; storage; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total cost is $175.98 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a Major Non-NATO Ally that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Middle East.

The proposed sale will improve Bahrain's capability to meet current and future threats by enhancing Bahrain's ability to defend itself against regional malign actors and improve interoperability with systems operated by U.S. forces and other Gulf countries. Bahrain's continued investment in its defensive capabilities is crucial to protecting its borders, energy infrastructure, and its residents, including over 15,000 U.S. citizens and Naval personnel living and working in the country. Bahrain will have no difficulty absorbing these upgraded MLRSs into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be the Lockheed Martin Corporation, Bethesda, MD. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Bahrain.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) is a high-mobility automatic system based on an M270 weapons platform. The MLRS fires surface-to-surface rockets: the Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) and the Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS). Without leaving the cab, the crew of three (driver, gunner and section chief) can fire up to 12 MLRS rockets in fewer than 60 seconds.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the Government of Bahrain can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Bahrain.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 0Q–21. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 16–58 of November 17, 2016.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 0Q–21

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(A), AECA)

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Qatar.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1). AECA Transmittal No.: 16–58; Date: November 17, 2016; Military Department: Navy; Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On November 17, 2016, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 16–58 of the possible sale under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) of Major Defense Equipment (MDE): seventy-two (72) F–15QA aircraft; one hundred forty-four (144) F–110–GE–129 aircraft engines; eighty (80) Advanced Display Core Processor II (ADCP II); eighty (80) Digital Electronic Warfare Suites (DEWS); eighty (80) M61A ''Vulcan'' gun systems; eighty (80) Link–16 systems; one hundred sixty (160) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS); three hundred twelve (312) LAU–128 missile launchers; eighty (80) AN/APG–82(V)1 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radars; one hundred sixty (160) Embedded GPS/Inertial Navigation Systems (INS) (EGI); eighty (80) AN/AAQ–13 LANTIRN navigation pods with containers; eighty (80) AN/AAQ–33 SNIPER Advanced Targeting Pods with containers (MDE Determination Pending); eighty (80) AN/AAS–42 Infrared Search and Track Systems (IRST) (MDE Determination Pending); two hundred (200) AIM–9X Sidewinder missiles; seventy (70) AIM–9X Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM); eight (8) AIM–9X Special Training Missiles; twenty (20) CATM AIM–9X missile Guidance Units; twenty (20) AIM–9X Tactical Guidance Kits; two hundred fifty (250) AIM–120C7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM); five (5) AIM–120C7 spare Guidance Kits; one hundred (100) AGM–88 High Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARM); forty (40) AGM–88 HARM CATMs; two hundred (200) AGM–154 Joint Standoff Weapons (JSOW); eighty (80) AGM–84L–1 Standoff Strike Anti-Ship missiles (Harpoon); ten (10) Harpoon exercise missiles; two hundred (200) AGM–65H/K (Maverick) missiles; five hundred (500) GBU–38 Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAM) Guidance Kits; five hundred (500) GBU–31 (V1) JDAM Guidance Kits; two hundred fifty (250) GBU–54 Laser JDAM Guidance Kits; two hundred fifty (250) GBU–56 Laser JDAM Guidance Kits; five hundred (500) BLU–111B bombs; five hundred (500) BLU–117B bombs; six (6) MK–82 inert bombs; and one thousand (1,000) FMU–152 Joint Programmable Fuses. Also included were ACMI (P5) Training Pods; Reece Pods (DB–110); Conformal Fuel Tanks (CFTs); Identification Friend/Foe (IFF) system; AN/AVS–9 Night Vision Goggles (NVG); ARC–210 UHF/UVF radios; LAU–118(v)1/A; LAU–117–AV2A; associated ground support; training materials; mission critical resources and maintenance support equipment; the procurement for various weapon support and test equipment spares; technical publications; personnel training; simulators and other training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated value was $21.1 billion. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted $11.5 billion of this total.

This transmittal reports the inclusion of an additional one (1) AGM–154 Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) (MDE). The MDE value will remain $11.5 billion. The total overall case value will remain $21.1 billion.

(iv) Significance: This notification is being provided to report the inclusion of an MDE item not previously notified. The proposed article and services will support Qatar's efforts to strengthen its homeland defense, meet current and future threats, and provide greater security for its critical infrastructure inside of its current budget.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country that continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Middle East.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology: The Sensitivity of Technology statement contained in the original notification applies to items reported here.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 24, 2022.

RECOGNIZING UTAH'S GOLD STAR FAMILIES

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of a grateful nation to pay tribute to the unparalleled sacrifices of Utah's Gold Star families. Thank you for your commitment to defending the Constitution of our great Nation. Thank you for your selfless service to others. And thank you for your love of our country, the United States of America. It is essential to our Nation's survival that we recognize and remember the sacrifices you have made.

Given the extraordinary nature of your sacrifices, the duty of recognizing and remembering them is of utmost importance. Furthermore, in a time when our Nation's cardinal values are more regularly attacked, this work mends the fraying fabric of freedom. My purpose today is to honor all that you, the Gold Star families of Utah, have done for our Nation and its citizens.

On August 1, 2020, a group of Utahns gathered at the North Ogden City Hall. There, in the heat of summer, the families, friends, and neighbors of fallen soldiers came together with business leaders and government officials to dedicate the North Ogden City Gold Star Families Memorial Monument. This monument, the first of its kind in Utah, but not the last, recognizes and remembers the sacrifices of Utah's Gold Star families. A similar monument has been built in St. George and will soon be dedicated. The monuments stand as beacons of light and hope, tributes to those who have been lost.

The idea for these monuments was inspired by the work of the Woody Williams Foundation whose mission is ''to honor, recognize, and serve Gold Star Families and the legacy of their Loved Ones who have paid the ultimate sacrifice.'' Their work, which focuses on the philosophical pillars of homeland, family, patriot, sacrifice, and legacy, gave North Ogden City and St. George a vision of what was possible.

After seeing the monument in North Ogden City, stakeholders in St. George decided they would raise funds, find land, and construct a monument of their own. St. George City, with the help of numerous residents and businesses began the work of designating space, securing over $100,000 of funding, and planning construction for the monument. The committee worked tirelessly to unify, educate, heal, and inspire others. Months of work led to a beautiful monument which now stands to honor Gold Star families and the losses they have endured.

Eight feet tall and 13 feet wide, the monuments made of solid black granite are two-sided tributes to the fallen. One side of each monument bears the words: ''Gold Star Families Memorial Monument, a tribute to Gold Star Families and Relatives who sacrificed a Loved One for our Freedom.'' The other side tells a story across four granite panels highlighting the themes of homeland, family, patriot, and sacrifice. The most significant component of each monument is a gaping hole at the center of the solid granite slabs. The empty space, a silhouette of a saluting servicemember, represents the legacy of the loved ones of the Gold Star families who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom. Together, these features tell each community's unique story of sacrifice.

On the day of the dedication of the North Ogden monument, powerful stories and memories were shared. I want to highlight just a few.

Kirk Chugg, the director of Follow the Flag North Ogden, said there could be ''no better place [for the tribute]. As people go about their day, we hope they see the monument and teach their children what it means. It publicly proclaims to families that we have not forgotten them.''

''This will help us remember what America is all about,'' said Debbie Allen, mother of the late Lt. Kenneth ''Kage'' Allen. ''I think too many people forget what we stand for.''

James Laselute, of Layton, was there representing his stepson, the late Lance Cpl. Quinn Keith. He said: ''For our family, things like this help us through the grieving process and remind us that our loved one's legacy endures.'' He continued: ''Monuments like this are what keeps their name alive.''

Neal Berube, the mayor of North Ogden City at the time of the monument's dedication shared: ''The Gold Star designation dates back to World War I, when military families displayed service flags featuring a blue star for every immediate family member serving in the Armed Forces. The star's color would change to gold if a loved one died so the community would know the price the family had paid for freedom.''

Mayor Berube then concluded: ''The strength of our nation is our military. The strength of our military is our soldiers. And the strength of our soldiers are our families.''

As the people of St. George set out to dedicate their Gold Star Families Memorial Monument, similar sentiments have been shared. Jennifer Moxon, Bronwyn Mount, and Mayor Michele Randall—who, with the help of the St. George City Council, staff, and in partnership with the Major Brent Taylor Foundation, have helped lead the development of the St. George monument—have made powerful statements of gratitude and hope.

Jennifer Moxon, mother of the late Sgt. Douglas Lee Moxon, recently

wrote: ''We are a family military. The very freedoms that we sometimes take for granted are what our sons and daughters fight for every day.'' She continued: ''When we lost our son, my perspective changed. The sacrifices these servicemembers and their families make every day are deserving of respect and honor. This monument allows us to pay tribute to the family members who lost loved ones. It is a place where we can come, feel peace, and hopefully recognize their sacrifice will never be forgotten.''

Gold Star Mother Bronwyn Mount, mother of the late Sgt. Bryan Cooper Mount, recently shared: ''I am constantly surprised by the realization that so many people all over the country are remembering and honoring Cooper. To have so many people working towards this dedication, for the last 20 months, has been humbling to our family. To have multiple friends and families be willing to donate to the cost of the memorial has touched us deeply. We are so grateful to be able to visit the memorial and think of Cooper's, and others', sacrifices. We are grateful for a community that cares about the sacrifice.''

Mayor Michele Randall shared: ''On August 6th, 2020, Sgt. Cooper Mount's flag-draped casket arrived at the St. George airport. Moved by the emotion and patriotism of the procession from the airport to the mortuary, the City of St. George chose to be the second city in Utah to install a Gold Star Families Memorial Monument in the heart of the city at historic Town Square. Saturday, March 26th, 2022, will be the dedication of the memorial and the culmination of many hours of work and over $100,000 dollars raised by our residents. I cannot wait for our community to see this breathtaking monument in remembrance of our Gold Star families.''

I am honored to have the opportunity to highlight the great work that so many people freely participated in to make this memorial, which recognizes and remembers the sacrifices of Utah's Gold Star families, possible. These monuments are not the last of their kind in Utah or in the United States. More monuments are being discussed, planned, and constructed. The movement to honor Gold Star families across America has taken hold of many communities throughout the country.

Let us not allow this movement to rise in relevance for a moment and then fade. Let us recognize and remember, forever, the sacrifices of our Nation's Gold Star families.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING OUR BEST RESTAURANT

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize the small business, Our Best Restaurant of Smithfield, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 1990, the late Kenneth Way and his wife Kay embarked on a new adventure in the autumn of their lives. After retiring from a career in the retail industry, Kenneth bought an old wheat mill in Smithfield, KY, population 100. Joined by his wife Kay who had just retired from her career serving the Kentucky State government, the two opened Our Best Restaurant. Kenneth's son Kenny Way will tell you himself that his father was not in the restaurant business; he was in the ''people business.'' Kenneth's motto was that if you treat people well, your business will succeed no matter what you do. Clearly, Kenneth was on to something as his restaurant and legacy continue to thrive for the past 32 years.

Kenneth's son Kenny Way now owns and operates the business, carrying on his father's mission of providing top quality service to everyone who walks in the door. Though Our Best Restaurant consistently serves delicious country cooking, it is the warm and friendly atmosphere that keeps people coming back time and time again. With a population as small as Smithfield's, the restaurant cannot depend on the typical walk-in customer that other Main Street businesses often see; their bread and butter are the locals—and even visitors, who keep coming back. A change in ownership never stopped their ''regulars'' from choosing Our Best Restaurant because Kenny learned from his late father that a loyal customer will only come back if you treat them right. That is why the staff of Our Best Restaurant put in such an effort to get to know their customers, to meet their families and their children, to ask them about their day, and to show that they care about the customer's experience beyond just the meal.

Such high-quality customer service and food have allowed Our Best Restaurant to grow and expand. Since 1990, they have expanded their dining space and have branched out to offer catering services asides from their dine-in operations. The catering business became a crucial stream of revenue for the restaurant as the COVID–19 pandemic put a temporary end to in-person dining. Local energy and utility companies turned to Our Best Restaurant to safely serve meals to their employees during the height of the pandemic. Our Best Restaurant has consistently proved to be a steadfast member of the small community of Smithfield. The restaurant maintains great relationships with the local high school, looking out for the local students and always feeding them a hearty meal of Kentucky country cooking.

The reputation of the feel-good-food and friendly atmosphere of Our Best Restaurant has allowed them to be a destination in themselves. They often have folks drive in from Jefferson County and Franklin County to enjoy their famous cooking. And of course, any and all visitors receive the same smalltown welcome as any Smithfield local would. Our Best Restaurant is the entrepreneurial embodiment of the late Kenneth and Kay's dream come true and a wonderful example of a father's mission carried on by his son. All across the country are little towns like Smithfield, areas that contain little more than a post office and a church, and it is businesses like Our Best Restaurant that keep those small communities thriving. Congratulations to Kenny, his son Aric, and the entire Our Best Restaurant team. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky.●

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4373. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 6968. An act to prohibit the importation of energy products of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7108. An act to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3580. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Paul J. Schlise, to be Rear Admiral.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Maria B. Barrett, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Tickner, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Tina B. Boyd and ending with Col. Todd W. Traver, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2022. (minus 1 nominee: Col. Paul J. McCarthy)

Navy nomination of Capt. Jeffrey J. Kilian, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Carey H. Cash, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. George E. Bresnihan, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Matthew Case and ending with Capt. Guido F. Valdes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2022.

Navy nomination of Capt. Tracy L. Hines, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Ryan M. Perry, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. John E. Dougherty IV and ending with Capt. Douglas L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2022.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Douglas F. Stitt, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Margaret H. Blais and ending with Col. Mathew C. Wenthe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2022. (minus 1 nominee: Col. Paul Drake IV)

Navy nomination of Capt. Michael L. Baker, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Gregory N. Todd, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Jeffrey T. Anderson and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Douglas C. Verissimo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 8, 2022.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) John S. Lemmon, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Nicholas M. Homan and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Michael J. Vernazza, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 8, 2022.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas J. Moreau, to be Rear Admiral.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. James J. Mingus, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Stephen R. Smith, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Luke A. Frost and ending with Capt. Mark B. Sucato, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 15, 2022.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators .

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Christopher L. Allam and ending with Curtis J. Wozniak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Justin L. Joffrion and ending with Beth L. Makros, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Nealy P. Brown and ending with Richard Alton Steen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with George A. Gonzalez and ending with Clayton L. Ricks, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Rebecca A. Burbridge and ending with Brian A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Darren Steele Beasley and ending with Jeffrey M. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Travis W. Gerlach and ending with Benjamin G. Romick, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jennifer J. Anderson and ending with Alexis K. Stucki, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michael M. Aflague and ending with James B. Mcmanus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jared Robert Brandt and ending with Sarah R. Speth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Anthony S. Alexander and ending with Christopher P. Zorich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Heather D. Harris and ending with Timothy Daniel Ray, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Cynthia L. Alvarado and ending with Shelley J. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Thomas F. Albrecht and ending with William Stanley Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Tricia L. Hill and ending with Donald T. Yap, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Air Force nomination of Christopher D. Corliss, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of James M. Blake, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Antuan X. Aaron and ending with D016144, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 30, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Amar J. Arias and ending with D015031, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 30, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Andrew J. Allen and ending with D001903, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 30, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with April N. Abbott and ending with D015964, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 30, 2021.

Army nomination of Matthew L. Parker, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Shawn R. Jokinen, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Robert J. Rowe, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Manuel C. Ruiz, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Jeffrey M. Beeman and ending with Alexander M. Willard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph V. Dasilva and ending with Jason R. Zuniga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2022.

Army nomination of Shaker F. Y. Saad, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with William T. Freakley and ending with Mason W. Thornal, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Brion J. Aderman and ending with Martin R. Yost, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022.

Army nomination of Daniel C. Canchola, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Steven M. Wingo, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Nicholas S. Cavallaro, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ernestina Delapenaguba, to be Lieutenant Colonel .

Army nomination of Gurdeep S. Buttar, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ashlee B. McKeon, to be Major.

Army nomination of D013344, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Ram A. Parekh, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Zane N. Beegle and ending with Cody D. Workman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Army nomination of Matthew B. Young, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of William M. Yund, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Alex V. Funicello, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Arlie L. Miller, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Mulugeta D. Temesgen, to be Lieutenant Commander .

Navy nomination of John M. Rosati, Jr., to be Lieutenant Commander.

Space Force nominations beginning with Kyle S. Allen and ending with Neal R. Roach, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Matthew P. Bruno and ending with Sol R. Snedeker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Kelly S. Anderson and ending with Jeffrey E. Weisler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with James P. Banta and ending with Scott M. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Artem S. Agoulnik and ending with Donald W. Zeck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Christopher Alan Albright and ending with Victor J. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Robert J. Alleman and ending with Edward Seunglee Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Rachel T. Alessi and ending with Heather L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Luke M. Sauter and ending with Zachary W. Fields, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2022.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3912. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to deter labor slowdowns and prohibit labor organizations from blocking modernization efforts at ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 3913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to public health data accessibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 3914. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definition of a qualifying investment, for purposes of the exemption from registration for venture capital fund advisers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, to include an equity security issued by a qualifying portfolio company and to include an investment in another venture capital fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3915. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide technology grants to strengthen domestic mining education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 3916. A bill to permit the Securities and Exchange Commission to increase regulatory exemption thresholds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3917. A bill to apply the Medicaid asset verification program to all applicants for, and recipients of, medical assistance in all States and territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3918. A bill to establish programs to improve family economic security by breaking the cycle of multigenerational poverty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 3919. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide that an issuer that is required to file certain quarterly reports may elect to file those reports semiannually; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 3920. A bill to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 3921. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to expand the definition of a qualifying accredited investor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

S. 3922. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to create a safe harbor for finders and private placement brokers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3923. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal certain provisions requiring non-material disclosure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 3924. A bill to amend the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to extend the sunset for sanctions with respect to human rights violations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 3925. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for the negligent creation of space debris, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3926. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to address the issuance of securities by Chinese entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CRAMER)):

S. 3927. A bill to establish the Mental Health Excellence in Schools Program to increase the recruitment and retention of school-based mental health services providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3928. A bill to establish a program so that small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals may achieve proficiency to compete, on an equal basis, for contracts and subcontracts in Department of Transportation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 3929. A bill to provide for disadvantaged business enterprise supportive services programs at modal administrations of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 3930. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to permit certain defendants to remove administrative proceedings to Federal court; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. LUMMIS:

S. 3931. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to extend exemptions for securities offered as part of employee pay to other individuals providing goods for sale, labor, or services for remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WARNOCK:

S. Res. 556. A resolution commemorating the 90th birthday of former Mayor of Atlanta, ambassador, and congressional representative Andrew Jackson Young and recognizing the contributions of Andrew Jackson Young to civil and human rights and his work to uplift Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 557. A resolution recognizing the week of March 20 through March 26, 2022 as ''National Poison Prevention Week'' and encouraging communities across the United States to raise awareness of the dangers of poisoning and promote poison prevention; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 98

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 98, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for neighborhood revitalization, and for other purposes.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to repeal the wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to provide adequate funding for water and sewer infrastructure, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave to Federal employees, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and

stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2050

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2050, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2069

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2069, a bill to expand the Medicaid certified community behavioral health clinic demonstration program and to authorize funding for additional grants to certified community behavioral health clinics.

S. 2343

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2343, a bill to require the head of each agency to establish a safety plan relating to COVID–19 for any worksite at which employees or contractors are required to be physically present during the COVID–19 pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 2607

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2607, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the former hostages of the Iran Hostage Crisis of 1979–1981, highlighting their resilience throughout the unprecedented ordeal that they lived through and the national unity it produced, marking 4 decades since their 444 days in captivity, and recognizing their sacrifice to the United States.

S. 3518

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3518, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 5.1 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 3522

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 3522, a bill to provide enhanced authority for the President to enter into agreements with the Government of Ukraine to lend or lease defense articles to that Government to protect civilian populations in Ukraine from Russian military invasion, and for other purposes.

S. 3580

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3580, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

S. 3725

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3725, a bill to withdraw normal trade relations treatment from products of countries that commit acts of aggression in violation of international law against other countries or territories and to amend the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to modify the foreign persons subject to sanctions and to remove the sunset for the imposition of sanctions.

S. 3771

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3771, a bill to prohibit United States persons from engaging in transactions with foreign persons that purchase or transact in gold from the Russian Federation.

S. 3850

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3850, a bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Customs and Border Protection officers and support staff and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry.

S. 3867

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3867, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the use of cryptocurrency to facilitate transactions by Russian persons subject to sanctions, and for other purposes.

S. 3889

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3889, a bill to reform the labor laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 3905

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 3905, a bill to prevent organizational conflicts of interest in Federal acquisition, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution requiring the advice and consent of the Senate or an Act of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 43

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 43, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Treasury and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Updating Payment Parameters, Section 1332 Waiver Implementing Regulations, and Improving Health Insurance Markets for 2022 and Beyond''.

S. RES. 547

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 547, a resolution recognizing the 201st anniversary of Greek Independence and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 3913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to public health data accessibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, the COVID–19 pandemic has caused extraordinary challenges for our Nation's public health system and put a spotlight on longstanding gaps in public health preparedness. Our Nation's public health system needs accurate, timely, and high-quality data to protect the public from emerging health threats and to respond to existing public health emergencies.

For far too long, gaps in data infrastructure have prevented policymakers and public health officials from quickly translating public health data into their decisionmaking. Outdated and inconsistent public health data systems have made it hard for Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments to get a full picture of the COVID–19 crisis. In turn, these data gaps have made it difficult for public health departments to tailor their responses. Specifically, inconsistent definitions of data, ambiguous reporting requirements, and data accessibility issues have hindered the U.S. response to the COVID–19 pandemic and prevented the timely communication of public health data.

We know that effective pandemic prevention and response requires coordinated efforts between public health

officials across all levels of government. Today, I am pleased to introduce with my colleagues, Senators BALDWIN, SMITH, and MURPHY, the Improving Data Accessibility Through Advancements in Public Health Act, or the Improving DATA in Public Health Act, to use the lessons learned from the COVID–19 pandemic to ensure that our Nation's public health system has the data capabilities to address and prevent future pandemics.

The Improving DATA in Public Health Act amends public health data systems' modernization provisions in current law by establishing a timeline for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to disseminate data standards to improve the exchange of electronic public health data. The bill also directs the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to expand the access, exchange, and use of public health data by improving data sharing between Federal Agencies and State and local public health systems when preparing for, identifying, monitoring, and responding to public health emergencies.

The Improving DATA in Public Health Act also expands upon existing data modernization efforts by commissioning a study on improving electronic data standards and reporting between laboratories and public health data systems. Finally, the legislation calls for the development of best practices to improve the quality and completeness of demographic data to support equitable public health responses.

The Improving DATA in Public Health Act will strengthen our public health data systems and take commonsense steps to improve our ability to prevent and respond to future pandemics.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3918. A bill to establish programs to improve family economic security by breaking the cycle of multigenerational poverty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from New Mexico, Senator HEINRICH, in introducing the Two-Generation Economic Empowerment Act. Our bipartisan bill would support an innovative approach to fighting poverty, one that focuses on addressing the needs of children and their parents or other primary caregiver—two-generations together—in order to help break the cycle of intergenerational poverty.

Far too many American families are living below the poverty line, and the prolonged public health and economic crisis has exacerbated this problem. In 2020, when COVID–19 shut down our communities and economy, we unfortunately saw the first increase in poverty after 5 consecutive years of decline. Nearly 38 million people, or about 1 in 10 Americans, lived below the poverty line in 2020. Sadly, this includes nearly 11 million children, 35,000 of whom live in Maine. Despite recent progress, Maine's child poverty rate is still higher than all of the other New England States except Rhode Island.

While Federal programs have helped many of those living in poverty manage day-to-day hardships, they are falling short of breaking the cycle of poverty that has trapped too many families. As Tomas Philipson, an economist who served previously as the Acting Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, recently wrote in the Wall Street Journal, ''you don't cut poverty by increasing reliance on government. You do it by making them self-reliant.''

Our legislation marks an important first step toward reevaluating our approach to poverty-reducing programs and encouraging innovative, more effective uses of taxpayer dollars. We support an approach aimed at equipping both parents and their children with the tools they need to have opportunities to succeed and become self-sufficient. Oftentimes, Federal programs intended to help low-income individuals address challenges in silos, over looking the fact that the needs of family members are usually interconnected. Our bill seeks to change that. For example, helping a mother secure safe, high-quality childcare can have a positive impact on her ability to succeed in the workforce, as well as improving her child's ability to be ready for school. While that child receives care and an education, her mother can connect with skills training that could lead to a better paying job. Connecting various Federal programs that target both parents and children with supports aimed at increasing economic security, educational success, social capital, and health and well-being has the potential to lift whole families out of poverty.

Listen to the story of Kaytlyn Robbins, a mother of four who recently relocated to Windham, ME, from Aroostook County, where a two-generation, or whole family, approach to economic mobility helped her turn her life around. I had the privilege of meeting Kaytlyn in August 2020 at a roundtable hosted by the Aroostook County Community Action Program, ACAP.

When Kaytlyn first connected with ACAP, she was living in a homeless shelter, battling with substance use, and had just lost custody of her young daughter. With the assistance of ACAP's Whole Family Program, she worked with a career counselor to set new goals for herself and created a customized plan to refocus and transform her life.

ACAP established a work experience for Kaytlyn at a local recovery center in Caribou, which later became a full-time job. She was able to secure safe housing and was reunited with her daughter, whom the team assisted with childcare placement. Kaytlyn is now thriving and told me she is ''healing as a family unit.'' She is married and has a new baby who just turned 1. Professionally, she is now a registered recovery coach and recently started up a nonprofit dedicated to substance use disorder recovery coaching, peer groups, and community education. Kaytlyn and her family are just one example of how the two-generation approach can truly transform a family and put them on a path towards economic independence. With legislation like the Two-Generation Economic Empowerment Act, I am confident we can recreate thousands of success stories like Kaytlyn's and expand upon successful programming like that offered by ACAP.

Specifically, the bill we are introducing would codify an Interagency Council on Economic Mobility to better coordinate Federal efforts that are aimed at supporting vulnerable families and moving them out of poverty. The council would also make recommendations to Congress about ways to improve coordination of anti-poverty programs and to identify best practices. While I applaud ongoing efforts across the Federal Government to implement two-generation strategies, this council is needed to tackle logistical challenges, such as lack of coordination and communication across Agencies—and in some cases different entities within a single Department—and to improve the dissemination of information and best practices. In fact, a recent nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, GAO, report that Senator Heinrich and I requested confirmed that more coordination at the Federal level would provide the critical assistance and flexibility States and localities need to develop and implement two-gen policies to improve family well-being. This report from 2020 underscores why adoption of our legislation, particularly its emphasis on increasing the coordination of services, is critical to a robust two-gen approach.

Our bill would also authorize a performance pilot program that would provide additional flexibility for States and local governments to improve the administration of poverty-reducing programs. To-Generation Performance Partnerships would be piloted in five States, which would be able to blend similarly purposed funds across multiple Federal programs. Two-generation approaches are often created ''from the bottom up,'' meaning local organizations and States are at the forefront of responding to local or regional needs. The Federal Government should be empowering States and local organizations with the flexibility to be creative problem solvers. For this reason, our legislation would reduce duplicative reporting and application requirements that may deter local agencies and organizations from making the most effective use of taxpayer dollars. To ensure accountability, the bill would require that these pilot programs be targeted at specific, poverty-reducing outcomes.

With the Two-Generation Economic Empowerment Act, we have the chance to make a permanent difference in the lives of families and to break the multigenerational cycle of poverty. Just as a child's ZIP Code should not determine his or her future success, the current bureaucratic, siloed approach to aid should not stand in the way of helping families escape poverty. As Ascend at the Aspen Institute—a key partner on this legislation—recently observed, ''Today's economic and public health crisis demands the innovation, inclusiveness, collaboration, coordination, and flexibility that the 2Gen approach provides.''

In addition to strong support from national organizations like Ascend at the Aspen Institute and National Community Action Partnership, the Maine Community Action Partnership and the Maine Head Start Directors' Association have endorsed this important legislation. I very much appreciate their support.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this innovative approach to moving families out of poverty by giving them the tools they need to succeed.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 3929. A bill to provide for disadvantaged business enterprise supportive services programs at modal administrations of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Supportive Services Expansion Act and the Accelerating Small Business Growth Act, which I introduced today.

The unprecedented investment in American infrastructure over the next decade provides a major opportunity to strengthen our most underserved businesses and communities. Providing resources to help develop women-owned, minority-owned, and disadvantaged businesses will uplift our entire economy, and it is how we truly build back better.

Last year, President Biden set a goal of increasing the share of Federal contracts going to small, disadvantaged businesses by 50 percent by 2025, which would translate to an additional $100 billion for these businesses.

To help accomplish this ambitious goal, we should empower Federal, State, and local agencies to deliver resources to underserved businesses to help them become self-sufficient and grow.

Established in 1970, the Federal Highway Administration's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Supportive Services Program already provides training, assistance, and services to minority- and women-owned businesses to help them develop into self-sufficient organizations that viably compete for federally assisted highway project contracts. Unfortunately, Congress has not allowed this program to keep up with the needs of our underserved businesses.

The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Supportive Services Expansion Act would increase this program's annual funding cap for the first time in nearly 50 years from $10 million to $25 million. Additionally, the bill would create similar programs at the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Transit Administration.

Local, regional, and State agencies have also been leaders in developing innovative programs to prioritize disadvantaged businesses, invest in efforts to create equitable competition, and promote diverse economic development initiatives.

The Accelerating Small Business Growth Act would create a new grant program to help transportation agencies across our Nation carry out these innovative programs to help underserved businesses grow and achieve proficiency to compete, on an equal basis, for contracts and subcontracts in federally funded transportation projects. Agencies that receive funding through this grant program would be required to submit reports to the Department of Transportation evaluating the effectiveness of their activities, which would help inform future Federal procurement policymaking.

I want to thank Representatives PETE AGUILAR and JIMMY GOMEZ for co-leading these bills with me, and I hope colleagues will join us in support of this legislation to minority-owned, women-owned, and disadvantaged businesses compete for contracts to develop and build Federal infrastructure projects funded by the bipartisan infrastructure law.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 556—COMMEMORATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF FORMER MAYOR OF ATLANTA, AMBASSADOR, AND CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE ANDREW JACKSON YOUNG AND RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ANDREW JACKSON YOUNG TO CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS AND HIS WORK TO UPLIFT GEORGIA

Mr. WARNOCK submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 556

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young was born on March 12, 1932, to Daisy Fuller Young and Andrew Jackson Young, Sr., in New Orleans, Louisiana;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young received an undergraduate degree from Howard University in 1951 and a degree in divinity from Hartford Theological Seminary and was ordained with the United Church of Christ in 1955;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young is a proud 1950 initiate of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc.;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young was a devoted pastor in Georgia and Alabama for several years, and worked with the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA (commonly referred to as the ''National Council of Churches'') from 1957 to 1961;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young worked diligently throughout the early 1960s with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (commonly referred to as the ''SCLC'') to mentor and uplift African-American leaders in communities across Georgia, and served as Executive Director of the SCLC in 1964 and Executive Vice President from 1967 to 1970;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young worked alongside Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to advance the civil rights movement;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young was elected to the House of Representatives in 1972 and 1974 and was the first African American to represent Georgia in the House of Representatives since Reconstruction;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young was nominated by President James E. Carter to serve as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations from 1977 to 1979, and was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Carter in 1981;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young was elected mayor of Atlanta, Georgia, in 1981, and served 2 terms as mayor;

Whereas, during his time as mayor, Andrew Jackson Young was instrumental to modernizing and spurring the economic development of the city of Atlanta, making it an international city;

Whereas, in 1994, Andrew Jackson Young was appointed by President William J. Clinton to oversee the Southern Africa Development Fund;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young, as Mayor of Atlanta, launched the Atlanta Organizing Committee to win the big to host the Centennial Olympic Games and was co-chairman of the host committee for the 1996 Summer Olympics, which were hosted in Atlanta, Georgia;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young served as President of the National Council of Churches from 2000 to 2001;

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young established the Andrew J. Young Foundation in 2003, which focuses on education, economic justice, and global human rights; and

Whereas Andrew Jackson Young is a husband, a father of 4 children, a grandfather of 9 children, a great-grandfather of 1 child, and a renowned author, speaker and leader and continues to uplift the people of Georgia and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 90th birthday of Andrew Jackson Young;

(2) expresses thanks and commendations to Andrew Jackson Young and his family for his decades of public service to Georgia and to the United States; and

(3) honors the life and impact of Andrew Jackson Young, an American civil rights hero whose work has helped generations of people in the United States and Georgia prosper.

SENATE RESOLUTION 557—RECOGNIZING THE WEEK OF MARCH 20 THROUGH MARCH 26, 2022 AS ''NATIONAL POISON PREVENTION WEEK'' AND ENCOURAGING COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES TO RAISE AWARENESS OF THE DANGERS OF POISONING AND PROMOTE POISON PREVENTION

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 557

Whereas the designation of National Poison Prevention Week was first authorized by Congress and President Kennedy in 1961 in Public Law 87–319 (75 Stat. 681);

Whereas National Poison Prevention Week occurs during the third full week of March each year;

Whereas, as of January 31, 2022, poison centers have handled more than 1,019,000 cases related to the COVID–19 pandemic alone and have seen dramatic increases in cases relating to hand sanitizer and household cleaning products;

Whereas poison control centers responded to COVID–19 related surges by conducting poison safety and poisoning prevention outreach in a virtual format during the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas the American Association of Poison Control Centers (referred to in this preamble as the ''AAPCC'') works with the 55 poison control centers in the United States to track—

(1) more than 1,000 commonly used household and workplace products that can cause poisoning; and

(2) poisonings and the sources of those poisonings;

Whereas the National Poison Data System (referred to in this preamble as ''NPDS'') database contains over 456,000 products, ranging from viral and bacterial agents to commercial chemical and drug products;

Whereas, in 2020, 2,128,198 people called the poison help line to reach a poison control center;

Whereas, in 2020, as reported to the AAPCC, 93 percent of poison exposures reported to local poison control centers occurred in the home;

Whereas local poison control centers save the people of the United States $1,800,000,000 in medical costs annually;

Whereas the AAPCC and poison control centers partner with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Food and Drug Administration, and State, local, Tribal, and territorial health departments to monitor occurrences of environmental, biological, and emerging threats in communities across the United States, including food poisoning, botulism, and vaping-associated lung injury;

Whereas, in the United States, more than 420 children 19 years of age and younger are treated in emergency departments for poisoning every day, and more than 135 children 19 years of age and younger die as a result of being poisoned each year;

Whereas, in 2020, children younger than 6 years of age constituted 42 percent of all poison exposures;

Whereas, from 2010 to 2021, data from poison control centers revealed a significant increase of an average of 18.8 percent per year in the number of intentional suicide patients who were adolescents 10 to 19 years of age, and that increase disproportionately occurred among female adolescents;

Whereas, in 2021, poison control centers have seen an increase in suspected suicides among adolescents 11 to 14 years of age;

Whereas, in 2020, more than 90,000 children 19 years of age and younger were treated in an emergency room due to unintended pediatric poisoning, and more than 90 percent of those incidents occurred in the home, most often with blood pressure medications, ibuprofen, acetaminophen, laundry packets, bleach, or sedatives or anti-anxiety medication;

Whereas, based on an analysis of the NPDS, from 2018 to 2019, there was a 444 percent increase in pediatric magnet ingestion cases reported to poison control centers in the United States, following the reintroduction of high-powered magnets to the market;

Whereas, an analysis of the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System shows—

(1) an increased incidence of ingestion of dangerous foreign bodies like button batteries and high-powered magnets during the COVID–19 pandemic; and

(2) evidence that parents and caregivers sought care for foreign body ingestions either because they knew the relative danger of the object ingested or because they sought advice from available resources like the poison control centers;

Whereas 70,630 cases of death due to drug overdose were reported in the United States in 2019, and the majority of those cases, approximately 71 percent, involved an opioid;

Whereas, in 2020, the most common medications that adults called the poison help line about were prescription and non-prescription pain relievers, household cleaning substances, cosmetics and personal care products, and antidepressants;

Whereas pain medications lead the list of the most common substances implicated in adult poison exposures, and are the single most frequent cause of pediatric fatalities reported to the AAPCC;

Whereas poison control centers issue guidance and provide support to individuals, including individuals who experience medication and dosing errors;

Whereas more than 35 percent of calls to the poison help line are from individuals 20 years of age or older, with more than 25 percent of those calls involving patients older than 50 years of age, and a common reason for those calls is therapeutic errors, including questions regarding drug interactions, incorrect dosing route, timing of doses, and double doses;

Whereas normal, curious children younger than 6 years of age are in stages of growth and development in which they are constantly exploring and investigating the world around them, and are often unable to read or recognize warning labels;

Whereas the AAPCC engages in community outreach by educating the public on poison safety and poisoning prevention, and provides educational resources, materials, and guidelines to educate the public on poisoning prevention;

Whereas individuals can reach a poison control center from anywhere in the United States by calling the poison help line at 1-800-222-1222 or accessing PoisonHelp.org;

Whereas, despite regulations of the Consumer Product Safety Commission requiring that a child-resistant package be designed or constructed to be significantly difficult for children under 5 years of age to open, or obtain a harmful amount of the contents, within a reasonable time, children can still open child-resistant packages; and

Whereas, each year during National Poison Prevention Week, the Federal Government assesses the progress made by the Federal Government in saving lives and reaffirms the national commitment of the Federal Government to preventing injuries and deaths from poisoning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the week of March 20 through March 26, 2022, as ''National Poison Prevention Week'';

(2) expresses gratitude for the people who operate or support poison control centers in their local communities;

(3) expresses gratitude for frontline workers supporting poison prevention during the COVID–19 pandemic;

(4) supports efforts and resources to provide poison prevention guidance or emergency assistance in response to poisonings; and

(5) encourages—

(A) the people of the United States to educate their communities and families about poison safety and poisoning prevention; and

(B) health care providers to practice and promote poison safety and poisoning prevention.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5010. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5002 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5011. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5002 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5012. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5002 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5013. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7108, to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5014. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. KELLY)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2102, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure.

SA 5015. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 253, to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5010. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5002 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 567, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 568, line 17.

SA 5011. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be

proposed to amendment SA 5002 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1002(a), add the following:

(5) CONDITIONS OF RECEIPT.—

(A) REQUIRED AGREEMENT.—A covered entity to which the Secretary of Commerce awards Federal financial assistance under section 9902 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4652) or paragraph (3) of this subsection with amounts appropriated under this subsection shall enter into an agreement that specifies that, during the 5-year period immediately following the award of the Federal financial assistance—

(i) the covered entity will not—

(I) repurchase an equity security that is listed on a national securities exchange of the covered entity or any parent company of the covered entity, except to the extent required under a contractual obligation that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(II) outsource or offshore jobs to a location outside of the United States; or

(III) abrogate existing collective bargaining agreements; and

(ii) the covered entity will remain neutral in any union organizing effort.

(B) FINANCIAL PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce may not award Federal financial assistance to a covered entity under section 9902 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4652) or paragraph (3) of this subsection with amounts appropriated under this subsection, unless—

(I)(aa) the covered entity has issued securities that are traded on a national securities exchange; and

(bb) the Secretary of the Treasury receives a warrant or equity interest in the covered entity; or

(II) in the case of any covered entity other than a covered entity described in subclause (I), the Secretary of the Treasury receives, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury—

(aa) a warrant or equity interest in the covered entity; or

(bb) a senior debt instrument issued by the covered entity.

(ii) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions of any warrant, equity interest, or senior debt instrument received under clause (i) shall be set by the Secretary of Commerce and shall meet the following requirements:

(I) PURPOSES.—Such terms and conditions shall be designed to provide for a reasonable participation by the Secretary of Commerce, for the benefit of taxpayers, in equity appreciation in the case of a warrant or other equity interest, or a reasonable interest rate premium, in the case of a debt instrument.

(II) AUTHORITY TO SELL, EXERCISE, OR SURRENDER.—For the primary benefit of taxpayers, the Secretary of Commerce may sell, exercise, or surrender a warrant or any senior debt instrument received under this subparagraph. The Secretary of Commerce shall not exercise voting power with respect to any shares of common stock acquired under this subparagraph.

(III) SUFFICIENCY.—If the Secretary of Commerce determines that a covered entity cannot feasibly issue warrants or other equity interests as required by this subparagraph, the Secretary of Commerce may accept a senior debt instrument in an amount and on such terms as the Secretary of Commerce deems appropriate.

SA 5012. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5002 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In division B, at the end of title V insert the following:

SEC. ___. WORKER OWNERSHIP, READINESS, AND KNOWLEDGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXISTING PROGRAM.—The term ''existing program'' means a program, designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking, that exists on the date on which the Secretary is carrying out a responsibility authorized under this section.

(2) INITIATIVE.—The term ''Initiative'' means the Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative established under subsection (b).

(3) NEW PROGRAM.—The term ''new program'' means a program, designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking, that does not exist on the date on which the Secretary is carrying out a responsibility authorized under this section.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Labor.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given the term under section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).

(b) EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION INITIATIVE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish within the Department of Labor an Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall—

(A) support within the States existing programs designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking; and

(B) facilitate within the States the formation of new programs designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking.

(3) DUTIES.—To carry out the functions enumerated in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(A) support new programs and existing programs by—

(i) making Federal grants authorized under subsection (d); and

(ii)(I) acting as a clearinghouse on techniques employed by new programs and existing programs within the States, and disseminating information relating to those techniques to the programs; or

(II) funding projects for information gathering on those techniques, and dissemination of that information to the programs, by groups outside the Department of Labor; and

(B) facilitate the formation of new programs, in ways that include holding or funding an annual conference of representatives from States with existing programs, representatives from States developing new programs, and representatives from States without existing programs.

(c) PROGRAMS REGARDING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program to encourage new programs and existing programs within the States to foster employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking throughout the United States.

(2) PURPOSE OF PROGRAM.—The purpose of the program established under paragraph (1) is to encourage new and existing programs within the States that focus on—

(A) providing education and outreach to inform employees and employers about the possibilities and benefits of employee ownership, business ownership succession planning, and employee participation in business decisionmaking, including providing information about financial education, employee teams, open-book management, and other tools that enable employees to share ideas and information about how their businesses can succeed;

(B) providing technical assistance to assist employee efforts to become business owners, to enable employers and employees to explore and assess the feasibility of transferring full or partial ownership to employees, and to encourage employees and employers to start new employee-owned businesses;

(C) training employees and employers with respect to methods of employee participation in open-book management, work teams, committees, and other approaches for seeking greater employee input; and

(D) training other entities to apply for funding under this subsection, to establish new programs, and to carry out program activities.

(3) PROGRAM DETAILS.—The Secretary may include, in the program established under paragraph (1), provisions that—

(A) in the case of activities described in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) target key groups, such as retiring business owners, senior managers, unions, trade associations, community organizations, and economic development organizations;

(ii) encourage cooperation in the organization of workshops and conferences; and

(iii) prepare and distribute materials concerning employee ownership and participation, and business ownership succession planning;

(B) in the case of activities described in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) provide preliminary technical assistance to employee groups, managers, and retiring owners exploring the possibility of employee ownership;

(ii) provide for the performance of preliminary feasibility assessments;

(iii) assist in the funding of objective third-party feasibility studies and preliminary business valuations, and in selecting and monitoring professionals qualified to conduct such studies; and

(iv) provide a data bank to help employees find legal, financial, and technical advice in connection with business ownership;

(C) in the case of activities described in paragraph (2)(C)—

(i) provide for courses on employee participation; and

(ii) provide for the development and fostering of networks of employee-owned companies to spread the use of successful participation techniques; and

(D) in the case of training described in paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) provide for visits to existing programs by staff from new programs receiving funding under this section; and

(ii) provide materials to be used for such training.

(4) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue formal guidance, for recipients of grants awarded under subsection (d) and one-stop partners (as defined in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29

U.S.C. 3102)) affiliated with the workforce development systems (as so defined) of the States, proposing that programs and other activities funded under this section be—

(A) proactive in encouraging actions and activities that promote employee ownership of, and participation in, businesses; and

(B) comprehensive in emphasizing both employee ownership of, and participation in, businesses so as to increase productivity and broaden capital ownership.

(d) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (c), the Secretary may make grants for use in connection with new programs and existing programs within a State for any of the following activities:

(A) Education and outreach as provided in subsection (c)(2)(A).

(B) Technical assistance as provided in subsection (c)(2)(B).

(C) Training activities for employees and employers as provided in subsection (c)(2)(C).

(D) Activities facilitating cooperation among employee-owned firms.

(E) Training as provided in subsection (c)(2)(D) for new programs provided by participants in existing programs dedicated to the objectives of this section, except that, for each fiscal year, the amount of the grants made for such training shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of the grants made under this section.

(2) AMOUNTS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall determine the amount and any conditions for a grant made under this subsection. The amount of the grant shall be subject to paragraph (6), and shall reflect the capacity of the applicant for the grant.

(3) APPLICATIONS.—Each entity desiring a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(4) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Each State may sponsor and submit an application under paragraph (3) on behalf of any local entity consisting of a unit of State or local government, State-supported institution of higher education, or nonprofit organization, meeting the requirements of this section.

(5) APPLICATIONS BY ENTITIES.—

(A) ENTITY APPLICATIONS.—If a State fails to support or establish a program pursuant to this section during any fiscal year, the Secretary shall, in the subsequent fiscal years, allow local entities described in paragraph (4) from that State to make applications for grants under paragraph (3) on their own initiative.

(B) APPLICATION SCREENING.—Any State failing to support or establish a program pursuant to this section during any fiscal year may submit applications under paragraph (3) in the subsequent fiscal years but may not screen applications by local entities described in paragraph (4) before submitting the applications to the Secretary.

(6) LIMITATIONS.—A recipient of a grant made under this subsection shall not receive, during a fiscal year, in the aggregate, more than the following amounts:

(A) For fiscal year 2023, $300,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2024, $330,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2025, $363,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2026, $399,300.

(E) For fiscal year 2027, $439,200.

(7) ANNUAL REPORT.—For each year, each recipient of a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary a report describing how grant funds allocated pursuant to this subsection were expended during the 12-month period preceding the date of the submission of the report.

(e) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to reserve not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this section, for the purposes of conducting evaluations of the grant programs identified in subsection (d) and to provide related technical assistance.

(f) REPORTING.—Not later than the expiration of the 36-month period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report—

(1) on progress related to employee ownership and participation in businesses in the United States; and

(2) containing an analysis of critical costs and benefits of activities carried out under this section.

(g) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants pursuant to subsection (d) the following:

(A) For fiscal year 2023, $4,000,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2024, $7,000,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2025, $10,000,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2026, $13,000,000.

(E) For fiscal year 2027, $16,000,000.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of funding the administrative expenses related to the Initiative, for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027, an amount not in excess of the lesser of—

(A) $350,000; or

(B) 5.0 percent of the maximum amount available under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year.

SA 5013. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7108, to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 6 and insert the following:

SEC. 6. REAUTHORIZATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

Section 1265 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by striking ''6 years'' and inserting ''12 years''.

SA 5014. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. KELLY)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2102, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas Supporting Expanded Review for Veterans In Combat Environments Act'' or the ''Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas SERVICE Act''.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF BREAST CANCER MAMMOGRAPHY POLICY OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PROVIDE MAMMOGRAPHY SCREENING FOR VETERANS WHO SERVED IN LOCATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH TOXIC EXPOSURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7322 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''The'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL.—The'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''The'' and inserting ''STANDARDS FOR SCREENING.—The''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting ''a record of service in a location and during a period specified in subsection (d),'' after ''risk factors,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR SCREENING FOR VETERANS EXPOSED TO TOXIC SUBSTANCES.—The Under Secretary for Health shall ensure that, under the policy developed under subsection (a), any veteran who, during active military, naval, or air service, was deployed in support of a contingency operation in a location and during a period specified in subsection (d), is eligible for a mammography screening by a health care provider of the Department.

''(d) LOCATIONS AND PERIODS SPECIFIED.—(1) The locations and periods specified in this subsection are the following:

''(A) Iraq during following periods:

''(i) The period beginning on August 2, 1990, and ending on February 28, 1991.

''(ii) The period beginning on March 19, 2003, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Iraq.

''(B) The Southwest Asia theater of operations, other than Iraq, during the period beginning on August 2, 1990, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in such location, including the following locations:

''(i) Kuwait.

''(ii) Saudi Arabia.

''(iii) Oman.

''(iv) Qatar.

''(C) Afghanistan during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Afghanistan.

''(D) Djibouti during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Djibouti.

''(E) Syria during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Syria.

''(F) Jordan during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Jordan.

''(G) Egypt during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Egypt.

''(H) Lebanon during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Lebanon.

''(I) Yemen during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Yemen.

''(J) Such other locations and corresponding periods as set forth by the Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry established under section 201 of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note).

''(K) Such other locations and corresponding periods as the Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, may determine appropriate in a report submitted under paragraph (2).

''(2) Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of the Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas Supporting Expanded Review for Veterans In Combat Environments Act, and not less frequently than once every two years thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to Congress a report

specifying other locations and corresponding periods for purposes of paragraph (1)(K).

''(3) A location under this subsection shall not include any body of water around or any airspace above such location.

''(4) In this subsection, the term 'burn pit' means an area of land that—

''(A) is used for disposal of solid waste by burning in the outdoor air; and

''(B) does not contain a commercially manufactured incinerator or other equipment specifically designed and manufactured for the burning of solid waste.''.

(b) REPORT ON BREAST CANCER RATES FOR VETERANS DEPLOYED TO CERTAIN AREAS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that compares the rates of breast cancer among members of the Armed Forces deployed to the locations and during the periods specified in section 7322(d) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), as compared to members of the Armed Forces who were not deployed to those locations during those periods and to the civilian population.

SA 5015. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 253, to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Cannabidiol and Marihuana Research Expansion Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—REGISTRATIONS FOR MARIHUANA RESEARCH

Sec. 101. Marihuana research applications.
Sec. 102. Research protocols.
Sec. 103. Applications to manufacture marihuana for research.
Sec. 104. Adequate and uninterrupted supply.
Sec. 105. Security requirements.
Sec. 106. Prohibition against reinstating interdisciplinary review process for non-NIH-funded researchers.

TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT OF FDA-APPROVED DRUGS USING CANNABIDIOL AND MARIHUANA

Sec. 201. Medical research on cannabidiol.
Sec. 202. Registration for the commercial production and distribution of Food and Drug Administration-approved drugs.
Sec. 203. Importation of cannabidiol for research purposes.

TITLE III—DOCTOR-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP

Sec. 301. Doctor-patient relationship.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL RESEARCH

Sec. 401. Federal research.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''appropriately registered'' means that an individual or entity is registered under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) to engage in the type of activity that is carried out by the individual or entity with respect to a controlled substance on the schedule that is applicable to cannabidiol or marihuana, as applicable;

(2) the term ''cannabidiol'' means—

(A) the substance, cannabidiol, as derived from marihuana that has a delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol level that is greater than 0.3 percent; and

(B) the synthetic equivalent of the substance described in subparagraph (A);

(3) the terms ''controlled substance'', ''dispense'', ''distribute'', ''manufacture'', ''marihuana'', and ''practitioner'' have the meanings given such terms in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802), as amended by this Act;

(4) the term ''covered institution of higher education'' means an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) that—

(A)(i) has highest or higher research activity, as defined by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education; or

(ii) is an accredited medical school or an accredited school of osteopathic medicine; and

(B) is appropriately registered under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

(5) the term ''drug'' has the meaning given the term in section 201(g)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(g)(1));

(6) the term ''medical research for drug development'' means medical research that is—

(A) a preclinical study or clinical investigation conducted in accordance with section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)) or otherwise permitted by the Department of Health and Human Services to determine the potential medical benefits of marihuana or cannabidiol as a drug; and

(B) conducted by a covered institution of higher education, practitioner, or manufacturer that is appropriately registered under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.); and

(7) the term ''State'' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any territory of the United States.

TITLE I—REGISTRATIONS FOR MARIHUANA RESEARCH

SEC. 101. MARIHUANA RESEARCH APPLICATIONS.

Section 303(f) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(f)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively;

(2) by striking ''(f) The Attorney General'' and inserting ''(f)(1) The Attorney General'';

(3) by striking ''Registration applications'' and inserting the following:

''(2)(A) Registration applications'';

(4) by striking ''Article 7'' and inserting the following:

''(3) Article 7''; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (2)(A), as so designated, the following:

''(B)(i) The Attorney General shall register a practitioner to conduct research with marihuana if—

''(I) the applicant's research protocol—

''(aa) has been reviewed and allowed—

''(AA) by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i));

''(BB) by the National Institutes of Health or another Federal agency that funds scientific research; or

''(CC) pursuant to sections 1301.18 and 1301.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successors thereto; and

''(II) the applicant has demonstrated to the Attorney General that there are effective procedures in place to adequately safeguard against diversion of the controlled substance for legitimate medical or scientific use pursuant to section 105 of the Cannabidiol and Marihuana Research Expansion Act, including demonstrating that the security measures are adequate for storing the quantity of marihuana the applicant would be authorized to possess.

''(ii) The Attorney General may deny an application for registration under this subparagraph only if the Attorney General determines that the issuance of the registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. In determining the public interest, the Attorney General shall consider the factors listed in—

''(I) subparagraphs (B) through (E) of paragraph (1); and

''(II) subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), if the applicable State requires practitioners conducting research to register with a board or authority described in such subparagraph (A).

''(iii)(I) Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Attorney General receives a complete application for registration under this subparagraph, the Attorney General shall—

''(aa) approve the application; or

''(bb) request supplemental information.

''(II) For purposes of subclause (I), an application shall be deemed complete when the applicant has submitted documentation showing that the requirements under clause (i) are satisfied.

''(iv) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Attorney General receives supplemental information as described in clause (iii)(I)(bb) in connection with an application described in this subparagraph, the Attorney General shall approve or deny the application.

''(v) If an application described in this subparagraph is denied, the Attorney General shall provide a written explanation of the basis of denial to the applicant.''.

SEC. 102. RESEARCH PROTOCOLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2)(B) of section 303(f) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(f)), as amended by section 101 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(vi)(I) If the Attorney General grants an application for registration under clause (i), the registrant may amend or supplement the research protocol without reapplying if the registrant does not change—

''(aa) the quantity or type of drug;

''(bb) the source of the drug; or

''(cc) the conditions under which the drug is stored, tracked, or administered.

''(II)(aa) If a registrant under clause (i) seeks to change the type of drug, the source of the drug, or conditions under which the drug is stored, tracked, or administered, the registrant shall notify the Attorney General via registered mail, or an electronic means permitted by the Attorney General, not later than 30 days before implementing an amended or supplemental research protocol.

''(bb) A registrant may proceed with an amended or supplemental research protocol described in item (aa) if the Attorney General does not explicitly object during the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General receives the notice under item (aa).

''(cc) The Attorney General may only object to an amended or supplemental research protocol under this subclause if additional security measures are needed to safeguard against diversion or abuse.

''(dd) If a registrant under clause (i) seeks to address additional security measures identified by the Attorney General under item (cc), the registrant shall notify the Attorney General via registered mail, or an electronic means permitted by the Attorney General, not later than 30 days before implementing

an amended or supplemental research protocol.

''(ee) A registrant may proceed with an amended or supplemental research protocol described in item (dd) if the Attorney General does not explicitly object during the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General receives the notice under item (dd).

''(III)(aa) If a registrant under clause (i) seeks to change the quantity of marihuana needed for research and the change in quantity does not impact the factors described in item (bb) or (cc) of subclause (I) of this clause, the registrant shall notify the Attorney General via registered mail or using an electronic means permitted by the Attorney General.

''(bb) A notification under item (aa) shall include—

''(AA) the Drug Enforcement Administration registration number of the registrant;

''(BB) the quantity of marihuana already obtained;

''(CC) the quantity of additional marihuana needed to complete the research; and

''(DD) an attestation that the change in quantity does not impact the source of the drug or the conditions under which the drug is stored, tracked, or administered.

''(cc) The Attorney General shall ensure that—

''(AA) any registered mail return receipt with respect to a notification under item (aa) is submitted for delivery to the registrant providing the notification not later than 3 days after receipt of the notification by the Attorney General; and

''(BB) notice of receipt of a notification using an electronic means permitted under item (aa) is provided to the registrant providing the notification not later than 3 days after receipt of the notification by the Attorney General.

''(dd)(AA) On and after the date described in subitem (BB), a registrant that submits a notification in accordance with item (aa) may proceed with the research as if the change in quantity has been approved on such date, unless the Attorney General notifies the registrant of an objection described in item (ee).

''(BB) The date described in this subitem is the date on which a registrant submitting a notification under item (aa) receives the registered mail return receipt with respect to the notification or the date on which the registrant receives notice that the notification using an electronic means permitted under item (aa) was received by the Attorney General, as the case may be.

''(ee) A notification submitted under item (aa) shall be deemed to be approved unless the Attorney General, not later than 10 days after receiving the notification, explicitly objects based on a finding that the change in quantity—

''(AA) does impact the source of the drug or the conditions under which the drug is stored, tracked, or administered; or

''(BB) necessitates that the registrant implement additional security measures to safeguard against diversion or abuse.

''(IV) Nothing in this clause shall limit the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services over requirements related to research protocols, including changes in—

''(aa) the method of administration of marihuana;

''(bb) the dosing of marihuana; and

''(cc) the number of individuals or patients involved in research.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations to carry out the amendment made by this section.

SEC. 103. APPLICATIONS TO MANUFACTURE MARIHUANA FOR RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (k) as subsections (d) through (l), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c)(1)(A) As it relates to applications to manufacture marihuana for research purposes, if the Attorney General places a notice in the Federal Register to increase the number of entities registered under this Act to manufacture marihuana to supply appropriately registered researchers in the United States, the Attorney General shall, not later than 60 days after the date on which the Attorney General receives a completed application—

''(i) approve the application; or

''(ii) request supplemental information.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), an application shall be deemed complete when the applicant has submitted documentation showing each of the following:

''(i) The requirements designated in the notice in the Federal Register are satisfied.

''(ii) The requirements under this Act are satisfied.

''(iii) The applicant will limit the transfer and sale of any marihuana manufactured under this subsection—

''(I) to researchers who are registered under this Act to conduct research with controlled substances in schedule I; and

''(II) for purposes of use in preclinical research or in a clinical investigation pursuant to an investigational new drug exemption under 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)).

''(iv) The applicant will transfer or sell any marihuana manufactured under this subsection only with prior, written consent for the transfer or sale by the Attorney General.

''(v) The applicant has completed the application and review process under subsection (a) for the bulk manufacture of controlled substances in schedule I.

''(vi) The applicant has established and begun operation of a process for storage and handling of controlled substances in schedule I, including for inventory control and monitoring security in accordance with section 105 of the Cannabidiol and Marihuana Research Expansion Act.

''(vii) The applicant is licensed by each State in which the applicant will conduct operations under this subsection, to manufacture marihuana, if that State requires such a license.

''(C) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Attorney General receives supplemental information requested under subparagraph (A)(ii) with respect to an application, the Attorney General shall approve or deny the application.

''(2) If an application described in this subsection is denied, the Attorney General shall provide a written explanation of the basis of denial to the applicant.'';

(3) in subsection (h)(2), as so redesignated, by striking ''subsection (f)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (g)'';

(4) in subsection (j)(1), as so redesignated, by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)''; and

(5) in subsection (k), as so redesignated, by striking ''subsection (f)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (g)''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 102 (21 U.S.C. 802)—

(i) in paragraph (52)(B)—

(I) by striking ''303(f)'' each place it appears and inserting ''303(g)''; and

(II) in clause (i), by striking ''(d), or (e)'' and inserting ''(e), or (f)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (54), by striking ''303(f)'' each place it appears and inserting ''303(g)'';

(B) in section 302(g)(5)(A)(iii)(I)(bb) (21 U.S.C. 822(g)(5)(A)(iii)(I)(bb)), by striking ''303(f)'' and inserting ''303(g)'';

(C) in section 304 (21 U.S.C. 824), by striking ''303(g)(1)'' each place it appears and inserting ''303(h)(1)'';

(D) in section 307(d)(2) (21 U.S.C. 827(d)(2)), by striking ''303(f)'' and inserting ''303(g)'';

(E) in section 309A(a)(2) (21 U.S.C. 829a(a)(2)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''303(g)(2)'' and inserting ''303(h)(2)'';

(F) in section 311(h) (21 U.S.C. 831(h)), by striking ''303(f)'' each place it appears and inserting ''303(g)'';

(G) in section 401(h)(2) (21 U.S.C. 841(h)(2)), by striking ''303(f)'' each place it appears and inserting ''303(g)'';

(H) in section 403(c)(2)(B) (21 U.S.C. 843(c)(2)(B)), by striking ''303(f)'' and inserting ''303(g)''; and

(I) in section 512(c)(1) (21 U.S.C. 882(c)(1)) by striking ''303(f)'' and inserting ''303(g)''.

(2) Section 1008(c) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 958(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''303(d)'' and inserting ''303(e)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''303(h)'' and inserting ''303(i)''.

(3) Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 520E–4(c) (42 U.S.C. 290bb–36d(c)), by striking ''303(g)(2)(B)'' and inserting ''303(h)(2)(B)''; and

(B) in section 544(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 290dd–3(a)(3)), by striking ''303(g)'' and inserting ''303(h)''.

(4) Title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 1833(bb)(3)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1395l(bb)(3)(B)), by striking ''303(g)'' and inserting ''303(h)'';

(B) in section 1834(o)(3)(C)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(o)(3)(C)(ii)), by striking ''303(g)'' and inserting ''303(h)''; and

(C) in section 1866F(c)(3)(C) (42 U.S.C. 1395cc–6(c)(3)(C)), by striking ''303(g)'' and inserting ''303(h)''.

(5) Section 1903(aa)(2)(C)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(aa)(2)(C)(ii)) is amended by striking ''303(g)'' each place it appears and inserting ''303(h)''.

SEC. 104. ADEQUATE AND UNINTERRUPTED SUPPLY.

On an annual basis, the Attorney General shall assess whether there is an adequate and uninterrupted supply of marihuana, including of specific strains, for research purposes.

SEC. 105. SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An individual or entity engaged in researching marihuana or its components shall store it in a securely locked, substantially constructed cabinet.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR OTHER MEASURES.—Any other security measures required by the Attorney General to safeguard against diversion shall be consistent with those required for practitioners conducting research on other controlled substances in schedules I and II in section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)) that have a similar risk of diversion and abuse.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITION AGAINST REINSTATING INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW PROCESS FOR NON-NIH-FUNDED RESEARCHERS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not—

(1) reinstate the Public Health Service interdisciplinary review process described in the guidance entitled ''Guidance on Procedures for the Provision of Marijuana for

Medical Research'' (issued on May 21, 1999); or

(2) require another review of scientific protocols that is applicable only to research on marihuana or its components.

TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT OF FDA-APPROVED DRUGS USING CANNABIDIOL AND MARIHUANA

SEC. 201. MEDICAL RESEARCH ON CANNABIDIOL.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), chapter 81 of title 41, United States Code, or any other Federal law, an appropriately registered covered institution of higher education, a practitioner, or a manufacturer may manufacture, distribute, dispense, or possess marihuana or cannabidiol if the marihuana or cannabidiol is manufactured, distributed, dispensed, or possessed, respectively, for purposes of medical research for drug development or subsequent commercial production in accordance with section 202.

SEC. 202. REGISTRATION FOR THE COMMERCIAL PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-APPROVED DRUGS.

The Attorney General shall register an applicant to manufacture or distribute cannabidiol or marihuana for the purpose of commercial production of a drug containing or derived from marihuana that is approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355), in accordance with the applicable requirements under subsection (a) or (b) of section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823).

SEC. 203. IMPORTATION OF CANNABIDIOL FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES.

The Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1002(a) (21 U.S.C. 952(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting ''and'' after ''uses,''; and

(C) inserting before the undesignated matter following paragraph (2)(C) the following:

''(3) such amounts of marihuana or cannabidiol (as defined in section 2 of the Cannabidiol and Marihuana Research Expansion Act) as are—

''(A) approved for medical research for drug development (as such terms are defined in section 2 of the Cannabidiol and Marihuana Research Expansion Act), or

''(B) necessary for registered manufacturers to manufacture drugs containing marihuana or cannabidiol that have been approved for use by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.),''; and

(2) in section 1007 (21 U.S.C. 957), by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no person may—

''(A) import into the customs territory of the United States from any place outside thereof (but within the United States), or import into the United States from any place outside thereof, any controlled substance or list I chemical, or

''(B) export from the United States any controlled substance or list I chemical,

unless there is in effect with respect to such person a registration issued by the Attorney General under section 1008, or unless such person is exempt from registration under subsection (b).

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the import or export of marihuana or cannabidiol (as defined in section 2 of the Cannabidiol and Marihuana Research Expansion Act) that has been approved for—

''(A) medical research for drug development authorized under section 201 of the Cannabidiol and Marihuana Research Expansion Act; or

''(B) use by registered manufacturers to manufacture drugs containing marihuana or cannabidiol that have been approved for use by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).''.

TITLE III—DOCTOR-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP

SEC. 301. DOCTOR-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP.

It shall not be a violation of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) for a State-licensed physician to discuss—

(1) the currently known potential harms and benefits of marihuana derivatives, including cannabidiol, as a treatment with the legal guardian of the patient of the physician if the patient is a child; or

(2) the currently known potential harms and benefits of marihuana and marihuana derivatives, including cannabidiol, as a treatment with the patient or the legal guardian of the patient of the physician if the patient is a legal adult.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL RESEARCH

SEC. 401. FEDERAL RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the Director of the National Institutes of Health and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit to the Caucus on International Narcotics Control, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the potential therapeutic effects of cannabidiol or marihuana on serious medical conditions, including intractable epilepsy;

(2) the potential effects of marihuana, including—

(A) the effect of increasing delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol levels on the human body and developing adolescent brains; and

(B) the effect of various delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol levels on cognitive abilities, such as those that are required to operate motor vehicles or other heavy equipment; and

(3) the barriers associated with researching marihuana or cannabidiol in States that have legalized the use of such substances, which shall include—

(A) recommendations as to how such barriers might be overcome, including whether public-private partnerships or Federal-State research partnerships may or should be implemented to provide researchers with access to additional strains of marihuana and cannabidiol; and

(B) recommendations as to what safeguards must be in place to verify—

(i) the levels of tetrahydrocannabinol, cannabidiol, or other cannabinoids contained in products obtained from such States is accurate; and

(ii) that such products do not contain harmful or toxic components.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, either directly or through awarding grants, contacts, or cooperative agreements, shall expand and coordinate the activities of the National Institutes of Health and other relevant Federal agencies to better determine the effects of cannabidiol and marihuana, as outlined in the report submitted under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have four requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITIEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 24, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITIEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 24, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITIEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 24, 2022, at 11 a.m., to conduct a classified briefing.

COMMITIEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 24, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUPPORTING EXPANDED REVIEW FOR VETERANS IN COMBAT ENVIRONMENTS ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2102 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2102) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Boozman substitute amendment be considered and agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 5014) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas Supporting Expanded Review for Veterans In Combat Environments

Act'' or the ''Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas SERVICE Act''.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF BREAST CANCER MAMMOGRAPHY POLICY OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PROVIDE MAMMOGRAPHY SCREENING FOR VETERANS WHO SERVED IN LOCATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH TOXIC EXPOSURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7322 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''The'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL.—The'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''The'' and inserting ''STANDARDS FOR SCREENING.—The''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting ''a record of service in a location and during a period specified in subsection (d),'' after ''risk factors,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR SCREENING FOR VETERANS EXPOSED TO TOXIC SUBSTANCES.—The Under Secretary for Health shall ensure that, under the policy developed under subsection (a), any veteran who, during active military, naval, or air service, was deployed in support of a contingency operation in a location and during a period specified in subsection (d), is eligible for a mammography screening by a health care provider of the Department.

''(d) LOCATIONS AND PERIODS SPECIFIED.—(1) The locations and periods specified in this subsection are the following:

''(A) Iraq during following periods:

''(i) The period beginning on August 2, 1990, and ending on February 28, 1991.

''(ii) The period beginning on March 19, 2003, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Iraq.

''(B) The Southwest Asia theater of operations, other than Iraq, during the period beginning on August 2, 1990, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in such location, including the following locations:

''(i) Kuwait.

''(ii) Saudi Arabia.

''(iii) Oman.

''(iv) Qatar.

''(C) Afghanistan during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Afghanistan.

''(D) Djibouti during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Djibouti.

''(E) Syria during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Syria.

''(F) Jordan during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Jordan.

''(G) Egypt during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Egypt.

''(H) Lebanon during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Lebanon.

''(I) Yemen during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on such date as the Secretary determines burn pits are no longer used in Yemen.

''(J) Such other locations and corresponding periods as set forth by the Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry established under section 201 of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note).

''(K) Such other locations and corresponding periods as the Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, may determine appropriate in a report submitted under paragraph (2).

''(2) Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of the Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas Supporting Expanded Review for Veterans In Combat Environments Act, and not less frequently than once every two years thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to Congress a report specifying other locations and corresponding periods for purposes of paragraph (1)(K).

''(3) A location under this subsection shall not include any body of water around or any airspace above such location.

''(4) In this subsection, the term 'burn pit' means an area of land that—

''(A) is used for disposal of solid waste by burning in the outdoor air; and

''(B) does not contain a commercially manufactured incinerator or other equipment specifically designed and manufactured for the burning of solid waste.''.

(b) REPORT ON BREAST CANCER RATES FOR VETERANS DEPLOYED TO CERTAIN AREAS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that compares the rates of breast cancer among members of the Armed Forces deployed to the locations and during the periods specified in section 7322(d) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), as compared to members of the Armed Forces who were not deployed to those locations during those periods and to the civilian population.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2102), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I further ask that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

CANNABIDIOL AND MARIHUANA RESEARCH EXPANSION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 253 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 253) to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Feinstein amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5015) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The bill (S. 253), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 4373

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4373) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee has completed its hearing for Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson. I enjoyed meeting the nominee. I went into the Senate's process with an open mind.

But after studying the nominee's record and watching her performance this week, I cannot and will not support Judge Jackson for a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court.

First, Judge Jackson refuses to reject the fringe position that Democrats should try to pack the Supreme Court. Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer had no problem denouncing this unpopular view and defending their institution. I assumed this would be an easy softball for Judge Jackson, but it wasn't. The nominee suggested there are two legitimate sides to the issue. She testified she has a view on the matter but would not share it. She inaccurately compared her nonanswer to a different, narrower question that a prior nominee was asked. But Judge Jackson, seemingly, actually tipped her hand. She said she would be ''thrilled to be one of however many.''

''However many.''

The opposite of Ginsburg and Breyer's sentiment. The most radical pro-court-packing fringe groups badly wanted this nominee for this vacancy. Judge Jackson was the court-packer's pick, and she testified like it.

Second, for decades, activist judges have hurt the country by trying to make policy from the bench. This has made judicial philosophy a key qualification that Senators must consider.

President Biden stated he would only appoint a Supreme Court Justice with a specific approach that is neither textualist nor originalist. That is the President's litmus test: No strict constructionists need apply. And that President picked Judge Jackson.

If the nominee had a paper trail on constitutional issues, perhaps it could reassure us, but she doesn't. When Justice Gorsuch was nominated to the Supreme Court, he had written more than 200 circuit court opinions that Senators could actually study. Justice Kavanaugh had written more than 300. Justice Barrett outpaced them both. She wrote almost 100 appellate opinions in just 3 years, plus years of scholarship as a star professor that Senators could actually examine.

Judge Jackson has been on the DC Circuit for less than a year. She has published only two opinions. Beforehand, Judge Jackson served as a trial judge on the district court. She testified on Tuesday that that role did not provide many opportunities to think about constitutional interpretation.

Yet when Senators tried to dig in on judicial philosophy, the judge deflected and pointed back to the same record she acknowledged would not shed much light. One Senator simply asked the judge to summarize—summarize—well-known differences between the approaches of some current Justices. The nominee replied that 2 weeks' notice had not been enough time to prepare an answer.

President Biden said he would only nominate a judicial activist. Unfortunately, we saw no reason to suspect that he accidentally did the opposite.

Third, and relatedly, we are in the midst of a national violent crime wave and exploding illegal immigration. Unbelievably, the Biden administration has nevertheless launched a national campaign to make the Federal bench systemically softer on crime. The New York Times calls this a ''sea change.''

Is it more likely the administration chose a Supreme Court nominee who would push against their big campaign or somebody who would be its crowning jewel?

This is one area where Judge Jackson's trial court records provide a wealth of information, and it is troubling, indeed.

The judge regularly gave certain terrible kinds of criminals light sentences that were beneath the sentencing guidelines and beneath the prosecutor's request.

The judge herself, this week, used the phrase ''policy disagreement'' to describe this subject. The issue isn't just the sentences. It is also the judge's rhetoric and trial transcript and the creative ways she actually bent the law.

In one instance, Judge Jackson used COVID as a pretext to essentially rewrite—rewrite—a criminal justice reform law from the bench and make it retroactive, which Congress, of course, had declined to do. She did so to cut the sentence of a fentanyl trafficker while Americans died in huge numbers from overdoses.

Judge Jackson declined to walk Senators through the merits of her reasoning in specific cases. She just kept repeating that it was her discretion and if Congress didn't like it, it was our fault for giving her the discretion. That is hardly an explanation as to why she uses her discretion the way she does.

It was not reassuring to hear Judge Jackson essentially say that if Senators want her to be tough on crime, we need to change the law, take away her discretion, and force her to do it.

That response seems to confirm that deeply held personal policy views seep into her jurisprudence, and that is exactly what the record suggests.

I will conclude with this. Late on Tuesday, after hours of questioning, I believe we may have witnessed a telling moment. Under questioning about judicial activism, Judge Jackson bluntly said this:

> Well, any time the Supreme Court has five votes, then they have a majority for whatever opinion they determine.

That isn't just a factual observation. It is a clear echo of a famous quotation from perhaps the most famous judicial activist of all time, the archliberal William Brennan.

The late Justice Brennan told people the most important rule in constitutional law was ''the Rule of Five.'' With five votes, a majority can do whatever it wants.

That is a perfect summary of judicial activism. It is a recipe for courts to wander into policymaking and prevent healthy democratic compromise.

This is the misunderstanding of the separation of powers that I have spent my entire career fighting against. But President Biden made that misunderstanding his litmus test.

And nothing we saw this week convinced me that either President Biden or Judge Jackson's deeply invested, far-left fan club have misjudged her.

I will vote against this nominee on the Senate floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was disappointed but not surprised that Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and announced that he would not support the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson, by President Biden, to fill the vacancy of Stephen Breyer on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Just this morning, or early afternoon, we wrapped up the 4-day process in the Senate Judiciary Committee to consider her nomination, and that is why some of the statements which the Senator made in justifying his opposition, I believe, need to be addressed. I will be brief in doing so, but I wanted to make a record of it quickly.

It seems that he is concerned, as many Republicans are, with the notion of packing of the Court. The notion behind that is that the Democrats are inspired to appoint some number of new Justices to that Court—maybe four—and, thereby, tip the balance back toward the Democratic side.

The question, obviously, before us is, Where does that idea come from?

I will be honest with you, even as chairman of the committee, I don't know. I suppose there are some academics and theorists and researchers who believe that is well worthy of conversation, but let's be honest about this issue which seems to consume the Republicans in the Senate.

There is only one U.S. Senator who has had a direct impact on the composition of the U.S. Supreme Court in modern memory. Who was that Senator? It was Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, of Kentucky, because he decided to keep the Court at eight Justices for almost a year after the death of Antonin Scalia. He refused to give President Obama his constitutional and legal option of filling the vacancy from the Scalia departure on the Court, and for a year, MITCH MCCONNELL, for his own political purposes, kept the Court's composition at eight. So, when it comes to moving the numbers of Justices, he has retired the trophy in modern times because he was the one who did it.

When he starts speculating about the possibility of, ''Well, maybe they will add one, two, three, or four more Justices if the Democrats get an opportunity,'' I happen to know—and the Presiding Officer does as well—that nothing is going to happen in changing the composition of the Court unless it passes the U.S. Senate, which, under current rules, requires 60 votes. There are currently 50 Democrats and 50 Republicans. So the likelihood of ''packing the Court'' is very unlikely in the near future unless some decision is made by the electorate that dramatically changes that.

In the meantime, we are in a situation wherein we have a vacancy on the Court which we are trying to fill with a very competent person, and this notion of packing the Court being the No. 1 issue in deciding is beyond me. There

is no sinister conspiracy that I am even aware of that suggests that this is an agenda item for the Democrats. Of course, we would like to see the Court be more sympathetic to our point of view, but there is no grand plan for this to happen.

Incidentally, the Constitution of the United States—I usually keep a copy in my desk here—does not mandate the number of Supreme Court Justices. We have had various numbers over the years, and we arrived at the number of nine in 1869. I believe that was the year. So it has been a tradition on the Court since that time.

The answer by Ketanji Brown Jackson—a Federal judge, a DC Circuit judge—was the obvious answer when asked about whether she wanted to pack the Court. She said: Senator, that is not my job. I would be a judge. You are a legislator, and you would have the power, if you wished, to change the composition of the Court. I, as a judge, don't have that authority.

So to make that the No. 1 reason you can't support her nomination is less than compelling.

The second thing he raised was one we heard over and over again. Judge Jackson, what is your philosophy? Tell us your philosophy when it comes to the Court. What is your judicial philosophy? We want to make sure we know.

Well, there are different schools of thought when it comes to the Constitution. Antonin Scalia was a so-called originalist, and Supreme Court Justice Kavanaugh is a textualist, I believe, and there may be many other schools of thought.

The bottom line is, she has said: I have published 578 written opinions. If you want to know what I think about the law, here is my body of work—take a look at it—on almost every topic under the Sun.

So, if you want to know how she rules and what she thinks, she can represent whatever she wishes, but her words already speak for themselves. She has been very open and has provided 12,000 pages from her time on the Sentencing Commission that also reflect her views on very important topics.

There is also the old saw. We knew it was coming. The Republicans are testing their messages for the November election, and I will bet you have heard some of them.

One of them is that Democrats are soft on crime. They said that about Judge Jackson, but they have got a problem. Judge Jackson has been endorsed by the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and NOBLE, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, in addition to other law enforcement leaders.

She has a history in her family of brothers and other members, uncles, who have been in law enforcement, risking their lives for the safety of their communities over and over. One of her uncles is the chief of police of Miami, FL.

This woman is no stranger to law enforcement. It is part of her family; it is part of what she grew up in. To argue that she is ''soft on crime'' ignores the obvious. She has got it in her blood. She is going to be fair, I am sure, when she is on the Supreme Court, but she has no prejudice against police groups. It is part of her family history.

There is also the question about giving light sentences. We spent more time on this than one can imagine.

Three or four Republican Senators were dwelling on her sentencing in a handful of cases and wouldn't let go of it, day after day for 2 straight days. They refused to acknowledge—and the reality is—that her choice of sentencing guidelines was within the same limits and boundaries of 70 percent of current Federal judges; in some regions, 80 percent. She was not out of the mainstream; she was directly in the mainstream when it came to sentencing. You would think the opposite was true.

When you look at these facts and realize that here is our opportunity to put the first African-American woman on the U.S. Supreme Court and that these are the best arguments they could come up with against her, it really troubles me.

I sincerely hope—I really hope and not just because I want to make sure she is on the Court—that we will have bipartisan support for her nomination. If this turns out to be a strictly partisan vote with this historic opportunity, it will be sad, sad for our country and sad as a commentary on where the parties are today.

I am hoping—I am still hoping—that several Republicans and, I hope, many more will step forward and support her nomination. I am disappointed in Senator MCCONNELL's decision, but I am not surprised.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—H.R. 6968 and H.R. 7108

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6968) to prohibit the importation of energy products of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 7108) to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes.

Mr. DURBIN. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of PN1696, Chris Saunders, of Vermont, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission, and that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: PN1696 and Calendar Nos. 793, 731, 462, 760, 788, 812, 813 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard and Foreign Service; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate resume legislative session.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations en bloc of Chris Saunders, of Vermont, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission; Stacey Michelle Brandenburg, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2025; Terrence Keith Wright, of Delaware, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring May 29, 2025; Julieta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Population, Refugees, and Migration); Jodi Beth Herman, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development; Erin Elizabeth McKee, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development; Douglas T. Hickey, of Idaho, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland; Alina L. Romanowski, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq; and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard and Foreign Service, as follows: PN1827 COAST GUARD nomination of Min H. Kim, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 2022; PN1828 COAST GUARD nomination of Michael A. Cintron, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 2022; PN1810

FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (306) beginning Bryan Patrick Abraham, and ending Matthew Zuccaro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 2022; and PN1811 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (78) beginning Ranissa V. Adityavarman, and ending Todd R. Stone, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 2022?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senate will now resume legislative session.

NATIONAL POISON PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 557, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 557) recognizing the week of March 20 through March 26, 2022 as ''National Poison Prevention Week'' and encouraging communities across the United States to raise awareness of the dangers of poisoning and promote poison prevention.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the preamble be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 557) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 28, 2022

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; and that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, the America COMPETES Act.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 28, 2022, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:19 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 28, 2022, at 3 p.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination by unanimous consent and the nomination was confirmed:

CHRIS SAUNDERS, OF VERMONT, TO BE FEDERAL CO-CHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 24, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JULIETA VALLS NOYES, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (POPULATION, REFUGEES, AND MIGRATION).

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ANDREW M. LUGER, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP FOUNDATION

TERRENCE KEITH WRIGHT, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 29, 2025.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JODI BETH HERMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

ERIN ELIZABETH MCKEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT .

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

STACEY MICHELLE BRANDENBURG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2025.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DOUGLAS T. HICKEY, OF IDAHO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND.

ALINA L. ROMANOWSKI, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF MIN H. KIM, TO BE COMMANDER.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF MICHAEL A. CINTRON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRYAN PATRICK ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW ZUCCARO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2022.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RANISSA V. ADITYAVARMAN AND ENDING WITH TODD R. STONE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2022.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

CHRIS SAUNDERS, OF VERMONT, TO BE FEDERAL CO-CHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION.